



**Fourth item on the agenda:
ILO Centenary outcome document**

**Report of the Committee of the Whole:
Summary of proceedings ¹**

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Opening statements	2
Consideration of the draft Declaration contained in Report IV	15
Consideration of the draft Declaration and draft resolution	141
Closing remarks	158

¹ The Declaration and resolution submitted by the Committee for adoption by the Conference are published in *Provisional Record* No. 6A.

-
1. At its first sitting, on 10 June 2019, the International Labour Conference (Conference) constituted the Committee of the Whole to address the fourth item on the agenda: ILO Centenary outcome document. The Committee of the Whole held its first sitting on 11 June 2019. The Committee was originally composed of 222 members (107 Government members, 36 Employer members, 79 Worker members). To achieve equality of voting strength, each Government member entitled to vote was allotted 2,844 votes, each Employer member 8,453 votes and each Worker member 3,852 votes. The composition of the Committee was modified five times during the session and the number of votes allocated to each member was adjusted accordingly.²
 2. The Committee elected its Officers as follows:

<i>Chairperson:</i>	Mr S. Baddoura (Government member, Lebanon) at its first sitting
<i>Vice-Chairpersons:</i>	Ms R. Hornung-Draus (Employer member, Germany) and Ms C. Passchier (Worker member, Netherlands) at its first sitting
<i>Reporter:</i>	Mr S. Ndebele (Government member, South Africa) at its 16th sitting
 3. At its fourth sitting, the Committee appointed a Drafting Group composed of 16 Government members, eight Employer members and eight Worker members.
 4. The Committee held 17 sittings.
 5. The Committee had before it Report IV entitled *ILO Centenary outcome document*, prepared by the International Labour Office for the fourth item on the agenda of the Conference.

² The modifications were as follows:

- (a) 12 June: 203 members (112 Government members with 83 votes each, 8 Employer members with 1,162 votes each and 83 Worker members with 112 votes each);
- (b) 13 June: 209 members (116 Government members with 170 votes each, 8 Employer members with 2,465 votes each and 85 Worker members with 232 votes each);
- (c) 14 June: 147 members (118 Government members with 84 votes each, 8 Employer members with 1,239 votes each and 21 Worker members with 472 votes each);
- (d) 17 June: 149 members (120 Government members with 7 votes each, 8 Employer members with 105 votes each and 21 Worker members with 40 votes each);
- (e) 20 June: 151 members (123 Government members with 40 votes each, 8 Employer members with 615 votes each and 20 Worker members with 246 votes each);

Opening statements ³

6. The Chairperson thanked the Committee for the trust which it had placed in him and noted the unique and historic opportunity that lay before the Committee to provide strategic direction and guidance to the ILO and its constituents in jointly shaping a future of work that worked for all. He acknowledged the draft resolution submitted by the Employers' group and Workers' group on the draft ILO Centenary Declaration (draft Declaration) presented in Report IV, noting that the additional document would be open to the Committee for discussion and amendment.
7. The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean Countries (GRULAC), urged the Committee to focus its work on the draft Declaration and not on a proposed draft resolution. Any discussion on implementation and follow-up should be dealt with under Part V of the draft Declaration, which provided a wise and adequate way forward. Consideration of an additional document should take place only if time allowed, though GRULAC did not see the need for such a document.
8. The Government member of Romania, speaking on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its Member States, indicated support for the view expressed on behalf of GRULAC, as did the Government member of the United States.
9. The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the adoption of a Declaration accompanied by a resolution and noted that the additional document should be discussed at the same time as Part V of the draft Declaration.
10. The Government member of Australia, speaking on behalf of the Asia and Pacific group (ASPAG), indicated that the preference of the group was to focus solely on the draft Declaration, although the group was open to the development of a high-level resolution for the implementation of the draft Declaration. That could be finalized either through discussions at the Governing Body in October–November 2019 or at the Conference in 2020.
11. The Government member of Zimbabwe suggested that any follow-up to the draft Declaration should be covered either in Part V or in a resolution, and that the preference of the Employers' group and the Workers' group for a resolution would be acceptable.
12. The Government member of Canada supported the option of strengthening Part V of the draft Declaration instead of a resolution, and echoed the statements made by ASPAG, GRULAC, the EU and its Member States, and the Government member of the United States.
13. The Government member of China emphasized that the focus of the discussion should be on the contents of the draft Declaration.
14. The Chairperson confirmed that the draft resolution was tabled before the Committee and would be open for discussion and amendment in due course.
15. The representative of the Secretary-General, Mr G. Vines, Deputy Director-General for Management and Reform of the International Labour Office, presented the background for the development of the draft outcome document and the contents of the draft Declaration. The journey had begun with the Report of the Director-General to the Conference in 2013,

³ Unless otherwise specified, all statements made by Government members on behalf of regional groups or intergovernmental organizations are reported as having been made on behalf of all Governments members of the group or organization in question who are Members of the ILO and are attending the Conference.

in which he had proposed a reflection on the future of work as the centrepiece of the ILO's Centenary. Since then, over 110 member States had taken part in tripartite dialogues on the future of work, and the Global Commission on the Future of Work had published its report, *Work for a brighter future*, with ten recommendations for a human-centred approach. The Governing Body had met five times since March 2017 to discuss the agenda of the present Conference. It had been agreed that the agenda should focus on the future of work and that a Committee of the Whole should be established to produce an ambitious outcome document, comparable to the texts adopted at other key moments in the ILO's history.

- 16.** A consensus had emerged for a Centenary Declaration that would build on the Constitution of the International Labour Organisation, the Declaration of Philadelphia (1944) and other existing declarations, but that would go beyond a mere reaffirmation of those instruments. Such a Declaration should reinforce and reaffirm the core principles, strategic objectives and normative role of the ILO, as well as the value of tripartism and social dialogue, and be relevant to all member States at all stages of development. It should be short, concise and action-oriented, not time-bound, and set a long-term strategic direction for the ILO. Moreover, it should consolidate the ILO as the global authority on labour and employment matters, strengthen the ILO's role and influence in the multilateral system and drive the ILO's leadership role in shaping the future of work.
- 17.** The representative of the Secretary-General summarized the different parts of the draft Declaration and urged the Committee to adopt a Declaration that would ensure that the ILO remained relevant and able to pursue its mandate into its second century with unrelenting vigour.
- 18.** The Chairperson presented the Committee's tentative plan of work and explained the role of the Drafting Group that would examine any draft text referred to it by the Committee for further consideration after thorough but inconclusive discussion. Should there be draft text on which the Drafting Group was not able to reach agreement, it would be clearly marked and referred back to the Committee for further examination. In addition to the Drafting Group, the Committee would set up a Committee Drafting Committee⁴ to ensure linguistic consistency between the three official language versions of the Declaration. The Committee Drafting Committee would be composed of two Government members, two Employer members and two Worker members, together with the Reporter and the Legal Adviser, and assisted by members of the secretariat.
- 19.** After noting the concerns expressed by some members of the Committee that the proposed approach might not allow for a fully inclusive debate of amendments in plenary, complicate discussions and possibly limit the amount of time for general discussion of the draft Declaration, the Chairperson welcomed the flexibility of Committee members to begin work on the basis of the plan of work as proposed, with the possibility of reviewing working methods in due course. The plan of work was adopted. At its tenth sitting, the Committee reviewed the way it had worked and it was agreed to continue its consideration of amendments as the Committee of the Whole.
- 20.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that it was an honour to speak on behalf of the Employers' group at the Centenary Session of the Conference. The Declaration produced by the Committee would provide the basis for the ILO's work in the near future and have implications for the next 50 or even 100 years.

⁴ Due to the late completion of the Committee's work and the lack of nominations from the government group, the final check of the linguistic consistency between the three official languages of the Declaration and the Resolution was undertaken by the secretariat.

-
- 21.** There was a need to strengthen multilateralism as the multilateral system was under pressure. The Centenary Session provided an opportunity for the ILO to reaffirm its values and principles, set out its vision and objectives, and agree on strategies to achieve them. The Organization had been human-centred since its creation, as articulated in previous declarations, especially the Declaration of Philadelphia. The ILO's mission remained the same but, since the landscape had changed, the Organization needed to adapt and conduct a reality check without fear, even if it required substantial changes in the way the ILO operated and the mindsets of its constituents. The work of the Committee needed to take into account changes in the world of work in the twenty-first century.
 - 22.** Tripartism and social dialogue had improved people's lives, had kept the ILO close to economic realities, and were its strength. ILO constituents had accomplished a lot in the first 100 years of the Organization but could do a lot more. It was important to remain faithful to the principle of tripartism and ensure that the ILO remained a house of employers as much as a house of workers and governments.
 - 23.** The impact of automation and changes in the world of work was not new and had been debated at previous Conferences. It was unfortunate that past initiatives had been adopted by the ILO but never implemented. To avoid a similar fate, the draft Declaration therefore needed to lead to concrete action and not just be aspirational. That was why the adoption of a resolution to accompany the draft Declaration was important. The Declaration should not be limited to a cut and paste of the report of the Global Commission for the Future of Work, but should be based on the issues and aspirations of the constituents to ensure their full ownership.
 - 24.** The draft Declaration required substantial reworking because it missed two critical points that the Employers' group wished to be included, namely economic growth and the role of private enterprises, which were necessary foundations for social justice to be achieved. Economic growth and private enterprises were preconditions for generating prosperity, employment and opportunities for social progress for all, as had been established in both the Declaration of Philadelphia and the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, 2008 (Social Justice Declaration). Economic growth and productivity were indicators of Goal 8 of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), a goal that placed full and productive employment and decent work at the same level as sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth.
 - 25.** Social justice rested on three pillars: economic growth and productive employment; an enabling environment for private enterprises to create decent jobs; and decent work. Those should be translated into action in all ILO activities, from development cooperation programmes to policies and projects. The ILO should focus on the reduction and eventual elimination of informality and on promoting access to general education, vocational training and lifelong learning to facilitate the transformation of the world of work and the employability of all.
 - 26.** Among the key issues that needed to be revised in the draft Declaration were, first, for the preamble to adopt a more differentiated tone as in its current form it was too negative. It was important to recognize progress where it had been made. Second, some of the concepts used needed to be examined in more detail, in particular the social contract and a human-centred approach, because they ignored a critical need for economic growth and development. Third, it would not be appropriate to elevate occupational safety and health (OSH) to a fundamental principle and right at work, even though it was very important and member States should pay full attention to it. Fourth, the Employers' group questioned the proposition that a universal labour guarantee should apply to all workers, regardless of their contractual arrangements or employment status. National legislation defined who was an employee and who was an employer. Fifth, the reference to a guaranteed "adequate living wage" – even

within quotation marks – was not acceptable. Although the term was taken from the ILO Constitution, it should be considered as an aspirational concept rather than a guarantee. Sixth, the notion of time sovereignty only addressed the issue of working time from the perspective of an employee and did not take into account the needs of employers.

27. In closing, the Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the comments of the Employers' group were grounded in the new realities of the world of work and that the specific points they wished to include in the draft Declaration would be submitted to the Committee as amendments. The group was committed to tripartism and social dialogue and to improve the leadership of the ILO in the multilateral system and was ready to adopt an ILO Centenary Declaration that was owned by ILO constituents.
28. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that it was an honour and a privilege to represent the voice of workers in the Committee of the Whole. She underlined that trade unions sought to be ambitious as the world was a good place for some, but a worrying one for many.
29. The report of the Global Commission on the Future of Work was both a visionary and practical road map. It was positive that key aspects of the Commission's report had been included in the draft Declaration proposed by the Office. It was hoped that the Committee would include other elements of the report in the final Declaration.
30. Delegates were reminded that social justice was a precondition for peace, tripartite governance was necessary to establish democracy in the world of work and regulations were essential to ensure a level playing field for the protection of workers against the forces of globalization driving down wages and working conditions.
31. The Declaration of Philadelphia stated that "labour is not a commodity", which was an undeniable basic truth. However, the world was seeing an enormous increase in commodified labour, leading to insecurity, precarious work and increases in inequalities. Freedom of expression and association were essential to sustained progress and it was necessary to reaffirm their place at the heart of a renewed social contract. Also important was another quotation from the Declaration of Philadelphia which stated that "poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere".
32. With informality and insecure work arrangements on the rise, the inequality of wages and income increasing, and climate change exacerbating poverty and instability, a renewed commitment was needed to address the root causes of poverty and move to a better distribution of income and wealth to create suitable conditions for development.
33. A reinvigorated or renewed social contract and the achievement of social justice called for the establishment of clear responsibilities for all relevant stakeholders, including business and governments. That had to form the basis for the ILO's work in its second century.
34. The Workers' group sought the following from the ILO Centenary Declaration: that it provide a bold and ambitious agenda for the ILO and be accompanied by a resolution that provided clear guidance on its implementation. It needed to address the increasing insecurity of jobs and income, rising income and wealth inequalities, attacks on workers' and trade union rights, and climate change and its impact on the world of work. The Declaration needed to at least match the historical commitments and ambitions of those of 1919 and 1944.
35. The Declaration needed to confirm the tripartite, normative and supervisory mandate of the ILO as still fully relevant and up to date, while at the same time identifying areas in which there was unfinished business. There was urgent work to do on strengthening the ILO's role

in the multilateral system to ensure decent work and social justice for all and address the increasing commodification of labour, and on fighting poverty and its root causes.

- 36.** It was of key importance to address the erosion of the employment relationship which was both a national and an ILO task. The concept of the employment relationship was now often abused to exclude workers. The coverage of all dependent forms of work under the umbrella of the employment relationship and the recommendations from the *OECD* in its *Employment Outlook 2019* published by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) were useful in that regard.
- 37.** The ILO also needed to develop ways to integrate so-called “new forms of work” including platform work in its policies and standards, to ensure that the notion of “a worker” remained inclusive, covering old and new forms of work with adequate protection. It needed to include the right to organize also for self-employed workers and workers in the informal economy, to ensure that they could collectively negotiate for the improvement of their living and working conditions. That was about formalizing the informal economy and not about eliminating it.
- 38.** The Global Commission on the Future of Work had recommended the introduction of a universal labour guarantee, which would provide all workers with protection in some key areas at work, which the Workers’ group fully supported.
- 39.** Workers’ rights should be promoted as a key strategy for inclusive and sustainable economic development. It was necessary to strengthen social dialogue and collective bargaining as strong and indispensable building blocks of democracy in the workplace and the world of work at large.
- 40.** A legal enabling environment was needed at the national level with member States ratifying and applying the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87), and the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98). Transnational dimensions of industrial relations needed to be developed that could deal with the cross-border challenges of a globalizing world.
- 41.** It was necessary to provide the means and the basis to reduce the vast and growing income inequalities that were affecting workers, their families and communities and weakening economies.
- 42.** An urgent priority was a transformative and measurable agenda for gender equality at work. Gender equality could no longer be just an add-on; it required urgent action across the board. The promotion of public services and the employment opportunities generated could provide the foundation for sustainable, inclusive and gender-equal economies and societies. It was important to recognize that the private sector could not function effectively in a way which delivered benefits to society if there was not a strong public sector.
- 43.** Technology brought huge promises and opportunities. However, technological change did not automatically produce well-being and fair outcomes for all workers. Regulation was necessary to manage and master such change and reap its benefits. In order to create the future of work that worked for all, a human-in-command approach was needed, with a strong guiding and regulating role for the ILO.
- 44.** The reinvigoration of the social contract called for by the Global Commission on the Future of Work needed to include fiscal, trade and industrial policies. That meant reaffirming tripartism, social dialogue and collective bargaining as key drivers for negotiating the terms of socially and environmentally just transitions.

-
45. A change of direction was certainly needed when it came to current business models governing economies, societies and the world of work, which put profit above people and the planet. Businesses and companies should be geared towards more sustainable models of enterprise. To achieve that, effective regulation was indispensable, not only at the national level, but also cross-border when it came to global supply and value chains, with due diligence on human and labour rights at the heart of it.
 46. In addition, the ILO should take a leading role in developing and refining new measures of economic performance that were more holistic and went beyond just gross domestic product (GDP).
 47. The Workers' group welcomed the specific proposal for OSH to be accorded the status of a fundamental right.
 48. Finally, it was important to safeguard the ILO's unique role and contribution to the multilateral system in the context of United Nations (UN) reform. Against the backdrop of a world in turmoil, leadership by the ILO was required, with social justice as its guiding principle and primary goal.
 49. The Workers' group looked forward to working with all constituents and the Office to ensure that a strong ILO, standing up for workers' rights and decent work in a sustainable world, would play a key role in the next 100 years with a strong, bold and ambitious Declaration, accompanied by a resolution.
 50. The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, reminded delegates that many African member States had contributed to the deliberations about the future of work through the organization of national dialogues. The ILO Centenary was an important occasion to advance social justice and promote decent work. Also important was the concept of a fairer globalization as set out in the Social Justice Declaration. The Africa group was in favour of a Centenary Declaration accompanied by a resolution. The draft resolution, which would replace Part V of the draft Declaration, proposed a follow-up mechanism that would be reflected in the programme and budget. The Africa group stressed the importance of the democratization of the Governing Body of the ILO, on which a declaration had been adopted by the African Union at its third Specialised Technical Committee on Social Development, Labour and Employment meeting in Addis Ababa in April 2019. It was of central importance to the countries of the region and needed to be reflected in the preamble of the draft Declaration. The ILO needed to find a final solution for the ratification of the 1986 Instrument of Amendment to the ILO Constitution, to ensure equality for all member States.
 51. The Government member of Australia, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, noted that the text before the Committee was the result of a long process of preparation and called on all delegates to do their best to reach a tripartite consensus on a draft Declaration. Despite the fact that there were differing opinions on the implementation of such a document, it was important to agree on a strategic agenda for the ILO's second century. The Declaration should be concise, meaningful and have long-term relevance. The text should acknowledge that member State activity would be in accordance with national circumstances. Lifelong learning and inclusive skills development were essential for the future world of work and as such must be prominent in the Declaration, as should OSH. However, it was important to better understand the implications of making OSH a fundamental principle and right at work. Multilateralism was also important in shaping the future of work and the Declaration must call for its promotion.

-
- 52.** The Government member of Romania, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, indicated that Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Republic of Moldova, Montenegro, Serbia and Ukraine aligned themselves with the statement. He expressed strong support for the objective of adopting an ambitious Centenary Declaration that would equip the ILO to better serve tomorrow's world of work, social justice and peace. It should support collective efforts in combating poverty and decent work deficits by promoting fair and inclusive labour markets, adequate social protection and strong social dialogue. The draft Declaration needed to call on everyone to actively participate in actions to further promote social justice, achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and strengthen multilateral governance. The EU and its Member states had taken many initiatives at the national, subregional and European levels with that aim. In November 2017, the EU had proclaimed a European Pillar of Social Rights and reviewed their internal and external policies to further ensure decent work in a transforming world of work. Such a dynamic was needed at the global level.
- 53.** The EU and its Member States appreciated that the draft Declaration built on the ILO's core principles, strategic objectives, its normative role and body of international labour standards, the value of tripartism and social dialogue and their relevance to the future. The value of bipartite social dialogue also needed to be acknowledged. There was a need to reaffirm the ILO's mandate in view of the fundamentally changing nature of work. Because peace was easy to destroy but difficult to build, the ILO's constitutional mandate of social justice for a lasting peace was as relevant today as it had ever been. The importance of multilateralism was highlighted, which was the reason why the EU and its Member States had always been strong supporters of the ILO. The combined effects of globalization, technological, environmental, climate, societal and demographic changes were transforming work at an unprecedented pace and scale. Shaping the future of work was essential to the future of all societies. Important issues for the draft Declaration to address were gender equality and equal opportunities, investment in skills, both upskilling and reskilling, as well as OSH, which should be a fundamental right.
- 54.** Labour protection and fair conditions of work should be provided to all workers, including in changing and evolving forms of employment, and decent work should be promoted in global value chains. The effects of climate change on the world of work should be addressed. The Declaration should also pay attention to the need to provide universal access to social protection, to organize support for all during future of work transitions, and to strengthen and reinvigorate social dialogue. With regard to the role of the ILO, the EU aimed to strengthen the following: its position as the central international organization for labour, employment, social protection and social dialogue; its core mandate of setting and supervising international labour standards and ensuring that the body of standards was up to date and relevant to the current world of work; its knowledge and research capabilities; and its cooperation with other international organizations for greater coherence between economic, environmental and social policies.
- 55.** In view of the calls for a resolution complementing the Declaration, it was stressed that the resolution should be short, concise and focused on procedural issues and follow-up. It was suggested that the Office prepare a draft resolution based on the one proposed by the Employers' group and the Workers' group.
- 56.** The Government member of Zimbabwe observed that, since its inception, the ILO had encountered challenges and successes, especially related to tripartism. It was important to keep up the momentum built around advancing social justice. Zimbabwe aligned itself with the statement made by the Africa group and pointed out that the adoption of a Centenary Declaration was a fitting way to celebrate 100 years of the ILO's existence. The speaker stressed that the democratization of the ILO Governing Body was unfinished business of the ILO's first century and that it was unfortunate that it had to be carried over to its second

century. It was not an issue for Africa alone, but a collective issue, and affected Members designated as countries of chief industrial importance. It also affected social partners since they were part of the ILO. Therefore, the ILO needed to collectively reflect on the issue to move forward. The place for that was the Centenary Declaration. Therefore, Zimbabwe supported the inclusion of the democratization of the ILO Governing Body in the draft Declaration

- 57.** A representative of the International Co-operative Alliance stated that cooperatives had been growing continuously for almost two centuries. The contribution of cooperatives was not just quantitative as the employment they generated tended to last longer and was better balanced between rural and urban areas. Cooperatives helped poor and marginalized people to lift themselves out of informality, as recognized by the Transition from the Informal to the Formal Economy Recommendation, 2015 (No. 204). They had an important clustering role for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), as recognized by the ILO resolution concerning small and medium-sized enterprises and decent and productive employment creation, adopted in 2015. They were also promoting labour standards, as set out in the Promotion of Cooperatives Recommendation, 2002 (No. 193). The contribution of cooperatives to the future of work should be explicitly mentioned in the draft Declaration.
- 58.** The representative of the International Occupational Hygiene Association (IOHA) stated that safety and health for workers worldwide should be recognized as a fundamental principle and right at work. The consequences of poor OSH practices on society and families was significant, especially in developing countries, where a large proportion of the population was engaged in hazardous work such as mining, construction and agriculture. The IOHA embraced the proposed human-centred approach for the future of work that strengthened the social contract by placing people and the work they performed at the centre of economics, social policy and business.
- 59.** The representative of International Young Christian Workers affirmed that it was crucial to discuss the future of work as new types of work and the challenges of tomorrow were already here. Many young workers lived in insecurity, which was reinforced by unemployment and inequality. His organization supported a human-centred approach and a universal labour guarantee. Gender equality, universal social protection, managing technology and providing incentives to promote investment in key areas such as the care, green or rural economies were necessary to promote decent work.
- 60.** The representative of the International Transport Workers' Federation underlined that technology had always shaped the transport industry, but that platform economies were having a major impact and technology was being used by the owners of those platforms for their own ends. Digital labour platforms were often detrimental to workers and characterized by disguised employment. With growing legal disputes around the world, the prospect of a labour standard regulating digital labour platforms modelled on the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006, would be most welcome. The ILO could regulate digital labour platforms through such a standard and that should be included in the draft Declaration.
- 61.** The representative of the Arab Federation of Petroleum, Mining and Chemical Workers stressed that, when speaking of the future of work, the issue of terrorism must be addressed. Terrorism profoundly affected Arab and African member States and was a factor in the many millions of refugees and displaced persons as well as billions in GDP lost in those countries. The ILO needed to support those member States, including by providing modern technology and eliciting the support of employers, workers and governments.
- 62.** The representative of Women in Informal Employment: Globalizing and Organizing praised the ILO's achievements at its Centenary and noted that a human-centred agenda required a much greater emphasis on inclusion. Several principles were key in that regard. Everyone

who worked should be recognized as a worker. As new forms of work evolved, standards and protections covering all workers, including informal workers, should be pursued. In many instances, labour regulation had not kept up with technological advances. In addition, a transformative agenda for gender equality was required and alternative economies needed to be developed as existing economic models had squeezed out many workers. It was vital to ensure a just transition from the informal economy to the formal economy. The representative expressed her support for the recommendation made by the Global Commission on the Future of Work that the ILO fully recognize the universality of its mandate. That should include support to groups of workers who had been prevented historically from benefiting from social justice and decent work, notably informal workers.

- 63.** The Government member of Spain identified a number of priorities that her Government believed should be reflected in the draft Declaration. It should promote social justice in the face of the social, technological, demographic and other changes facing the world of work. It should underline the role of tripartism in fighting inequality and precariousness, and in ensuring that workers benefited from the introduction of new forms of work. It should strengthen the role of the ILO and its coordination with other international organizations and should promote gender equality. Moreover, it should promote environmentally responsible practices and a just transition to more sustainable ways of working. Working people must be able to benefit from technological progress that would leave no one behind.
- 64.** The Government member of Senegal welcomed the draft Declaration. His country had participated fully in the national dialogue process on the four Centenary conversations, with the full involvement of the social partners and of civil society. Themes taken up had included the relation between work and society; the governance of the ILO; technological innovation; progress in social dialogue; the future of the world of work; and increasing levels of social protection by the formalization of the informal sector. Challenges apart, the future also presented opportunities for the ILO to further strengthen its mandate to promote decent work for all. Senegal supported the Africa group's statement concerning the democratization of the governance structure of the ILO.
- 65.** The Government member of India supported the draft Declaration but felt that it should address some issues more explicitly. Those included job creation; the elimination of child labour, human trafficking and bonded labour; and reducing informality. It should highlight innovative ways of enabling labour law to cover new forms of employment. The Centenary should also provide for a moment of self-analysis. The ILO should consider reforming its governance structure to allow all member States to participate fully in guiding the Organization. The Government of India supported coordination and collaboration between the different institutions in the UN system, but agencies should avoid overlapping action. Labour issues and international labour standards should not be linked with trade issues as that would ultimately have an adverse economic impact on the lives of workers. The draft Declaration must be sufficiently flexible to take account of differing national circumstances and cultural backgrounds. The mechanism to review progress in implementing the Declaration should be included in the Declaration itself.
- 66.** The Government member of Morocco said that the draft Declaration should highlight themes covered in the report of the Global Commission of the Future of Work, including technological innovation, climate change, demographic shifts and the need to promote gender equality. The future would provide opportunities as well as challenges. His Government was working on human-centred policies that targeted disadvantaged populations, promoted productive job opportunities and enhanced social dialogue. It was important to foster entrepreneurship and competitiveness in the economy. Morocco supported the call for democratization of the governance structure of the ILO.

-
67. The Government member of Canada welcomed the draft Declaration, stressing that the text should be clear and concise. An implementing resolution was not required, as Part V of the text could be expanded to that effect. Her Government strongly supported the human-centred approach promoted in the draft, including through advancing labour rights and maintaining a strong international normative system. Canada believed gender equality and equal pay for work of equal value to be crucial pillars in an inclusive future of work; the text should reflect that. It should also reaffirm the importance of the Organization's tripartite nature, drawing inspiration from the Declaration of Philadelphia and, as had that historic text, provide guidance to the ILO in facing the challenges to come. She requested more information concerning the implication of elevating OSH to a fundamental principle and right at work.
68. The Government member of the United States said that the draft Declaration should reaffirm the ILO's key mandate, values and principles, as embodied in the ILO Constitution, the Declaration of Philadelphia and the Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. The ILO Centenary coincided with a period of profound technological, social, political and demographic change in the world of work. As workplaces evolved, it was imperative that workers be able to enjoy fundamental rights and protections. The ILO core texts remained as relevant as ever. The challenge was therefore not to update those texts, but to adapt national and ILO mechanisms, techniques and procedures to the new environment. The draft Declaration should stress the importance of skills development to meet new working circumstances; equal pay for work of equal value must be promoted; and support should be given to the private sector and to creating an enabling business environment. The ILO's supervisory system should be reinforced. However, the text should avoid including a mass of specific goals and solutions and focus on providing broad strategic guidance. Budgetary and policy questions could be dealt with by the Governing Body. As such, his Government did not see the need for a follow-up mechanism. If a resolution were to be adopted in that sense, it should be a concise and practical guide to implementation of the goals of the draft Declaration.
69. The Government member of Iraq highlighted the plight of those persons simply unable to find jobs, and the negative effect that it could have on youth. He also stressed the impact that terrorism had had on his country, a third of which had been occupied by a terrorist movement. Neighbouring countries had had similar experiences and the issue should be reflected in the draft Declaration.
70. The Government member of Switzerland said that the draft Declaration should be a robust text that focused not only on challenges, but also on the opportunities that change could bring to the world of work. He cited as an example of such a text his country's Tripartite declaration on the future of work and social partnership in Switzerland in the digital business age. The ILO must develop tools to enable it to represent the present and future worlds of work, and technological developments might assist to that end. Partnerships with non-state entities and cooperating with other agencies in the UN system were further paths to pursue. The draft Declaration should state that point more clearly and stress the central role of the ILO. The text should also highlight the importance of promoting a favourable macroeconomic environment for building sustainable enterprises. An operational resolution should be adopted to implement the Declaration. Certain elements currently in the body of the draft Declaration would be more appropriately contained in the resolution and his Government would be making suggestions to that effect in due course.
71. The Government member of the Russian Federation said that the draft Declaration provided an overview of the main tasks to be undertaken in addressing future issues in the world of work, and set out the ILO's role therein. There was an urgent need for a fairer world of work. Commenting on specific points in the text, he said that his Government wished to see a different formulation concerning gender equality in Part II, Section A, paragraph (v). He queried the phrase in Part II, Section A, paragraph (x), "promoting systems of governance

of labour migration and mobility”, given that the ILO’s mandate did not include such governance, and he wished for clarification of “labour mobility”. Greater clarity was also required when referring in Part III to “social protection”, which could take different forms. The draft Declaration could be complemented by a resolution.

72. The Government member of Germany, stressing that the text should be clear, concise and ambitious, highlighted the need for a relevant body of social standards and norms, developed and updated by the ILO to deal with technological and structural change. Eighty per cent of world trade was carried out through global supply chains, so the ILO must direct its attention to ensuring decent working conditions in those and thereby fulfil its mandate. The capacities of the social partners should be reinforced to ensure effective social dialogue also in the multilateral system. The Organization must promote the provision of OSH and adequate social protection. Because social inequality could only be resolved through the provision of decent work and social justice.
73. The Government member of Ethiopia urged the Committee to use the draft Declaration to promote the democratization of ILO governance structures by encouraging ratification of the 1986 Instrument of Amendment to the ILO Constitution. The Declaration should also reaffirm the core principles and values of the Organization.
74. The Government member of Belgium, recalling that his country had been one of the founding Members of the ILO, said that the Centenary should celebrate past achievements of the Organization and look to the future with optimism. The challenges to be faced included coping with climate change, reducing informality and ensuring gender equality, and such challenges should be clearly highlighted in the text. Technological innovation was the result of human ingenuity, and the technology of tomorrow should be put to the service of decent work and sustainable enterprises. A tripartite approach through social dialogue and collective bargaining would be of critical importance in the future world of work, especially transnational work in global supply chains. Lifelong learning and social protection, as well as protection from violence and discrimination at work, should also be included in the draft Declaration.
75. The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran said that the ILO had rightly placed the future of work at the heart of the Organization’s Centenary celebrations. Youth should be prominent in the draft Declaration. If young people were to be the agents of change, they must be able to reach their full potential and access emerging possibilities. Training programmes and education must therefore be adapted to deal with the introduction of new technology and meet future needs. Labour market information systems should be developed to predict future skills requirements. Emphasis should be placed on promoting an enabling environment for sustainable enterprises and cooperatives. It was also important to take account of the impact of natural disasters on work. The Declaration should reinforce multilateralism, which was currently under pressure, and ensure fair and equal access to an open, rules-based international economic system. It should also promote development cooperation, including through South–South and triangular cooperation.
76. The Government member of the United Kingdom said that his Government wanted a global economy that left no one behind. The ILO had a critical role in that respect. Recent domestic legislation aimed at building a United Kingdom fit for the future by helping businesses to create better, higher-paid jobs. The ILO should work to that end at the global level. The United Kingdom strongly supported ILO action to end modern slavery and work towards achieving SDG 8.7. The Organization’s efforts to promote decent work in global supply chains was particularly important in that respect. More emphasis should be placed on that in the draft Declaration.

-
77. The Government member of Turkey said that the Centenary presented a historic occasion to adopt a declaration that would give direction to the ILO in the years to come, placing people at the centre of its action, with technology at the service of people. Turkey found the concept of a universal labour guarantee interesting, but felt that it needed further reflection. OSH should be included as a fundamental principle and right. Efforts should be directed to safeguarding the quality of work and ensuring the social protection of workers in digital labour platforms. He welcomed the idea of universal social protection but noted that its implementation would have to take national circumstances into account. The follow-up and implementation mechanism of the draft Declaration should be integrated with the respective mechanisms for the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, 1998, and the Social Justice Declaration.
78. The Government member of South Africa said that the draft Declaration should retain a strong emphasis on social justice, which had been central to the Organization's vision since 1919. He stressed that the Declaration provided the Organization with the opportunity to review the structure of its governance bodies and complete the work done in the 1980s, which had resulted in the 1986 Instrument of Amendment to the ILO Constitution. The ILO should accelerate that Instrument's entry into force to ensure the equitable representation of member States within the institution.
79. The Government member of France said that the draft Declaration should be ambitious in scope, reaffirming the key ILO principle of social justice. It should be human-centred and uphold a universal guarantee of workers' rights as set out in ILO Conventions, at the same time ensuring an enabling environment for the development of enterprises, public services and job creation. ILO cooperation with other international agencies rightly featured in the draft text. The role of international labour standards in trade and in investment programmes should be strengthened. Greater emphasis should be placed in the draft Declaration on the responsible business conduct of enterprises, and on States as economic agents, operating in global supply chains. The draft could also clearly attribute roles and responsibilities to each of the tripartite partners.
80. The Government member of Ireland aligned herself with the EU statement and said that her views were shared within the EU. The draft Declaration was balanced, but could be more dynamic. The relationship and articulation between Parts II and III was not clear. It was unclear whether Part II concerned only the role and mandate of the Office or whether it referred to the Organization as a whole. Part III appeared to concern only governments, but it should also be addressed to the social partners. That problem might be remedied by giving the parts short, explanatory titles. Most of the important points needed to address changes in the world of work were included, and the centrality of the ILO's position in the world of work was clearly stated. However, more emphasis should be laid on the Organization's normative mandate, gender equality, social protection, decent work in global supply chains and effective responses to climate change.
81. The Government member of the United Arab Emirates, speaking on behalf of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) countries, noted that the list of challenges to the achievement of decent work for all that was contained in the third preambular paragraph should also include geopolitical and economic challenges, as well as the fight against terrorism, all of which could negatively affect labour markets. Paragraph E of Part I should call on the Office to increase its efforts to promote the ratification of the 1986 Instrument of Amendment to the ILO Constitution, and invite governments to ratify that instrument. The Declaration should have a simple and flexible implementation mechanism. The Governing Body had stipulated that it should fix a strategic, long-term direction for the ILO. The present text did not give sufficient direction. It should stress the role of the Organization in promoting decent work in countries affected by armed conflict, and promote education and training as a tool to facilitate workers' transition to the sustainable jobs of the future. OSH should be

recognized as a fundamental right at work. The Declaration should reaffirm the ILO's standard-setting role and take account of the differing economic and cultural situations in countries.

- 82.** The Government member of Japan welcomed the draft Declaration. Over the coming century, population ageing would continue to increase in many countries and thought must be given to overcoming the related challenges and harnessing the opportunities of ageing. A human-centred approach would be key to resolving that issue. His Government supported the inclusion of OSH as a fundamental principle and right at work.
- 83.** The Government member of Burkina Faso stressed the need to democratize the ILO's governance structure. His country was affected by terrorist activity, which greatly complicated the promotion of human-centred decent work. The ILO should urgently develop policies to help overcome that problem. He noted that, while decent work could only be achieved in a secure environment, it had been tripartism and social dialogue that had permitted the Organization to deliver its major achievements of the past century.
- 84.** The Government member of China said that his Government was committed to the Decent Work Agenda. Labour was not a commodity in China, but was valued as the vehicle of productivity. The draft Declaration should foster social dialogue and social justice. It should encourage lifelong learning, and support multilateralism and development cooperation.
- 85.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson welcomed the prevailing positive and serene atmosphere and noted with satisfaction that all were ready to work together in the Committee. She thanked participants for the many good suggestions they had made to ensure that the draft Declaration would be concise, clear and ambitious.
- 86.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted in particular the number of references made by Government members to the importance of multilateralism, an issue currently in need of further impetus. As had been stated, the ILO's mission had not changed, but the Organization should adapt itself to the changing world of work, while remaining steadfast in its objectives of promoting social justice and peace. The Employers' group welcomed the assertions made by several Members that ILO standards should take account of differing national circumstances, and appreciated the emphasis placed by governments on the importance of education, skills development and lifelong learning, as well as on gender equality. Some governments had also highlighted the key role of private enterprise in creating employment and decent work. The Government member of the Russian Federation had queried the role of the ILO in relation to the governance of labour migration, which in the view of the Employers' group pertained to the International Organization for Migration (IOM). The ILO was responsible for ensuring the rights of migrant workers in the labour market, not for governance of migration. The importance of standard setting and the task of ensuring compliance with standards were also stressed. The problem, as the Employers' group saw it, was that the ILO had too many Conventions that had been ratified by too few. Member States should only ratify what they could apply. Standard setting had to be relevant to the realities faced by member States. The group also welcomed the support given to reducing informality, thus paving the way to decent work.

Consideration of the draft Declaration contained in Report IV

Composition and work of the Drafting Group

87. The Chairperson explained that during examination of the amendments to the draft Declaration, text that did not attain consensus within the Committee would be referred to a Drafting Group. The Officers had consulted with the regional groups and proposed that the Drafting Group be composed of 16 Government members, eight Employer members and eight Worker members, while each group could be accompanied by observers, though a limited number as there were constraints in room space. The observers would not have the right to speak. The Drafting Group would work on the basis of consensus. Where it could not reach agreement, the text would be returned to the Committee for further examination. The Committee would take a decision in respect of the text modified by the Drafting Group, but could continue to discuss, including through a formal amendments process, only those parts of text on which the Drafting Group could not reach consensus.
88. The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, endorsed the proposed arrangements, but stressed that for the legitimacy of the final text and, above all, for its ownership by as wide a range of participants as possible, the approach should be truly inclusive, and the number of observers should not be limited.
89. The Government member of Cuba asked what criteria would be used to distribute the 16 Government seats in the Drafting Group.
90. The representative of the Secretary-General said that the 16 Government seats would be divided equally among the four regional groups.
91. The Government member of the United States said that a greater number of observers should be allowed to attend the sittings of the Drafting Group.
92. The Government member of Panama stated his preference for a larger number of Government seats in the Drafting Group to allow the five regions of the Latin American continent to be represented. However, he agreed with the proposed composition, provided that broad observer participation was made possible.
93. The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed with the proposed working methods for the Drafting Group.
94. The proposed working methods of the Drafting Group were approved.

Consideration of amendments

Preamble

Title

95. The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the EU Member States, introduced an amendment, co-sponsored by the Government member of Canada, to insert the title “Preamble” at the beginning of the preambular part of the draft Declaration. She said that further amendments to insert titles for the rest of the sections would follow in order to give greater coherence to the structure of the draft Declaration.

96. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, as did the Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group.

97. The amendment was adopted.

First preambular paragraph

98. No amendments had been received on the paragraph. The first preambular paragraph was adopted.

Second preambular paragraph

99. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert “, democracy” after “social justice”. She explained that the continuous and concerted action of governments and representatives of employers and workers had indeed been conducive to the achievement of democracy over the past century, as well as to that of social justice and the promotion of universal and lasting peace.

100. The Employer Vice-Chairperson preferred the original text. The ILO was not concerned with political systems and the original wording was aligned to that of the Declaration of Philadelphia.

101. The Government member of the United States supported the amendment, as did the Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Canada, and the Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group.

102. The Employer Vice-Chairperson reiterated her preference for the original text, but did not disagree with the proposed amendment.

103. The amendment was adopted.

104. The second preambular paragraph was adopted as amended.

Third preambular paragraph

105. The Government member of Ireland, also speaking on behalf of the Government members of the EU Member States, introduced two amendments, co-sponsored by the Government member of Canada, one to divide the paragraph into two and the other to redraft the subsequent second paragraph, to read as follows:

Acknowledging that such action has brought historic advances in the realization of truly humane conditions of work;

~~*Acknowledging that such action has brought historic advances in the realization of truly humane conditions of work;*~~ *but Considering that access to employment, social protection, rights at work and social dialogue is not open to all and that persisting poverty, inequalities and injustices, and fragility and conflict in many parts of the world, constitute a threat to those advances and that pressing challenges remain in securing gender equality and equal opportunities and treatment, shared prosperity and decent work for all;*

She said that the Organization’s achievements should stand alone in an individual paragraph.

106. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that her group could support the amendments, but wished to hear the views of others.

107. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to delete “truly” from the first paragraph.

-
108. The Worker Vice-Chairperson reaffirmed her support for the amendments but did not support the Employers' subamendment; she noted that her group had also submitted an amendment to the second part of the split paragraph.
 109. The Government members of China, United States, and Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Canada, supported the subamendment; the Government member of the United States proposed a further subamendment to replace "and the resultant realization" with "that have resulted in".
 110. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the further subamendment.
 111. The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the division of the paragraph into two. He had no major issues with the first part, but proposed to make comments on the second part in due course.
 112. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the subamendments went too far in stating that ILO action had "resulted in humane conditions of work" when in many places inhumane conditions of work persisted. She proposed a further subamendment for the last phrase of the paragraph to read "has brought historic advances, economic and social progress and more humane conditions of work".
 113. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that that formulation lost the essential link between economic progress and more humane conditions of work, which was important to her group.
 114. The Worker Vice-Chairperson suggested subamending the phrase to read "have contributed to more humane conditions of work".
 115. Noting a lack of consensus, the Chairperson proposed that the Committee leave the first amendment to one side and consider the second amendment, which was organically connected to the first.
 116. The Government member of Ireland, also speaking on behalf of the EU Member States and Canada, presented the rationale for the amendment to the second part of the split paragraph and said that the issue of those who had no access to employment, and were deprived of social protection, rights at work and social dialogue, was of great importance and should be addressed in the preamble.
 117. The Worker Vice-Chairperson reaffirmed her group's support for the second amendment, and proposed a subamendment to replace "is not open to all" with "is not a reality for all".
 118. The Government members of Cuba, New Zealand, Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the subamendment.
 119. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the balance between the positive achievements listed in the first amendment and the negative elements listed in the second had now been lost. The Employers' group had submitted an alternative amendment splitting the original paragraph, but proposed different wording for the second part of it.
 120. The Government member of Cuba requested clarification as to the meaning of the term "fragility".
 121. The representative of the Secretary-General explained that the term "fragility" was used generally in combination with conflict as it affected labour.

-
122. The Chairperson added that “fragility” was a term frequently used in international instruments, and that the Committee took note of the reservations of the Government member of Cuba.
 123. The Government member of South Africa queried the need to enumerate the four strategic objectives of the Decent Work Agenda – employment; social protection; rights at work and social dialogue – in the first part of the paragraph, and subsequently refer to “decent work for all” at the end of the same paragraph. That would appear to be duplication.
 124. The Government member of the United States agreed that that appeared to be the case.
 125. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that that was why her group could not support the amendment.
 126. The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Canada, explained that the draft Declaration needed to be outward-looking. It should address a wider public than persons well acquainted with ILO policies and practices. It was therefore necessary to spell out the four strategic objectives of the Decent Work Agenda.
 127. The Worker Vice-Chairperson suggested that the Committee should suspend the formal negotiation process on the amendments submitted, to allow all those who wished to express their opinions on all amendments relating to the third preambular paragraph.
 128. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed with the suggestion.
 129. The Chairperson, again noting that there was no consensus in the room in respect of the amendments, proposed that the groups should follow the procedure suggested by the Worker Vice-Chairperson and approved by her Employer counterpart, and each clarify their position with regard to all the amendments under consideration and the various subamendments that had been submitted so far. The task of finding a way forward would then be passed to the Drafting Group.
 130. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that her group believed the EU/Canada proposal to enumerate the strategic objectives of the Decent Work Agenda to be useful, as not everyone was an expert in ILO affairs. The group would support that amendment if their own subamendment to replace “is not open to all” with “is not a reality for all” was supported. The group also supported the reference in that amendment to gender equality and equal opportunities and treatment. The Workers’ group saw no difficulty with the term “fragility” which in the ILO was used to describe instances where conflict situations created difficulties for workers. The changes proposed by the Government member of Brazil on behalf of GRULAC in a first amendment to the third preambular paragraph could be incorporated in the EU/Canada amendment to the same paragraph. That amendment included “within and between countries, gender disparities and injustices, as well as fragility” after the word “inequalities”. A second amendment put forward by Brazil on behalf of GRULAC and also modifying the third preambular paragraph by adding the words “which must be addressed progressively, taking into account national capacities and realities” at the end of the draft text, was not appropriate in a preamble, which should state general and universal principles. The group could not accept the Employer members’ proposed amendment to split the third preambular paragraph but largely retain the original wording in the second part of the split, as they felt that reference should be made to problems that persisted in the world of work.
 131. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that her group did not support the EU/Canada amendment to the third preambular paragraph, setting out the four pillars of the Decent Work Agenda. The reference to decent work further on in the paragraph made that redundant and, besides, the concept of decent work was well established. The inclusion of the reference to

“gender equality and equal opportunities and treatment” was not necessary either, and the group preferred to retain the original drafting, which referred to “equal opportunities”, which covered gender. The group could support the deletion of the term “fragility”, and accepted the GRULAC addition of the phrase “within and between countries, gender disparities and injustices, as well as [fragility and] conflict in many parts of the world” in the third preambular paragraph. The amendment proposed by the Workers’ group to insert “, including transformations in the world of work” after “pressing challenges” was incorrect syntactically and inappropriate in that position. The group strongly supported the GRULAC amendment relating to “national capacities and realities”.

- 132.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that GRULAC had sought to introduce the notion of inequalities within and between countries and to give weight to the issue of gender disparity. That had been echoed in the amendment proposed by the EU Member States and Canada. He had noted the agreement of the social partners for that amendment. In GRULAC’s second amendment, language had been used that appeared frequently in international instruments, which sought to highlight the differing circumstances prevailing in countries; while challenges were common, capacities and capabilities varied. A degree of flexibility and progressivity should be built into the text. He disagreed with the view of the Workers’ group that the inclusion of that notion was inappropriate in a preamble, but accepted that it could feature elsewhere in the text. GRULAC felt that the inclusion of the four pillars of the Decent Work Agenda added clarity to the text. The group noted the possibility of deleting the term “fragility”. Regarding the amendment proposed by the Workers’ group that referred to transformations in the world of work, GRULAC felt that that notion did not fall into the category of “pressing challenges”. The subamendment proposed by the Employers’ group to retain the original wording of the split paragraph would be acceptable if other ideas were added to it.
- 133.** The Government member of China supported the EU/Canada amendment which laid emphasis on the importance of the four pillars of the Decent Work Agenda. The terms “fragility” and “conflict” could both be deleted from the text.
- 134.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, recalled that the group had previously expressed its preference for the original text. However, it could accept the proposal of the Workers’ group to include “more humane”. The amendment proposed by the EU Member States and Canada raised some concerns. Overall, a more concise text was desirable. The amendment proposed by the Employers which retained the original text of the second split paragraph did not add much value, but could be accepted as part of an overall compromise. The group supported the other amendment to the first split paragraph. The Africa group supported the addition of a reference to gender disparities, but wished to discuss the matter further before placing such references in the text. Regarding the amendment proposed by the Workers’ group that referred to transformations in the world of work, that was taken into account by the previous proposals. The same was true of the second amendment submitted by the Government member of Brazil, on behalf of GRULAC. The Drafting Group might be able to resolve those issues.
- 135.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of EU Member States and Canada, explained that they had felt it important to add a reference to the four pillars of decent work in their amendment; they supported the Worker Group subamendment of “not a reality” and the deletion of “fragility,” however, they wished to add text relating to eradicating child and forced labour. They supported the addition of “economic and social progress” included in the amendment to the first part of the split third preambular paragraph submitted by the Employers’ group. While sympathetic to the concept of national capacities in the GRULAC amendment, which introduced the notion of progressiveness to the text, they preferred the term “national circumstances”. Likewise, as gender was a priority for Ireland, for the EU and its Member States and for Canada, they supported the amendment submitted by the

Government member of Brazil, on behalf of GRULAC, regarding gender disparities, but would again prefer more commonly used terminology, such as gender equality.

- 136.** The Government member of Cuba emphasized the importance of producing a final document which would have the greatest possible impact. As such, Cuba supported the EU/Canada amendment, as it provided more information on the Decent Work Agenda. Cuba recognized a causal link between social and economic progress and improved working conditions, but not everywhere and not in all cases. His Government could therefore not accept language that implied universality. The Drafting Group would be able to resolve that issue. Cuba supported both amendments proposed by GRULAC, as well as the amendment proposed by the Workers' group. He was of the view that "fragility" should be deleted from the second part of the split third preambular paragraph.
- 137.** The Government member of the United States suggested that the EU/Canada amendment was wordy, but as it did not cause any substantive concerns he could support it. He also agreed with adding a reference to the elimination of forced and child labour. He supported the amendment proposed by the Workers' group, but suggested that "pressing challenges in the world of work" was preferable to "pressing challenges, including transformations in the world of work." While agreeing that acknowledging national capacities and allowing for progressive improvement was often appropriate, he said that that should not appear in an aspirational preamble, especially one referencing fundamental principles and rights at work. With respect to the Employers' group's proposal to split the third preambular paragraph into two paragraphs, he asserted that the promotion of equal opportunity and inclusive prosperity, contained in the second of the split paragraphs, was not solely the responsibility of member States, but that the private sector had a very important role in securing both. Lastly, he believed "fragility" to be an acceptable term; however, an appropriate substitute should be found if the majority favoured its deletion.
- 138.** The Government member of Switzerland supported the EU/Canada amendment, the GRULAC amendment and the Workers' group's amendment as subamended. With regard to the latter, "transformation" was not the ideal word and it was important to mention the "opportunities and risks" presented by that transformation. He supported the second amendment introduced by the Government member of Brazil, on behalf of GRULAC, to insert "which must be addressed progressively, taking into account national capacities and realities" after "all" and observed that it was not usual to add "national capacities and realities" and that the sentence needed to stop after "progressively". An amendment to the third preambular paragraph introduced by the Employers' group was thought to be limited as it included only "member States" and therefore other players who played an important role in promoting such opportunities needed to be included.
- 139.** The Government member of the Plurinational State of Bolivia supported the statement made by Brazil on behalf of GRULAC. She also supported the view expressed by the Government member of Cuba that the word "fragility" should be deleted.
- 140.** The Chairperson said that the Committee had finished its consideration of the second and third preambular paragraphs. The EU/Canada amendment on the second preambular paragraph, as well as all amendments pertaining to the third preambular paragraph, were referred to the Drafting Group.

Fourth preambular paragraph

- 141.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete "and" before "principles" and insert "and mandate" between "principles" and "set out". The two documents referred to define the mandate of the ILO to a large extent and it was therefore important to reflect

that. She referred to an amendment on the same paragraph submitted by the Employers' group and said that her group supported it.

142. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment. The word "mandate" added completeness. She introduced her group's amendment to add "(1919)" after "Constitution" for the sake of consistency, as a year had been specified for the Declaration of Philadelphia, and requested clarification as to why the year had not been included.
143. The representative of the Secretary-General said that it was standard ILO practice to refer to the "ILO Constitution" only.
144. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment as it was an issue of drafting and not of substance.
145. The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States supported the amendment proposed by the Workers' group, as did the Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group.
146. The amendment was adopted.
147. The fourth preambular paragraph was adopted as amended.

Fifth preambular paragraph

148. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced two amendments: the first to replace "Underlining" with "Reasserting"; and the second to insert ", as well as the ILO Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy (5th Edition, 2017)" at the end of the paragraph. "Reasserting" was a stronger word than "underlying". The reference to the MNE Declaration was important.
149. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendments. "Underlining" was preferred as that was the only paragraph in the preamble that used that word and "Reasserting" gave it another meaning. The other two Declarations mentioned in the fourth preambular paragraph were higher in status than the MNE Declaration which had been adopted by the Governing Body and not by the Conference and therefore its inclusion was not appropriate.
150. The Government member of Brazil preferred to keep "Underlining" as it would refer back to the importance the Declaration would have.
151. The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that his group supported the amendment to include "Reasserting". Regarding the second amendment, the group had no particular opinion but noted that despite the fact that the MNE Declaration had not been adopted by the Conference, the group would still support it, if there was majority support.
152. The Government member of the United States supported the first amendment since "Reasserting" would be an upgrade compared with "Underlining". He did not support the second amendment because the MNE Declaration was a Governing Body document.
153. The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the first amendment. They did not support the second amendment for the same reasons outlined by the Employers' group.

-
- 154.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson reaffirmed that “Reasserting” and “Underlining” were similar but that “Reasserting” would be better. She proposed a subamendment to split the paragraph into two parts and have the reference noting the importance of the MNE Declaration in a separate paragraph. Thus the importance of the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and the Social Justice Declaration would be reasserted and the importance of the MNE Declaration would be noted, thereby establishing a difference in importance.
- 155.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson clarified that the Employers’ group had always supported the MNE Declaration. The draft Centenary Declaration was aiming at the next 100 years and when speaking about the 1998 and 2008 Declarations, it would not be appropriate to refer to Governing Body decisions. Therefore, the group did not support the subamendment. Moreover, their position regarding the first amendment was that “Underlining” would be the appropriate term, so it was best to stick with the Office text.
- 156.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that “Underlining” was acceptable and withdrew the amendment. She asked for an indication from those Governments which had expressed an opinion regarding the MNE Declaration, as to whether mentioning it in a separate paragraph would make a difference. Not mentioning the MNE Declaration would be disappointing given that it was referred to in several other important ILO documents.
- 157.** The Chairperson thanked the Worker Vice-Chairperson for displaying a spirit of compromise. Governments now needed to focus on two questions relating to the second amendment. First, would they be comfortable with the mention of the MNE Declaration; and, second, if they were, should it be mentioned in a separate paragraph.
- 158.** The Government member of the United States explained that the issue was not the mentioning of the MNE Declaration but that other important ILO documents and Declarations were mentioned which had a much wider scope. The MNE Declaration was narrower and very specific.
- 159.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, acknowledged that the Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and the Social Justice Declaration had been adopted by the Conference and that the MNE Declaration had only been adopted by the Governing Body. However, he reiterated his willingness that both kinds of texts be mentioned in the draft Declaration.
- 160.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, acknowledged the importance of the MNE Declaration but agreed with the Government member of the United States that it did not have as broad a scope of vision as the other two documents; therefore, she did not support the amendment.
- 161.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed her disappointment and added that the future of work in a globalizing world would not only be about social justice and lasting peace but would be increasingly determined by actors, such as multinational enterprises, in the world of work. After thanking the Africa group for their support, she withdrew the amendment.
- 162.** The fifth preambular paragraph was adopted.

New paragraph after the fifth preambular paragraph

- 163.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new paragraph to read “Noting the report of the ILO Global Commission on the Future Work “Work for a brighter future” (2019);”. It was appropriate to note the work of the Global Commission and its report since it was a visionary report which was relevant for the work being done and would be a

point of reference in the future. Acknowledging the sensitivity surrounding the report, the term “noted” had been used in the amendment rather than “welcomed”.

- 164.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson highlighted the need for consistency in the approach of the Centenary Declaration. The preamble had recalled and reaffirmed the ILO Constitution and the Declaration of Philadelphia, and underlined the Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and the Social Justice Declaration. All of those documents had been adopted by the Conference. It was necessary to live up to the level of importance of those documents and a report by a commission of eminent people acting in a personal capacity did not seem appropriate in the context. The report did not have the significance of the other Declarations and did not have the legitimacy of reports produced by the governance organs of the ILO.
- 165.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson raised a point of order and requested clarification as to whether the report of the Global Commission on the Future of Work was the Report of the Director-General to the Conference.
- 166.** The representative of the Secretary-General stated that the Report of the Director-General to the Conference transmitted the report of the Global Commission to the Conference.
- 167.** The Government member of Côte d’Ivoire supported the amendment. The work the Committee was doing meant that a report about the future of work was relevant, so it was entirely appropriate to note the report of the Global Commission.
- 168.** Referring to the intervention by the Employer Vice-Chairperson, the Government member of Sweden pointed out that the establishing of the Global Commission on the Future of Work had been discussed several times in the Governing Body so the notion that the Global Commission had not been discussed in authoritative bodies within the ILO was incorrect. All constituents had been aware of the work of the Global Commission and the Governing Body had been briefed on its work.
- 169.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment.
- 170.** The Government member of South Africa said that the report of the Global Commission was the only one looking at the future of work that was not solely focused on automation. He believed it brought a balancing social element which was key to the work of the ILO.
- 171.** The Government member of Brazil did not support the amendment. He recognized the importance of the report of the Global Commission for the Conference, but preferred to avoid making reference to it in the preamble. Brazil would have preferred a more inclusive process, with more discussions with member States and the social partners. A number of provisions of the report contained controversial elements and there had clearly been no tripartite consensus.
- 172.** The Government member of Uruguay supported the amendment. The report of the Global Commission was general in nature and a good reference for the next 100 years.
- 173.** The Government member of Mexico supported the amendment. There had been a far-ranging discussion on the Global Commission on the Future of Work. The report was the only report that tackled the future of work.
- 174.** The Government member of the United States did not support the amendment. He raised the question of the lasting relevance of the report of the Global Commission. The Declaration was not the best place to enshrine the report as the Declaration needed to be timeless.

-
- 175.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment. She expected that the Director-General would, as was the usual custom with declarations, write an introductory note to the Declaration that would make a reference to the report of the Global Commission.
- 176.** The Government member of Canada supported the EU position.
- 177.** In response to an intervention by the Government member of Sweden, the Employer Vice-Chairperson raised a point of order. She clarified that she had not stated that the report had not been discussed in the Governing Body, but rather that it was not a tripartite report that had been endorsed by any structure of the ILO.
- 178.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that although there was considerable support for the amendment, it was insufficient to allow the report of the Global Commission on the Future of Work to be included. She expressed her deep disappointment and withdrew the amendment.

Sixth preambular paragraph

- 179.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace “sentiment” by “imperative”. The word “sentiment” was insufficient as a term and did not do justice to the conditions that led to the creation of the ILO. She felt that there was an “imperative” of social justice.
- 180.** The Government member of the United States supported the amendment, as it seemed to better reflect the post-war reality at the time the ILO was created.
- 181.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, echoed the view of the Government member of the United States and supported the amendment.
- 182.** The Government member of Cuba proposed a subamendment, seconded by the Government member of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, to insert “to achieve” before “social justice”.
- 183.** The Government member of Canada supported the amendment.
- 184.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment as subamended.
- 185.** The Government member of Mali supported the amendment.
- 186.** The Government member of Zimbabwe supported the amendment.
- 187.** The Government member of New Zealand supported the amendment.
- 188.** The Government member of China supported the amendment as subamended.
- 189.** The Government member of Switzerland supported the amendment.
- 190.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson would support the amendment on condition that their amendment to the paragraph was also supported.
- 191.** The Chairperson asked the Worker Vice-Chairperson if their amendment could be bracketed to allow discussion of the amendment from the Employers’ group.

-
192. The Worker Vice-Chairperson thought that the packaging of amendments was to be done in advance of the discussion of the amendment, as she herself had done with the amendments to the third preambular paragraph. She felt that there was wider support for the original amendment but was amenable to the subamendment from Cuba.
 193. The Government member of Mexico supported the Employer Vice-Chairperson's proposal to consider the two amendments together. He supported the original amendment and was flexible about the subamendment.
 194. The Government member of Cuba stated that his proposed subamendment was not intended to slow procedure. If it was not helpful and impeded progress, it could be withdrawn.
 195. The Government member of the United States preferred to discuss amendments individually, particularly when they embodied separate ideas. He did not support the amendment submitted by the Employers' group.
 196. The Employer Vice-Chairperson reiterated that her group could only discuss the amendment if it were bracketed and both were taken as a package.
 197. The Chairperson indicated that the amendment by the Workers' group would indeed be bracketed to allow discussion of the amendment submitted by the Employers' group.
 198. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendment to add "revitalizes and" between "that" and "realizes", and noted that there had been a loss of commitment to the ILO's founding vision. The Centenary Declaration should revitalize that vision.
 199. The Government member of South Africa raised a point of order to clarify procedure regarding the adoption of amendments which had received broad support, as the Workers' group's amendment had.
 200. The Chairperson responded that the ultimate goal was to give ownership to all parties, which entailed hearing all views. The amendment proposed by the Workers' group had not received the support of all Government members. The Employers' group had not rejected the amendment and it would be dealt with later.
 201. The Government member of South Africa noted that the position of the Employers' group had been clear: acceptance of the Workers' group's amendment was conditional. It was better to discuss the amendments individually, as there was no logic in tying the amendments together.
 202. The Employer Vice-Chairperson reiterated that the amendment proposed by the Employers' group sought to revitalize the ILO's founding vision.
 203. The Worker Vice-Chairperson echoed the Government member of South Africa's concerns. Regarding the amendment introduced by the Employers' group, the construction of the sentence did not work since the "future of work" would be "revitalizing the ILO's vision". Her group did not support the amendment.
 204. The Government member of Cuba did not support the amendment for the same reason the Worker Vice-Chairperson had expressed.
 205. The Government member of Brazil considered that the amendment had merit, as there was a need to revitalize the ILO, which had achieved great things but must also look to the future. He proposed a subamendment, seconded by the Government member of Mexico, proposing "... revitalizes the Organization and maintains (or reaffirms) its founding vision".

-
- 206.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment.
- 207.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the text was now confusing in all three languages. It appeared to be saying that the future of work was to shape and revitalize the ILO.
- 208.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson raised a point of order, and reminded the Chairperson that the adopted method of work provided that if extensive discussion led nowhere, it would be appropriate to refer a paragraph to the Drafting Group. Perhaps that was now appropriate.
- 209.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson referred to the earlier comment and request for clarification by the Government member of South Africa. She was not sure she understood the intended meaning of “revitalize,” or whether the amendment had support. There was no need for referral to the Drafting Group but a need for decision-making, as the Workers’ group insisted on including “imperative” as in their amendment.
- 210.** The Chairperson indicated that he was not inclined to refer this to the Drafting Group and expressed the hope that the matter could be resolved in the Committee, without adding to the burdens of the Drafting Group. He urged the Employers’ group to reconsider the linking, especially given the flexibility he had shown in bracketing the Workers’ group’s amendment.
- 211.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson expressed disappointment. She suggested that if there was confusion or a lack of clarity around the intent, the text could be revised. However, the question of revitalization was vital.
- 212.** The Chairperson noted the concerns raised and sought approval for delinking the two amendments and returning to discussion of the first amendment, which had wide support.
- 213.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson emphasized that the link was important in that the paragraph was the most appropriate place to reference revitalization, and the working method had seemed to allow for such an approach.
- 214.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated her commitment to a tripartite process and finding consensus. She drew attention to the fact that the Employers’ group had proposed conditionality and insisted on linking their amendment when support was evident for the amendment.
- 215.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said it was essential that member States also be heard. The Government members of Brazil and Mexico had supported the Employers’ group’s amendment. The Employers had been flexible and “revitalize” had been moved to another part of the sentence.
- 216.** The Government member of Cuba said that positions in the room had been clear and valuable time was being used to decide on what was already clear. If it was necessary to say that the Organization needed to be revitalized then it should be said.
- 217.** Raising a point of order, the Worker Vice-Chairperson said that clarity was needed from the Chairperson as to whether the amendments were being discussed or whether a decision was to be made on the two amendments.
- 218.** The Chairperson said that subamendments were not being discussed but the semantics had to be made clear.

-
- 219.** The Government member of Brazil suggested “reinvigorate” in English and “redinamizar” in Spanish. He proposed this new wording as a compromise as the end result was that the Organization was strengthened and made dynamic.
- 220.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson asked for clarity on the procedures.
- 221.** The Government member of Cuba observed that there were divisions in the Committee. Such problems might also be present in the Drafting Group. He introduced a subamendment to insert “only with revitalized commitment of governments, workers and employers of the world we will be able to shape future of work that realizes the Organization’s founding vision” after “conviction”.
- 222.** The Chairperson stated that he was counting on a spirit of consensus and noted broad support for the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Workers’ group to replace “sentiment” with “imperative”.
- 223.** Referring to the amendment proposed by the Employers’ group, the Worker Vice-Chairperson reiterated the concern of her group regarding the use of “revitalize” and added that the original language was confusing. She proposed a subamendment to insert “to strengthen the Organization and shape a future of work that realizes its founding vision”.
- 224.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that she had hoped that consensus would be reached and noted that although “strengthen” might not be the right word, the Employers’ group would support the subamendment by the Government member of Brazil to use “reinvigorate”.
- 225.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that as the Committee had adopted several paragraphs that highlighted the ILO’s achievements, to use terms such as “reinvigorate” or “revitalize” would be contradictory.
- 226.** The Government member of South Africa supported the subamendment. The Report of the Director-General to the Conference – which had been informed by the Global Commission on the Future of Work – used “reinvigorate”.
- 227.** The Government member of Cuba requested views on his subamendment.
- 228.** The Chairperson noted in reply to the Government member of Cuba that the current version made it clear that it was the government, workers and employers who shaped the world of work.
- 229.** The Government member of Cuba asked for clarification as to whether the Committee would be discussing the strengthening of the ILO, which was important but should come somewhere else in the text.
- 230.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that the proposal to accommodate both views by using “strengthening” was a good compromise. She introduced a subamendment to replace “reinvigorate” by “strengthen”.
- 231.** The Government member of Cuba supported the subamendment.
- 232.** The Government member of South Africa preferred “reinvigorate” as it implied giving new energy or strength to something and hence strengthening the Organization. That was nothing new and had been also mentioned in the Report of the Director-General presented to the Conference.

-
- 233.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Chile, Mexico, Peru and Uruguay, said that although he had proposed the subamendment to introduce “reinvigorate”, he was willing to support “strengthen” in order for consensus to be achieved.
- 234.** The Government member of the United States recalled that the Declaration should be visionary and set the direction and guidance for the coming decades. Although he preferred the original text, as a compromise he could support “strengthen”.
- 235.** In answer to a question from the Government member of South Africa, the Government member of Brazil confirmed that he had not withdrawn his amendment.
- 236.** The Government member of Norway supported the statements of the Government members of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and the United States.
- 237.** The Government member of Canada preferred the original language but could accept “strengthen” as a compromise.
- 238.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that his group could also support “strengthen” in order to reach a consensus.
- 239.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson regretted that the new working methods meant that a lot of time had been spent on one paragraph and said that it was necessary to reflect on how they moved forward. While she understood the Government of South Africa’s sentiments on “reinvigorating” and indeed liked the word “revitalizing”, she wished to clarify that the report of the Global Commission on the Future of Work referred to the reinvigoration of the social contract and not of the ILO. The group maintained their subamendment.
- 240.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson expressed the view that the original proposal of “revitalizing” implied that the Organization needed to adapt to the new challenges of work. The word “strengthen” did not have same meaning. There were new realities in the world of work, so the Organization needed to be reinvigorated to address those new realities.
- 241.** The Chairperson noted that the word “strengthen” had seemed to garner support in the room, and many delegations had shown flexibility in terms of accepting the word. He therefore asked the Employers’ group to be flexible.
- 242.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson reiterated her group’s commitment to producing a draft Declaration that reinforced and provided vital guidance to the ILO, enabling it to confront the challenges of the twenty-first century effectively. The group had clear and transparent reasons for maintaining such terms as “reinvigorate” or “revitalize” and could not support the use of the term “strengthen”. Experience showed that great enterprises could fail and disappear if they failed to reinvigorate themselves and adapt themselves to change. So it was with the ILO. Every organization needed to draw energy from changing circumstances that previous generations had been unable to foresee. An organization that remained rigid and attached to the past was bound to fail, no matter how much it was strengthened. The ILO would thrive by adapting, modernizing and engaging with the dynamism of the modern world. Only thus would it retain the relevance it deserved. The group was open, however, to finding alternative, forward-looking wording that would be acceptable to the Workers’ group.
- 243.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that her group did not consider the ILO to be either rigid or backward-looking. The Organization retained its full relevance and vitality. With the exception of the Employers’ group, there had been strong support for the term “strengthen”. In a spirit of tripartism, the group had refrained from asking the Chairperson to move a

decision on the basis of majority support. The matter should be submitted to the Drafting Group.

244. The text was referred to the Drafting Group.

New paragraphs after the sixth preambular paragraph

245. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add the following new preambular paragraph:

Recognizing that poverty anywhere is a danger to prosperity everywhere and that it is strongly related to informality and to insecurity of work arrangements;

The intention of the paragraph was to draw attention to the continuing relevance of the Declaration of Philadelphia, from which the first phrase was directly drawn, and at the same time to refer to challenges that remained in the world of work.

246. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that her group had already accepted a reference to the Declaration of Philadelphia earlier in the preamble. Singling out parts of that text was unhelpful and could give the impression that the parts that were not mentioned had lost their purpose.

247. The Government member of Brazil recognized the value of citing the Declaration of Philadelphia, but the origins of poverty were complex; they might include informality and insecurity of work arrangements, but not necessarily so. He did not support the amendment.

248. The Government members of Australia, Switzerland, United States, Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment.

249. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the substance of the amendment could be dealt with elsewhere in the draft Declaration; she withdrew the amendment.

250. The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, introduced an amendment to add the following new preambular paragraph:

Recognizing the importance of the role of enterprises as generators of employment and promoters of innovation and decent work;

The group had submitted the amendment to highlight the fundamental role that the private sector must play in the future. The draft Declaration should give impetus to that role, which would help to reinforce other areas of the text such as those dealing with sustainable enterprises and SMEs.

251. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, which would add a new and important aspect to the draft Declaration that had thus far been missing.

252. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that objections had been raised earlier to the inclusion of elements in the preamble on the grounds that they were dealt with elsewhere in the text. Now, the fact that reference was made to sustainable enterprises and SMEs elsewhere in the text was being used as an argument to include a reference to them in the preamble. In line with their previous motive for rejection, her group did not support the amendment.

253. The Government members of Australia, China, South Africa, Switzerland, United States, and Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment.

254. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the preamble of the Centenary Declaration should contain universal principles, and not details of specific types of enterprises, which were included already under Part II, Section A, paragraph vii, of the draft text. She proposed the following subamended version of the GRULAC amendment:

Recognizing the importance of the role of sustainable private and public enterprises as in the generation generators of employment, innovation and ~~promoters of innovation and~~ decent work and the role of social dialogue in supporting this;

255. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the subamended text no longer had the same meaning. Social dialogue did not create employment.

256. The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that, as sponsors of the original amendment, they could accept the first parts of the subamendment, but the inclusion of social dialogue was unhelpful here and altered the focus of the paragraph. He queried the use of the word “generation”.

257. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the proposed paragraph would follow on from the previously adopted paragraph which read “labour is not a commodity”; the notion of social dialogue was thus already present.

258. The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the text as subamended by the Workers’ group.

259. The Government member of Switzerland said that for the draft Declaration to be as readable as possible, there should be only one idea per clause. The original drafting should stand, with “enterprise” remaining general. However, he would not block a compromise.

260. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that other parts of the draft Declaration dealt with private enterprises. It was for that reason that the group preferred to speak clearly in the preamble of the role of social dialogue in supporting sustainable “public and private” enterprises.

261. The Government member of the United States, seconded by the Government member of Canada and supported by the Government member of Switzerland, proposed a subamendment to the text to delete “private and public”.

262. The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment as drafted by the Workers’ group.

263. The Worker Vice-Chairperson explained that the group wished to include mention of public enterprises, as a great majority of people considered all enterprises to be private entities. However, there were public enterprises in health services and in the booming care industry, for instance, that generated employment and were innovative.

264. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment proposed by the Government member of the United States. She preferred the original text proposed by GRULAC and suggested a further subamendment to read:

Recognizing the importance of the role of sustainable enterprises as generators of employment ~~and promoters of~~, innovation and decent work;

265. The Chairperson said that the amendment and subamendments would be referred to the Drafting Group; he closed the discussion on the amendment.

-
- 266.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC said that there had been substantial support, except from the Workers' group, for the original GRULAC amendment, subamended to include the word "sustainable".
- 267.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the aim was to achieve a Centenary Declaration that had the widest tripartite support possible.
- 268.** The Chairperson said that he had already ruled on the matter, but that the Government member of Brazil's comments would be recorded in the report of the Committee.
- 269.** The paragraph was referred to the Drafting Group.
- 270.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add a new preambular paragraph, which she subamended to read:

~~*Reaffirming* that labour is not a commodity and that the increasing commodification of labour is a threat to the fundamental value and dignity of work;~~

- 271.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, while agreeing that labour was indeed not a commodity, said that the amendment once again singled out a particular phrase from the Declaration of Philadelphia.
- 272.** The Government members of Canada, China, United States, Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment as subamended.
- 273.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 274.** The new paragraph after the sixth preambular paragraph was adopted.
- 275.** The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran introduced an amendment, seconded by the Government member of China, who also spoke also on behalf of the Government members of Indonesia, Lebanon, Malaysia, Philippines and the Syrian Arab Republic, to insert a new paragraph after the sixth preambular paragraph to read as follows:

Underlining the significance of promoting multilateralism, particularly in shaping the future of work that we want and in dealing with the challenges of the world of work;

Multilateralism was of great significance in shaping the future of work and had a key role to play in implementing the ILO Centenary Declaration. As it stood, the draft text lacked sufficient reference to multilateralism.

- 276.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson wished to focus the sense of the amendment to the ILO, and proposed a subamendment to read "promoting the ILO's role in multilateralism".
- 277.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that her group had often strongly emphasized the role of multilateralism. She felt that in the preamble it should be promoted in the general sense, and not restricted to the ILO. She therefore supported the original text.
- 278.** The Government member of the United States did not support the amendment. The preamble of a Declaration concerning the future of the ILO was not the place to insert statements about multilateralism. That message could be conveyed elsewhere in the text.
- 279.** The Government member of Canada also felt that the message would be inappropriate in the preamble and did not support the amendment.

-
- 280.** The Government members of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Mexico and Namibia supported the amendment in its original form.
- 281.** The Government member of Panama supported the amendment in both forms.
- 282.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew her group’s subamendment.
- 283.** The amendment was adopted.
- 284.** The new preambular paragraph was adopted.

Seventh preambular paragraph

- 285.** The Chairperson said that four amendments had been submitted on the paragraph. He invited the sponsors to introduce their own amendments and give their opinions on the other amendments.⁵

Submitted by the Employer members:

Calling upon all constituents of the ILO to reinvigorate their efforts to achieve social contract for social justice and universal and lasting peace to which they committed in 1919, taking into account continuous and profound transformations in the world of work;

Submitted by the Government member of Brazil, on behalf of GRULAC:

Calling upon all constituents of the ILO to make every effort, within their abilities, to realize the full potential of sustainable development in pursuit of reinvigorate the social contract for social justice and universal and lasting peace to which they committed in 1919;

Submitted by the Worker members:

Calling upon all constituents of the ILO to renew reinvigorate the social contract for social justice and universal and lasting peace to which they committed in 1919;

Submitted by the Worker members:

Calling upon all constituents of the ILO to reinvigorate the social contract for social justice and universal and lasting peace to which they committed in 1919 and 1944;

- 286.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced her group’s amendment and explained that while the group wished to remain faithful to ILO terminology, it also wished to highlight the continuous and profound transformations the world of work was undergoing. The term “social contract” had been deleted as it was not commonly used in ILO texts and belonged more properly to the political philosophy of Jean-Jacques Rousseau or to trade union manifestos. It could cause confusion and it would therefore be wiser to remain with “social justice and universal and lasting peace”. The group supported the GRULAC amendment, which could be merged with their own. The first amendment proposed by the Workers’ group included the term “social contract” and therefore the Employers’ group did not support it. They had no objection to the second amendment, which was simply to include the year of the Declaration of Philadelphia: 1944.
- 287.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced her group’s two amendments. Referring to the amendment proposed by the Employer members, she pointed out that the World Bank and

⁵ Note for the reader: For ease of reference, amendments that were discussed in parallel are listed at the beginning of the relevant section of the report.

the OECD used the term “social contract”. They did not support the GRULAC amendment because of the deletion of “social contract”. The last, additional phrase of the Employers’ group’s amendment appeared useful, provided the words “continuous and profound” were not used as limiting qualifiers, to the exclusion of other transformations. As for their own amendments, the first drew from the report of the Global Commission on the Future of Work, calling for tripartite commitment to renew the social contract, while the second included the year of the Declaration of Philadelphia, as that was a previous occasion on which the ILO’s mandate had been reaffirmed.

- 288.** The Government member of Brazil introduced the GRULAC amendment and said that it aimed to link the commitments of 1919 with the SDGs of the twenty-first century. The term “social contract” was ambiguous in the context and should not be retained. The amendment also recognized the differing capacities of member States. He confirmed that, as suggested by the Employer Vice-Chairperson, it would be possible to merge the GRULAC amendment with that of the Employers’ group. GRULAC supported the use of “reinvigorate” and the inclusion of the year 1944.
- 289.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that the group favoured the original wording of the paragraph, as they wished to maintain the use of the term “social contract”. The wording supplied by the Employers’ group, “continuous and profound transformations in the world of work”, could be included, if supported by other Committee members. The Africa group supported both amendments submitted by the Workers’ group.
- 290.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment submitted by the Employers’ group as it deleted the term “social contract”. The Government members of the EU Member States had intended to propose a subamendment to reinstate the term within that amendment; however, they supported the second part of the amendment, “taking into account continuous and profound transformations in the world of work”. They preferred the original draft text to the amendment submitted by GRULAC and the first amendment submitted by the Workers’ group. They saw no difficulty in including the year 1944 in the paragraph.
- 291.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson acknowledged the differing views with relation to the term “social contract” and said that the group would be willing to review the drafting and develop a text that would be acceptable to the three groups.
- 292.** The amendments were referred to the Drafting Group.

New paragraph before the eighth preambular paragraph

- 293.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, introduced an amendment to add the following new paragraph:

Keen to democratize ILO governance by ensuring a fair representation of all regions and establishing the principle of equality among member States;

The purpose of the new paragraph was to ensure that all member States were represented fairly and democratically in the ILO’s governing organs. That issue scarcely featured in the draft Declaration and was of such importance that it should be included in the preamble.

- 294.** The Government member of the United States said that although he was sensitive to the position of the Africa group, the preamble should be a statement of vision and not include issues of governance.

295. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.

296. The Government members of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Cuba, Switzerland, Zimbabwe, and China, also speaking on behalf of the Government members of Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Qatar, Sri Lanka and the United Arab Emirates, and Ireland on behalf of the EU and its Member States supported the amendment.

297. The amendment was adopted.

298. The new paragraph before the eighth preambular paragraph was adopted.

Eighth preambular paragraph

299. The eighth preambular paragraph was adopted on the understanding that the date of adoption of the Centenary Declaration would be added subsequently.

Part I

Chapeau

300. No amendment was received and the chapeau was adopted.

Part I, Section A

301. The Chairperson said that the following six amendments had been submitted on Part I, Section A:

Submitted by the Worker members:

- A. The ILO marks its Centenary at a time of growing inequality of wealth and transformative change in the world of work, driven by technological innovations, demographic shifts, climate change and globalization, which bring into question the very nature and future of work, and the place and dignity of people in it.

Submitted by the Government members of Brazil and the United States:

- A. The ILO marks its Centenary at a time of transformative change in the world of work, driven by technological innovations, demographic shifts, ~~climate~~ environmental change and globalization, which bring into question the very nature and future of work, and the place and dignity of people in it.

Submitted by the Employer members:

- A. The ILO marks its Centenary at a time of transformative change in the world of work, driven by technological innovations, demographic shifts, climate change and globalization, among others, which have profound impacts on ~~bring into question~~ the very nature ~~and future~~ of work and its future, and the place and dignity of people in it.

Submitted by the Government member of Brazil, on behalf of GRULAC:

- A. The ILO marks its Centenary at a time of transformative change in the world of work, driven by technological innovations, demographic shifts, climate change and globalization, which constitute challenges for ~~bring into question~~ the very nature and future of work and its very nature, and for the place and dignity of people in it.

Submitted by the Government member of Canada and the Government members of the EU Member States:

- A. The ILO marks its Centenary at a time of transformative change in the world of work, driven by technological innovations, demographic shifts, climate change and globalization, which will impact ~~bring into question~~ the very nature and future of work, and the place and dignity of people in it.

Submitted by the Worker members:

- A. The ILO marks its Centenary at a time of transformative change in the world of work, driven by technological innovations, demographic shifts, climate change and globalization, which bring into question the very nature and future of work, and the place and dignity of working people in it.

He invited the sponsors to introduce their own amendments and give their opinions on the other amendments.

- 302.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced her group's amendments. The first amendment was intended to take account of growing concern over increasing inequality of wealth. The amendment submitted by the Government members of Brazil and the United States, which amended the words "climate change" to "environmental change", suggested a lessening of support for the Paris Agreement on climate change, and thus the Workers' group could not endorse it. The group could consider endorsing the amendment submitted by the Employer members. The Workers' group found the language of the GRULAC amendment insufficiently strong, as "challenges" diminished the urgency of the statement. The amendment proposed by the Government member of Canada and the Government members of the EU Member States also weakened the language of the paragraph. Finally, the second amendment submitted by the Workers' group simply sought to add "working" before "people" in the final line of the Section, thus retaining the original text, but concentrating its meaning on working people.
- 303.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the first amendment proposed by the Workers' group, as she considered it one-sided as well as inaccurate. While growing inequality was certainly a problem, huge numbers of people had been lifted out of poverty. The term "persisting poverty and inequality" already appeared in the third preambular paragraph, and was thus redundant here. Both Brazil and the United States had endorsed the SDGs, which referred to climate change. To amend that term to "environmental change" was therefore unnecessary, though the Employers' group would accept a majority decision on that use of terminology. She introduced her group's amendment to end the list of causes of change with "among others", the intention of which was to indicate that the list was not exhaustive. The group felt that "profound impacts" was an improvement on the original "bring into question", which suggested the very unlikely hypothesis that work might one day cease to exist. Because the text should refer to the dignity of all people, without modifier or limitation, they could not support the second amendment proposed by the Workers' group to include "working people". They took no position on the GRULAC amendment where it replaced "bring into question" with "constitute challenges". The amendment by the Government member of Canada and the Government members of the EU Member States was very similar to their own and they supported it.
- 304.** Introducing the amendment that he co-sponsored with the Government member of Brazil, the Government member of the United States explained that "environmental" change was an accurate description, as the environment comprised the sum total of all external effects, including climate, natural disasters, or disease. The United States could support many of the other amendments, including the Workers' group's amendment: "working people".

-
- 305.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, introduced their amendment and said that it constituted an attempt to grapple with the huge transformations in the world of work without portraying them as entirely negative. Challenges could also be opportunities. GRULAC took no position with respect to the first amendment submitted by the Workers' group. The amendment proposed by the Employers' group converged with their own proposal, while that submitted by the Government members of Canada and the EU Member States was also similar in content. GRULAC could not support the Workers' group's amendment "working people", and wished to retain the reference to all people.
- 306.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the Government member of Canada and the Government members of the EU Member States, introduced their amendment and said that its intent was to bring more balance to the text, by acknowledging challenges and opportunities. Speaking subsequently only for the EU and its Member States, she said that the amendment proposed by the Workers' group to include "growing inequality of wealth" was inappropriate in the proposed location. They could not support the amendment submitted by the Government members of Brazil and the United States, nor the "working people" amendment in the Workers' group's second amendment. They could accept the Employers' group's proposed text, if the words "among others" were deleted. Speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States and also for the Government member of Canada, she said that they supported the GRULAC amendment, but preferred their own text.
- 307.** The Government member of Canada greatly preferred the term "climate change" over "environmental change". Canada agreed with the EU proposal to remove the term "among others", and could accept the term "profound impacts" contained in the Employers' amendment. The delegation could not accept "working people".
- 308.** The Government member of China supported the amendment submitted by GRULAC and the second amendment, including the term "working people", submitted by the Workers' group, but did not support any of the other amendments.
- 309.** The Government member of Mexico agreed with the Workers' group on the importance of including the notion of inequality, which was central to the 2030 Agenda, though it might fit more appropriately elsewhere. Climate change constituted one of the main challenges to the future of work and should not be expanded to "environmental change", as proposed by the amendment submitted by the Government members of Brazil and the United States. The amendment submitted by the Government members of Canada and the EU Member States was similar in content to the GRULAC amendment. A formulation might be found in the Drafting Group that would combine those proposals. Mexico did not support the amendment: "working people" proposed by the Workers' group as the issues in question affected all people.
- 310.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the Workers' group's proposed text on growing inequality. The Africa group preferred "climate change" to "environmental change", and favoured the Office text over the GRULAC amendment. The group could support the amendment proposed by the Government members of Canada and the EU Member States, with a subamendment to change the tense of "which will impact" to "which have an impact on". The group could join a consensus on the term "working people", but preferred the original draft text.
- 311.** The Government member of the Plurinational State of Bolivia strongly supported the amendment proposed by the Workers' group regarding growing inequality. She was not in favour of changing the wording from "climate change" to "environmental change" as proposed in the amendment by the Government members of Brazil and the United States.

The proposal from the Employers' group could possibly be merged with the GRULAC amendment.

- 312.** The Government member of Cuba also supported the amendment proposed by the Workers' group regarding growing inequality. The words "climate change" should be retained. The amendments submitted respectively by the Employers' group and by GRULAC were very similar, and his Government could support either.
- 313.** The Government member of Panama also spoke in favour of the Workers' group's amendment related to growing inequality. He preferred the use of "environmental change" to "climate change" as the former was more inclusive and could include the effects of tsunamis, earthquakes and hurricanes on the world of work. His Government could support both the amendment submitted by the Employers' group and that submitted by GRULAC.
- 314.** The representative of the Secretary-General introduced the Chairperson's consolidated proposal for Part I, Section A. He explained that the insertion of "growing inequality" attempted to capture different forms of inequality and also highlight the consequences of changes in the world of work. He suggested the combined phrase "climate and environmental change" could incorporate both terms suggested by members of the Committee. The amendment to insert "have profound impacts on" as proposed by the Employers' group had been added after receiving broad support. Regarding the amendment to insert "working" previously proposed by the Workers' group, he explained that the word "it" at the end of the paragraph referred to people in the world of work. Therefore adding the word "working" was redundant.
- 315.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson favoured the consolidated paragraph, but was open to hearing the views expressed by other members of the Committee.
- 316.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson broadly agreed with the proposal of the Chairperson with the exception of the term "growing inequality". It was transformative changes, such as technological and demographic change, which would have a profound impact, not "growing inequality".
- 317.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to the Chairperson's proposal by adding "of" before "transformative change" so as not to exclude other forces of change and therefore address the concern of the Employer Vice-Chairperson.
- 318.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the EU Member States, stated a preference for the previous version and introduced a subamendment to delete "growing inequality" and add "as well as at a time of persisting inequalities" after "globalization". She asked for clarification on the meaning of the "nature of work and its future", and noted her preference for the earlier phrase "the very nature and future of work".
- 319.** The Government members of Canada and China supported the subamendment.
- 320.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment.
- 321.** The Government member of Mexico supported the proposed text, and proposed a subamendment to change the order of words to "environmental and climate change".
- 322.** The Government member of China supported the subamendment.
- 323.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment.

-
- 324.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that his group preferred the original text without the EU subamendment, but supported the subamendment proposed by the Government member of Mexico.
- 325.** The Government member of the United States considered climate to be a subset of environment, but nonetheless supported the subamendment proposed by the Government member of Mexico. The mention of inequality, however, did not belong in the paragraph; he preferred the original version previous to the EU subamendment.
- 326.** The Government member of New Zealand considered the summary provided by the Chairperson to have captured the previous discussion well. He therefore did not support the subamendment proposed by the Government members of the EU Member States, but supported the subamendment proposed by the Workers' group.
- 327.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the text as presented by the Chairperson but did not support any of the subamendments.
- 328.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson queried whether it was necessary to replace “the nature of work and its future” with the phrase “the nature and future of work”. The Workers' group preferred the term “future of work” as it had been widely accepted.
- 329.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that the group could accept either formulation though preferred the term “the future of work”.
- 330.** The representative of the Secretary-General recalled that the original text read “the nature and future of work”. While the two phrases had a similar meaning, it was perhaps more eloquent to restore the original wording. The term “future of work” was not intended to refer to the report of the Global Commission on the Future of Work, but simply to be more grammatically concise.
- 331.** All other amendments on Part I, Section A, fell.
- 332.** Part I, Section A, was adopted as amended:
- A. The ILO marks its Centenary at a time of transformative change in the world of work, driven by technological innovations, demographic shifts, environmental and climate change and globalization, as well as at a time of persisting inequalities, which have profound impacts on the nature and future of work, and the place and dignity of people in it.

Part I, Section B

- 333.** The Chairperson said that four amendments had been submitted in relation to Part I, Section B. He invited the sponsors to introduce their amendments and give their opinions on the other amendments submitted.

Submitted by the Worker members:

- B. It is imperative to act with urgency to seize all opportunities and address all risks to shape a fairer, inclusive and more secure future of work with full employment and decent work for all.

Submitted by the Employer members:

-
- B. It is imperative to act with urgency to seize all opportunities to shape a fairer, inclusive and ~~more~~ secure future of work with full and productive employment and decent work for all.

Submitted by the Worker members:

- B. It is imperative to act with urgency to seize all opportunities to shape a fairer, inclusive and more secure future of work with full, productive, freely chosen employment and decent work for all.

Submitted by the Government member of Brazil, on behalf of GRULAC

- B. It is imperative to act with urgency to seize all opportunities to shape a fairer, inclusive and more secure future of work with full employment and decent work for all men and women, with an emphasis on young persons and vulnerable people.

- 334.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendments submitted by her group and noted the need to balance opportunities and risks. It was not only workers in fragile or more vulnerable parts of the world that faced risks and insecurities; therefore, there was a need to address those risks in addition to seizing opportunities. With respect to the amendment submitted by the Employers' group, she had no problem with the terms "productive" and "full" employment but recalled that the standard ILO formulation detailed the promotion of full, productive and freely chosen employment. Regarding the amendment submitted by the Government member of Brazil on behalf of GRULAC, the Workers' group understood the intention of the proposal but noted that the term "decent work for all" was already well established. Adding the categories of men, women, young persons and vulnerable people left many others out.
- 335.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendment submitted by her group and explained that its intention was to make the sentence more linguistically coherent. She supported the amendment proposed by the Workers' group to add "productive" as well as "freely chosen". With regard to the other amendment submitted by the Workers' group, she recalled that the original text made a positive appeal to "seize all opportunities to shape a fairer, inclusive and more secure future of work". That implied that risks had to be addressed, and it was unnecessary to introduce a negative aspect which did not add any substance. The Employers' group did not support that amendment. Regarding the GRULAC amendment, she shared the Workers' group's concern that decent work for all should not be limited by qualifiers, and noted that specific categories of vulnerable workers were addressed later in the draft Declaration. The Employers' group did not support that amendment.
- 336.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, introduced the amendment submitted by the group and emphasized that the fundamental challenge at present was to secure decent work for future generations of young people. While it was important to take action to protect all workers, special emphasis should be placed on vulnerable workers. With regard to the other amendments, he supported the use of wording that had emerged as a result of previous tripartite agreement for consistency.
- 337.** The Government member of the United States acknowledged the intent of the first amendment submitted by the Workers' group. However, while ministries of labour indeed took steps to address risks, it was not possible to address all potential risks. He preferred the original draft which emphasized the urgency to "seize all opportunities to shape fairer, inclusive and more secure future of work". He supported the amendment submitted by the Employers' group and the second amendment submitted by the Workers' group. He did not support the GRULAC amendment.

-
- 338.** The Government member of Australia concurred with the Government member of the United States.
- 339.** The Government member of China, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the amendment submitted by the Employers' group.
- 340.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf the EU and its Member States, did not support the first amendment submitted by the Workers' group. The second amendment, to insert "productive, freely chosen", was preferable to the amendment to add "and productive" submitted by the Employers' group. The EU did not support the GRULAC amendment as it was a duplication of what was addressed elsewhere in the draft Declaration.
- 341.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, asked for clarification from the Workers' group regarding the meaning of "risks". He supported the amendment to insert "productive, freely chosen" employment, submitted by the Workers' group. He proposed a subamendment to delete "men and women" in the GRULAC amendment.
- 342.** The Government member of Peru supported the GRULAC amendment and considered it important to maintain an emphasis on young people.
- 343.** In response to the Government member of Mali, the Worker Vice-Chairperson explained that the word "risks" was not intended to add a negative connotation, but rather to convey a realistic view of the world of work. The Declaration should provide hope for a better future to those who did not currently enjoy decent work, by addressing current risks and challenges. The Social Justice Declaration had managed to note progress made and at the same time identify current and existing challenges. The Declaration needed to be similarly balanced by mentioning risks. In order to help to reach consensus, the Workers' group was amenable to using "challenges" instead of "risks".
- 344.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that she did not perceive widespread support in the Committee for "all risks", and suggested that the notion of addressing risks was implicit when seizing opportunities.
- 345.** The representative of the Secretary-General explained that when the Office had prepared the draft Declaration, it had tried not to be repetitive. Part I, Section A, highlighted the challenges and risks while Part I, Section B, stressed the need to address those risks as a matter of urgency to shape a fairer, inclusive and more secure future of work. Those Sections were designed to be read as a whole and sequentially. There was no intention to ignore risks but rather to indicate them in order to consider how to approach them.
- 346.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted the explanation provided by the secretariat; however, while Part I, Section A, detailed concerns and Part I, Section B actions, the latter should not only be about addressing the opportunities but also the challenges.
- 347.** The Government member of Argentina concurred with the Workers' group that it was important to address all risks. While some had suggested that that was not possible, it was also not possible to seize all opportunities. With consensus in mind, he suggested deleting the word "all" in both instances so that the sentence read "it is imperative to act with urgency to seize opportunities and address risks".
- 348.** The Government member of Switzerland observed that the present divergence was due to the words "risks" and "challenges". He proposed using "obstacles" instead.

-
- 349.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the suggestion made the Government member of Argentina to remove “all” could work. The Workers’ group was unsure about the use of “obstacles”, and noted that “challenges” already had considerable support among Committee members. In any case, the Workers’ group was not opposed to seizing opportunities, but wanted a realistic recognition of risks.
- 350.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not agree with the suggestion to delete “all” as the text would become less ambitious without it. If there was consensus on the term “challenges”, the Employers’ group would also support it.
- 351.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson considered it to be a linguistic matter. The term “all” was indeed ambitious but even without that term the Workers’ group was prepared to support the text as long as it included “address the risks”.
- 352.** The Government member of Argentina stated that if the Committee’s intention was to “seize all opportunities”, the phrase “striving to achieve” was needed to ensure that the text was realistic. He was also amenable to the use of “the” instead of “all”.
- 353.** The Government member of the United States supported the subamendment proposed by the Workers’ group as it was a good and realistic compromise.
- 354.** The Government members of Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the text as subamended.
- 355.** The Committee adopted Part I, Section B, as amended:
- B. It is imperative to act with urgency to seize the opportunities and address the challenges to shape a fair, inclusive and secure future of work with full, productive and freely chosen employment and decent work for all.
- 356.** All other amendments on Part I, Section B, were withdrawn.

Part I, Section C

- 357.** The Chairperson stated that six amendments had been submitted in relation to Part I, Section C.

Submitted by the Government member of Brazil, on behalf of GRULAC:

- C. ~~Such a~~ future of work with such characteristics is a precondition for sustainable development that puts an end to poverty and leaves no one behind.

Submitted by the Government members of Australia, Canada, Switzerland and the United States:

- C. Such a future of work is ~~a precondition~~ critical for sustainable development that puts an end to poverty and leaves no one behind.

Submitted by the Government member of Brazil on behalf of GRULAC:

- C. Such a future of work is fundamental ~~for a precondition for~~ sustainable development that puts an end to poverty and leaves no one behind.

Submitted by the Employer members:

-
- C. Such a future of work is essential ~~a precondition~~ for sustainable development that puts an end to poverty and leaves no one behind.

Submitted by the Employer members:

- C. Such a future of work is a precondition for sustainable development based on integrated and balanced economic, social and environmental dimensions that puts an end to poverty and leaves no one behind.

Submitted by the Worker members:

- C. Such a future of work is a precondition for sustainable development that puts an end to poverty, addresses income inequality and leaves no one behind.

358. The Employer Vice-Chairperson indicated that the two amendments submitted by her group were intended to be a single amendment and the secretariat should have combined them in the same sentence, rather than split. In the first amendment, “precondition” was not appropriate and “essential” was much better. The second amendment expanded on the three pillars of sustainable development, namely the economic, social and environmental dimensions. Regarding the first GRULAC amendment, it was a linguistic question, but some clarification of the intent was desirable. The amendments by the Government members of Australia, Canada, Switzerland and the United States and the second GRULAC amendment were similar to their own amendment to change “precondition” to “essential” and, as such, the Employers’ group could support either wording. Regarding the amendment submitted by the Workers’ group to include “income inequality”, in the context it was too narrow and the idea of leaving no one behind was broad enough to take it into account.

359. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that she was focusing on the two amendments submitted by the Employers’ group, as they could form the basis for a possible agreement. At the same time, the Committee needed to consider Sections A and B in parallel and in no case should they be a “precondition” of Section C. She proposed a subamendment for the paragraph to read “A future of work based on integrated economic, social and environmental dimensions that put an end to poverty, address income inequality and leaves no one behind is essential for sustainable development.” She did not support the first GRULAC amendment. Regarding the amendment proposed by Australia, Canada, Switzerland and the United States and the second GRULAC amendment, both “critical” and “fundamental” were acceptable. Regarding her group’s own amendment, the inclusion of income equality was highly important. International organizations such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the OECD and World Bank recognized that inclusive growth was a paramount challenge of our time as too many were being left behind. Excessive global inequality between the wealthy few and large numbers of poor people inhibited inclusion and undermined social capital and trust. It was important to include at least some reference to income inequality, which had a close relationship to other issues discussed in the draft Declaration

360. The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, explained that their second amendment intended to reflect a number of elements that must be taken into account for sustainable development, and consequently “precondition” did not fit the purpose. He suggested that “fundamental” was the most appropriate alternative, and noted that it seemed to enjoy the support of the Workers’ group and the Employers’ group, who had a similar amendment. The additional wording in the first amendment was intended to clarify the sentence, but he remained open to considering other formulations. The subamendment proposed by the Workers’ group was a positive attempt to bring a number of elements together and find a way forward. He expressed some concern about the term “income inequality” and its consistency with the SDGs, which used the term “inequalities”.

-
- 361.** The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Canada and Switzerland, explained the rationale of their amendment. She noted that the term “precondition” in the original text implied an inappropriate causality, which the amendment sought to remedy by using the term “critical”. Speaking for her Government, she did not support the use of “fundamental” or “essential”, as proposed by the Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, and the Employers’ group. Furthermore, she did not support the unclear wording in the first GRULAC amendment; listing the pillars of sustainable development was repetitive.
- 362.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that “such a future of work” was coherent as it followed from the meaning of Part I, Section B, which set out what the future was. Noting that inequality had already been mentioned twice, once in the preamble and once in Part I, Section A, she appealed for moderation from the Workers’ group. The Employers’ group had accepted the second reference in a spirit of compromise, but a third mention would be unnecessarily repetitive given that the present Section was intended to speak about jobs, growth and opportunities. She defended the amendment her group had submitted to spell out the “integrated and balanced economic, social, and environmental dimensions” of sustainable development.
- 363.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that, in a spirit of compromise, she supported the amendment submitted by the Workers’ group.
- 364.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson hoped that the Committee would not engage in a word-counting exercise. In the preamble, there had been agreement to include a general reference to inequality. Later, the Workers’ group had proposed a reference to inequality of wealth and had agreed to modify it to reach consensus. She emphasized that spelling out concepts, such as decent work objectives was important since the draft Declaration was intended for a broader audience. The same was true for inequality. While there were many types of inequality, the amendment focused on income inequality, which was enormous and growing. In the context, it was not sufficient only to speak about addressing poverty.
- 365.** The Chairperson observed that there appeared to be general agreement on dropping “preconditions”. Also, the notion that “such a future of work” was “fundamental” as well as the listing of the three pillars of sustainable development seemed coherent and acceptable to the Committee.
- 366.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson was concerned that the original text had a significantly different meaning compared to the newly amended version. Rather than adopting a new text that changed the meaning, it was preferable to rework and subamend the original amendment. The main meaning of the amendment submitted by the Employers’ group was that “this type of future of work” was “essential for sustainable development,” and that appeared to have a lot of support in the Committee.
- 367.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, requested that since there had been no objection to introducing the word “fundamental,” it should be reflected in the text under consideration. Speaking on behalf of his own Government, he concurred with the Government member of Switzerland and stated that each Section needed to have a clear focus. When many concepts were spelled out, the meaning become less clear. The present Section seemed originally to be about sustainable development and the elimination of poverty. In that regard, if the text went directly from the “end of poverty” to “leaving no one behind” it would be much more straightforward and in line with the declaratory nature of the text.

-
368. The Employer Vice-Chairperson clarified that she supported the use of “fundamental”. In a spirit of compromise, the Employers’ group was prepared to remove the listing of the elements of sustainable development and simply mention “sustainable development that puts an end to poverty and leaves no one behind”. She reiterated that “income inequality,” should be removed to ensure that the Declaration was clear and concise.
369. The Government member of Argentina proposed a subamendment, seconded by the Government member of Switzerland, for the phrase to read “such a kind of work”, instead of “such a future of work”. It was more in line with the future of work previously described in Section B.
370. The Government member of Switzerland added that the aim of the subamendment was to preserve short and sharp Sections which would bring visibility and clarity to outside readers.
371. The Government member of Canada supported the amendment as proposed by the Employers’ group, without the subamendment from the Government member of Argentina.
372. The Government members of Australia, New Zealand, United States, Zimbabwe, Ireland on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Mali on behalf of the Africa group supported the amendment but not the subamendment.
373. The Government member of China, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the addition of the word “critical”. Speaking on behalf of his own Government, he supported the subamendment proposed by the Workers’ group.
374. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that it was unclear why income inequality was not explicitly mentioned anywhere in the draft Declaration even though it was contained in the 2030 Agenda, but observed that there was nonetheless support for the current version of the text.
375. The Committee adopted Part I, Section C:
- C. Such a future of work is fundamental for sustainable development that puts an end to poverty and leaves no one behind.
376. All other amendments on Part I, Section C, were withdrawn.

Part I, Section D

377. The Chairperson said that six amendments had been submitted on Part I, Section D. He invited the sponsors to introduce their own amendments and to give their opinions on the other amendments.

Submitted by the Employer members:

- D. The ILO must carry forward its enduring human-centred mandate into its second century with unrelenting vigour ~~its enduring mandate~~ informed by renewed consideration of all relevant economic and financial factors, and supported by strengthened commitment to tripartism and social dialogue for social justice by making people’s rights, needs and aspirations the primary objectives of economic, social and environmental policies ~~the human-centred approach for the future of work.~~

Submitted by the Government member of Canada and the Government members of the EU Member States:

-
- D. The ILO must carry forward into its second century with unrelenting vigour its ~~enduring~~ constitutional mandate for social justice by making people's rights, needs and aspirations the primary objectives of economic, social and environmental policies – *the human-centred approach for the future of work*.

Submitted by the Worker members:

- D. The ILO must carry forward into its second century with unrelenting vigour its enduring normative mandate for social justice by making people's rights, needs and aspirations the primary objectives of economic, social and environmental policies – *the human-centred approach for the future of work*.

Submitted by the Worker members:

- D. The ILO must carry forward into its second century with unrelenting vigour its enduring mandate for social justice by making working people's rights, needs and aspirations the primary objectives of economic, social and environmental policies – *the human-centred approach for the future of work*.

Submitted by the Government members of Canada and the United States:

- D. The ILO must carry forward into its second century with unrelenting vigour its enduring mandate for social justice by making people's rights, needs and aspirations ~~the~~ a primary objective of economic, social and environmental policies – *the human-centred approach for the future of work*.

Submitted by the Worker members:

- D. The ILO must carry forward into its second century with unrelenting vigour its enduring mandate for social justice by making people's rights, needs and aspirations the primary objectives of economic, social and environmental policies – *the human-centred approach for the future of work, reaffirming that labour is not a commodity*.

378. The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew her group's last amendment to add “, reaffirming that labour is not a commodity” as it was now included in the preamble. She suggested adding “normative” before “mandate” but noted that the amendment proposed by the Government member of Canada and the Government members of the EU Member States to insert “constitutional” before “mandate” was preferable. The Workers' group would withdraw their own amendment if that wording was adopted. She proposed a subamendment to another of her group's amendments to read “workers' rights” as opposed to “working people's rights”; ILO language typically spoke about the rights of workers and not of people in general. Regarding the amendment submitted by the Employers' group, she voiced a concern that workers' rights were disappearing from the picture. The phrase did not appear in the preamble, which referred to enterprises but not to workers' rights. That resulted in an imbalanced text. Moreover, the preamble was normative in character but the amendment suggested the misleading term “human-centred mandate”. The Workers' group could not compromise on the inclusion of workers' rights.

379. Recalling her opening remarks, the Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the human-centred approach had been part of the ILO since its creation and was not in fact a new approach. The Declaration of Philadelphia clearly set out a human-centred agenda when it referred to “all human beings” in its Part II and the “well-being of all peoples” in Part IV, not only of workers. The ILO's human-centred approach needed to be put into its proper historical context in order to avoid confusion about the ILO's previous and future mandate. That was why the Employers' group proposed moving it to earlier in the text. The second part of their amendment was intended to identify the relevant factors that informed the human-centred mandate. Without identification of those factors, rights could not be secured in reality. It was also important to highlight the need to strengthen the ILO's commitment to tripartism and

social dialogue, as those were the distinguishing features of the Organization, and had come under potential threat in the context of ongoing UN reforms. The Employers' group supported the Canada/EU amendment to add the word "constitutional" before "mandate", but opposed the Workers' group's amendment to add the word "normative". They did not support the subamendment proposed by the Workers' group to limit the text to "workers' rights" and said that Section D should focus on institutional matters.

- 380.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the EU Member States and also on behalf of the Government member of Canada, introduced their amendment to add the "constitutional" before "mandate". She noted that the amendment had already received support from the Workers' group and the Employers' group. The amendment submitted by the Employers' group was not seen as appropriate in the context. She preferred the original text to the subamendment to add "working people's rights" because the world of work did not only include working people. She supported the amendment submitted by the Government members of Canada and the United States to replace "the" by "a" in "the primary objectives".
- 381.** The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of the Government member of Canada, introduced their amendment and clarified that there should not just be one primary objective but others too, including fighting poverty or disease. Speaking on behalf of his own Government, he observed that the amendment submitted by the Employers' group was unclear; he preferred the original text. He suggested that an alternative wording could include a "human-centred strategy" as opposed to "approach". He supported the EU/Canada amendment to insert "constitutional" before "mandate" as well as their subamendment: "workers' rights", as the Organization was about workers' rights.
- 382.** The Government member of Canada did not support the amendment submitted by the Employers' group and said that she preferred the original text. She supported the broader scope of the term "peoples' rights" in the original text and therefore did not support the amendment and subamendment proposed by the Workers' group to change it to "workers' rights".
- 383.** The Government member of Brazil considered the term "constitutional" as more appropriate in qualifying the ILO's mandate and therefore did not support the amendment of the Workers' group to add "normative". He said that that group's subamended amendment to change "people's rights" to "workers' rights" was problematic as the focus should encompass the broader notion of people's rights. He supported the amendment submitted by the Government members of Canada and the United States. Although it was important to consider the human-centred history of the ILO, the amendment submitted by the Employers' group contained a number of difficult elements. He suggested the compromise wording "developing a human-centred approach for the future of work".
- 384.** The Government member of China did not support the amendment submitted by the Employers' group. He supported the amendments to insert "constitutional" and "normative" before "mandate". He expressed a preference for the wider range of "people's rights" compared to "workers' rights" and proposed a subamendment to insert "ecological and" before "environmental policies".
- 385.** The Government member of Brazil supported the original text with the addition of "constitutional", which clarified the potential multiplicity of objectives. He proposed a subamendment to insert "developing a" before "human-centred approach" since the endeavour remained a work in progress.
- 386.** The Government member of Switzerland supported the amendment to add the word "constitutional", as well as the amendment singularizing "a primary objective". The

suggested change to “workers’ rights” through the subamended amendment proposed by the Workers’ group would narrow the Section, whereas it required a broader term. With respect to the notion of a human-centred approach, he supported the subamendment proposed by the Government member of Brazil, which emphasized the need to talk not only about the ILO’s past but also its future.

- 387.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, aligned himself with the comments made by the Government member of Switzerland. While he thought the Committee could combine a number of the amendments, including adding “constitutional”, “normative” and “working” people’s rights, he approved of the current drafting of the Section.
- 388.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson understood that the ILO had always been a human-centred institution. While that was not new, it was important to consider the future of the human-centred approach in an age of automation. There seemed to be confusion within the Committee, as though all the efforts of the ILO on workers’ rights did not already include a focus on children or older people, which of course they did. As the subamendment proposed by the Workers’ group to insert “workers’ rights” had only received the support of the Government member of the United States, she asked the secretariat to clarify whether the term “workers’ rights” already encompassed a broader understanding of “people” and what in fact the word “people” meant in the context of the ILO. Pending clarification, the Workers’ group preferred the term “workers’ rights”. With respect to the subamendment proposed by the Government member of Brazil to insert the words “developing a”, that suggested that the ILO did not already have a human-centred approach. She therefore proposed a further subamendment to read “further developing its human-centred approach for the future of work”.
- 389.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted the query of the Government member of the United States as to whether a “human-centred mandate” was an acceptable term. She found the suggestion to replace “mandate” with “strategy” to be useful and acceptable but wished to discuss the matter further. In any case, the Employers’ group stated that the additional phrase “strengthened commitment to tripartism and social dialogue” was of great institutional importance to the ILO and that Part I, Section D, was the appropriate place to put it. She reiterated that the report of the Global Commission on the Future of Work was not supposed to be the basis for the Committee’s discussions, but that many of the report’s terms and ideas appeared throughout the draft Declaration. With respect to the recommendations of the Global Commission, she sought assurances from the secretariat that the term “human-centred approach”, as it appeared in the draft Declaration, did not implicitly refer to the ten recommendations of a human-centred agenda as set out on page 51 of that report.
- 390.** The Government member of Mexico supported the proposal by the Government member of Brazil to use the term “constitutional mandate” to clarify the ILO’s role in “developing a human-centred approach for the future of work”. She noted the shared language with the report of the Global Commission and observed that the human-centred approach had been a long-standing ILO mandate which featured in numerous other documents and discussions. Because of that historical perspective, the subamendment proposed by the Workers’ group was appropriate and captured both the historical aspect and the need for the ILO to further develop that mandate.
- 391.** In response to the point raised by the Employers’ group, the representative of the Secretary-General explained that in preparing the draft Declaration, the Office had deliberately used the term “human-centred approach”, whereas the language in the report of the Global Commission referred to the “human-centred agenda”. He assured the Employers’ group that the draft Declaration had not imported the elements of the human-centred agenda as detailed in that report.

-
- 392.** In response to the request for clarification on terminology made by the Worker Vice-Chairperson, the representative of the Secretary-General imparted the guidance received from the Office of the Legal Adviser regarding the terms “people” and “workers”. “People” was used in a considerable number of ILO instruments, including in the preamble of the ILO Constitution. That document also used the terms “worker”, “children” and “women”. The Declaration of Philadelphia referred to “all human beings”, which was analogous to “people”. There was no overall definition of “worker” or “people”; the term “worker” was used in many ways, for example, part-time worker, full-time worker, migrant worker, in numerous ILO instruments. The term “people” was used in a number of ILO instruments, including: the Resolution on recovering from the crisis: A Global Jobs Pact, 2009; the Protocol of 2014 to the Forced Labour Convention, 1930; the Social Protection Floors Recommendation, 2012 (No. 202); the Declaration concerning the Policy of “Apartheid” of the Republic of South Africa, 1964; and the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy, 2017. The speaker indicated that the Office believed that the term “people” was correctly used in the context of Part I, Section D, of the draft Declaration.
- 393.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that there was a significant difference between “people” and “peoples”. The difference in the terms “workers’ rights” and “peoples’ rights” still did not seem clear.
- 394.** The Government member of Argentina said that his understanding was that a degree of consensus existed on parts of the text in the Section but that there were differences of opinion regarding the terms “worker” and “people”. He suggested inserting “labour-related” before “people’s rights”.
- 395.** The Government member of the United States expressed strong support for the wording put forward by the Workers’ group. Workers’ rights were the key element that had brought the ILO together in 1919. Workers’ rights ought to be a cornerstone of the Declaration.
- 396.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson concurred with the explanation provided by the secretariat of the appropriate use of “people”. She preferred not to limit the wording just to “workers”.
- 397.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that all workers were people, and that it was not a matter of workers versus people. She proposed two subamendments: the first to amend the text to read “workers’ and people’s rights, needs and aspirations”; and the second to amend it to read “workers’ rights and people’s needs and aspirations”.
- 398.** The Government member of China thanked the secretariat for the explanation and said that he supported the original text.
- 399.** The Government members of Canada, Chile, Norway, United States, Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the second subamendment proposed by the Workers’ group.
- 400.** The Government member of Switzerland also supported the second subamendment proposed by the Workers’ group. He noted that the last phrase of Section D was not ambitious enough, and voiced a preference for the earlier subamendment proposed by the Government member of Brazil to add the word “developing”.
- 401.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson reiterated his group’s view that the human-centred approach had existed since the ILO’s creation; she suggested the following text, to appear after “social justice”: “by further developing its human-centred approach to the world of work which puts the needs, aspirations and rights of people at the heart of economic, social

and environmental policies”. The revision referenced the world of work, and using “workers” would be too limiting as people also had rights.

- 402.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled that her group had proposed two subamendments. Regarding the subamendment proposed by the Employers’ group, she said that her group could not support it as it was essential to include “workers’ rights”.
- 403.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson clarified that the Employers’ group did support workers’ rights. In a spirit of compromise, they would support the second subamendment proposed by the Workers’ group, which read “workers’ rights and people’s needs and aspirations”.
- 404.** The Government member of the United States preferred the wording “workers’ rights and people’s needs and aspirations” as workers’ rights were strongly connected with the ILO, whereas other UN bodies covered human rights. The reordering of the Section proposed by the Employers’ group was acceptable.
- 405.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the text did not imply that people did not have rights. As the Government member of the United States had pointed out, “workers” and “rights” should not be split up.
- 406.** The Government member of Mexico said that there were different connotations associated with workers’ rights and people’s rights. The rights of people in general were not relevant in such a discussion. The reference to the “future of work” should be retained.
- 407.** The Government member of Cuba said that the ILO’s mandate was related to workers. People’s rights implied both the rights of a person as an individual and the rights of people as a collective. In the ILO context, “workers’ rights” was appropriate. Therefore, he suggested the wording “puts workers’ rights and needs and aspirations of people” to avoid a reference to people’s rights.
- 408.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the EU Member States, proposed the following subamendment: “The ILO must carry forward into its second century with unrelenting vigour its constitutional mandate for social justice by further developing its human-centred approach to the future of work, which puts people’s and workers’ rights, needs and aspirations at the heart of economic, social and environment policies.”
- 409.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment proposed by the Government members of the EU Member States.
- 410.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the French translation of “people’s rights” indicated individual rights (*droits des individus*) versus workers’ rights, which included both individual and collective rights. The text should not pitch individual rights against collective rights. She proposed a subamendment for the text to read “puts workers’ rights and the needs, aspirations and rights of all people”.
- 411.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendments proposed by the Government members of the EU Member States and the Workers’ group.
- 412.** The Government member of the United States suggested replacing the word “people” with “persons”.
- 413.** The Chairperson noted that the Employers’ group, the Workers’ group and Government members showed support for the proposed term “people”.

-
414. The Government member of United States requested to hear the views of Government members regarding the inclusion of the term “persons”.
415. The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the text as subamended by the Workers’ group and the Government members of the EU Member States.
416. The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, also supported the subamended text.
417. The Government members of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, China, Peru and Switzerland also supported the subamended text.
418. The Government member of Mexico said that he would have preferred the earlier text but, in a spirit of compromise, supported the subamended text.
419. Part I, Section D, was adopted as amended:
- D. The ILO must carry forward into its second century with unrelenting vigour its constitutional mandate for social justice by further developing its human-centred approach to the future of work, which puts workers’ rights and the needs, aspirations and rights of all people at the heart of economic, social and environmental policies”.
420. As a result, a number of amendments fell.
421. The Government member of Cuba said that he accepted the decision but wished for his reservations to be put on record. “Human-centred approach” broadened the scope of the ILO mandate into human rights. Other UN agencies covered and dealt with human rights more broadly. It could be misinterpreted in the future and lead to legal issues when implementing the Declaration.

Part I, Section E

422. The Chairperson said that eight amendments had been submitted on Part I, Section E, one of which, submitted by the Africa group, was a linguistic matter concerning only the French text and would be referred to the Committee Drafting Committee.

Amendment submitted by the Africa group:

- E. The growth of the Organization over the last 100 years towards universal membership means that social justice can be achieved in all regions of the world ~~the full contribution of the ILO’s constituents to this endeavour can be assured only through their full, equal and democratic participation in its governance.~~

Amendment submitted by the Government member of Brazil on behalf of GRULAC:

- E. The growth of the Organization over the last 100 years towards universal membership means that the ~~full~~ contribution of the ILO’s constituents to this endeavour can be assured only through their full, equal and democratic participation in its governance.

Amendment submitted by the Government member of Brazil on behalf of GRULAC:

- E. The growth of the Organization over the last 100 years towards universal membership means that the full contribution of the ILO’s constituents to this endeavour can be assured only through their full, ~~equal~~ tripartite and democratic participation in its governance.

Amendment submitted by Government member of Brazil on behalf of GRULAC:

- E. The growth of the Organization over the last 100 years towards universal membership means that the full contribution of the ILO's constituents to this endeavour can be assured only through their full, equal and democratic participation ~~in its governance~~.

Amendment submitted by the Workers' group:

- E. The growth of the Organization over the last 100 years towards universal membership means that the full contribution of the ILO's constituents to this endeavour can be assured only through their full, equal and democratic participation in its tripartite governance.

Amendment submitted by the Government members of Switzerland and the United States:

- E. The growth of the Organization over the last 100 years towards universal membership means that the full contribution of the ILO's constituents to this endeavour can be assured only through their full, equal and democratic participation in its governance and through reaching all workers and employers, including via the use of new technologies.

423. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendment to insert “tripartite” before “governance”. She indicated her preference to give the floor to the Africa group – provided that the Employers’ group agreed – in order for them to introduce their amendments.

424. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment proposed by the Workers’ group and said that she would like to hear the views of Government members before voicing her opinion on other amendments.

425. The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, noted that the linguistic amendment the group had submitted would be referred to the Committee Drafting Committee. He withdrew an amendment which had sought to replace “towards universal membership” with “judging by the number of member States”. He also withdrew an amendment which had sought to insert after Part I, Section E, the paragraph “All member States should be involved again in the democratization of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.” He introduced the remaining amendment the Africa group had submitted and proposed a subamendment, which included the proposal contained in the amendment submitted by the Workers’ group. The resulting text read:

- E. The growth of the Organization over the last 100 years towards universal membership means that social justice can be achieved in all regions of the world and the full contribution of the ILO's constituents to this endeavour can be assured only through their full, equal and democratic participation in its tripartite governance.”

426. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment as subamended.

427. The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, introduced the three amendments submitted by the group. She explained that the first sought to delete “full” before “contribution” as the word was redundant. The second sought to replace “equal” by “tripartite” as democratic participation implied equality. The third sought to delete “in its governance”, the reason being that full, equal and tripartite participation would not be restricted to the ILO's governance structures.

428. The Government member of the United States supported the amendment and subamendment proposed by the Africa group.

429. The Government member of Switzerland supported the amendment and subamendment proposed by the Africa group and proposed a further subamendment, seconded by the

Government member of the United States, to add “and through reaching all workers and employers, including via the use of new technologies” at the end of the Section.

- 430.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the further subamendment and explained that she considered it inappropriate to mention new technologies in the present Section.
- 431.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that she did not support the further subamendment for the same reasons given by the Employers’ group.
- 432.** The Government member of Switzerland noted the comments made on his further subamendment and withdrew it. He said that it was an important issue, which he would consider placing elsewhere in the text.
- 433.** The Chairperson asked Government members to give their position on the current proposed version of the text.
- 434.** The Government member of Panama said that the version had broadly the same content and issues as the amendment GRULAC had proposed. The only major difference was that the text mentioned the importance of governing the ILO in a tripartite way. He suggested replacing “tripartite governance” by “tripartism”.
- 435.** The Government member of the Plurinational State of Bolivia preferred the version presented by GRULAC, as it was much broader. She invited the Committee to reconsider that proposal which she felt had met with a degree of consensus.
- 436.** The Chairperson said that he had understood that the amendment and subamendment proposed by the Africa group was preferable to the Committee.
- 437.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, considered that their amendment and subamendment had support and he saw no reason why it was not coherent within the context of the ILO.
- 438.** The Government member of the Plurinational State of Bolivia welcomed the discussion around tripartite governance. She also supported the GRULAC amendment to delete “equal” since “full” already included the notion of “equal”. Tripartite governance in the ILO also implied the participation of governments in the composition of the various ILO bodies. Normally, the Governments occupied a larger space than the Workers and the Employers and she therefore queried if it would remain a full and democratic process. She wished to understand if that would change the composition of the various ILO bodies; if it did mean a change, they would have to carry out consultations in that regard. They were not against the consensus but wished to be clear on any possible implications.
- 439.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment and subamendment proposed by the Africa group.
- 440.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson requested an explanation from the Government member of Mali as to why the first “full” had been deleted. She quoted the original amended text and said that she did not wish to assume that the Africa group was not already contributing, but merely questioned if they were fully contributing. She queried whether it was not the intention for all of them to acknowledge their “full” contribution. She wished to know whether “full” was meant to be deleted, or had been accidentally removed in the regrouping of the amendments.
- 441.** In response to the concerns voiced by the Government member of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, the representative of the Secretary-General explained that the notion of “equal” in

the text meant that all constituents were treated in an equal way with equal opportunity for participation of all of the ILO's constituents in its tripartite governance. There was no suggestion that the 2:1:1 representation formula would change. On the use of "full" in the original drafting, he took note of what the Worker Vice-Chairperson had said. In the Office's view, the two uses of the word "full" were in different contexts in that the capacity to fully contribute was related to the opportunity to fully participate in the ILO's tripartite governance.

442. The Government member of Mali pointed out that it was a GRULAC amendment that had deleted "full", not the amendment proposed by the Africa group.
443. The Government member of the Plurinational State of Bolivia thanked the secretariat for the explanation and wished it to be placed on record. Following the explanation, she said that she had no difficulty accepting the text as currently amended.
444. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment proposed by the Africa group and noted that her group wished to keep the word "full".
445. The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the text.
446. Part I, Section E, was adopted as amended:
- E. The growth of the Organization over the last 100 years towards universal membership means that social justice can be achieved in all regions of the world and that the full contribution of the ILO's constituents to this endeavour can be assured only through their full, equal and democratic participation in its tripartite governance."
447. As a consequence, all other amendments to Part II, Section E, fell.
448. Part I was adopted as amended.

Part II

Title

449. An amendment submitted by the Government members of the EU Member States sought to add the subtitle "Role of the International Labour Organization" before the chapeau of Section A. After consultation with the Officers of the Committee, the Chairperson proposed to postpone discussion of the amendment and any other proposals relating to titles or subtitles. It was necessary to first focus on the substance of the draft Declaration before considering titles and subtitles.
450. The postponement was agreed.

Chapeau of Part II

451. No amendments had been submitted to the chapeau. The chapeau was adopted.

Part II, Section A

Chapeau

452. The Chairperson said that two amendments to the chapeau had been submitted which were to be considered in parallel.

Amendment submitted by the Employers' group:

- A. In discharging its constitutional responsibilities taking into account the profound transformations in the world of work ~~and adopting the human-centred approach for the future of work~~, the ILO must direct its efforts to:

Amendment submitted by the Government members of the EU Member States:

- A. In discharging its constitutional ~~responsibilities~~ mandate and adopting the human-centred and rights-based approach for the future of work, the ILO must direct its efforts to:

- 453.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendment submitted by her group. The Section needed to be clear about priorities in the changing world of work. She did not support the amendment proposed by the Government members of the EU Member States.
- 454.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment submitted by the Government members of the EU Member States; both “human-centred” and “rights-based” were in the mandate of the ILO. Regarding the amendment submitted by the Employers' group, she wished to keep the addition of “rights-based approach” and “mandate”, although the Workers' group was amenable to deleting the reference to a “human-centred approach”. They could also support the amendment proposed by the Employers' group.
- 455.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the EU Member States, introduced the amendment to replace “responsibilities” with “mandate”. It was more appropriate to speak about the ILO's “mandate”. They did not support the amendment proposed by the Employers' group and preferred the original text.
- 456.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment proposed by the Government members of the EU Member States; however, she questioned the phrase “human-centred and rights-based approach”. She considered “rights-based” to be too narrow. Her preference was not to include “rights-based” and she supported the inclusion of “mandate”.
- 457.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that she had only proposed to delete “human-centred” in an attempt to reach a compromise with the Employers' group. She preferred both “rights-based” and “human-centred” but could accept just “rights-based”.
- 458.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, preferred the text as follows: “In discharging its constitutional mandate, and adopting the human-centred and rights-based approach for the future of work, the ILO must direct its efforts to:”. He did not support the latest proposed version.
- 459.** The Chairperson announced that the Committee would pay tribute to the current strike in Switzerland for women, which had as its slogan “Pay, Time and Respect”. Given the Committee's interest in working towards a more equal and respectful world of work, he suspended its activities for five minutes to show solidarity with the strike and to pay tribute to the women of the Committee.
- 460.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson announced that a news item on the official website of the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) urged the ILO to immediately recognize and adopt safe and healthy working conditions as one of its fundamental principles and rights at work. In so doing, it claimed that some employers and their representative organizations were attempting to block that effort, calling into question the depth of the private sector's commitment to respect human rights. She expressed her dismay and displeasure at the public blaming of employers. In addition, some delegates had heard senior ILO officials suggesting that the Employers' group was trying to derail those efforts. The Employers' group was operating in good faith on the issue and, if true, such

suggestions were untrue and unfitting of the spirit of tripartism. She highlighted and reiterated the Employers' group's continued support, commitment and engagement to see the Declaration adopted.

461. The Chairperson assured the Employer Vice-Chairperson that the Committee did not prejudice the efforts of the Employers' group in any way. The statements had been made outside of the ILO. As to the alleged comments of ILO officials, he had not heard them.
462. The representative of the Secretary-General assured the Employer Vice-Chairperson that he could say, in his capacity as one of the three Deputy Directors-General of the ILO, that the alleged comments certainly did not reflect the views of ILO senior management.
463. Upon resuming the consideration of amendments, the Employer Vice-Chairperson explained that her group would need to further discuss the term "human-centred approach", but that they favoured the formulation about "further developing the human-centred approach" used elsewhere.
464. The Worker Vice-Chairperson indicated that the Workers' group could be flexible, but for them it was important to retain "constitutional" and "rights-based" in the text.
465. The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, proposed a subamendment to join the two amendments in order to read "taking into account the profound transformations in the world, and further developing the human-centred approach for the future of work," after "mandate".
466. The Worker Vice-Chairperson acknowledged that before GRULAC had spoken, she had indicated the flexibility of the Workers' group. Nonetheless, she insisted on including both "constitutional mandate" and "rights-based approach." The GRULAC proposal, however, left out any mention of a rights-based approach in relation to the mandate, which was of significant importance to the Workers' group.
467. The Employer Vice-Chairperson could accept GRULAC's amendment provided "world of work" was used instead of "world." On the question of the "rights-based approach," she drew the Committee's attention to an upcoming amendment proposed by the Government members of the EU Member States that would cement the rights-based pillar of the human-centred approach. If the Workers' group looked at the EU proposal in conjunction with the current formulation, it would eliminate the need to include "rights-based" in the chapeau. In any case, the Employers' group considered that the notion of rights was implicit in the understanding of a human-centred approach, which should make GRULAC's wording acceptable.
468. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that if the Employers' group would support the subsequent EU amendment on international labour standards, which still had to be discussed, the Workers' group could withdraw their opposition to the GRULAC proposal.
469. The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the GRULAC subamendment, and was pleased to learn of the favourable disposition to their forthcoming amendment.
470. The Chairperson provided the consolidated text:
 - A. In discharging its constitutional mandate, taking into account the profound transformations in the world of work, and further developing its human-centred approach to the future of work, the ILO must direct its efforts to:

471. The chapeau of Part II, Section A, was adopted as amended.

New paragraphs before Part II, Section A, paragraph (i)

472. The Chairperson noted two amendments that proposed new paragraphs before Part II, Section A, paragraph (i), which would be considered individually.

Submitted by the Africa group:

- () complete, at the earliest opportunity, the process of ratification of the Instrument of Amendment to the ILO Constitution, 1986, in order to definitively democratize the functioning and composition of the governing bodies of the ILO;

Submitted by the Government members of the EU Member States:

- () having a clear, robust and up-to-date body of international labour standards, which offers necessary protections covering all forms of work, which are ratified and applied in law and practice, and which are subject to authoritative and effective supervision;

473. The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, stated that the group had submitted the amendment because ratification of the Instrument constituted an urgent action for the ILO.

474. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson invited Government members to comment on the amendment before they gave their own views.

475. The Government member of Brazil agreed that the amendment conveyed an important message, but did not support the amendment as it concerned ILO governance, which was best dealt with elsewhere.

476. The Government member of the United States, noting that his comment was without prejudice to the validity of the request itself, queried whether the amendment was appropriate for Part II, Section A. The paragraphs in Section A concerned efforts the ILO must make, but the amendment concerned the process of ratification, which was not an act of the ILO, but of its member States. He suggested the proposed new paragraph could be placed elsewhere in the text.

477. The Government member of Germany thanked the Africa group for its effort to strengthen democratization within the ILO. Germany held the view that a reform of the Governing Body was necessary and the appropriate representation of all regions within the Governing Body should be secured. Adequate representation of African governments on the Governing Body was important, and therefore changing the composition of that executive body was essential. Such reforms had already taken place in other international institutions. The amendment focused on ratification of the Instrument; she noted that even after 30 years, it had not been possible to garner sufficient ratifications. As a result, alternatives should be considered. At the 303rd Session of the Governing Body in November 2008, changes were proposed to increase the number of permanent members from ten to 12, and to establish two non-elective seats for African Members. That proposal should be part of the Committee's discussion. Permanent representation, which she noted was already the case for the Workers' group and the Employers' group, was vital to maintain continuity of expertise and experience. Additionally to this benefit a ratification allowing for two additional permanent members was more promising. The decision should be taken without rushing. The main point was to find a solution that enabled the continuation and democratization of the ILO Governing Body and at the same time allowed for a balanced regional representation in the Governing Body.

-
478. The Government member of France supported the statement by the Government member of Germany.
479. The Government member of Switzerland supported the amendment and recalled that Switzerland had already ratified the Instrument. On the question of the placement of the amendment, it needed to be somewhere in the draft Declaration, or perhaps in the draft Resolution, should one be adopted.
480. The Government member of the United Kingdom also endorsed Germany's position to seek a mutually agreeable solution for equal, permanent representation, such as adding two non-elective seats. Referring to the comment made by the Government member of the United States, she asked if it was appropriate to include the amendment in the Part that detailed ILO action, given that it was for member States to ratify the Instrument.
481. The Government member of Cuba supported the amendment. He noted that wording inviting member States to ratify various instruments was common across UN agencies, including the ILO, keeping in mind that neither the Conference nor the ILO had any say in ratification. The substance, rather than the precise wording, was the important part of the amendment. There was no greater objective relevant to decent work for all than the democratization of the ILO. In addition, adding two non-elective regional seats was not the only possible reform on that front. The inclusion of the amendment was relevant and the discussion of the Committee should focus on seeking agreement on improved wording and proper placement.
482. The Government member of the Russian Federation appreciated the concerns of the Africa group but concurred with the reservations expressed by the Government member of Brazil. The proposed amendment did not fit in the Declaration. The issue had been discussed at numerous sessions of ILO Governing Body and the Russian Federation joined with Germany and France in expressing a willingness to pursue further talks on the proposal.
483. The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that the mandate of the ILO Director-General included promoting ratification of the Instrument. To make social justice a reality, action had to be taken in that regard. The ILO had changed considerably over the past 100 years but while social justice was still a focus of the Organization, it should be demonstrated with the actions taken by its decision-making bodies. Now was not the time for discussing the addition of two permanent seats. The Centenary Declaration was an opportunity to advance the democratization of the ILO. He encouraged the Committee to engage in a serious discussion on the issue and find a way to place the amendment within the Centenary Declaration or its possible Resolution.
484. The Government member of China appreciated that the Africa group had raised the issue of democratization within the Organization as it had an important connection to ongoing governance reforms. China supported the statement made by Germany and wished to see follow-up action on the proposed amendment.
485. The Government member of United Arab Emirates endorsed the intent of the amendment but favoured a revision of the wording to ensure that there was a follow-up orientation.
486. The Government member of Liberia recalled that the UN had been an important partner in the democratization of many countries throughout the world. The ILO itself was a force for improving democracy, and not only for countries in Africa. The democratization of the ILO itself was an important contribution in that regard and he considered it an injustice if the amendment was excluded from the Declaration.
487. The Government member of India supported the amendment and called upon the ILO to evolve through equal geographic representation for improved transparency and democracy.

She suggested however that the amendment could be revised and a more suitable place found for its inclusion in the draft Declaration.

- 488.** The Government member of Turkey supported the amendment and suggested an alternative place be sought for the paragraph.
- 489.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said the Workers' group would continue to support the legitimate demands of the Africa group for more democratic governance structures in the ILO. Inclusion of the amendment in the Declaration would be helpful but, in any case, immediate follow-up was needed, though she was not very optimistic in that regard. The Workers' group supported the amendment but thought it should be modified appropriately as the ILO could only call upon member States to ratify the Instrument. She suggested adding wording on the follow-up process and finding the right place for the amendment, either at the end of the Declaration or in the possible Resolution.
- 490.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the ongoing discussion was proof that the Organization needed to be reinvigorated since the issue had persisted for more than 30 years. There appeared to be agreement among Government members on the issue as demonstrated by the fact that the Committee had previously adopted a new preambular paragraph which read "to democratize ILO governance by ensuring a fair representation of all regions and establishing the principle of equality among member States". Government members should work out a solution to take into account the legitimate request from the Africa group. The Employers' group supported the principle of full democratic representation in the governance structures of the ILO.
- 491.** Acknowledging the wide support from Government members, the Workers' group and the Employers' group for the intent and spirit of the Africa group amendment, the Chairperson referred the amendment to the Drafting Group, which could then consider the proper placement of the amendment.
- 492.** The Government member of South Africa said he was surprised that the Chairperson had referred the amendment to the Drafting Group. The democratization of the ILO and its bodies had already been agreed to by the Committee. The debate had been ongoing for 33 years and Africa had always been patient, but not for much longer. Around one third of the ILO's member States were from Africa, all of which supported the proposal, as had the Workers' and Employers' groups. It was extremely important to find a practical and concrete approach to have the process of achieving democratization reflected in the Declaration.
- 493.** The Chairperson clarified that he considered the proposal to have been complex and noted that several concerns had been raised about the placement and formulation of the text. He favoured addressing the issue in the Drafting Group.
- 494.** The Government member of Cameroon recalled the importance of the Declaration in the ILO's Centenary year. He hoped that in decades to come, constituents would be able to look back on what had been achieved as a result of the deliberations. While Africa's current influence might not be significant, that could change in the future and the Committee should act accordingly.
- 495.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the EU Member States, introduced their amendment to move text from Part IV, Section A, to before Part II, Section A, paragraph (i). The text referred to the ILO's normative function, which was important and should be given more prominence. Accordingly, it would be better placed in Part II of the draft Declaration.

-
- 496.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment and proposed a subamendment to replace “covering all forms of work” with “to workers”.
- 497.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed that the normative function of the ILO should be placed more prominently in Part II, using text taken from Part IV, Section A. However, a decision was required as to whether now was the appropriate time to reposition parts of the text. The approach might cause confusion because there were many amendments pending on the portion of text in question.
- 498.** The Chairperson agreed that the discussion around moving blocks of text should be postponed until the discussion reached Part IV, Section A. The amendments were essentially the same and a consideration of the positioning of the text could be considered at the same time.

Part II, Section A, paragraph (i)

- 499.** The Chairperson noted two amendments on Part II, Section A, paragraph (i), which he proposed should be discussed in parallel.

Submitted by the Government member of Brazil on behalf of GRULAC:

- (i) ensuring a just transition to ~~a an environmentally sustainable~~ future of work geared towards sustainable development in its economic, social and environmental dimensions;

Submitted by the Employer members: move Part II, Section A, paragraph (i), to before Part II, Section B.

- 500.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendment and explained that Part II, Section A, paragraph (i), should be moved to the bottom of the list of paragraphs since it was less important than other ILO issues, such as international labour standards, which should appear earlier in the list. She supported the substance of the GRULAC amendment but thought the wording might need to be modified.
- 501.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, commenting on the GRULAC amendment, stated that the issue was not only about transition, but transition to an environmentally sustainable future of work. The meaning of the phrase “a just transition to a future of work geared through development” also required further explanation. As for the amendment proposed by the Employers’ group, she suggested not to move paragraphs until the substance had been agreed upon.
- 502.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, introduced the amendment. She believed it was more important to have a broader concept of sustainable development as used by the United Nations since 1992. The concept of sustainable development included three pillars: environmental, economic and social development. The three pillars were interdependent and should be addressed in a balanced way. It was more appropriate to have the concept fully reflected in the paragraph, although she could consider changing its position relative to other paragraphs.
- 503.** The Government member of the United States supported the GRULAC amendment and accepted to discuss substance before placement.
- 504.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its member States, did not support the GRULAC amendment and preferred the original text. She also did not support the amendment proposed by the Employers’ group and considered the paragraph to be in its proper place.

-
- 505.** The Government member of New Zealand supported the GRULAC amendment.
- 506.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that the group had no particular view on the GRULAC amendment and could join with whatever consensus emerged. Regarding the amendment proposed by the Employers' group, he agreed with the Government member of Ireland that the text should remain as it was. Once the substance of the text had been agreed, they would consider if it was necessary to move it.
- 507.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, stated that, having listened to the further explanation provided by the Government member of Brazil on behalf of GRULAC, the Workers' group was in a position to support the amendment, but remained flexible since they also supported the original text.
- 508.** In view of the emerging consensus, the Chairperson asked the Government members of the EU and its Member States whether they supported the amendment proposed by GRULAC or whether they would consider a compromise.
- 509.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, explained that for the EU an environmentally sustainable future was important, and that they would be prepared to accept the following text: "(i) ensuring a just transition to a future of work, which contributes to sustainable development in its economic, social and environmental dimensions;".
- 510.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that the group supported the revised text.
- 511.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the revised text.
- 512.** A decision on the amendment submitted by the Employers' group concerning the placement of the paragraph was deferred.
- 513.** Part II, Section A, paragraph (i), was adopted as amended.

Part II, Section A, paragraph (ii)

- 514.** The Chairperson noted five amendments on Part II, Section A, paragraph (ii), which would be discussed in parallel.

Submitted by the Employer members:

- (ii) harnessing the fullest potential of technological progress and productivity growth to achieve ~~the material welfare~~ prosperity, self-realization and dignity of all human beings, with a just sharing of its benefits for all;

Submitted by the Government member of Brazil on behalf of GRULAC:

- (ii) harnessing the fullest potential of technological progress to achieve ~~the material welfare~~, self-realization, ~~and the~~ dignity of all human beings and material welfare, with a just sharing of its benefits for all;

Submitted by the Worker members:

- (ii) harnessing the fullest potential of technological progress for decent work through social dialogue and collective bargaining to achieve the material welfare, self-realization and dignity of all human beings, with a just sharing of its benefits for all;

Submitted by the Government members of Australia, Switzerland and the United States:

- (ii) harnessing the fullest potential of technological progress to achieve the material welfare, ~~self-realization~~ and dignity of all human beings, with a just sharing of its benefits for all;

Submitted by the Worker members:

- (ii) harnessing the fullest potential of technological progress to achieve the material welfare, self-realization and dignity of all human beings, with a just sharing of its benefits for all, with humans in control of decisions and with regulatory measures to ensure that workers are protected from intrusive surveillance and that their privacy and access to their data are secured;

515. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the group’s amendments were small but were important to add productivity growth to the potential of technological progress. Since the GRULAC amendment to the same text maintained the term “material welfare”, the Employers’ group would align themselves with the majority consensus. Concerning the first amendment proposed by the Workers’ group, the concept of social dialogue and collective bargaining was not in the right place. She did not support the amendment proposed by the Government members of Australia, Switzerland and the United States to delete “self-realization”, but could accept it. Finally, she did not support the second amendment proposed by the Workers’ group to add text on “humans in control”. The additional text made the paragraph unnecessarily long with wording that was not widely understood currently. It was not appropriately positioned in the text, and “the dignity of all human beings” already implied that humans should be in control of their decisions with respect to technology.

516. The Worker Vice-Chairperson could support the amendment proposed by the Employers’ group to introduce “productivity growth”. However, she questioned the logic of the sentence which was ambiguous regarding what was being harnessed and could imply the harnessing of productivity growth. She had no problem with the introduction of “prosperity”, however, she preferred the original text. As for the GRULAC amendment, she thought the term “material welfare” could be improved by using “material well-being” instead. With respect to the first of their own amendments, she proposed a subamendment to read “for decent work including through social dialogue and collective bargaining”. Many trade unions and workers were concerned about the issue of a just transition in the face of technological changes and there needed to be negotiations with workers on those matters, given the consequences for their prosperity and dignity. Regarding the amendment submitted by the Government members of Australia, Switzerland and the United States, “self-realization” appeared to be something broader than dignity but the Workers’ group could be flexible on the suggestion, while still favouring the concept of well-being. The second of their own amendments sought to introduce the notion of “humans in control” in light of technological advances and related concerns over data protection, surveillance and privacy.

517. The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, thought the human-centred approach was important, as it concerned the dignity of human beings. The use of the word “prosperity” was reasonable enough, although “well-being” was a broader concept that encompassed other concepts already in the text such as “self-realization and dignity”.

518. The Government member of Switzerland supported the use of “prosperity”. The term “productivity” was also acceptable but was not well placed in the sentence. He did not support the GRULAC amendment. While he had no opposition to the first of the amendments proposed by the Workers’ group, he queried the placement of “social dialogue and collective bargaining”. With respect to his joint amendment with the Government members of Australia and the United States, the term “self-realization” was not properly defined and should be deleted. The issue of data privacy raised in the second of the

amendments proposed by the Workers' group was important but would be better placed elsewhere in the draft Declaration.

- 519.** The Government member of the United States supported the Employers' group's amendment to introduce "prosperity" and "productivity growth", and preferred the formulation to the GRULAC amendment and that of the Workers' group. The amendment on "humans in control" was simplistic and he did not support it. While it raised important questions about the intrusiveness of technology in people's lives, the acceptable boundary between machine and human control was not well established and warranted more discussion.
- 520.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment proposed by the Employers' group. While she agreed with the addition of "prosperity", she could not accept "and productivity growth". Instead, she suggested revising the text to read "to achieve sustainable and inclusive growth". She supported the GRULAC amendment. With respect to the first of the amendments proposed by the Workers' group, harnessing technological progress was a broad notion and not limited to social dialogue and collective bargaining. There were other means through which decent work benefits could be derived. She appreciated the rationale of the amendment proposed by the Government members of Australia, Switzerland and United States on the meaning of "self-realization", but preferred the term "self-fulfilment" to be deleted. The second of the amendments proposed by the Workers' group, on "humans in control", addressed an important issue, but it was also considered in Part III. Here, it was perhaps sufficient to say "with humans in control of decisions".
- 521.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment proposed by the Employers' group and the somewhat similar GRULAC amendment. He supported the first of the amendments proposed by the Workers' group to introduce "social dialogue and collective bargaining" but he was uncertain about the subamendment to introduce "including through". It was important to recognize that there were other factors at play. The Africa group agreed with the deletion of "self-realization". As for the amendment on "humans in control", the additional text made the paragraph quite long and might be better placed elsewhere.
- 522.** The Government member of Canada indicated her preference for the EU suggestion to modify the amendment proposed by the Employers' group to include "to achieve sustainable and inclusive growth". She had no position on the GRULAC amendment. She supported the amendment proposed by the Workers' group to use the phrase "material well-being". The expression "self-realization" could have been clearer. She was open to accepting the EU suggestion to introduce "self-fulfilment". She did not support the second of the amendments proposed by the Workers' group on "humans in control" since privacy and personal data protection were dealt with under Part III, Section B, paragraph (v).
- 523.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson preferred the EU suggestion to use the term "self-fulfilment". She could likewise accept the EU subamendment on the amendment proposed by the Employers' group, which read "to achieve sustainable and inclusive growth". With regard to their own amendment concerning the role of social dialogue and collective bargaining, the Workers' group wished to hear the views of other Committee members on the EU subamendment to add "including through social dialogue and collective bargaining". The Workers' group took on board the EU suggestion that the phrase "with humans in control of decisions" be used in respect of technological process. In response to the comments of the Government member of the United States, she noted that while there were many trivial ways in which human beings interacted with and controlled technology, current trends in robotics, automation and artificial intelligence posed serious concerns for workers and human beings

in general. Those technologies would have a profound impact on daily life and the ability to control technological change.

- 524.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson indicated a preference for the term “self-fulfilment” over “self-realization”. Regarding the amendment proposed by the Workers’ group, she sought clarification on the EU suggestion, but could accept “including through social dialogue”. With regard to the second amendment proposed by the Workers’ group, she supported the addition of “humans in control” and the EU subamendment. With respect to suggestions on her group’s own amendment, she supported “sustainable and productivity growth” and, regarding “well-being” and similar terms, could agree with the majority. Regarding the first of the amendments proposed by the Workers’ group, there was a whole paragraph devoted to social dialogue and collective bargaining in Section B; it was preferable not to refer to it in paragraph (ii). Her group viewed collective bargaining as a part of social dialogue, but could agree to the addition of “including through social dialogue” at the end of the paragraph. She reiterated that the Employers’ group could support the EU suggestion to add “humans in control of decisions”.
- 525.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson maintained that in addition to the paragraph on social dialogue in Section B, it would be useful to make specific references to social dialogue elsewhere in the text. However, she could be flexible and support the addition of “, including through social dialogue”. However, she emphasized that collective bargaining was not just part of social dialogue or sharing benefits, but was much more than that.
- 526.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson recalled that the text should be concise and readable to an outside audience, and that the current compromise text was too lengthy. Decent work was not referenced in the original text. Introducing decent work into the text could be acceptable, but the rest of the text was too long. As such, it was preferable to delete the words “dignity”, “prosperity” and “self-realization”.
- 527.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that she was unconvinced with respect to many of the options presented in the consolidated draft paragraph. For the Worker members, the most important elements were the inclusion of “dignity” and “including through social dialogue”. She also preferred using the terms “self-fulfilment” and “humans in control”.
- 528.** The representative of the Secretary-General explained that the 11 paragraphs under Part II, Section A, were intended to outline individual areas of action relating to the future of work to be taken by the Organization, in collaboration with the social partners and governments. For instance, paragraph (i) dealt with the environment; paragraph (ii) with technology; paragraph (iii) with skills; paragraph (iv) with youth employment; and paragraph (v) with gender equality; and so on. With respect to the present discussion, paragraph (ii) was intended to address technological progress and the need for it to benefit all people. In the view of the Office, social dialogue, as well as international labour standards, were implied in all the paragraphs.
- 529.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, proposed a subamendment to the consolidated text for it to read:
- Harnessing the fullest potential of technological progress and productivity growth with humans in control and through social dialogue to achieve self-fulfilment and prosperity of all human beings and with a just sharing of benefits for all.”
- 530.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson appreciated GRULAC’s proposed text. The desire of her group was to see social dialogue explicitly mentioned in the text, especially since it was not mentioned in the chapeau. Sometimes, it was important to repeat ideas or mention them in several places for the sake of clarity. The Workers’ group could support the paragraph as subamended.

-
- 531.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson contended that, in the current context, “social dialogue” was too limited. She referred to the representative of the Secretary-General’s comments that the intent of the Office had been to be broad at the beginning of each Section and not to repeat core ILO principles in each of the 11 paragraphs. Social dialogue was certainly one of the elements necessary to achieve self-fulfilment and prosperity, but not the only means. It would be preferable to mention social dialogue elsewhere, for example in Part II, Section B.
- 532.** The Government member of Liberia outlined several concerns related to the consolidated GRULAC text. First, the text elevated the role of social dialogue to achieving self-fulfilment and prosperity, when other elements could contribute as well. Concerning “humans in control,” the ILO could not dictate the various and powerful forces at play in technological progress. In addition, the concept of humans in control was not clear, whereas the Decent Work Agenda was well developed and understood and would be preferable to reference in the text.
- 533.** The Government member of Canada echoed those concerns. It was likely beyond the mandate of the ILO to discuss technology in that way. She would at the very least need time to seek instructions from her Government or other experts on appropriate wording. She suggested bracketing the paragraph for further discussion. Although Canada was a strong supporter of social dialogue, she questioned whether its inclusion in the paragraph was the appropriate place to do so.
- 534.** The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran valued GRULAC’s efforts, though he shared some of the other Government members’ concerns. “Humans in control” seemed to be a vague though promising idea, but since it had not been discussed in a comprehensive manner it was therefore not warranted in the text. With regard to social dialogue, he agreed that it was one of the most important ways to achieve decent work. To address the concerns expressed by some Committee members regarding its inclusion, he proposed modifying the subamendment to read “including through social dialogue” to achieve decent work. The change could offer a way out and he would be able to support the paragraph as subamended.
- 535.** The Government member of the United States agreed with the suggested additions regarding productivity and sustainable growth. His preference was for “self-fulfilment” over “self-realization”. The original Office text was clearer than the GRULAC subamendment, but the latter was acceptable. He shared the concerns about “humans in control,” contending that there was a very fine line between when humans were in control and when machines were. As it was too hard to determine the implications, he did not support including the phrase in the paragraph.
- 536.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed an additional subamendment to read:

Harnessing the fullest potential of technological progress and productivity growth to achieve decent work and sustainable and inclusive growth that ensure dignity, self-realization, and just sharing of benefits for all.

The subamendment was intended to give the paragraph a clearer focus while avoiding wording that had received objections from some of the Committee members.

- 537.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the views of the Workers’ group had not been taken into account in the latest version proposed by the Employers’ group. Social dialogue was important and the Workers’ group wished to see it included as the Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran had just suggested. It was also important to be clear on the need to remain in control of technological developments.

-
- 538.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson clarified that she had not included terms that in her assessment did not enjoy broad support by members of the Committee. She added that “decent work” was already in the consolidated paragraph and that it already encompassed social dialogue, which was one of its pillars. Adding “social dialogue” to the sentence would thus be a duplication. In any case, it was not in the original draft prepared by the Office.
- 539.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of Africa group, said it was essential to find consensus so that social dialogue was appropriately included. He favoured including the wording proposed previously by the Government members of the Islamic Republic of Iran and the EU Member States, which read “including through social dialogue”.
- 540.** The Government of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, put forward an amended version of Part II, Section A, paragraph (ii), of the draft Declaration, to read:
- (ii) Harnessing the fullest potential of technological progress and productive and sustainable growth, including through social dialogue, to achieve decent work that ensures dignity, self-fulfilment and a just sharing of benefits for all;
- 541.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that productive and sustainable growth was not the same as productivity growth, and therefore the group did not support the amendment.
- 542.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that her group was able to accept a wording that referred both to productivity and to sustainable growth. She proposed the wording “harnessing the fullest potential of technological progress, productivity growth and sustainability”.
- 543.** The Government member of Brazil supported that wording; sustainability was an extremely important notion.
- 544.** The Government of Liberia supported the formulation as subamended by the Workers’ group.
- 545.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that sustainability was something to be achieved, not something to be harnessed.
- 546.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, put forward a subamended version of the EU amendment to read:
- (ii) Harnessing the fullest potential of technological progress and productivity growth, including through social dialogue, to achieve decent work and sustainable development that ensures dignity, self-fulfilment and a just sharing of benefits for all;
- 547.** The Government members of India, Islamic Republic of Iran, Mali and Norway supported the amendment.
- 548.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 549.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that her group believed that social dialogue was wrongly included in that paragraph of the draft Declaration, but was able to join the consensus.
- 550.** Part II, Section A, paragraph (ii), was adopted as amended.
- 551.** As a consequence, a number of amendments fell.

Part II, Section A, paragraph (iii)

552. The Chairperson noted that seven amendments had been submitted in relation to that paragraph.

Submitted by Employer members:

- (iii) promoting the acquisition of skills for all ~~workers at all stages of~~ throughout their working lives as a shared responsibility, in order to address existing and anticipated skills gaps, with particular attention to elevating the level of general education for all, and aligning both education and formal and informal training systems with labour market needs;

Submitted by the Government member of Brazil on behalf of GRULAC:

- (iii) ensuring that workers acquire the knowledge and ~~promoting the acquisition of~~ skills needed for all workers at all stages of their working lives in order to address existing and anticipated skills gaps, with particular attention to aligning education and training systems with labour market needs;

Submitted by the Worker members:

- (iii) promoting the acquisition of skills, competences and qualifications for all workers at all stages of their working lives in order to address existing and anticipated skills gaps, with particular attention to aligning education and training systems with labour market needs;

Submitted by the Worker members:

- (iii) promoting the acquisition of skills for all workers at all stages of their working lives in order to address existing and anticipated ~~skills~~ gaps, with particular attention to aligning education and training systems with labour market needs;

Submitted by the Worker members:

- (iii) promoting the acquisition of skills for all workers at all stages of their working lives in order to address existing and anticipated skills gaps, with particular attention to taking into account the evolution of work in ~~aligning~~ education and training systems ~~with labour market needs~~;

Submitted by the Government members of the EU Member States:

- (iii) promoting the acquisition of skills for all workers at all stages of their working lives in order to address existing and anticipated skills gaps, with particular attention to ensuring ~~aligning~~ education and training systems that are responsive to ~~with~~ labour market needs;

Submitted by the Worker members:

- (iii) promoting the acquisition of skills for all workers at all stages of their working lives in order to address existing and anticipated skills gaps, with particular attention to aligning education and training systems with labour market needs and enhancing workers' capacity to make use of the opportunities available to secure and retain decent work;

553. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced her group's amendment, stressing the importance that the group placed on the notion of the acquisition of skills as a shared responsibility. Raising the general level of education was also critical, especially in view of new and emerging technologies. In respect of the GRULAC amendment, the term "promoting" was preferable to "ensuring". The group supported the addition by the Workers' group in their first amendment of "competences and qualifications", but felt that the deletion, in their second amendment, of the word "skills" rendered that version less

precise. The Employers' group did not support the deletion of the word "aligning" in the third amendment proposed by the Workers' group, and favoured the original text which clearly established a linkage between education and labour market needs. The group could accept the amendment submitted by the Government members of the EU Member States, without seeing any particular merit or improvement in the text as compared to the original draft. The meaning of the final amendment submitted by the Workers' group was not clear.

- 554.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that their first amendment was drafted with a view to broadening the idea of education, by including competences and skills. She noted the Employers' group's agreement to that expansion. With regard to the deletion of the word "skills" from "skills gaps", the idea was again to broaden the notion, and to include all possible gaps that might exist. Regarding their amendment to delete "aligning" from the original text, the reason for that deletion was because skills should not simply be aligned to labour market needs. Young people today were being educated for jobs that did not yet exist; an arts education could teach innovative thinking that could be of use in new technological fields. That had guided their choice of the wording "taking into account the evolution of work in education". The language of the amendment submitted by the Government members of the EU Member States was acceptable, as it also went in that direction by "ensuring education and training systems that are responsive to labour market needs". The Workers' group accepted the subamendment proposed by the Employers' group to their final amendment". Regarding the amendment submitted by the Employers' group, her group could certainly support elevating the level of general education for all, but questioned the meaning of "formal and informal training systems", and also asked for clarification in respect of the term "shared responsibility".
- 555.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the EU Member States, said that their amendment was similar to that of the Workers' group in respect of the linkage between education and the labour market. It aimed at softening the original draft text's "aligning" by rephrasing the wording as follows: "ensuring education and training systems that are responsive to labour market needs". They could be flexible regarding the GRULAC amendment, but preferred the original Office text. In the amendment proposed by the Employers' group, the EU Member States could accept the first part "throughout", but not the wording "formal and informal training systems". The amendment proposed by the Workers' group to add "competences and qualifications" was acceptable to the EU Member States, but they preferred the original text. Regarding the amendment proposed by the Workers' group to refer only to "gaps" and not to "skills gaps", the EU Member States considered that amendment would remove the main focus of the paragraph. They could see the similarity between their own amendment and the GRULAC amendment, but preferred their own text. In respect of the fourth amendment submitted by the Workers' group, she suggested a subamendment, to read "enhancing workers' capacities to make use of the opportunities available to secure, retain and transition into decent work".
- 556.** The Government of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that the group's amendment aimed at widening and intensifying the original text's meaning, by replacing "promoting the acquisition of skills" with "ensuring that workers acquire the knowledge needed at all stages of their working lives".
- 557.** The Government member of the United States felt that the original text addressed the issues and the linkage between skills training and the job market better than the amended texts.
- 558.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment proposed by the Employers' group as it was too cumbersome. The same was true for the GRULAC amendment. The Africa group could support the first, second and fourth amendments proposed by the Workers' group, which they considered could be merged into one.

-
- 559.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson clarified the meaning of “shared responsibility”. That wording was language that had been agreed by the social partners and adopted as tripartite terminology. It was also used by the EU. The phrase “formal and informal” had been introduced to indicate that training occurred in formal training situations, as well as on-the-job training at the workplace, but also in many informal settings outside it. However, the Employers’ group would not insist on its inclusion in the text. The retaining of “skills gaps” was also something the Employers’ group could endorse. Regarding the wording proposed by the Workers’ group on the “evolution of work”, the concept was too broad, while at the same time the concept of “labour market needs” was too narrow. The wording proposed by the EU Member States “responsive to” was acceptable. Regarding the amendment proposed by the Workers’ group on decent work, the Employers’ group was pleased that their subamendment had been acceptable to the Workers’ group, but the Employers’ group could not support the EU subamendment.
- 560.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, noting her Employer counterpart’s explanation of “shared responsibility” and “formal and informal”, observed that the paragraph addressed workers throughout their working lives. However, the group could not accept that skills training and education was a shared responsibility. Regarding formal and informal skills training, the concepts were acceptable but not sufficiently relevant in the context. She felt that the fourth amendment submitted by the Workers’ group on securing and retaining decent work, merged with the EU amendment and could provide a basis for a text that would achieve tripartite consensus.
- 561.** The Government member of Argentina preferred the GRULAC amendment.
- 562.** The Government member of Canada did not support the inclusion of shared responsibility for skills training.
- 563.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the inclusion of “shared training”.
- 564.** The Government member of Brazil queried the use of the terms “skills and competences”, which had been covered in the GRULAC amendment by the term “knowledge”. She required further clarification of “shared responsibility”.
- 565.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the notion of “shared responsibility” was very important to her group. She could accept “taking into account the evolution of work”, but asked the Committee to show flexibility with regard to “shared responsibility”. General education, access to schools, universities and public training institutions was the responsibility of governments; vocational training, lifelong training and training for specific jobs was the responsibility of employers; and workers were responsible for attending training to upgrade their skills. The social partners, who were closest to the labour market, were in many countries responsible for ensuring that the content of training programmes was responsive to the needs of the labour market. If the Committee preferred “shared between States and social partners” that would be acceptable to the group.
- 566.** The Chairperson provided the consolidated text combining the various amendments and subamendments which read:
- (iii) promoting the acquisition of skills, competencies and qualifications for all workers throughout their working lives as a joint responsibility of governments and social partners in order to address existing and anticipated skills gaps, with particular attention to ensuring education and training systems that are responsive to labour market needs, taking into account the evolution of work, and enhancing workers’ capacity to make use of the opportunities available for decent work;

567. Part II, Section A, paragraph (iii), was adopted as amended.

568. As a consequence, a number of amendments fell.

Part II, Section A, paragraph (iv)

569. The Chairperson noted that three amendments had been submitted and would be considered in parallel.

Submitted by the Employer members:

- (iv) developing effective policies aimed at to generate full and productive employment and decent work opportunities for all, including by youth and facilitate the transition from education school to work with emphasis on the effective integration of young people into the labour market;

Submitted by the Government members of the EU Member States:

- (iv) developing effective policies to generate decent work opportunities for all, in particular youth, and facilitate the transition from school to work;

Submitted by the Worker members:

- (iv) developing effective policies to generate decent work opportunities for youth and facilitate the transition from education and training school to work;

570. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the group's amendment provided a more complete picture of the issues. The term "education" was preferable to "school," as it was broader and less exclusive. There might be older people wishing to enter the labour market after vocational training or lifelong learning, thus transitioning from education to employment, and the wording should acknowledge that fact. She had no objection to the EU amendment, which could be merged with their own. Her group could support the amendment submitted by the Workers' group, which also moved away from "school" as its meaning was narrow. The phrase "with emphasis on the effective integration of young people into the labour market" nevertheless ensured that the focus was on young people. The three amendments could be brought together as one.

571. The Worker Vice-Chairperson reminded the Committee that "full, productive, and freely chosen employment" was standard ILO terminology with which the draft Declaration should remain consistent. She could accept "emphasis on the effective integration of young people" but given the increasing diversity in the types and combinations of training and the world of work, the sentence should replace "integration of young people into the labour market" with "integration of young people into the world of work".

572. The Government member of Ireland speaking on behalf of the Government members of the EU Member States, explained that the EU amendment sought to place particular emphasis on youth, as was the intent with the original text. Within the amendment submitted by the Employers' group, the first two changes were not an improvement on the Office text. She did not support replacing "school" with "education," as the paragraph's intended focus was ensuring effective transitions for youth from school to work. The last part of the amendment was acceptable, but she would prefer something more concise. She did not support the amendment submitted by the Workers' group, as "school" was the better term in the context.

573. The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, commented only on the amendment submitted by the Employers' group, as she believed it provided a good basis for agreement by the Committee. She particularly approved of "effective integration of youth

into the labour market”. GRULAC supported the amendment as originally presented but indicated that some changes could be acceptable. For example, “education” was more comprehensive than “school” and thus preferable.

574. The Chairperson provided a consolidated text, based on the amendment submitted by the Employers’ group, combining the various amendments as follows:

- (iv) developing effective policies aimed at generating full, productive and freely chosen employment and decent work opportunities for all, and in particular facilitating the transition from education and training to work with emphasis on the effective integration of young people into the world of work;

575. The Government member of Canada preferred the original text but joined the consensus around the amended text.

576. The Government members of Argentina, Mexico, Switzerland and the United States supported the amended text.

577. The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, felt that the focus had been diluted but joined the consensus.

578. The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amended text.

579. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amended text.

580. Part II, Section A. paragraph (iv) was adopted as amended.

581. As a consequence, a number of amendments fell.

New paragraphs after Part II, Section A, paragraph (iv)

582. The Chairperson noted that two similarly worded amendments had been submitted which proposed the insertion of new paragraphs.

Submitted by the Government members of the EU Member States:

- () supporting measures to older workers that expand their choices and enable a lifelong active society;

Submitted by the Government members of Japan and Turkey:

- () increasing support to older workers that expands choice and enables a lifelong active society;

583. The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, said that as the focus of the preceding paragraph had been on youth, it was necessary to have a paragraph that addressed older workers.

584. The Government member of Japan said that older persons were an asset to society, and it was important that an enabling environment be put in place to support them. The Government of Japan was increasing the range of measures in place to establish such an environment.

585. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that her group had a problem with the very general nature of the amendment, which left out the key issue of what group of workers were meant,

-
- workers before retirement or also beyond retirement, as raising the age of retirement was a major and very conflictual issue worldwide. She queried whether the suggestion was that all populations were going to have to work longer, regardless of retirement arrangements. Older workers had a narrower choice of employment opportunities. They required reduced working hours. The text was vague as to what choices were available to older workers.
- 586.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported both amendments. Countries where there were ageing populations needed to develop expanded opportunities for them. For example, older workers needed support to help them participate and benefit from digital technologies.
- 587.** The Government member of Switzerland supported both amendments.
- 588.** The Government delegate of the United States proposed a subamendment to the EU amendment, seconded by the Government member of Canada, to read “supporting measures that help older workers to have more employment options and enable a lifelong active society;”.
- 589.** The Government member of Mexico requested clarification of the term “lifelong active society”.
- 590.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, clarified that “lifelong active society” was characterized by a holistic approach that allowed older people to maintain their option to work if they wished, to have access to social protection, or to lifelong learning. She felt that the subamendment narrowed the scope of the original text.
- 591.** The Government member of Singapore supported both texts, with a preference for that submitted by the Government members of Japan and Turkey. Singapore wanted older workers to have the choice to continue working, possibly opting for working reduced hours.
- 592.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment.
- 593.** The Government member of Australia supported the amendment and subamendment.
- 594.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson observed that while in some parts of the world populations were very young, in others they were ageing. It was hard to encompass that diversity in a single sentence. Many workers under the age of 60 were unable to continue working for health reasons. It would not do for the ILO to send out a message to the world in its Centenary Declaration that it was advocating for a higher retirement age, and without addressing the need for good working conditions. She therefore proposed a subamendment to the text to read: “supporting measures that help older workers to expand their choices, optimizing their opportunities to work in good quality, productive and healthy conditions until their retirement”.
- 595.** The Government member of Argentina appreciated the points raised by the Workers’ group, but wished to hear the views of other Government members.
- 596.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that the subamendment proposed by the Workers’ group provided a good basis for consideration.
- 597.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, proposed a subamendment to the subamended text, deleting “until their retirement” and adding “to enable active ageing”.

-
- 598.** The Government member of the United States queried the sense of “good quality productive and healthy conditions”.
- 599.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that “active ageing” had a disagreeable ring to it, as if it might imply ageing more quickly. She wished to propose a further subamendment for the text to read as follows: “supporting measures aimed at expanding employment choices for older workers and that promote and active and productive lifelong society;”.
- 600.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that her group supported the text as subamended by the EU Member States to include “to enable active ageing”.
- 601.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson cautioned against the use of terms that were not understood readily in all regions of the world and which remained Eurocentric. She stressed once again that it would not do to have the ILO sending out a message that workers must remain in paid employment until they died.
- 602.** The Chairperson suggested the words “to enable active ageing until retirement”.
- 603.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson preferred “until their retirement to enable active ageing”.
- 604.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that although there were many policies on active ageing in the EU, the World Health Organization also disseminated such policies at the global level. The concept was therefore widely acknowledged.
- 605.** The Government member of Switzerland suggested that “and” be inserted between “retirement” and “to”, such that the entire text would read as follows:
- () supporting measures that help older workers to expand their choices, optimizing their opportunities to work in good quality, productive and healthy conditions until their retirement and to enable active ageing;”.
- 606.** The new paragraph to follow Part II, Section A, paragraph (iv), was adopted as amended.
- 607.** As a consequence, a number of amendments fell.

New paragraph after Part II, Section A, paragraph (iv)

- 608.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new paragraph, “promoting workers’ rights as a key strategy for inclusive and sustainable growth, with a focus on freedom of association and collective bargaining;” after paragraph (iv). It introduced notions that were important for the ILO and also emanated from authoritative reports by the EU, the IMF, the OECD and the World Bank.
- 609.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment. She agreed that workers’ rights on freedom of association and collective bargaining were important but recalled that they were already mentioned through references to fundamental principles and rights at work and core labour Conventions. The focus was too narrow and the text was redundant.
- 610.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of Africa group, supported the amendment.
- 611.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson asked to hear the views of Government members. Although others might view the inclusion of those two fundamental rights as repetitive, it was

necessary to highlight them. The two rights were the most violated in the world of work and could not be construed as redundant. A specific mention of freedom of association and collective bargaining as enabling rights was missing in the draft Declaration so far. She introduced a subamendment to add “as enabling rights” at the end of the paragraph.

- 612.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the focus remained too narrow and one-sided. Decent work consisted of four pillars and all were important, but freedom of association and collective bargaining was only part of one pillar. She asked if the Workers’ group were willing to broaden the statement to include decent work. She proposed a subamendment to read “promoting decent work as a key strategy for inclusive and sustainable growth”. It was not appropriate to focus on only two of the eight core Conventions.
- 613.** The Government member of the United States supported the amendment proposed by the Workers’ group. He suggested a further subamendment to replace “key strategy” with “key element for the attainment of”. Workers’ rights were not, in themselves, a strategy.
- 614.** The Government members of Argentina, Canada, Norway, Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment proposed by the Workers’ group as subamended by the Government member of the United States.
- 615.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson asked for clarification as to whether the subamendment proposed by the Government member of the United States stopped after “sustainable growth” and did not include freedom of association and right to collective bargaining.
- 616.** The Government member of the United States confirmed that he had meant to initially have the full text so as to include freedom of association and collective bargaining.
- 617.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment and proposed a further subamendment to delete “with a focus on freedom of association and collective bargaining”.
- 618.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson was concerned about objections to long-established terminology. The term “freedom of association and collective bargaining” was commonplace in many ILO texts. She did not understand why the Employers’ group did not agree to the wording.
- 619.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson repeated that she did not question the rights themselves. The point was that the amendment was too narrow. Noting that the Workers’ group was intent on mentioning freedom of association and collective bargaining in the paragraph, she proposed a subamendment using text from the Declaration of Philadelphia: ‘promoting workers’ rights as a key element for the attainment of inclusive and sustainable growth, with a focus on freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining as enabling rights”.
- 620.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment, as did the Government members of the United States, and Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
- 621.** The amendment was adopted as amended.
- 622.** The new paragraph after Part II, Section A, paragraph (iv), was adopted.

Part II, Section A, paragraph (v)

- 623.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment which read:

-
- (v) giving urgent priority to the further development and implementation of carrying to its conclusion the unfinished struggle for gender equality at work through a transformative and measurable agenda for gender equality at work, that includes measures to prohibit and prevent discrimination, violence and harassment, promote equal treatment and opportunity, strengthen women's participation, representation and leadership, along with a more balanced sharing of family responsibilities, including through accessible and affordable child and social care and equal remuneration for women and men for work of equal value which achieves equal participation and equal remuneration for women and men for work of equal value;

The preference for the Workers' group would have been for gender to be mainstreamed throughout the document; however, they considered it unhelpful to amend multiple sentences throughout the draft Declaration. She acknowledged that the amendment was long, but it was important to show that it was not an issue that would be easy to resolve. The Declaration needed to carry emphasis and urgency, and highlight specific issues. That was why it was also important to have "measurable" as well as transformative change. The draft Declaration also needed to address discrimination, violence and harassment. Equal treatment and opportunity were also important. More balance in family responsibilities had already been on the ILO agenda in 1919. One of the most central issues to gender equality was access to affordable childcare. Finally, equal remuneration was one of the first issues for the ILO, and was key. She emphasized the importance of spelling out the issues, especially as they were not mentioned elsewhere.

- 624.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace "carrying to its conclusion the unfinished struggle for" with "achieving". It made the sentence more open to the future.
- 625.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, introduced an amendment that was identical to the one proposed by the Employers' group. It emphasized that gender equality was far from being achieved.
- 626.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the EU Member States, introduced an amendment which read
- (v) carrying to its conclusion the goal of unfinished struggle for gender equality at work through a transformative agenda, which achieves equal opportunities, equal participation and equal treatment, including equal remuneration for women and men for work of equal value;

She explained that the paragraph needed strengthening. As their amendment also emphasized gender equality as a goal, her group could accept the amendments proposed by the Employers' group and GRULAC. Their own amendment modified the Office text to mirror the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111).

- 627.** The Government member of the United States also speaking on behalf of the Government member of Australia, introduced an amendment to insert "aims to" before "achieves" and delete "s" from the word "achieves". Gender equality was something that had not yet been achieved; "aims to" offered more flexibility.
- 628.** The Government member of Canada, also speaking on behalf of the Government member of Switzerland, introduced an amendment to delete "for women and men", as gender equality was implicit.
- 629.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment submitted by the Workers' group because it was too detailed and long. She agreed with all of the substance, but it was not appropriate. As the GRULAC amendment was identical to their own, they fully supported it. She supported the EU amendment as it strengthened the paragraph while

keeping it concise. She also supported the amendment introduced by the Government member of the United States. She did not support the amendment submitted by the Government members of Canada and Switzerland as it introduced ambiguity, and the gender dimension needed to be clear. The original Office text used agreed wording.

630. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the EU amendment and introduced a subamendment for the paragraph to read:

- (v) achieving gender equality at work through a transformative and measurable agenda for gender equality at work, that includes measures to prohibit and prevent discrimination, violence and harassment, promote equal treatment and opportunity, strengthen women's participation, representation and leadership, along with a more balanced sharing of family responsibilities, including through accessible and affordable child and social care and equal remuneration for women and men for work of equal value;

It would be of particular importance to have “a transformative and measurable agenda” in the text as it was important to measure progress.

631. The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the EU amendment and the subamendment proposed by the Workers’ group. She proposed a subamendment which read “achieving gender equality at work through a transformative agenda which ensures equal opportunities, equal participation and equal treatment, including equal remuneration for women and men for work of equal value”.

632. The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the proposal put forward by the Workers’ group and the subamendment proposed by GRULAC. However, all the elements listed in that proposal were already present in the current version subamended by GRULAC.

633. The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the original Office text and did not support the GRULAC subamendment.

634. The Government members of Australia and Norway supported the proposals made by the EU and GRULAC.

635. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed to shorten the proposed text but said that it was crucial to include the notion of the sharing of family responsibilities, which was missing in both the EU and GRULAC proposals. It would be necessary to have equal opportunities, participation and treatment in a measurable agenda. She introduced two further subamendments to insert “and measurable agenda” after “transformative” and “support for a more balanced sharing of family responsibilities” at the end of the paragraph. All wording regarding care work was now missing but needed to be included later in the draft Declaration as it was key. It was also possible to delete the word “equal”, for the text to read “achieve equal opportunities, participation and treatment”.

636. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the EU and GRULAC amendments. However, she did not support the subamendment to add “measurable” as it would not do justice to gender equality to use quantitative figures. Instead, it would be stronger to refer to a transformative agenda only. She supported the inclusion of “equal opportunities, equal participation and equal remuneration for work of equal value” because it was important to have that emphasis.

637. The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the wording concerning a measurable agenda and the sharing of family responsibilities. She proposed a subamendment to replace “support for” by “a more balanced sharing of family responsibilities”.

-
- 638.** The Government member of Liberia supported the initial proposal but did not support the subamendment proposed by the Workers' group regarding family responsibilities, a matter generally beyond the mandate of ministries of labour. However, he supported the highlighting of equal opportunities, participation, treatment and remuneration.
- 639.** The Government member of Mexico supported the subamended proposal made by the Workers' group, which encompassed and merged many important elements. The notion of a more balanced sharing of family responsibilities was important.
- 640.** The Government member of the United States did not support the insertion of the term "measurable" because it was overly prescriptive. She did not support the subamendment proposed by the Workers' group on the sharing of family responsibilities. She proposed a subamendment to replace "aims" and "to ensure" by "which aims to ensure".
- 641.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, did not support the proposal made by the Government member of the United States. She supported the subamendment proposed by the Workers' group on the sharing of family responsibilities, which was fundamental, and proposed a subamendment to replace "and support for" by "enabling a more balanced sharing of family responsibilities".
- 642.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the Workers' proposal to insert "equality of opportunity and treatment".
- 643.** The Government member of Canada supported "which ensures" over "which aims to ensure", and also supported GRULAC's suggestion of "enabling a more balanced sharing of family responsibilities".
- 644.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, preferred the latest text "which ensures equal opportunities" as it was a stronger formulation. She supported the proposed wording "enabling a more balanced sharing of family responsibilities".
- 645.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not wish to delete "and" in the sentence "and enabling a more balanced sharing of family responsibilities" since, without it, the text would read that it was only if there was equal pay that there could be a sharing of family responsibilities. That was not true; there needed to be a sharing of family responsibilities in order for women to fully participate in the labour market. She supported the inclusion of "enabling". Regarding the objection of the Employers' group to "measurable", she remarked that there were many reports on pay, labour market participation, care and any number of issues which showed results and helped measure progress. It was important to be able to capture and measure progress made.
- 646.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed with the comments made by the Worker Vice-Chairperson regarding the balanced sharing of family responsibilities. It was not logical without the word "and"; she suggested using the wording "and enables a more balanced" or the wording originally proposed by the Workers' group. Without the "and" it would relate only to equal remuneration. If they said "and enables", it would refer to the transformative agenda. Regarding "measurable", she agreed that many things could be measured, but many could not as they were qualitative; she did not wish "transformative agenda" to be limited to quantifiable matters. She concurred with the Government member of the United States not to include "measurable". Therefore, with the change made on the sharing of family responsibilities, and removing "measurable" they could agree to the text.
- 647.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson requested clarification on the term "measurable agenda" in relation to ministries of labour. The chapeau read that "the ILO must direct its efforts to" so

it was important to clarify that they were not just asking member States or ministries of labour to take action in that regard.

- 648.** The representative of the Secretary-General explained that, generally, as in all paragraphs of Section II, much work would be required by the Governing Body to ensure that words were put into action. In terms of a “measurable” agenda, the ILO itself was in a position to report on progress in achieving the agenda, but it would be dependent on the Office receiving data from member States in a measurable way. He recognized that not all ILO issues were measurable in a quantifiable way. Perhaps there was a better word than “measurable” that could be used that encompassed the notion of assessing progress beyond quantifiable measurements. The intention was not just to have an agenda, but also to be able to show what progress was being achieved.
- 649.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson reiterated that “measurable” definitely had a quantifying connotation. She agreed that it was for the Governing Body to see how the transformative agenda had been implemented and what progress made; that could be achieved through quantifiable measures or qualitative criteria.
- 650.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, raised a linguistic question concerning the word “ensure” (*garantie*) in French. “Garantie” implied compliance and “permettre” was more appropriate. He supported the wording “and enables” and did not support the inclusion of “measurable”.
- 651.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed that it was for the Office to measure the agenda to see if progress had been made. There would be quantitative and qualitative measures. She did not support the use of indicators and thought that “a measurable agenda” was appropriate, since it was important to measure the impact of actions taken. She encouraged efforts to find a better word than “measurable”. She supported the rest of the text.
- 652.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said the term “measurable” was acceptable. She noted that there were already indicators in place for gender equality in the context of the SDGs. She supported the proposed text relating to the sharing of family responsibilities.
- 653.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, had a suggestion to address the concerns expressed about the term “measurable”; she proposed the wording “achieving gender equality at work through a transformative agenda, which is measurable, which ensures”, as the concept of the transformative agenda should remain, and it should be measurable. She supported the repetition of the word “equal”, as well as the inclusion of “and enables” as that was both the cause and consequence of everything that came before.
- 654.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that regarding indicators and the term “measurable”, she did not think that indicators were appropriate in the context. In a spirit of compromise, she proposed a subamendment to read “a transformative and results-oriented agenda”.
- 655.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that reducing “transformative agenda” to something that was not measurable would be problematic. She did not support the subamendment proposed by the Employers’ group.
- 656.** The Chairperson considered that consensus had been reached on certain words; the inclusion of “and enables” and “which ensures” and the repetition of “equal” enjoyed approval in the room. The discussion on “measurable” was still open.
- 657.** The representative of the Secretary-General clarified the use of the term “measurable”. Discussions and reports in the Governing Body often used measurements using non-

numerical methods. “Measurable” was used in a broad sense, which included impact and went beyond the purely numerical.

658. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to add “regularly evaluating progress made”.

659. Part II, Section A, paragraph (v), was adopted as amended.

- (v) achieving gender equality at work through a transformative agenda, which ensures equal opportunities, equal participation and equal treatment, including remuneration for women and men for work of equal value and enables a more balanced sharing of family responsibilities, regularly evaluating progress made;”

660. As a consequence, a number of amendments fell.

Part II, Section A, paragraph (vi)

661. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment.

- (vi) ~~realizing~~ensuring equality opportunities in the world of work for people in vulnerable situations, including people with disabilities;

The aim was to make the paragraph more accurate and broader. The focus was on equal opportunities, which needed to be ensured.

662. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add at the end of the paragraph “and others facing discrimination, including on multiple bases, and barriers to the full realization of their rights;”. The intention was to ensure that not just workers with disabilities were represented. She added that because there were instances when a person could be discriminated against on multiple bases, for example on the basis of being a woman and an indigenous person, it was necessary to reflect that reality.

663. The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, introduced an amendment to delete “realizing” and insert “promoting”. The aim was to focus on those with disabilities, an important consideration in their region.

664. The Employer Vice-Chairperson shared the sentiment of the GRULAC amendment but stated that their own amendment to include “ensuring” was stronger. The amendment proposed by the Workers’ group went in a similar direction to their amendment. She questioned the use of “facing discrimination”; a person could be in a strong position and still face discrimination. Their own suggestion of “in vulnerable situations” was preferable.

665. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the suggestion made by the Employers’ group to include “ensuring”. She understood GRULAC’s wish to focus on persons with disabilities, but stated that it would be wrong for the ILO not to mention other groups, which was why they had added other forms of discrimination. She proposed a subamendment for the text to read “ensuring equal treatment and opportunities in the world of work for people with disabilities and facing discrimination or in vulnerable situations, including on multiple bases, and barriers to the full realization of their rights;”.

666. The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, preferred the wording “ensuring equal opportunities in the world of work”, and also an inversion of the text, so that the focus remained on persons with disabilities. She proposed a subamendment to include “ensuring equal treatment and opportunities for people with disabilities”.

-
- 667.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson voiced her concern that the text was losing its focus as it contained many issues. Equal treatment was not what was needed, as persons with disabilities required special treatment. Discrimination was a legal term and did not apply in the context. Discrimination was very different to equal opportunities. The proposed subamendments would weaken the text.
- 668.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that equal treatment meant being considered equal. Indeed, some groups required more protection. A whole body of international law existed on the subject. What persons with disabilities needed was equal treatment. It was important to keep the main focus on them but also to cover other groups.
- 669.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, noted that the reference to equal treatment was not necessary. She proposed the following subamendment: “ensuring equal opportunities in the world of work for people with disabilities as well as other people in vulnerable situations;”. The proposed text covered persons with disabilities, but also other groups.
- 670.** The Government member of Switzerland supported the GRULAC subamendment, and concurred that reference to equal treatment would weaken the text.
- 671.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the EU Member States, proposed a further subamendment to read “ensuring equal treatment and opportunities in the world of work for people with disabilities and others facing discrimination;”.
- 672.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson requested clarification from the secretariat on the subject of equal treatment and equal opportunities.
- 673.** An official of the secretariat confirmed that, in the ILO context, the notion of equality would necessarily imply both equality of opportunity and of treatment. That was made clear in Convention No. 111, which had been ratified by 175 member States.
- 674.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the original Office text, which referred only to equality, should therefore be understood to include opportunity and treatment. Consequently, the group wished to add “treatment” to any amendment including “opportunity”. That terminology was upheld in the Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment (Disabled Persons) Convention, 1983 (No. 159), Article 4 of which read “Special positive measures aimed at effective equality of opportunity and treatment between disabled workers and other workers shall not be regarded as discriminating against other workers.” The group supported the EU subamendment.
- 675.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that her group accepted the word “treatment”, but that the wording should follow that of Convention No. 159 regarding “opportunities and treatment”. She put forward the subamendment “as well as other people in vulnerable situations”, as a more positive formulation than the EU wording “and others facing discrimination”.
- 676.** The Government member of the United States supported the GRULAC amendment.
- 677.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, proposed a further subamendment to the EU subamendment, to replace the final phrase with “as well as others facing discrimination”.
- 678.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the subamendment proposed by the Africa group.

-
679. The Government member of China could accept either version, but preferred the GRULAC subamendment. His Government could also accept either “equal opportunity and treatment” or “equality”.
680. The Government member of Cuba preferred the GRULAC subamendment; “equal opportunity and treatment” and “equality” were both acceptable formulations.
681. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that her group preferred the GRULAC subamendment.
682. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that, to help achieve consensus, the group supported the GRULAC subamendment.
683. The Government members of Norway, Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, and Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the GRULAC amendment.
684. The Worker Vice-Chairperson suggested inserting the word “for” between “as well as” and “other”.
685. Part II, Section A, paragraph (vi), was adopted as amended.
686. As a consequence, a number of amendments fell.

Part II, Section A, paragraph (vii)

687. The Chairperson noted that ten amendments had been submitted on the paragraph.
688. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew one amendment to delete the paragraph, retained the amendment proposing reformulated text, and informed the Committee that the group’s third amendment was to place the paragraph higher in the order of paragraphs.
689. The Chairperson reminded the Committee that questions regarding the order of the text would be dealt with at a later stage. He listed the remaining amendments.

Submitted by the Employer members:

- (vii) supporting the role of business as drivers of inclusive economic growth, job creation and productivity by promoting an enabling environment for entrepreneurship, innovation and sustainable enterprises, in particular including social enterprises and micro, small and medium-sized enterprises, as well as social enterprises, so as to generate productive efficiency, decent work, productive efficiency and improved living standards;

Submitted by the Worker members:

- (vii) promoting an enabling environment for entrepreneurship, innovation and sustainable public and private enterprises, including social enterprises and micro, small and medium-sized enterprises, so as to generate decent work, productive efficiency and improved living standards;
- (vii) promoting an enabling environment for entrepreneurship, innovation and sustainable enterprises, including cooperatives and the wider social and solidarity economy enterprises and micro, small and medium-sized enterprises, so as to generate decent work, productive efficiency and improved living standards;
- (vii) promoting an enabling environment for entrepreneurship, innovation and sustainable enterprises, including social enterprises and ~~micro~~, small and medium-sized enterprises, so as to generate decent work, productive efficiency and improved living standards;
- (vii) promoting an enabling environment for entrepreneurship, innovation and sustainable enterprises, including social enterprises and micro, small and medium-sized enterprises,

~~so as to generate~~ that respect decent work, generate productive efficiency and improved living standards;

Submitted by the Government members of the EU Member States:

- (vii) promoting an enabling environment for entrepreneurship, innovation and sustainable enterprises, including social enterprises and micro, small and medium-sized enterprises as well as the social and solidarity economy, so as to generate decent work, with productive and full employment ~~efficiency~~ and improved living standards for all;

Submitted by the Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran:

- (vii) promoting an enabling environment for entrepreneurship, innovation and sustainable enterprises, including ~~social enterprises~~ cooperatives and micro, small and medium-sized enterprises, so as to generate decent work, productive efficiency and improved living standards;

Submitted by the Government member of Brazil on behalf of GRULAC:

- (vii) promoting an enabling environment for entrepreneurship, innovation and sustainable enterprises, including social enterprises, cooperatives and micro, small and medium-sized enterprises, so as to generate decent work, productive efficiency and improved living standards;

- 690.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said the group’s amendment sought to provide more complete wording, and to introduce the notion of the role of business as a driver of inclusive economic growth and productivity.
- 691.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that her group’s first amendment aimed at recognizing the role of the public sector; the second referred specifically to “cooperatives and the wider social and solidarity economy”; and the third deleted “micro” enterprises from the text, as the group wished the paragraph to remain within the context of SMEs; it was willing to be flexible on that point. The fourth amendment changed the text from “so as to generate decent work” to “that respect decent work”, as respect for decent work was always an important notion for the group. The Workers’ group could accept the amendment proposed by the Employers’ group as a working basis on which to develop a text agreed by all.
- 692.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, introduced the group’s amendment. She explained that the group wished to include “cooperatives” as enterprises before “small and medium-sized enterprises” in the text. The amendment proposed by the Workers’ group to amend the text to read “that respect decent work” had merit, as did that group’s amendment to include public sector enterprises by the words “public and private”, which GRULAC strongly supported.
- 693.** The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran agreed that cooperatives played a key role in many countries’ economies, including his own. A reference to them should feature in the draft Declaration.
- 694.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson subamended the group’s own amendment by replacing “social enterprises” with “cooperatives”, a term that had a broader meaning. The group could accept the inclusion of public sector enterprises, but would prefer the text to read “sustainable enterprises, private or public”. They wished to retain the mention of micro enterprises, which after all were enterprises that might grow into SMEs or indeed even into larger or multinational enterprises; she noted the flexibility expressed by the Workers’ group in that regard. Her group was not in favour of “solidarity economy” as proposed by the Workers’ group and by the EU Member States, as it was a French concept, and hence out of place in a text of international scope. The group supported the inclusion of “cooperatives”,

as proposed by the Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran and by GRULAC. It also supported the inclusion of “full employment” from the EU amendment, but wished to retain “productive efficiency”. The proposal of the Workers’ group to include “respect” for decent work seemed odd, given that the aim of the paragraph was to establish an enabling environment for the creation of decent work.

- 695.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, taking as a basis the subamended amendment of the Employers’ group, further subamended that text: by adding “public and private” before enterprises; bracketing “micro”, as the inclusion of that word would require her consulting the Worker members; and by adding “and the wider social and solidarity economy” after “cooperatives”. She suggested that the text begin with “promoting an enabling environment for entrepreneurship, innovation and sustainable enterprises”. She asked for clarification of the meaning of “social and solidarity economy”.
- 696.** In response, the representative of the Secretary-General explained that, according to the ILO website, the social and solidarity economy consisted of enterprises and organizations such as cooperatives, mutual benefit societies, associations, foundations and social enterprises that produced goods, services and knowledge that met the needs of a community, through the pursuit of specific social and environmental objectives and the fostering of solidarity. The ILO was also participating in the United Nations Inter-Agency Task Force on Social and Solidarity Economy (TFSSE).
- 697.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the explanation showed that cooperatives were a part of the “social and solidarity economy”, which was therefore the more encompassing term.
- 698.** The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran favoured “cooperatives”.
- 699.** The Government member of the United States said that the original Office text was preferable, but that he supported the amendment and subamendments put forward by the Employers’ group. He suggested replacing the word “supporting” by “recognizing the role of business as drivers of growth”. That was quite simply because that was what business had always done and would continue to do: create growth. He also suggested that the term “productive efficiency” should be changed to “high productivity”, as it was hard to imagine what “unproductive efficiency” might be. It was sufficient to say “enterprises” without qualifying them as public or private enterprises, as the one word covered both. The term “social enterprises” already included cooperatives, and should therefore be favoured over all other qualifying amendments. The wording “generate decent work” was preferable to “respect for decent work”.
- 700.** The Government member of China said that his Government could agree with either “supporting” or “recognizing” as the first word of the paragraph. The Government favoured the inclusion of “public and private”, as well as “cooperatives and the wider social and solidarity economy”, and the last phrases, as drafted by the EU amendment, reading “so as to generate decent work, with productive and full employment and improved living standards for all”.
- 701.** The Government member of India approved inclusion of the terms “recognizing” and “public and private”. She wished to retain “micro” and to include “cooperatives” in the list of enterprises.
- 702.** The Government of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, favoured “supporting the role of enterprises” over “recognizing the role of enterprises”. He also supported inclusion of “cooperatives and the wider social and solidarity economy”.

-
- 703.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, pointed out that “supporting the role of business as drivers of inclusive economic growth, productivity and job creation” fitted better with the chapeau, which read “the ILO must direct its efforts to”. It would not make sense to direct efforts to recognizing the role of business. The question of including “public and private” had been referred to the Drafting Group earlier in the Committee’s discussions. She suggested that the Drafting Group might therefore be better placed to decide on its inclusion in the present paragraph as well. She subamended the end of the paragraph to read “so as to generate decent work, with productive and full employment and improved living standards for all”.
- 704.** The Government member of Switzerland supported the subamended text proposed by the Employers’ group. The aim was to achieve a clear and concise Centenary Declaration. At present, there was a risk that it would become too complex. It might be better to divide the paragraph into two.
- 705.** The Government member of Argentina said that the EU subamendment provided a comprehensive basis. It was important to recognize the role of business as drivers of growth, as the Government member of the United States had said.
- 706.** The Government member of Cuba agreed that the text as subamended by the EU Member States contained all the elements that were necessary. However, the order should be arranged differently. He argued that the purpose of the ILO was to promote social justice, not to support businesses in their role as drivers of growth. The paragraph should begin with a reference to “promoting an enabling environment for entrepreneurship”.
- 707.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the word “business” was not standard ILO terminology. She therefore favoured the first part of the paragraph in the original Office version. Her group insisted that work should be freely chosen, and thus the consecrated phrase “productive, full and freely chosen employment” should be used. The group wished to include the word “potential” before “drivers of inclusive growth”. The fact was that exclusion still existed, and the generation of inclusive growth was not a completed fact. The text would thus now read:
- (vii) promoting an enabling environment for entrepreneurship, innovation and sustainable enterprises, private and public as potential drivers of inclusive economic growth, job creation and productivity, in particular micro, small and medium-sized enterprises as well as cooperatives and the wider social and solidarity economy, so as to generate decent work, with productive, full and freely chosen employment and improved living standards for all;
- 708.** The Government member of Panama did not support the proposed drafting. The term “public enterprise” meant different things in industrialized and non-industrialized countries. He queried whether “public” enterprises meant enterprises in which the State held a large stake.
- 709.** The Government member of New Zealand said that his Government preferred the paragraph opening suggested by the Employers’ group to “supporting the role of business as drivers of inclusive economic growth, productivity and job creation”. He suggested deleting the word “potential” from the version proposed by the Workers’ group, as well as the word “wider”, since cooperatives were not necessarily part of the social and solidarity economy.
- 710.** The Government member of the Republic of Korea supported the text with the addition of “social enterprises” before “cooperatives”.
- 711.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the version proposed by the Workers’ group, but was uncertain about the inclusion of the word “potential”.

-
- 712.** The Government member of Brazil supported the deletion of the word “potential”.
- 713.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that the version proposed by the Workers’ group was the closest to the original Office draft. She subamended the proposed version to read “as drivers of inclusive economic growth, productivity and job creation”.
- 714.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson reiterated that her group did not accept that enterprises were already fully fledged drivers of inclusive growth; there was still progress to be made in that direction.
- 715.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said her group was disappointed with the direction the discussions had taken. The support expressed by the Workers’ group in taking the amendment proposed by the Employers’ group as a basis for discussion had seemingly evaporated. In a spirit of compromise, the group would agree to the paragraph opening with “promoting an enabling environment for entrepreneurship, innovation and sustainable enterprises”, but required that the text recognize the role of enterprises as drivers of growth.
- 716.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, sought an exit to the impasse by means of the following wording: “and recognizing their capacity to generate inclusive growth”.
- 717.** The Government member of the United States said that “potential” was unacceptable, and “capacity to generate” was insufficient. The fact that enterprises were generators of growth needed to be recognized clearly.
- 718.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson rejected “had the capacity” as an amendment. Both public and private enterprises drove growth and employment and, as such, that should be stated openly in the draft Declaration.
- 719.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that if all the inclusive growth that was needed had already been generated, the ILO would no longer be needed. Her group accepted that enterprises could have a positive role, but within a certain framework. If compromise could not be reached on the basis of the subamendment presented by GRULAC, she recommended that the text be referred to the Drafting Group.
- 720.** The Chairperson said that all amendments to Part II, Section A, paragraph (vii), would be referred to the Drafting Group.

New paragraphs after Part II, Section A, paragraph (vii)

- 721.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new paragraph:

- () promoting quality public services to provide the foundation for sustainable, inclusive, gender-equal economies and societies;

Her group regretted the lack of mention of public sector services in the draft Declaration. Those services were a very important part of the fabric of society, especially with regard to healthcare, care for the elderly, infrastructure and security. A short, crisp recognition of the need to promote high-quality public services was appropriate.

- 722.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that for her group to support the proposed new paragraph, private sector services would have to be included as well. She requested an explanation of the term “gender-equal economies”.

-
- 723.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson explained that “gender-equal” was intended to cover many of the elements spelled out in paragraph (v) of the present Part, and thus avoid the need to spell them all out again. Public services of quality were essential to gender equality.
- 724.** The Government member of the United States was concerned that the meaning of “public services” was too broad. The “the” before “foundation” should be replaced by “a”, since quality public services were not the sole foundation for sustainable, inclusive, gender-equal economies and societies.
- 725.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson pointed out that private services operated in the fields of childcare, care for the elderly, private schools, private job placement and many others. They provided an important foundation for sustainable enterprises, which were absent from the text of the proposed paragraph.
- 726.** The Government member of the United States said that he could accept the reference to private services on that basis. He was doubtful about the inclusion of “societies”, and reiterated that “a” foundation was preferable to “the” foundation.
- 727.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed with changing to the indefinite article “a”. Regarding public services, they were for social welfare, not just for the economy. For that reason, “societies” must be retained. In response to the Employer Vice-Chairperson, she said that sustainable economies included enterprises, so “sustainable enterprises” did not need to be added to the list.
- 728.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that since sustainable enterprises had been qualified as “public and private” in the discussions on paragraph (vii) of the same Section, they should be included in the proposed new paragraph.
- 729.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that in most countries public services were not enterprises. Police forces, for example, were rarely enterprises. All States had public services to support their economies and for the functioning of society in general.
- 730.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, proposed a subamendment for the paragraph to read “promoting quality public and private services to provide a foundation for sustainable economies and inclusive societies”. The gender issue was dealt with elsewhere in the draft Declaration.
- 731.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that “société” in French could mean “company”, and that made the French text problematic. The Committee Drafting Committee would be able to find a solution.
- 732.** Given the lack of consensus, the Chairperson referred the amendment to insert a new paragraph to the Drafting Group.
- 733.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new paragraph to read:
- () strengthening labour administration and inspection;
- With the increasing complexity in the world of work, there was a real need to strengthen labour administration and inspection.
- 734.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that her group had no objection to the substance of the proposed new paragraph, but felt that “strengthening” was not adequate. She proposed a subamendment for the paragraph to read “capacity-building and promoting labour

administration and inspection”. It might also be appropriate to add “where necessary”, as some countries might not need capacity building.

- 735.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the subamendment proposed by the Employers’ group, as did the Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran.
- 736.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, preferred the original amendment. Strengthening labour administration required more than just capacity-building.
- 737.** The Government member of the United States supported the original amendment.
- 738.** The Government member of New Zealand supported both versions, but noted that the word “strengthening” appeared inconsistent with the wording in other parts of that section of the draft Declaration. He suggested the wording “ensuring effective labour administration and inspection”.
- 739.** The Government member of Canada supported the original amendment. Labour administration was an important part of public services.
- 740.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, proposed a subamendment for the paragraph to read “promoting capacity building for or strengthening, as appropriate, labour administration and inspection”.
- 741.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that it would be better to keep the wording simple. Member States would know what needed to be done to strengthen their labour administrations. It might involve capacity-building, further training or simply employing more inspectors. The State in question would make that decision.
- 742.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson suggested a further subamendment for the text to read “promoting effective labour administration and inspection”.
- 743.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that most Government members had agreed to the use of “strengthening”.
- 744.** The Chairperson asked Government members to express their preference between the two versions: “promoting effective labour administration and inspection” and “strengthening labour administration and inspection”.
- 745.** The Government member of Canada stated a preference for “strengthening”, which necessarily included “promoting”.
- 746.** The Government member of the United States said he preferred “strengthening”.
- 747.** The Government members of Australia, and Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported “promoting”.
- 748.** The Government member of New Zealand preferred “promoting”, which would be more consistent with the wording in that section of the draft Declaration.
- 749.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that although the discussion on the amendment was challenging, she was confident that the issue could be resolved in plenary. She urged the Committee not to refer the amendment to the Drafting Group.

750. The Employer Vice-Chairperson indicated her willingness to support either the original wording of the amendment or the subamended text, depending on the views of Government members.

751. The Chairperson noted that there were no objections from the Government members.

752. The new paragraph after Part II, Section A, paragraph (vii), was adopted.

Part II, Section A, paragraph (viii)

753. The Chairperson said that three amendments had been submitted and would be discussed in parallel. One of the amendments, submitted by the Government member of Brazil, on behalf of GRULAC, was purely linguistic and only affected the Spanish version. He referred it to the Committee Drafting Committee. He listed the other two amendments.

Submitted by the Employer members:

- (viii) ~~ensuring that the increasing~~ promoting diverse forms of work and ensuring that diversification of production and work arrangements, as well as ~~and~~ business models, leverages opportunities for ~~social and economic progress that are conducive to full and productive employment and the promotion of~~ decent work;

Submitted by the Worker members:

- (viii) ~~ensuring that the increasing diversification of production and work arrangements~~ and business models serves social and economic progress and the promotion of decent work and that such models are effectively regulated, including through due diligence on human and labour rights, in particular in global supply chains;

754. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendment, which sought to incorporate positive language about harnessing opportunities of diverse forms of work and leverage opportunities for social and economic progress. The purpose of Section A was to guide ILO action and it was therefore not correct to speak about “ensuring”, since the ILO could promote but not ensure actions by member States.

755. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendment, the aim of which was to clarify the paragraph’s meaning which was primarily about the diversification of production and business models. Issues related to work arrangements should be dealt with elsewhere. The amendment also added language to emphasize the need to for effective regulation, especially of global supply chains. That was particularly relevant in today’s global economy where large numbers of businesses and workers were part of global supply chains. It was also an important addition to the categories of production and business models.

756. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the amendment proposed by the Workers’ group would result in a paragraph dealing only with business models but not work arrangements, which were also part of the ILO’s mandate. She therefore insisted on retaining “work arrangements” and “diverse forms of work”. However, to introduce global supply chains completely changed the content of the paragraph and was unacceptable to the Employers’ group. In any case, global supply chains should not be singled out for special attention while ignoring domestic supply chains. Moreover, regulating through due diligence was not a reality in most countries and in practice only a working method. Labour rights, beyond core labour standards, were never part of due diligence, and companies did a lot of due diligence without the need for regulation. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to start the paragraph with “promoting” and to add “domestic and” before “global supply chains”.

-
- 757.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled that the ILO had spent years discussing non-standard forms of employment and precarious work and that there had never been agreement on the phrase “diverse forms of work”. That was why the Workers’ group proposed to delete “work arrangements”. She suggested adding “freely chosen” before “employment”. She could not accept the deletion of “due diligence”, as due diligence did not relate only to laws and regulations. Due diligence was part of the heritage of the ILO’s MNE Declaration. Even senior officials of the International Organisation of Employers (IOE) had recently stated at the ILO that “Companies not only want to do no harm; they also want to do good to go beyond compliance for advancing human rights and due diligence”. She proposed a subamendment to rephrase the connection between effective regulation and due diligence, and questioned why such wording could not appear in a Centenary Declaration. She preferred to keep “ensuring that” rather than “promoting” at the beginning of the paragraph because the group did not wish to promote diverse forms of work.
- 758.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that she agreed with some of the proposals put forward by the Workers’ group, including to retain “global supply chains” since domestic supply chains had been added. However, the phrase “work arrangements” must be retained. The addition of “and freely chosen” before “employment” was acceptable, but the phrase “including through due diligence” should be deleted.
- 759.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson reaffirmed that she could not accept “diverse work arrangements.” A paragraph focused on making production or business models conducive to social and economic progress would not need to address work arrangements. She reminded the Employers’ group that the recent G7 meeting, in which the IOE had participated, had made a strong tripartite declaration on the role of enterprises in promoting human and labour rights consistent with the OHCHR *Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights*, the *OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises* and the MNE Declaration. There was no reason why such a commitment could not be included in the ILO Centenary Declaration.
- 760.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the retaining of “work arrangements” as well as the reference to due diligence. She favoured the word “ensure” instead of “promote”.
- 761.** The Government members of Canada, China, Norway, Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the EU position.
- 762.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson pointed out that the meaning of the paragraph would change completely if the term “work arrangements” was retained. It would in essence suggest that promoting all different types of work arrangements was conducive to decent work, which was not true.
- 763.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that if Government members wished to keep the reference to due diligence, it must be accompanied by “including through more effective enforcement of national law,”. That was because enforcement deficits in many parts of the world were a key reason companies had to conduct due diligence. In addition, “through corporate social responsibility initiatives” would have to be added before “due diligence”. She noted that companies indeed wanted to go beyond minimum standards, they simply did not want everything to be regulated. The Employers’ group could accept the subamended text with such modifications.
- 764.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that if the G7 Tripartite Declaration did not mention corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives, it was unnecessary for the Centenary Declaration to do so. As a possible compromise, reference could be made to the MNE Declaration, which was the appropriate ILO framework in the context. She would propose a

subamendment to modify the paragraph to read “conducive to full, productive and freely chosen employment and the realization of decent work” if “work arrangements” were retained.

- 765.** The Government member of the United States stated that it was a difficult discussion that might need to go the Drafting Group. However, he could accept the language proposed by the Employers’ group. He supported the reference to more effective enforcement of national law as well as to CSR initiatives, both of which were important.
- 766.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the group would support the reference to more effective enforcement of national law if Government members supported it. It was not appropriate to mention CSR initiatives in the Declaration as they were not part of the ILO’s tripartite commitment, were unilateral in nature and of widely varying quality. The ILO’s commitment was to the MNE Declaration. It was also possible to mention the *OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises* or the *OHCHR Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights*, but it should not mention CSR.
- 767.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed with the proposal to add “realization of decent work.” Regarding the remainder of the proposed version, she considered the phrase “including through effective enforcement of national law, CSR initiatives, and due diligence” to be a package deal. Either all three elements should be kept or the entire phrase deleted. Her preference was for it to be removed. In any case, the G7 was not a relevant benchmark for the work of an ILO Committee, which was part of a multilateral organization with 187 member States. She added that the 2030 Agenda itself actually required companies to adopt CSR initiatives that went beyond legal obligations to ensure their contribution to the SDGs.
- 768.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said the proposed drafting would be acceptable with a further subamendment for the paragraph to read “social and economic progress, provide for decent work and are conducive to full, productive, and freely chosen employment”, without a reference to CSR.
- 769.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson reminded the Committee of the flexibility their group had shown in accepting the insertion of “global supply chains” and asked for similar flexibility from the Workers’ group on the issue of CSR. As she had stated earlier, either all three elements should be retained, or none at all.
- 770.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson pointed out that the Workers’ group had been flexible in suggesting the addition of the MNE Declaration and wondered why the insertion was not acceptable to the Employers’ group.
- 771.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, did not accept the inclusion of “more effective enforcement of national law”. It would send the wrong message in the Declaration that countries were not enforcing their laws. Given that the Employers’ group did not agree with the inclusion of “due diligence” and the Workers’ group did not support the reference to CSR”, she suggested that both be deleted and the sentence end after “employment”.
- 772.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of EU and its Member States, supported the GRULAC proposal. Reference to the MNE Declaration should be deleted since previous discussions on the preamble had determined that it was not appropriate to mention it in the Declaration. She suggested that deleting the word “more” would improve the text, which did not encourage much progress from countries starting from an already low level.

773. The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, suggested that since the Workers and Employers could not find a compromise, both “due diligence” and “CSR” should be removed. The reference to the MNE Declaration should also be deleted.

774. The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled that the group had suggested including a reference to the MNE Declaration in the preamble because it had been an important part of the ILO’s mandate since its initial version in 1977. That placement had been rejected by the Committee because the MNE Declaration was not seen as rising to the level of the other foundational ILO instruments. She considered, however, that the paragraph under discussion was indeed the proper place to include it, especially as the MNE Declaration helped qualify the meaning of due diligence. Yet the Committee still did not agree to include a reference. Due diligence was something which was widely accepted and practised and it was not clear to her why it could not be included in the Declaration. She did not wish to delete any of the text as proposed in their initial amendment.

775. The Chairperson concluded that there was no consensus on the text of Part II, Section A, paragraph (viii), in the form proposed by the two amendments and referred it to the Drafting Group. He reassured the Employer Vice-Chairperson that the Drafting Group would begin its consideration of the paragraph based on the original content of the two amendments, and not based on the subamendments proposed in the Committee.

New paragraph after Part II, Section A, paragraph (viii)

776. The Chairperson said that one amendment had been submitted to insert a new paragraph.

Submitted by the Government members of the EU Member States

- (.) promoting decent work for all, including in global supply chains, and fostering cross-border cooperation and global governance in areas or sectors of high international integration;

777. The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced the amendment and proposed a subamendment to insert “eradicating forced and child labour” at the start of the paragraph. The amendment emphasized the importance of eliminating forced and child labour in global supply chains through improved global governance. She recognized that the term “global supply chains” would be taken up by the Drafting Group in considering the amendments on paragraph (viii), and that that discussion could affect the EU amendment now under discussion. She recalled that the EU and its Member States had supported an earlier amendment highlighting freedom of association and collective bargaining, as well as previous language in the text referencing equal remuneration and non-discrimination; she hoped for similar flexibility in introducing the two additional fundamental principles and rights at work.

778. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment as the meaning of “global governance in areas or sectors of high international integration” was difficult to understand. She agreed with the reference to the promotion of decent work in global supply chains, but noted that it had already been discussed when considering the two amendments proposed by her group and by the Workers’ group on paragraph (viii). She suggested that the EU amendment be grouped with those previous amendments for consideration together by the Drafting Group.

779. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the EU amendment and subamendment. The phrase “eradicating child and forced labour” proposed by the subamendment was new to the draft Declaration. Since the amendment was linked to previous amendments submitted by the Worker members and the Employer members, she agreed that the amendment and subamendment be referred to the Drafting Group.

-
780. The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, suggested that before referring the amendment to the Drafting Group, it would be helpful to seek explanations from the EU on the meaning of “cross-border cooperation and global governance in areas or sectors of high international integration”. If the EU could give examples, or clarify the origins of the drafting, it would help the Committee understand the scope of the amendment.
781. The Government member of the United States said that while he supported the amendment and subamendment, he shared GRULAC’s concerns and supported their suggestion that further explanations be sought from the EU. He agreed with the suggestion to join the amendment with the previous amendments mentioned, for discussion in the Drafting Group.
782. The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the views expressed by the Government member of the United States.
783. The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, explained that the amendment was meant to address globalization. A number of sectors, such as the maritime and fishing sectors, regularly operated across borders. In the future, especially with the advance of technology, there would likely be more sectors working across borders that deserved specific attention, especially with respect to eradicating forced and child labour.
784. The Chairperson confirmed that the amendment would be referred to the Drafting Group.

Part II, Section A, paragraph (ix)

785. The Chairperson said that six amendments had been submitted on the paragraph. He invited the sponsors of the amendments to introduce them individually. The amendments read as follows.

Submitted by the Worker members:

- (ix) investing in achieving the reduction and eventual elimination of informality transition of workers and economic units from the informal to the formal economy, while ensuring the preservation and improvement of existing livelihoods during the transition;

Submitted by the Government members of the EU Member States:

- (ix) achieving the transition from the informal to the formal economy ~~reduction and eventual elimination of informality;~~

Submitted by the Government members of Australia, Canada, Switzerland and the United States:

- (ix) promoting the transition from the informal to the formal economy ~~achieving the reduction and eventual elimination of informality;~~

Submitted by the Employer members:

- (ix) achieving the reduction and eventually eliminating of informality, as a major obstacle to full and productive employment and decent work;

Submitted by GRULAC:

- (ix) promote the transition from the informal economy to the formal economy, including through cooperatives ~~achieving the reduction and eventual elimination of informality;~~

Submitted by the Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran:

(ix) achieving the reduction and eventual elimination of informality, in particular through cooperatives;

- 786.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendment and noted that the wording of the original draft did not take the proper approach. The goal of eliminating the informal economy was illusory, especially when considering the high rates of informality in many countries and the many different features of the informal economy. Regarding the wording, inspiration should be drawn from the Transition from the Informal to the Formal Economy Recommendation, 2015 (No. 204). It was inappropriate to look at the informal economy as a monolith without also looking at the circumstances of the working people and small and micro businesses operating within it. Even the goal of “achieving” a reduction of informality was too ambitious given the size of the informal economy. When pursuing policies related for example, to registration or taxation, it was important to ensure that people could retain their livelihood.
- 787.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendment and explained that its purpose was to reformulate the paragraph to add clarity. Although the Employers’ group appreciated the original Office text, the term “achieving” was too ambitious. Moreover, the inclusion of “full and productive employment and decent work” was proposed in order to bring the text closer to standard ILO terminology.
- 788.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced the amendment and explained that it sought to bring the paragraph into greater alignment with the wording of Recommendation No. 204. The amendment attempted to introduce positive and impactful wording that would suit the Declaration.
- 789.** The Government member of the United States, also speaking on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Canada and Switzerland, introduced an amendment and explained that it sought to achieve greater alignment between paragraph (ix) and the wording of Recommendation No. 204.
- 790.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, introduced the amendment. She explained that it contained two elements. First, it placed an emphasis on transitioning from the informal to the formal economy, in line with the amendment introduced by the Workers’ group. Although the transition was itself relevant, the focus should be on achieving it. The second part of the amendment highlighted the important role of cooperatives in the context. The inclusion of cooperatives was of particular importance to her region, since many cooperatives in Latin America had successfully shown how to transition from informality to formality.
- 791.** The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran introduced a similarly worded amendment, which added “cooperatives” to the text because they were an important means to achieve the transition. He also suggested using the phrase “transition from the informal to the formal economy” as it was a recognized term under Recommendation No. 204.
- 792.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that they could not support the amendment proposed by the Workers’ group. The notion of “investing” was vague and in any case insufficient to address informality. Moreover, the term “economic units” was difficult to understand without the benefit of the explanation in Recommendation No. 204. She supported the amendments introduced by the Government members of the Islamic Republic of Iran, United States, EU Member States, and GRULAC. The Employers’ group could support the inclusion of “cooperatives”, as suggested by the amendments proposed by the Government

member of the Islamic Republic of Iran and GRULAC; however, if a shorter version was preferred by the majority, it would be fine to leave it out.

- 793.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that she was flexible regarding the term “promoting” and thought that “achieving” was not the right word when talking about reducing and eliminating informality, especially given that Recommendation No. 204 was also about achieving decent work in the informal economy, not only in the formal economy. Otherwise, informal workers might be left without protections such as social protection floors. Recommendation No. 204 in fact spoke about “enabling” transitions, but “promoting” was still acceptable and, in any case, it remained important to preserve livelihoods during the transition process. In response to the Employer Vice-Chairperson, the term “economic units” had been added because it was a broader concept than “workers”. Many established terms appeared in the draft Declaration without requiring further explanation. That was the case with “decent work” and should also be possible with respect to “economic units”.
- 794.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, advocated for a strong and impactful text on the transition from the informal to the formal economy. Although “achieving” was her preferred term, “promoting” could also be accepted since both the Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson had already indicated their acceptance of the proposal.
- 795.** The Government member of the United States, also speaking on behalf of the Government members of Australia, Canada and Switzerland, understood that the text came from Recommendation No. 204 but, in order to keep the wording clear and concise, she preferred the wording of their own amendment.
- 796.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed with the views of the Government member of the United States, as did the Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group.
- 797.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson also supported the amendment introduced by the Government member of the United States, and noted that the issue of cooperatives would be dealt with later in the text.
- 798.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, referred to Part II, Section A, paragraph (vii), and asked whether that paragraph had been adopted including a reference to cooperatives, or whether it had been sent to the Drafting Group.
- 799.** The Chairperson said that paragraph (vii) had been referred to the Drafting Group
- 800.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, asked for assurances from members of the Committee that there would indeed be a reference to cooperatives in paragraph (vii). If so, GRULAC would support the amendment introduced by the Government member of the United States, without a reference to cooperatives. GRULAC was satisfied with the general agreement in the Committee that a reference to cooperatives would be included in paragraph (vii) following the work of the Drafting Group.
- 801.** Part II, Section A, paragraph (ix), was adopted as amended.
- 802.** As a consequence, a number of amendments fell.

Insert new paragraphs after Part II, Section A, paragraph (ix)

803. The Chairperson said that four amendments had been submitted to insert new paragraphs text after Part II, Section A, paragraph (ix). He invited the sponsors of the amendments to introduce them individually.

Submitted by the Worker members:

- () reaffirming the continued relevance of the employment relationship as a means of providing security and legal protection to workers, recognizing the need to address false self-employment and to ensure that contractual arrangements are classified properly;

Submitted by the Government members of the EU Member States:

- () developing and enhancing measures of social protection, which are adequate, sustainable and adapted to developments in the world of work;

Submitted by the Worker members:

- () ensuring that all workers regardless of their contractual arrangements or employment status are afforded and benefit from adequate social and labour protection;

Submitted by the Employer members:

- () supporting the development of modernized, viable and financially sustainable social protection systems, taking into account ongoing demographic changes, national priorities and circumstances;

804. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendment the aim of which was to emphasize the importance of the employment relationship as contained in the Employment Relationship Recommendation, 2006 (No. 198), and to take into account the OECD report *The Future of Work – OECD Employment Outlook 2019*, that reaffirmed “the continued relevance of the employment relationship as a means of providing social security and legal protection to workers”. It was important to reassure workers that the ILO was continuing to pay close attention to the issue at a time when many people were concerned about the ongoing transformations in the world of work.

805. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment submitted by the Workers’ group. The term “false self-employment” had no meaning and was only used in the OECD context and not by the ILO, which was a global organization. She did not challenge the relevance of the employment relationship, but thought it was an improper statement to include here. If it was retained, the text would also need to reflect the whole range of diverse forms of employment. She was of the view that classifying contractual arrangements was not an appropriate function for the Declaration.

806. The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that she agreed with the direction of the amendment, but also had concerns regarding the choice of wording. She suggested deleting the text “to address false self-employment and to ensure that contractual arrangements are classified properly”. If this passage was retained, she would suggest changing “false self-employment” to “bogus self-employment”, since “bogus” was the word used in ILO documents.

807. The Government member of Australia could not support the amendment as drafted. Its overall approach was too narrow and the terminology too difficult to understand.

808. The Government member of the United States echoed the view of the Government member of Australia.

-
- 809.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, had no particular opinion on the amendment submitted by the Workers' group. He suggested that that amendment and the EU amendment could be merged and contribute to finding consensus on the issue.
- 810.** The Government member of Liberia stated that there were some positive elements in the amendment submitted by the Workers' group, but that the text which appeared after "workers" was problematic and unlikely to find agreement. It was true that the employment relationship was important, but it was important to both workers and employers. He proposed a subamendment to add "and employers" after "workers" and to delete the remainder of the text. That would result in a more balanced paragraph since the employment relationship had two sides, employers' and workers' obligations. The proposed subamended text would read "reaffirming the continued relevance of the employment relationship as a means of providing security and legal protection to workers and employers;"
- 811.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson found it odd that an issue of such high importance to the ILO, as well as to other international institutions, might not appear in the text. The Workers' group felt that false self-employment must be addressed by the Declaration. She recognized there were different possible terminologies as noted by the EU and it was perhaps best to talk about disguised forms of employment, which was the standard ILO term. She preferred to keep the term "false self-employment", but expressed that she was ready to accept removing it and its corresponding clause and retaining "and to ensure that contractual arrangements are classified properly". She strongly objected to introducing the notion of the employment relationship, also meant to protect employers, as suggested by the Employers' spokesperson and apparently supported by Liberia, as this would run counter to 100 years of history of the ILO itself and the development of labour law throughout the world, which was based on the notion of the fundamental inequality between the parties to the employment contract, which was different from civil law where the parties were considered to be equals. She proposed a subamended text that read "reaffirming the continued relevance of the employment relationship as a means of providing security and legal protection to workers, and to ensure that contractual arrangements are classified properly;". The Workers' group could not accept the insertion of "the protection of the employer" as a point of principle.
- 812.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson acknowledged the divergent views of the Committee on the amendment proposed by the Workers' group. The employment relationship was an extremely difficult issue and she was of the view that it was not possible to achieve consensus in the Committee. She recommended that the amendment should be referred to the Drafting Group.
- 813.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed her strong disappointment and disagreement with the direction the discussion was taking, and withdrew the amendment.
- 814.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, recalled that in her opening statement to the Committee she had indicated that certain elements were missing from the draft Declaration, one of which was social protection. The purpose of their amendment was to introduce a new paragraph to read "developing and enhancing measures of social protection, which are adequate, sustainable and adapted to developments in the world of work;"
- 815.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the intention of the EU amendment, noting that their own amendment, to be inserted before Part II, Section A, paragraph (x), that stated "supporting the development of modernized, viable and financially sustainable social protection systems, taking into account ongoing demographic changes, national priorities and circumstances;" was similar. She asked if the substance of the amendments could be considered at the same time, before a decision was made on its placement.

-
- 816.** The representative of the Secretary-General informed the Committee that a reference to social protection appeared later in Part III, Section A, paragraph (ii), and that any duplication of substance should be avoided. He asked if the Committee might prefer to discuss social protection during the debate on Part III of the draft Declaration.
- 817.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, acknowledged that social protection appeared in Part III of the draft Declaration. However, Part III called on all member States to work individually and collectively, on a tripartite basis, to advance the human-centred approach for the future of work. By contrast, Part II dealt with the role of the ILO. Therefore, including social protection in Part II would not be a duplication but would provide important guidance to direct the ILO's efforts.
- 818.** The Government member of the United States supported the view of the Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
- 819.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that she shared the view of the Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and that she did not have an opinion on where the text of the amendment should be placed.
- 820.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson had questions about the meaning of the amendment, as there was some confusion about the effect of addressing this issue exclusively under Part III, Section A, paragraph (ii). She was also concerned that the proposed amendment did not use already well-established ILO terminology referring to universal, comprehensive and sustainable social protection. It would be preferable to use wording in the Declaration drawn from agreed and important ILO standards.
- 821.** The Government member of the Russian Federation supported the essence of the proposed amendment and thanked the secretariat for clarifying his own concern related to the possible duplication of substance in the draft Declaration. He noted that the wording of Part III, which included a provision on social protection in Section A, paragraph (ii), called upon "all member States to work individually and collectively, on a tripartite basis, to advance the human-centred approach for the future of work". He wondered where else but in the ILO could a multilateral tripartite forum be convened to address such issues. In that respect, ILO action was already anticipated under Part III.
- 822.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported both the EU amendment and the amendment proposed by the Employers' group. The question remained how to merge the content of the separate amendments. In that respect, GRULAC could support the formulation of either proposal.
- 823.** The Government member of Australia said that she preferred the text suggested by the Employers' group which read "taking into account ongoing demographic changes, national priorities and circumstances". It was important to reflect that sentiment in the text.
- 824.** The Government member of China said that social protection was of critical importance. He supported both amendments though he preferred the language of the EU amendment.
- 825.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson could support either amendment. Depending on the view of the Committee, she might propose adding the section from their amendment on demographic change to the EU amendment.
- 826.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled that the Social Justice Declaration and ILO standards provided clear language on establishing and extending national social protection floors. SDG 1 (Ending poverty in all its forms everywhere), spoke about implementing nationally appropriate social protection systems and measures for all, including floors, by 2030. SDG 3

(Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages) addressed achieving universal health coverage, including financial risk protection, access to quality essential healthcare services. It was not clear how the text of the EU amendment related to that important body of work of the ILO and UN. She proposed a subamendment to broaden the present scope of social protection contained in the EU amendment that read “[supporting the development and enhancement] [development and enhancing measures] of social and labour protection [systems], which are adequate, sustainable and adapted to developments in the world of work [, including the diversification of contractual arrangements and employment status]”. If the Committee did not accept the subamendment, the Workers’ group would prefer to keep the text as it existed in the draft Declaration. That was preferable to inventing a new conception of social protection that was not aligned with the significant work undertaken and agreements already reached on this subject.

- 827.** The representative of the Secretary-General responded to an earlier request for clarification on the relationship between the language in Part II and ILO standards. He underlined that Part II of the text was intended to give broad instructions on areas of work for the ILO and was action-oriented. Part II was not reshaping, but rather prioritizing the work the ILO needed to do, and where possible in accordance with established standards.
- 828.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson remained concerned about the relationship between the text of the draft Declaration and existing ILO standards and was not fully reassured by the explanation given. She requested more time to consult with the Worker members on the matter.
- 829.** The Chairperson reminded the Committee that time was getting tight and constructive solutions were required if progress were to be made. The Office text had been determined according to a structure approved by the Governing Body. The text had been the subject of consultations, and the preliminary suggestions put forward by participants in those consultations had been incorporated into the draft. Thus, when the Committee reached an impasse, it should consider the option of returning to the original Office text. If there was no evident convergence, the Chairperson would refer the text to the Drafting Group.
- 830.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed including the second of their amendments in the consideration of the two amendments currently under discussion. The group could take the amendment submitted by the Government members of the EU Member States as a basis for discussion. With regard to the amendment submitted by the Employers, the Workers’ found the use of the word “modernized” problematic. Members should not lose sight of the purpose and scope of the draft Declaration. While some modernization was certainly necessary, it could not be taken as a general concept: incessant modernization over the next 100 years was simply not viable. The Workers’ additional amendment would underline the need for all workers to benefit from adequate social and labour protection.
- 831.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that her group could support the original EU text, without the additional phrase: “including the diversification of contractual arrangements and employment status”. The text should focus on social protection, and therefore the amendment to include “social and labour protection” was not acceptable.
- 832.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the inclusion of the words “social and labour protection”, and wished to subamend the word “including” to read “in view of”.
- 833.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, preferred the Employers’ amendment, which flowed better from the chapeau that opened Part II, Section A.

-
- 834.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the EU text, without the phrase “in view of the diversification of contractual arrangements and employment status”.
- 835.** The Government member of the United States supported the original EU amendment, without subamendments.
- 836.** The Government member of Australia said that his Government favoured the Employers’ amendment, but could also support the subamended EU proposal.
- 837.** The Government member of Canada supported the subamended EU text.
- 838.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson could accept the subamended EU text with the inclusion of “in view of the diversification”.
- 839.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that her group supported the original EU amendment, not its subamended version. The Employers could not accept the inclusion of “social and labour protection”. The question of labour protection was dealt with elsewhere.
- 840.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that so far no wording had been included in respect of labour protection. The group could only accept a text that dealt solely with social protection once it had seen adequate text on labour protection elsewhere. For the moment that text did not exist, so she proposed that the text be referred to the Drafting Group.
- 841.** The representative of the Secretary-General advised the Committee against including overly specific items in the draft Declaration, as precision of that sort would complicate the work of the Governing Body when it was overseeing implementation of the Declaration in years to come, and prevent it from drawing the appropriate interpretations and guidance from the text.
- 842.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that her group did not insist on the phrase on diversification, but wanted to retain “labour protection”.
- 843.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the subamended text that included “diversification of contractual arrangements and employment status”.
- 844.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said her group could support the subamended text, but without “labour protection”.
- 845.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the Social Justice Declaration referred to “enhancing social protection – social security and labour protection”. The wording was also used in other important ILO texts. She suggested it might be appropriate here.
- 846.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that there was no need to spell everything out in this paragraph. The text subamended by GRULAC met with the group’s approval.
- 847.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the GRULAC proposal. While the general public might not know it, any social protection specialist would be certain to know that social protection encompassed labour protection.
- 848.** The Government member of China, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, agreed that the focus of the paragraph was social protection, but that ASPAG could also accept inclusion of the word “labour protection”.

-
- 849.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that she understood social protection to include labour protection.
- 850.** The Government member of the United States agreed that social protection included labour protection, but that he could accept a text with or without the specific mention of “labour protection”.
- 851.** The Government of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that her group could accept the wording “social protection – social security and labour protection” from the Social Justice Declaration.
- 852.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that her group could accept “social protection systems”, but wished her comments with respect to labour protection to be recorded.
- 853.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson confirmed that that wording was acceptable to her group.
- 854.** The new paragraph before Part II, Section A, paragraph (ix), was adopted.

Part II, Section A, paragraph (x)

- 855.** The Chairperson said that five amendments had been submitted.

Submitted by the Employer members:

- (x) ensuring the fair treatment of, and appropriate skills for development of migrant workers; promoting systems of governance of labour migration and mobility that fully respect the rights of migrant workers and benefit countries of origin, transit and destination; and

Submitted by the Government members of the EU Member States:

- (x) promoting measures to address the challenges and opportunities of demographic shifts, including legal systems of governance of labour migration and mobility that fully respect the rights of migrant workers and benefit countries of origin, transit and destination; and

Submitted by the Government members of GRULAC:

- (x) promoting cooperation and the exchange of information, including best practices, with respect to systems of governance of labour migration and mobility that fully respect the rights of migrant workers and benefit countries of origin, transit and destination; and

Submitted by the Government members of India and the Republic of Korea:

- (x) promoting systems of governance of labour migration and mobility that fully respect the rights of migrant workers and benefit countries of origin, transit and destination; and

Submitted by the Government members of Australia and the United States:

- (x) promoting systems of governance of labour migration and mobility that fully respect national sovereignty and the rights of migrant workers and benefit countries of origin, transit and destination; and

- 856.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson stressed that the role of the ILO was not to promote systems of governance of labour migration, but to make sure that migrant workers were fairly treated. For the Employers, it was important that migrants should acquire the skills necessary for them to integrate the labour market, and the group’s amendment of the paragraph had been drafted accordingly. The group could accept the term “legal” labour migration, from the EU amendment, and they welcomed the inclusion by GRULAC of “cooperation and the

exchange of information, including best practices”. The group did not feel that the question of national sovereignty should be included in the paragraph.

- 857.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the EU Member States, said that the EU amendment had been drafted to follow on correctly from the chapeau heading the text. The EU also felt that the ILO’s mandate did not include promoting systems of governance of labour migration.
- 858.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that her region was proud of its open attitude towards receiving migrants, but as the issue was frequently transnational, it was important to give countries space to apply their own national legislation. The group did not accept the wording concerning systems of governance of labour migration. GRULAC could take the Employers’ text as a basis, combined with some of the EU amendment language. But the legality or illegality of the migrants should not be highlighted. All migrants deserved respect and attention, irrespective of their legal status. It was for that reason that the group had included the phrase concerning cooperation, exchange of information and best practices.
- 859.** The Government member of the Republic of Korea, also speaking on behalf of the Government member of India, explained that their amendment to delete the word “fully” from “fully respect the rights of migrant workers” sought to take into account that some countries’ national legislation did not provide migrants with the full set of rights enjoyed by their own citizens.
- 860.** The Government member of the United States said that countries needed to control the flows of migrants over their own borders, so a reference to national sovereignty was important. The EU use of the word “legal” was acceptable in that connection, as its meaning was very close to national sovereignty.
- 861.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled that the Conference had held a general discussion on labour migration at its 106th Session (2017) and had adopted conclusions concerning fair and effective labour migration governance. The issue was therefore not new for the ILO. She suggested that “fair and effective labour migration governance” might be an acceptable formulation, given that it was pure Conference wording. She was able to support the Employers’ amendment to include “appropriate skills for development of migrant workers”, but the Employers had also deleted a large amount of text from the original draft. The EU’s use of the word “legal” was problematic, as the consecrated term, used to prevent criminalization of migrants’ status, was “regular” or “irregular”. The purpose of the paragraph was to promote regular migration. There was a need to provide irregular migrants with a path out of irregularity. She agreed with GRULAC that the terms “legal” and “illegal” were to be avoided. Likewise, it was not appropriate to refer to “national sovereignty”. The wording “promoting fair and effective labour migration governance that fully respect the rights of migrant workers and benefit countries of origin, transit and destination;” would be acceptable to the Workers’ group. The GRULAC text including cooperation, exchange of information and best practices was not necessary.
- 862.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the Employers placed importance on integrating migrant workers into the labour market and, for that, they must be provided with the right skills. Once again, she stressed that the ILO should not stray from its mandate. The International Organization for Migration (IMO) existed to cover such issues as governance of migration.
- 863.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, proposed a subamendment worded as follows:

-
- (x) promoting systems of governance of labour migration and mobility that respect the rights of migrant workers and benefit of countries of origin, transit and destination, while encouraging cooperation and exchange of information including best practices.
- 864.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that she could accept the word “regular” in place of “legal”.
- 865.** The secretariat produced a consolidated text, taking account of the various amendments thus far, as follows:
- (x) Promoting measures for fair and effective labour migration systems, cooperation and measure to address the challenges and opportunities of demographic shifts and labour market integration, which fully respect the rights of migrant workers and benefit countries of origin, transit and destination; and
- 866.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the question of provision of skills was missing.
- 867.** The representative of the Secretary-General explained that he understood “labour market integration” included the acquisition of skills by migrants.
- 868.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, pointed out that “regular” was also missing.
- 869.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that her group supported the original EU subamendment, itself subamended to include skills provision.
- 870.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, was against the inclusion of either “regular” or “legal”. The group suggested an alternative wording as follows:
- (x) promoting measures to address the challenges and opportunities of demographic shifts, in particular with regard to migrant workers and their integration in the labour market, including through cooperation and exchange of information on best practices, with full respect to their rights and benefit countries of origin, transit and destination.
- 871.** The Government member of the United States agreed with the Employers that the ILO had no place in issues of governance of migration. He supported the use of “regular” in place of “legal”.
- 872.** The Government member of Indonesia gave full support to the GRULAC subamendment, but could not support either the amendment submitted by the Government members of India and the Republic of Korea, or that submitted by the Employer members.
- 873.** The Government member of Ireland supported the opening phrase of the GRULAC subamendment, but said that the text should include either “regular” or “legal migration”.
- 874.** The Government member of China lent his support to the consolidated text as read out by the secretariat and to the subamendment put forward by the Africa group.
- 875.** The Government member of the United States said that the word “regular” was acceptable and suggested bringing the wording more closely into line with that of the 2017 Conference conclusions.
- 876.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that text from the outcome of a Conference general discussion would not be appropriate in the Declaration, the scope of which would be more universal compared with the specific nature of Conference conclusions. Her group favoured

the GRULAC subamendment, and she noted strong support for use of the term “regular migration”.

- 877.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson suggested that text taken directly from the 2017 Conference conclusions concerning fair and effective labour migration governance could work very well in the paragraph under discussion, as follows: “the ILO should deepen and scale up its work on international labour migration in response to constituents’ needs and take a leadership role on decent work in labour migration”.
- 878.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, subamended the GRULAC subamendment as follows:
- (x) promoting measures to address the challenges and opportunities of demographic shifts, in particular with regard to regular migration and those migrants’ integration into the labour market, including through cooperation and exchange of information on best practices, with full respect for their rights, benefiting countries of origin, transit and destination.
- 879.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported that wording, since integration into the labour market necessarily implied having the requisite skills.
- 880.** The Government member of the United States accepted that subamended version, but suggested including the phrase “in accordance with national legislation”, as in some countries the rights of regular and irregular migrants differed.
- 881.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson was dismayed at the turn the discussion had taken. Migrant workers had fundamental rights – that fact had been highlighted during the Conference discussion in 2017. The Workers could not accept any language that restricted ILO assistance to regular migrants only. The phrase taken from the 2017 Conference conclusions fully covered the issues at stake and defined a clear role for the ILO.
- 882.** The Chairperson noted a preference in the room for the GRULAC subamendment, and asked the Committee to take that version as the basis for discussion.
- 883.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, stressed the great importance of the issue of migration for her Government. She said that any reference to regular or irregular migration was misplaced. At no point during the 2017 Conference general discussion had migration been qualified in that way. The text of the Declaration must focus on labour migration in general.
- 884.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, agreed wholeheartedly with the statement made by the Government member of Mexico. Migration must not be divided into regular and irregular migration.
- 885.** The Government member of Turkey agreed with the Workers’ group and with the Government members of Mexico and Mali. The Government of Turkey said that Turkey was currently hosting 4 million migrants, including nationals of Afghanistan, Iraq and the Syrian Arab Republic. No questions had been asked or raised concerning their regular or irregular status. Clearly, migrants as a whole, and not as subdivided, different ranking groups should be considered in the text.
- 886.** The Government member of the United Arab Emirates, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, supported the GRULAC subamendment, without the further subamendments made by the EU.
- 887.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, further subamended their own version of the paragraph, as follows:

-
- (x) promoting measures to address the challenges and opportunities of demographic shifts, in particular with regard to labour migration and the integration of migrant workers into the labour market, including through cooperation and exchange of information on best practices, with full respect to their rights and benefit countries of origin, transit and destination.
- 888.** The Government member of the United States reminded the Committee that it was dealing with a section of the draft Declaration that was giving broad indications of the action the ILO should take. He encouraged the Committee to accept the Workers' amendment, drawn from the 2017 Conference conclusions.
- 889.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled how complicated the discussion on migration had been at the 2017 Conference. She recommended that the Committee should either adopt the Workers' subamendment, as suggested by the Government member of the United States, or that the text be referred to the Drafting Group.
- 890.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson reiterated her group's support for the GRULAC version of the text. Rather than use the words "regular" or "legal", she favoured adding the phrase "in line with national legislation". Introducing a completely new text to take the place of the amended and subamended Office text was not a good idea at this point. Much work had been done, and there were many elements that could be combined into an adequate paragraph.
- 891.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed to support the Workers' amendment.
- 892.** The Government member of Australia joined the EU Member States and the United States in supporting the Workers' amendment.
- 893.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that while the group could align itself with the GRULAC subamendment, which was similar to its own version, in the interest of breaking the stalemate, it could support the Workers' amendment.
- 894.** The Government member of Canada likewise supported the Workers' amendment.
- 895.** The Chairperson asked whether GRULAC could also support the Workers' amendment.
- 896.** The Government member of Norway supported the Workers' amendment.
- 897.** The Government member of Brazil said the 2017 conclusions from which the Workers had drawn their text contained a reference to the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration of the IOM. Some countries in the region did not align themselves with the Global Compact. They therefore preferred to maintain their own text, possibly with the addition of "in line with national legislation". The differing situations in the various countries of the region compelled the group to take national capacities into account. They were therefore not able to support the Workers' text.
- 898.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the text of the 2017 conclusions that she was quoting had been drafted expressly so as not to tie member States into necessarily complying with the Global Compact. It was compromise language that had been unanimously agreed in a tripartite setting.
- 899.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking in her national capacity, said that the region's concerns went beyond the issue of the Global Compact. The Workers' text lacked certain key elements that the original proposal, and the GRULAC proposal, included. In order to achieve agreement, she could support inclusion in the GRULAC text of the United States' suggestion to add the words "in line with national legislation".

-
- 900.** The Government member of the United States continued to express support for the Workers' amendment. Acceptance of that text in no way implied acceptance of any other instrument.
- 901.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson found the discussion very unsatisfactory. There had been reciprocal support between the Employers and GRULAC for each other's amendments. Her group now supported the GRULAC text, with the inclusion of the words "in line with national legislation", as suggested by the Government member of the United States.
- 902.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson was of the view that the only way to overcome the current impasse in the discussion was to adopt their suggestion.
- 903.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the GRULAC amendment including the United States' suggestion to include "in accordance with national legislation".
- 904.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of EU and its Member States, preferred the Workers' amendment.
- 905.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of Africa group, could support the GRULAC amendment but preferred the Workers' amendment.
- 906.** The Government member of Australia preferred GRULAC's amendment including the suggestion put forward by the Government member of the United States.
- 907.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, preferred their own amendment and could accept the United States' suggestion of "in line with national legislation".
- 908.** The Chairperson, noting the continued disagreement in the Committee, referred Part II, Section A, paragraph (x), to the Drafting Group.

New paragraph after Part II, Section A, paragraph (x)

- 909.** The Chairperson said that one amendment had been submitted by the Employers' group to insert the following new paragraph:
- () strengthening healthcare policies, programmes and systems for all, in line with the level of economic development and national circumstances;
- 910.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that it was of great importance to decent work that the ILO should strengthen general health-care policies. OSH was already amply covered, while general health-care policies were not.
- 911.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson had no objection to the strengthening of health-care policies, although they were covered by social protection.
- 912.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that her group naturally supported strengthening health-care policies, but that they felt that that was an issue that fell outside the ILO's purview. It was more properly dealt with by the World Health Organization (WHO). In view of the very slow progress being made by the Committee in its consideration of the amendments, she suggested that Committee members should refrain from submitting additional paragraphs to the draft Declaration, and should withdraw any amendments that were not of essential importance.
- 913.** The Government member of the United States did not support the Employers' amendment, and supported withdrawal of all non-essential amendments.

914. The Government members of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, Norway, Russian Federation, and Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment.

915. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment.

Part II, Section A, paragraph (xi)

916. The Chairperson noted that six amendments had been submitted in respect of the paragraph.

917. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew an amendment to delete the paragraph. The amendment had been submitted initially because the group considered that the subject covered by the paragraph had been dealt with elsewhere. However, if Government members strongly wished to retain the paragraph, her group would not go against those wishes.

918. The Chairperson listed the remaining amendments.

Submitted by the Government member of the United States:

- (xi) ~~strengthening policy coherence by further integrating international labour standards into the multilateral system in line with the intensifying engagement within the multilateral system, in line with the system's~~ recognition that decent work is key to sustainable development and ending poverty, and given that in conditions of globalization the failure of any country to adopt humane conditions of labour is more than ever an obstacle to progress in all other countries.

Submitted by the member States members of the League of Arab States:

- (xi) intensifying ~~its cooperation~~ engagement within the multilateral system, ~~in fragile and conflict areas,~~ in line with ~~the system's~~ its recognition that decent work is key to sustainable development and ending poverty, ~~and given that in conditions of globalization the failure of any country to adopt humane conditions of labour is more than ever an obstacle to progress in all other countries.~~

Submitted by the Worker members:

- (xi) intensifying engagement within the multilateral system with a view to achieve policy coherence, in line with the system's recognition that decent work is key to sustainable development and ending poverty, and given that in conditions of globalization the failure of any country to adopt humane conditions of labour is more than ever an obstacle to progress in all other countries.

Submitted by the Worker members:

- (xi) intensifying engagement within the multilateral system, in line with the system's recognition that decent work is key to sustainable development, addressing income inequality and ending poverty, and given that in conditions of globalization the failure of any country to adopt humane conditions of labour is more than ever an obstacle to progress in all other countries.

Submitted by the Government member of the United Arab Emirates on behalf of the GCC countries:

- (xi) intensifying engagement within the multilateral system, in line with the system's recognition that decent work is key to sustainable development and ending poverty, especially in fragile and conflict areas, and given that in conditions of globalization the failure of any country to adopt humane conditions of labour is more than ever an obstacle to progress in all other countries.

-
- 919.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced the group’s two amendments. The first amendment was aimed at strengthening policy coherence within the multilateral system and as such echoed the Declaration of Philadelphia. The second amendment was intended to address income inequality, which was a key issue in the text of the draft Declaration, and was also included in SDG 10, as was ending poverty.
- 920.** The Government member of the United States wished to include language that made reference to the document approved by the G7 Leaders’ Summit (8–9 June 2018, Charlevoix, Quebec), by including the notion of strengthening policy coherence by further integrating international labour standards into the multilateral system. The amendment had not been seconded, so she was prepared to withdraw it.
- 921.** The amendment was not seconded and consequently was withdrawn.
- 922.** The Government member of Saudi Arabia, speaking on behalf of the member States members of the League of Arab States, introduced an amendment to reword the paragraph to lay emphasis on the ILO increasing its cooperation within the multilateral system in fragile and conflict areas, in line with the Organization’s recognition that decent work was key to sustainable development and ending poverty. There were many areas of conflict around the world, and decent work was critical in those areas.
- 923.** The Government member of United Arab Emirates, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, introduced an amendment to insert the words “especially in fragile and conflict areas” after “poverty” and before “and given that”. Countries in such areas suffered greatly and the adverse effects of conflict on employment and in provoking mass flows of refugees were very serious.
- 924.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson observed that Committee members considered the paragraph to be important. The amendment submitted by the member States members of the League of Arab States was too limited in scope, as it referred only to cooperation in fragile and conflict areas. The group could support the Workers’ amendment aimed at increasing policy coherence, but not that which dealt with income inequality. The group could also support the amendment submitted by the Government members of the GCC countries.
- 925.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson felt that the paragraph contained important elements and should not be deleted. The group found merit in the unseconded amendment submitted by the Government member of the United States and felt that some of its elements might be reprised in subamendments to other amendments. She welcomed the Employers’ support for the Workers’ amendment regarding achieving policy coherence, but stressed that the group’s other amendment, which concerned income inequality, was of great importance to attaining the goals of the 2030 Agenda. The Workers wished to subamend the amendment proposed by the Government members of the GCC countries, by adding the words “with special attention to” before “fragile and conflict areas”, in acknowledgement that such areas did not always receive the attention they required.
- 926.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, did not support the amendment submitted by the member States members of the League of Arab States. The group could accept the Workers’ amendment regarding policy coherence, as that was of particular importance. GRULAC also approved the GCC amendment, as subamended by the Workers’ group.
- 927.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed with the Workers’ group that the amendment submitted by the member States members of the League of Arab States was too restrictive. The EU would retain the word “within” in the Workers’ amendment on policy coherence, and proposed a further

subamendment, so that the first phrase would read “intensifying engagement within the multilateral system and promoting further integration of international labour standards and strengthening policy coherence”.

928. The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendments submitted by both the member States members of the League of Arab States and by the GCC countries, which could be merged into one. In the latter, they proposed to replace the word “especially” by “notably”. The group supported the Workers’ amendment concerning income inequality.

929. The secretariat, at the Chairperson’s request, produced a consolidated version of the text reflecting the amendments and subamendments submitted so far:

(xi) intensifying engagement [and cooperation] within the multilateral system [and promoting further integration of international labour standards into the system] with a view to achieve/strengthening policy coherence., In line with the system’s recognition that decent work is key to sustainable development[, addressing income inequality] and ending poverty, [notably/paying special attention to fragile and conflict areas,] and given that in conditions of globalization the failure of any country to adopt humane conditions of labour is more than ever an obstacle to progress in all other countries.

930. The Government member of Cuba said that many of the changes improved the text. A question concerning use of the term “fragile” had already been referred to the Drafting Group, and it might be worthwhile waiting to hear the Drafting Group’s response to that question before using it in paragraph (xi). The phrase “cooperation within the multilateral system” had to cover all situations, given that decent work deficits existed in many places, not just in conflict and fragile areas. With regard to all the other amendments, he was flexible. He requested a further clarification from the secretariat in respect of “fragility”.

931. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the EU had subamended the Workers’ amendment on policy coherence with wording inspired by the unseconded United States amendment. The Employers could not accept that wording: imposing international labour standards as social clauses in trade agreements went into areas beyond those of the ILO’s mandate, such as World Trade Organization and trade policy. Trade agreements included references to the fundamental principles and rights at work, but they did not integrate labour standards, which might become an excuse for protectionism. The group could therefore not support the EU subamendments or any others of similar substance.

932. The Government member of the United States said that he could accept neither the amendment submitted by the member States members of the League of Arab States nor that submitted by the Workers in respect of income inequality. However, he could support the Workers’ amendment aimed at achieving policy coherence, as well as the EU submission of subamendments to the same amendment. He supported the GCC amendment as subamended by the Workers.

933. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the EU amendment to the Workers’ amendment on policy coherence reprised elements of the United States amendment which had not been seconded. Her group preferred “special attention” to “notably.” Retaining the amendment on income inequality was very important to the group. It was not mentioned elsewhere, so should feature here.

934. In reply to a request for clarification from the Government member of Cuba, the representative of the Secretary-General said that there was no legal definition of the term “fragility” in any ILO instrument. However, the notion generally referred to a country’s ability to cope with internal and external shocks. The Employment and Decent Work for Peace and Resilience Recommendation, 2017 (No. 205), referred “to crisis situations arising

from conflicts and disasters”. In addition, the preparatory work of Recommendation No. 205 also considered States to be in fragile situations “whether because of conflict or because of disasters or catastrophic events”. In the Governing Body’s follow-up to the Recommendation at its 331st Session in October–November 2017 reference was made to work in “countries currently affected by protracted situations of fragility, conflict and disaster”. In the context of the 2014 ILO High-Level Panel on Decent Work in Fragile States, it was noted that “State fragility is a complex phenomenon with multiple causes, and hinders the achievement of the MDGs. In fragile States, many of which are least developed countries, social institutions are unable to absorb and adapt to internal and external shocks, such as staggering rates of youth unemployment, rapid migration and urbanization, worsening climate disruption, and increasing poverty and inequality.”

- 935.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the text as subamended but without the inclusion of the phrase “and promoting further integration of international labour standards into the system”.
- 936.** The Government member of Saudi Arabia agreed with the consolidated text, and added that it was essential to retain “paying special attention to fragile and conflict areas”. While there was no agreed definition of “fragility” yet in the context of GCC countries, the issue was important.
- 937.** The Government member of Cuba welcomed the clarification by the secretariat on the term “fragility” but preferred a broader meaning. He proposed a subamendment to include “paying special attention to conflict areas and other areas in conflict situations”. The formulation was widely used in the humanitarian community and encompassed countries in conflict and fragility. Moreover, the last line of the paragraph that read “the failure of any country to adopt humane conditions of labour” was an inappropriate statement to make with respect to a sovereign State’s national circumstances and, if included at all, should be rephrased in a manner that did not single out a country’s failures with respect to decent work.
- 938.** The Government member of China endorsed the Employers’ statement.
- 939.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson could support the compromise text. The word “system” was not necessary. She did not support the use of “notably” but preferred the phrase “paying special attention to fragile and conflict areas”. The last line of the paragraph should not be changed as suggested by the Government member of Cuba, as it drew its inspiration from the Declaration of Philadelphia.
- 940.** The Government member of New Zealand supported the text as subamended by the Workers’ group and the Employers’ group, without the subamendment by the Government member of Cuba.
- 941.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the consolidated text but without “and promoting further integration of international labour standards into the system”. That view was supported by the Government members of Turkey and the United Arab Emirates.
- 942.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the consolidated text and further subamended it by adding “conflict and post-conflict situations”, to be in alignment with wording in the 2030 Agenda.
- 943.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the previous version but without the GRULAC subamendment. While she preferred to include “and promoting further integration of international labour standards into the system”, in view of the lack of support for the phrase, she could accept its deletion.

-
- 944.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, reiterated her preference for “conflict and post-conflict situations”, which was a clear term used by the UN, as opposed to the word “fragility”.
- 945.** The representative of the Secretary-General acknowledged the views of GRULAC with regard to the terminology. In ILO discussions prior to the adoption of Recommendation No. 205, some Governments had asked to take account of countries that were recovering from natural disasters and other catastrophic incidents. That was the genesis of the proposed terminology on fragility and conflict. Using “conflict and post-conflict” alone would reduce the scope and exclude countries that had suffered from natural disasters and equivalent disruptions.
- 946.** The Government member of Cuba acknowledged the additional explanations given by the secretariat and agreed to the addition of “natural disasters” to the text, but maintained that the word “fragile” was too broad and could be misunderstood.
- 947.** The Government member of Saudi Arabia agreed with the term “fragile” because it could cover situations caused by human beings as well as natural disasters. However, he thought that a better term could perhaps be found.
- 948.** The Chairperson noted the reservations of some Committee members to the term “fragile”. Nevertheless, considering the explanations given by the secretariat as well as other interventions, he was of the view that, on the whole, the text enjoyed broad support.
- 949.** Part II, Section A, paragraph (xi), was adopted as amended.
- 950.** As a consequence, the remaining amendments on the paragraph fell.

New paragraph after Part II, Section A, paragraph (xi)

- 951.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new paragraph to read:
- () Promoting effective and responsible social dialogue by strengthening the capacity of representative social partners’ organizations and social dialogue institutions, and enabling them to play a concrete role within relevant national and international labour market institutions, programmes and policies.

The paragraph was necessary because a reference to the ILO’s work on social dialogue was missing from Part II. Real and effective social dialogue and tripartism could not be achieved without strengthening the necessary capacity of the social partners. In so doing, tripartism in the multilateral system would also be reinforced. Such a priority area of ILO work should be clearly spelled out in the Declaration.

- 952.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson wondered why a new paragraph was needed here since Part II, Section B, already addressed the point. Capacity-building of the social partners was important, but it should be mentioned in the proper place. She did not support the Employers’ amendment and further asked what was meant by the term “responsible social dialogue”, which could be interpreted to suggest that some social dialogue practices were irresponsible.
- 953.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, understood the importance of the content of the proposed new paragraph, but felt it was a duplication of Part II, Section B, and Part IV, Section B. The EU did not support the amendment.

-
- 954.** The Government members of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, and Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the view stated by the EU.
- 955.** The Government member of Switzerland shared the view of the EU and noted that his country had submitted amendments related to the issue elsewhere in the draft, for example in Part II, Section B. He considered it more appropriate to discuss the content of the Employers' amendment when later Sections were being discussed.
- 956.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson informed the Workers' group that the concept of "responsible social dialogue" was agreed wording from the Oslo Declaration of the Ninth European Regional Meeting in 2013. The proposal made by the Government member of Switzerland to review the issue under later and related sections was acceptable. She drew attention to the wording and content of Part II, Section B, which stated that "tripartite cooperation through social dialogue between governments and employers' and workers' organizations provides the essential foundation of all ILO action and successful policy and decision-making in its member States". It did not, however, contain a reference to the need for the ILO to support the capacity-building of social partner organizations, which was the point of the Employers' proposal. However, since there appeared to be consensus in the Committee, the Employers' group was open to moving the amendment to Part II, Section B, and discussing it there. Where appropriate in the Declaration, it was necessary to add a component on capacity-building for representative social partner organizations, as that was important ILO work.
- 957.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson clarified that the Oslo Declaration spoke about "responsible social partnership", which was not the same as "responsible social dialogue".
- 958.** The Chairperson suggested that the Employers' group also look at the wording under Part IV, Section B, with respect to strengthening the capacity of the social partners.
- 959.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed that Part IV, which addressed ILO means of action, was a better place to discuss their proposal. Therefore, they agreed to defer the discussion to Part IV.
- 960.** The Chairperson deferred discussion of the amendment to Part IV.

Part II, Section B

- 961.** The Chairperson said that six amendments had been submitted to Part II, Section B, and would be considered individually.

Submitted by the EU Member States:

- B. Social dialogue, including ~~Tripartite cooperation through social dialogue~~ between governments and employers' and workers' organizations provides the essential foundation of all ILO action and with collective bargaining, contributes to successful policy and decision-making in its member States.

Submitted by the Worker members:

- B. Tripartite cooperation ~~through~~ and social dialogue between governments and employers' and workers' organizations provides the essential foundation of all ILO action and successful policy and decision-making in its member States.

Submitted by GRULAC:

-
- B. Tripartite cooperation through social dialogue between governments and employers' and workers' organizations provides ~~the~~ an essential foundation of all ILO action and successful policy and decision-making in its member States.
 - B. Tripartite cooperation through social dialogue between governments and employers' and workers' organizations provides the essential foundation of all ILO action and contributes to successful policy and decision-making in its member States.
 - B. Tripartite cooperation through social dialogue between governments and employers' and workers' organizations provides the essential foundation of all ILO action and successful policy and decision-making in its member States on issues related to the ILO.

Submitted by the Government members of Switzerland and the United States:

- B. Tripartite cooperation through social dialogue between governments and employers' and workers' organizations provides the essential foundation of all ILO action and successful policy and decision-making in its member States. To represent the world of work of today and in the future, ILO constituents must redouble efforts to reach all workers and employers, including through the use of new technologies.

- 962.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the EU Member States, introduced the amendment. She thought it was essential that the Declaration reflect the importance of social dialogue, which included tripartite cooperation and collective bargaining.
- 963.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced the group's amendment, the purpose of which was to differentiate between tripartite consultation and social dialogue, since not all social dialogue was tripartite. Because the EU amendment achieved the same result, the Workers' group could consider withdrawing their amendment in favour of the EU proposal.
- 964.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, introduced three amendments proposing three small modifications to the Office text. The first was to say that tripartite cooperation through social dialogue was "an essential foundation" and not "the essential foundation" since there were other possibilities, such as decent work. The second was to insert "contributes to" before "successful policy and decision-making" as the linkage was missing from the text. Lastly, they proposed adding "on issues related to the ILO" at the end of the paragraph since it helped clarify the scope of the paragraph.
- 965.** The Government member of Switzerland, also speaking on behalf of the Government member of the United States, introduced an amendment the aim of which was to ensure that the Declaration did not only focus on tripartism in the present, but also in the future. Because of the expected transformations in the world of work, it was important to include the ambition of trying to reach all workers and employers, including through the use of new technologies. The exact wording could be discussed, however, including possibly adding an element on capacity-building for workers and employers. The use of new technologies could help in that regard but was not crucial. The aim was to reach all workers and all employers.
- 966.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson suggested using the EU amendment as a basis, with some minor changes for clarity. She proposed a subamendment to insert "together" before "with collective bargaining". On the basis of that proposal, she withdrew the amendment her group had submitted. She supported GRULAC's amendment to use "an essential foundation" instead of "the essential foundation". Regarding the amendment proposed by the Government members of Switzerland and the United States, she said that many trade unions were already using new technologies to reach out to workers. She referred to examples of mobile applications for trade union members working cross border in the road transport sector as well as a recent online referendum on modernization of the pension system held among all its members by the Netherlands Trade Union Confederation (FNV). Although

more could be done, it was not appropriate to single out this matter in the context of the Declaration.

- 967.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed with the first proposed change in the EU amendment for the paragraph to begin with “Social dialogue, including tripartite cooperation” but did not agree with inserting a reference to collective bargaining as that singled out only one element of social dialogue, which was in fact much broader. The paragraph dealt instead with the entirety of social dialogue. She agreed with the Workers’ amendment to replace “through” by “and”, and with the GRULAC amendment replacing “the essential foundation” by “an essential foundation”. She also supported adding “contributes to” before “successful policy and decision-making in its member States” as proposed by GRULAC’s second amendment. She did not agree however with GRULAC’s third amendment to limit the paragraph to issues only related to the ILO as that scope was too narrow. She did not support the amendment proposed by the Government members of Switzerland and the United States. She understood the intention of their amendment, but did not think it was adequately expressed in the text itself. The Employers’ group used technology routinely for communicating with their members, but the amendment seemed to talk about organizing.
- 968.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that she supported the amended text without reference to collective bargaining because collective bargaining was already included in concept of social dialogue. There was therefore no need to single it out. They could also accept the original text but had no opinion on the amendment submitted by the Government members of Switzerland and the United States.
- 969.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, preferred the EU amendment to the one submitted by the Workers’ group. It was important to keep social dialogue and collective bargaining in the text. Regarding the first GRULAC amendment, she did not support replacing “the” with “an” as it diminished the importance of social dialogue. She supported GRULAC’s second amendment but not the third which added “on issues related to the ILO”, as it narrowed the focus too much. She wished to subamend the amendment proposed by the Government members of Switzerland and the United States to include wording from the recurrent discussion on social dialogue and tripartism at the 107th Session of the Conference in 2018. However, she was open to leaving it out as it appeared that the Workers’ group and the Employers’ group did not agree on the current wording.
- 970.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, favoured the EU amendment. He wished to subamend it to read “social dialogue, collective bargaining and tripartite cooperation”. Social dialogue was one of the central foundations on which all ILO action was based and, in the phrase, collective bargaining should be placed in second position.
- 971.** The representative of the Secretary-General suggested that the wording of the paragraph might need to be revised to help clarify the understanding of social dialogue. He noted that collective bargaining was generally, if not always, bipartite and that the current text that read “Social dialogue, tripartite cooperation and collective bargaining between governments and employers’ and workers’ organizations” could be misconstrued.
- 972.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson welcomed the suggestion and urged the Committee to remain with the formulation “Social dialogue, collective bargaining and tripartite cooperation”. It would help clear up possible confusion about collective bargaining, which had only two parties, even if a government was acting in its capacity as an employer.

-
- 973.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed that social dialogue was very diverse and could be bipartite or tripartite. However, within bipartite social dialogue, there were many forms, which was why the Employers' group did not agree with singling out only one aspect of social dialogue, namely collective bargaining. She could accept the original text prepared by the Office. She could also accept the EU amendment without including collective bargaining. That was of particular importance to the Employers' group.
- 974.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that collective bargaining was a fundamental principle and right at work and an important part of the ILO's work and yet there was not much mention of it in the draft Declaration. The text as it stood was a proper reflection of social dialogue, which included collective bargaining. The other forms of social dialogue considered by the Employers' group were already covered by the wording. She welcomed the solution proposed by the Government member of Mali for the phrase to read "social dialogue, collective bargaining and tripartite cooperation" and thought it was a reasonable way forward that should not present too much difficulty for the Committee.
- 975.** The Government member of Switzerland also speaking on behalf of the Government member of the United States, said that the aim of their amendment was to introduce an aspirational objective in the Declaration. Examples such as those given by the Worker Vice-Chairperson about the use of technology, should be encouraged. Their amendment was not just about technology but also reaching out to all workers and employers in the world of work. However, given the clear sentiment against it, he withdrew the amendment.
- 976.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, after having listened to all the views expressed and in a spirit of cooperation, said she was flexible about whether or not to include a reference to collective bargaining. She was also flexible with regard to GRULAC's second amendment replacing "the essential foundation" with "an essential foundation".
- 977.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson understood that Part II, Section B, was an umbrella text that was supposed to reflect general notions which would inform the remainder of the text and, therefore, it would not be necessary to refer to social dialogue repeatedly throughout the text.
- 978.** The Government member of the Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, did not have anything against collective bargaining, but did not see the need to single it out here in the context of social dialogue. That said, they could accept a text that included "collective bargaining".
- 979.** The Chairperson noted that there appeared to be support for adopting Part II, Section B, with the inclusion of "collective bargaining".
- 980.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson disagreed with the Chairperson's assessment that there was consensus on Part II, Section B, and suggested that it be referred to the Drafting Group. She recalled that the Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, had said that she was flexible about the inclusion of collective bargaining, however, the Chairperson seemed to consider that there was support to include it. That was a red line for the Employers' group that could not be crossed. The group could not accept singling out collective bargaining in the text. Either it was removed or the Employers' group would have to add other aspects of bipartite social dialogue.
- 981.** The Chairperson pointed out that he was not siding with any particular group and that since collective bargaining was part of social dialogue, its inclusion would not distort the text. After listening carefully to all views, he considered that support to remove collective bargaining was not strong enough. If the Employers' group, however, could not accept the inclusion of collective bargaining, the text would have to go to the Drafting Group.

-
- 982.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that sometimes things were being referred to the Drafting Group unnecessarily when there appeared to be strong consensus in the Committee. She recalled the conclusions of the recurrent discussion on social dialogue and tripartism at the 107th Session of the Conference in 2018, which stated that “Social dialogue, based on respect for freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining, has a crucial role in designing policies to promote social justice.” That text could have been used in Part II, Section B, but there had not appeared to be consensus for supporting it.
- 983.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson pointed out that the present draft Declaration was of a much different nature to the text of the 2018 conclusions of the recurrent discussion on social dialogue and tripartism. She requested the Committee to respect that they were different instruments, which served different purposes. The focus should be on the Declaration and not on discussions of a limited nature that addressed a single pillar of the Social Justice Declaration and its follow-up.
- 984.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, was concerned about how the discussion was unfolding and emphasized that where there was broad-based support for a given wording, that wording should be adopted. He wondered why the Committee would refer Part II, Section B, to the Drafting Group when there appeared to be broad support for a text that included “collective bargaining” and when the same debates among the same constituents might continue in the Drafting Group without further resolution.
- 985.** The Chairperson expressed understanding, but clarified that the discussion that took place in the Committee would lay the groundwork for the work of the Drafting Group. He announced that the amendment proposed by the Government members of Switzerland and the United States had been withdrawn, and that all other amendments proposed on Part II, Section B, would be referred to the Drafting Group.

Part II, Section C

- 986.** The Chairperson said that five amendments had been submitted on Part II, Section C.

Submitted by the Employer members:

- C. The promotion of occupational safety and health (OSH), based on effective OSH management systems, prevention culture, and strong inspectorates, is an important foundation of decent work ~~fundamental principle and right at work in addition to those specified in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (1998).~~

Submitted by the Government members of the EU Member States:

- C. The right to safe and healthy working conditions ~~Occupational safety and health~~ is a fundamental principle and right at work in addition to those specified in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (1998).

Submitted by the Worker members:

- C. Occupational safety and health should be recognized as ~~is~~ a fundamental principle and right at work in addition to those specified in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (1998).

Submitted by GRULAC:

-
- C. Occupational safety and health is a fundamental principle and right at work ~~in addition to those specified in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (1998).~~

987. The Government member of the Republic of Korea, also speaking on behalf of the Government member of India, withdrew their amendment to delete Section C.

988. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment and said that it was appropriate that the Declaration highlight the promotion of OSH as an important part of decent work. However, she could not accept the original text for several reasons. OSH was not a right or a principle like the other established fundamental principles and rights at work. Rights were unilateral, whereas OSH was about respecting rules and technical standards. OSH was a shared responsibility of governments, employers and workers and depended significantly on investment, a good safety culture and effective inspection systems. In addition, there were a number of formal concerns related to the adoption of the Section. Fundamental principles and rights at work were defined in 1998 in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, which also singled out the relevant fundamental Conventions. At present, there were some 40 ILO Conventions on OSH, and it was unclear what process should be undertaken for the selection of core OSH Conventions. In addition, ratification rates for many OSH Conventions were low. The Promotional Framework for Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 2006 (No. 187), had only been ratified by 13 EU Member States and 47 member States globally. The Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 1981 (No. 155), had only been ratified by 18 EU Member States and 68 member States globally, and the Protocol of 2002 to the Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 1981, had received only 12 ratifications in total. By contrast, the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111), one of the eight fundamental Conventions, had been ratified by 175 member States. There had already been a debate during the most recent recurrent discussion on fundamental principles and rights at work at the 106th Session of the Conference in 2017 where it had been agreed not to elevate OSH standards to that same level. In any case, any revision of the 1998 Declaration should follow a formal procedure specifically for that purpose. The Employer members did not consider the elevation of OSH as a fundamental right to be appropriate in the context of the Declaration and questioned its legality.

989. The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the EU Member States, introduced the EU amendment. She reminded the Committee that some 2.8 million workers died each year as a result of occupational accidents or work-related diseases and that there was no greater right for workers than the right to life. The right to health and safety had been enshrined in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights as well as the preamble to the ILO Constitution and the Declaration of Philadelphia. It was also a key part of the 2030 Agenda, specifically in SDG 8.8. Bearing all that in mind, now was the time for a game-changer to include safety and health as a fundamental principle and right at work in the ILO Centenary Declaration.

990. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced the group's amendment. It was not a major modification but aimed to clarify possible confusion around how to make OSH a fundamental principle and right at work. The Worker members believed that a safe and healthy work environment was a fundamental right all should enjoy. It was a strongly held aspiration that was reinforced by Article 7(b) of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, which recognized the right of everyone to the enjoyment of just and favourable conditions of work which ensured, in particular, safe and healthy working conditions. In pursuit of that ambition, she called on the secretariat to clarify the modalities for identifying the ILO Convention or Conventions that would apply. She supported the content of the EU amendment, and withdrew the Workers' amendment.

-
- 991.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the Employers' approach and withdrew the amendment.
- 992.** The representative of the Secretary-General addressed earlier questions on the implications of recognizing OSH as a fifth category of fundamental principles and rights at work. OSH already had a solid constitutional basis within the ILO including in the Declaration of Philadelphia. The Conference was empowered to modify existing declarations and the 1998 Declaration did not require a formal revision process to be modified. There would be a need to identify the OSH Convention or Conventions concerned, which could either be done by the Conference now or at a later stage by the Governing Body in its deliberations on the implementation of the Declaration. The Convention or Conventions so selected would then be subject to the same three-year reporting cycle as other fundamental Conventions.
- 993.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson explained that she understood that safe and healthy working conditions were included in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, as well as the ILO Constitution and the Declaration of Philadelphia, which the Employers' group fully supported. However, those texts had a different meaning and purpose. In the International Covenant, safety and health was explicitly identified as something for "progressive realization," and that member States were to take steps to the best of their available resources. It was aspirational, not fundamental. That was certainly not the case for rights such as the right to freedom of association, which the EU or the Workers' group would not likely view as "progressive" rights. The same applied for the Constitution and the Declaration of Philadelphia, where OSH was also mentioned in an aspirational context. The amendment proposed by the group underlined the importance of OSH, but there was a qualitative difference between recognizing its importance and recognizing it as a fundamental right. But if it was so fundamental, she wondered why so few member States ratified ILO Conventions on OSH.
- 994.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the EU amendment. He understood the Employers' legal concerns and the need for the secretariat to provide clarification. Even if OSH Conventions had low ratification rates, all governments had OSH policies. It was in the interest of employers, in order to have profitable companies, to have work performed in safe and healthy conditions.
- 995.** The Government member of Panama noted that GRULAC countries shared a consensus on the importance of OSH and that OSH and its promotion and administration were fundamentally about the right of workers to life and health. A great many people still suffered the consequences of occupational accidents and illnesses. What had to be ensured with the Declaration was the right to life of workers, which also had significant consequences for the well-being of workers' families. While there were countries that had not ratified OSH Conventions, domestic regulation frequently covered and even exceeded their contents. For the sake of consensus, Panama preferred the original wording of Part II, Section C.
- 996.** The Government member of Switzerland favoured considering OSH as a fundamental right in the future. He thanked the secretariat for their explanations but still had legal questions, and had been instructed to seek additional clarification from the secretariat during the Conference. Specifically, he wished to know which ILO Convention or Conventions would be added as fundamental principles and rights at work. In addition, he asked if it was possible to amend the 1998 Declaration by another declaration that did not concern the same subject.
- 997.** The Government member of the United States shared the concerns of the Government member of Switzerland and said he was not able to take a position on any of the amendments on Part II, Section C. The United States was very concerned about the 400 million non-fatal accidents and nearly 3 million deaths each year and, in principle, supported OSH as a fundamental right. But it was also unclear what was being signed up to. The other

fundamental rights were each anchored by two Conventions, and it was not clear which OSH Convention or Conventions would serve as a basis. He had three questions. First, he queried whether or not a declaration could amend another declaration; second, which Convention or Conventions would the principles of a new fundamental right be drawn from and what working method would be used to make that determination; and, third, what would happen if the idea of a fifth fundamental principle and right at work was adopted, but there was no agreement on the relevant OSH Convention or Conventions.

- 998.** The Government member of China echoed the concerns expressed by the Government members of Switzerland and the United States. The key statement in Part II, Section C, had been a source of uncertainty for his Government. OSH was indeed a critical right and principle in the world of work but, for example, freedom of association was a fundamental principle of a different order and should not be discredited by drawing a parallel with OSH. It was difficult to take a position on the issue and he wished to hear the views of other Committee members.
- 999.** The Government member of Australia shared the concerns of the Government members of Switzerland and the United States. In principle, she supported the EU text, subject to additional clarification from the secretariat. In addition, she wondered what role the Standards Review Mechanism (SRM) had in the consideration of the relevant OSH Convention or Conventions.
- 1000.** The Government member of Liberia noted that OSH was a right under Liberia's Decent Work Act. Not recognizing OSH as a fundamental right in the Declaration would be a backward step, not just for workers in Liberia but also in the rest of the world. However, there remained serious legal questions. He suggested some adjustments to the text that would allow the Declaration to speak to the importance of OSH even if not all the legal issues were settled. He proposed that Section C begin with "Occupational safety and health" rather than "The promotion of occupational safety and health" and to continue after "inspectorates" with "is an important foundation of decent work, in addition to specific ILO Conventions to be determined". By identifying OSH as fundamental in the present forum, the Conference could help put OSH on the trajectory to becoming a right and principle at work.
- 1001.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson called a point of order to clarify the question raised by the Government member of Australia on the SRM. In her understanding, the SRM had nothing to do with the decision as to what were or were not fundamental Conventions. The SRM's role was simply to review the ILO's standards to ensure that they were up to date. Second, at present, fundamental principles and rights at work, and the 1998 Declaration and its fundamental Conventions were referenced by many international bodies and instruments such as the OHCHR *Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights*, the *OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises*, EU texts and many others. If OSH standards were elevated to a fundamental principle and right at work in the Declaration, she wondered if it would be necessary to reference the two Declarations in the future.
- 1002.** The Legal Adviser addressed questions raised by Committee members on the legal implications related to Part II, Section C. Regarding to which Convention or Conventions a fifth fundamental principle and right at work would apply, he indicated that while it would, of course, belong to the Conference or the Governing Body to make such determination, there had been several important developments over the past 20 years pointing at an emerging consensus about the fundamental character and importance of the Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 1981 (No. 155), and the Promotional Framework for Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 2006 (No. 187), among all OSH standards. Both instruments underlined the importance of applying a systems approach to OSH management and of progressively establishing the goal of a preventative safety and health culture. The relevant instruments could be identified either at the time of negotiating the

adoption of a new declaration, or at a later stage, as the Declaration should not necessarily include an express reference to the Convention or Conventions concerned. Second, as regards the role of the SRM in the consideration of the relevant instruments, it was correct to say that the SRM's mandate was principally to identify standards in need of revision and therefore the SRM process was of little relevance to the current deliberations on the potential selection of fundamental OSH Conventions. Third, in response to whether it was possible to amend the 1998 Declaration through the ILO Centenary Declaration, the Legal Adviser expressed the view that, legally speaking, there was nothing to prevent the Conference as the supreme deliberative and executive organ of the Organization from adopting a declaration that would supplement or otherwise modify, in whole or in part, an earlier declaration. The Conference had therefore the authority 20 years after having recognized the prominence of four categories of fundamental principles and rights at work to "elevate" another principle, namely the workers' right to a safe and healthy working environment, to the same level of prominence. The legal consequence of the recognition of a new fundamental principle would be that the 1998 Declaration, as well as all other formal instruments referring to four categories of fundamental principles and rights at work, should be henceforth considered implicitly amended – by virtue of the principle that a later law repealed an earlier law or *lex posterior derogat priori* – but only to the extent that the ILO Centenary Declaration would specifically modify the scope and content of their provisions. Fourth, with respect to whether it would be necessary, following the identification of OSH as a fifth fundamental principle and right at work, to refer to two separate authoritative declarations, he considered that that would not appear to be necessary since the 1998 Declaration would have to be read and understood in the light of subsequent developments, such as the adoption of a Centenary Declaration and any additional elements that the latter would possibly bring in the field of OSH and fundamental principles and rights at work. Strictly speaking, no formal revision of the 1998 Declaration seemed to be required although such a possibility lay within the discretionary powers of the Conference. Among the declarations that had been formally amended in the past, the 1964 Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa and the MNE Declaration were just two examples. Fifth, in relation to what would happen if the Conference or the Governing Body could not agree on the relevant Convention or Conventions despite the ILO Centenary Declaration elevating OSH to the status of a fundamental principle and right at work, the Legal Adviser indicated that such eventuality had not yet been considered but he believed that an institutional solution should in principle always be possible.

- 1003.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson recalled that, first, the MNE Declaration had been adopted by the Governing Body and not the Conference. Second, changes to the MNE Declaration were made by reopening and revising the MNE Declaration itself, not through a separate declaration. Third, proper governance demanded a review of the 1998 Declaration and consideration of whether other Conventions should be added. Fourth, she disagreed that the Governing Body could select the Conventions. It was the Conference that instructed the Governing Body and not vice versa, especially bearing in mind the heavy reporting consequences on member States, the resulting recurrent item discussions, and the likely resources that member States would need to implement the new fundamental Conventions. The Employers' group could support the formulation suggested by the Government member of Liberia but they could not agree to back-door changes to the 1998 Declaration.
- 1004.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson pointed out that the ILO publication *Safety and Health at the Heart of the Future of Work* listed three instruments as dealing with fundamental principles of OSH. They included the two instruments already mentioned, Convention No. 155 and Convention No. 187, as well as the Occupational Health Services Convention, 1985 (No. 161). The debate was really around only a few OSH Conventions and not 40 as suggested by the Employer Vice-Chairperson. She disagreed with using the term "promotion". A fundamental right could not be only about promotion. She reinforced the Legal Adviser's point that the Conference, as the highest decision-making organ in the ILO

could declare OSH as a fundamental principle and right at work. That would not be a back-door change to the 1998 Declaration. She agreed with the EU that a big step was needed on the issue. OSH was a central part of the ILO's work and it was natural and the right time to take that step. She recognized that countries could not all invest the same resources to improve OSH outcomes but that that should not be an obstacle to recognizing a right. Nor was the low number of ratifications a reasonable justification for not selecting OSH fundamental Conventions, quite the opposite. At the time of the 1998 Declaration, the Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138), had only 68 ratifications. Over the years and as the result of ratification campaigns, the number rose to 171 ratifications. The ILO Centenary Declaration was about moving OSH higher up the agenda.

- 1005.** The Government member of New Zealand supported the amendment proposed by the EU.
- 1006.** The Government member of Singapore said that his country placed a high importance on OSH, having ratified both Conventions Nos 155 and 187. However, while many governments placed a high importance on OSH, its elevation to a fundamental principle and right at work deserved more thought.
- 1007.** The Government member of the United States stated that the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work was already enshrined in numerous multilateral and bilateral agreements. He asked for clarification from the Legal Adviser about the consequences for those agreements in the case of the 1998 Declaration being supplemented.
- 1008.** The Government member of Switzerland said that she was not opposed to making OSH a fundamental principle and right at work, but that there would be a legal problem if the new right was created by the Conference without being able to identify the applicable standards.
- 1009.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, echoed the question raised by the Government member of the United States. He suggested that the two Conventions be mentioned in order to clearly identify the sources of international law. Otherwise, he supported the amendment proposed by the EU Member States.
- 1010.** The Government member of Norway also supported the EU amendment.
- 1011.** The Legal Adviser, responding to the observations of the Employers' group, reiterated that there was no legal impediment to the Conference recognizing a new fundamental principle and right at work through the ILO Centenary Declaration. That would involve the same sovereign organ, the same procedure and the same constitutional logic that also underpinned the 1998 Declaration, namely that the protection of workers' safety and health had a clear and solid constitutional basis – both the preamble of the Constitution and the Declaration of Philadelphia contained express references to protection of disease and injury and adequate protection for the life and health of workers – so that Members had an obligation arising from the very fact of their membership to respect the principles concerning the fundamental right which was the subject of the Convention or Conventions recognized as fundamental in the area of OSH. The Conference could decide to either formally revise the 1998 Declaration or to do so through the adoption of a new declaration. The explanations given aimed at clarifying what was legally feasible, without expressing preference for any specific option. Finally, with respect to the question raised about the implications of the possible adoption of a new declaration supplementing the 1998 Declaration on the numerous multilateral agreements that made express reference to the 1998 Declaration, he noted that a formal revision of the 1998 Declaration would give more visibility to the recognition of OSH as a new fundamental principle and would facilitate the “reading” of the Declaration especially in the context of trade agreements, such as the 2018 trade agreement between the United States, Mexico and Canada, that made explicit reference to the 1998 Declaration. It should be borne in mind, however, that a formal amendment of the 1998 Declaration could not

ensure by itself the acceptance of the new fundamental principle by States parties to those trade agreements.

1012. The Worker Vice-Chairperson asked for further clarification from the Legal Adviser. The ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work was adopted in 1998 and initially included only seven Conventions. The Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182), was only added to it at a later stage and she wondered what the procedure was that had made that happen.

1013. The Legal Adviser recalled that apart from the six Conventions initially identified as fundamental in a Conference resolution of 1994, Conventions Nos 138 and 182 were added to the list in 1995 and 1999, respectively, based on proposals made by the Director-General and endorsed by the Governing Body. It was worth recalling, in that respect, that once Convention No. 182 had been adopted in 1999, the Director-General informed the Conference that he would launch a global campaign for its ratification. As it was always assumed that the new Convention would eventually be included in the category of fundamental Conventions, the reports to the Governing Body on the universal ratification of fundamental Conventions also included information on the campaign for the ratification of Convention No. 182 as from the date of its adoption. Similarly, upon its adoption in 2014, the Protocol to the Forced Labour Convention, 1930, was deemed to have become part of the fundamental Conventions within the meaning of the 1998 Declaration.

1014. The Chairperson noted that there remained serious concerns among several Committee members on Part II, Section C. As a result, he referred the relevant amendments to the Drafting Group.

Part III

Title

1015. The Chairperson noted that an amendment had been submitted by the EU Member States to add the subtitle “Role of member States, workers and employers” before the chapeau of Part III. He recalled that it had been agreed that titles would only be considered after a discussion on the substance of the underlying text and referred the amendment to the Drafting Group.

Chapeaux of Part III and Part III, Section A

1016. The Chairperson said that six amendments had been submitted on the chapeau of Part III.

Submitted by the Worker members:

The Conference calls upon the International Labour Organization to mobilize all its means of action to support all member States ~~to work~~ individually and collectively, on a tripartite basis, to advance the human-centred approach for the future of work by:

Submitted by the Government members of the EU Member States:

The Conference calls upon all member States, workers and employers to work individually and collectively, on a tripartite basis, to advance the human-centred approach for the future of work by:

Submitted by GRULAC:

The Conference calls upon all member States, in conformity with international law and consistent with their respective capacities and national circumstances, to work individually and

collectively, on a tripartite basis, to advance the human-centred approach for the future of work by:

Submitted by the Government members of Australia and the United States:

The Conference calls upon all member States to work individually and collectively, on a tripartite basis and in accordance with national circumstances, to advance the human-centred approach for the future of work by:

Submitted by the Africa group:

The Conference calls upon all member States to work individually and collectively, on a ~~tripartite~~ the basis of tripartism and social dialogue, to advance the human-centred approach for the future of work by:

Submitted by the Employer members:

The Conference calls upon all member States to work individually and collectively, on a tripartite basis, to advance the revitalized mandate of the ILO ~~human-centred approach~~ for the future of work by:

- 1017.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendment and noted that it was not always clear in the draft Declaration whom the text was addressing and what their responsibilities were. Part III of the Declaration included responsibilities that were not only relevant to member States but also to the ILO. The proposed addition would therefore clarify the role of the ILO with respect to those responsibilities.
- 1018.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced the amendment and stated that it would be important for Part III to call upon not only member States, but also workers and employers to work individually and collectively.
- 1019.** The Chairperson suggested that, given the multiplicity of stakeholders that the proposed amendments introduced to the chapeau, the discussion on the chapeau be deferred until the content of Part III was discussed. That would help clarify to whom the Part applied and was a matter of coherence, not of substance.
- 1020.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson disagreed and thought that it was first important to clarify the applicable stakeholders before proceeding with a discussion of the substance. The Employers' group understood Part III to be directed at member States and not at the ILO. If the ILO was included in its scope, that would change the nature of the content.
- 1021.** The Chairperson stated that the discussion would proceed.
- 1022.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced their amendment. It simply referred to the revitalized mandate of the Conference. However, since there had already been a long discussions on "revitalizing" versus "reinvigorating" during the preamble discussions, and that earlier amendments had been referred to the Drafting Group, she proposed that the amendment be referred to the Drafting Group to avoid repeating the debate.
- 1023.** In reply to a request for clarification from the Employer Vice-Chairperson, the representative of the Secretary-General, providing some context on the drafting of Part III and its relation to Part II, said that when the text referred to the ILO, it referred to the International Labour Organization, not the International Labour Office. The Organization had three constitutional organs: the International Labour Conference, the Governing Body and the International Labour Office. In Part II of the draft Declaration, the ILO was referred to in the broad sense just described. Part III identified specific areas for member States to focus on, in addition to Part II.

-
- 1024.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that her group had included two important notions in their amendment, firstly to ensure conformity with international law, and secondly to take national circumstances into account.
- 1025.** The Government member of Australia, also speaking on behalf of the Government member of the United States, said that their amendment was similar to the one submitted by GRULAC. Each member State had different circumstances and the diversity and uniqueness of member States needed to be included.
- 1026.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that their amendment was editorial and aimed to improve the wording.
- 1027.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the Workers' amendment as her group thought Part III of the draft Declaration was addressed to member States. She did not support the EU amendment as the text already referred to "on a tripartite basis" so there was no need to insert "workers and employers". She supported the other amendments.
- 1028.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson had looked at the structure of the document and observed that it needed clarity. Part II covered general policy issues and in Part III the Conference called upon member States. There needed to be clarity on who was doing what for whom. She referred to the EU amendment and agreed that the addition of those words was not necessary as the text said "tripartite basis". She supported the amendment presented by the Africa group. Regarding the GRULAC amendments and the amendment proposed by the Government members of Australia and the United States, in an ILO context, when "in accordance with national circumstances" was referred to, this was usually in the text of an ILO instrument on labour standards. She proposed a subamendment to include the phrase "taking into account".
- 1029.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, noted with regard to the amendment proposed by the Worker members that Part III was addressed to member States as well as to workers and employers, which was appropriate and which the EU supported. With regard to the GRULAC amendment and the amendment submitted by the Government members of Australia and the United States, the EU preferred the latter. The EU was flexible as to the amendment proposed by the Africa group and could support the inclusion of "tripartism and social dialogue". Regarding the amendment proposed by the Employer members, the EU preferred the original Office text.
- 1030.** The Government member of the United States, with respect to the amendment proposed by the Worker members, said that he was cautious due to the potential budgetary implications. The United States could support the amendments submitted by the Government members of the EU Member States and by the Africa group. Regarding the GRULAC amendment and the amendment submitted by the Government members of Australia and the United States, she preferred the amendment she had co-sponsored. She supported the subamendment proposed by the Workers' group to change the wording to "taking into account national circumstances."
- 1031.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the amendment proposed by the Government members of Australia and the United States, subamended by the Workers' group. She supported the amendments submitted by the Africa group and by the Employer members.
- 1032.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, noted that his group could be flexible, and suggested a combination of their amendment and the amendment proposed by the Government members of Australia and the United States, as subamended.

-
- 1033.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that it was essential that there be a reference to the ILO in the chapeau of Part III, as the ILO provided support on the issues it contained and thus there were implications both for the ILO's work but also its budget.
- 1034.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that clarification was required regarding the structure of the document. It was the member States that needed to revitalize the ILO. A similar structure had been used in the Oslo Declaration and the Istanbul Initiative, which first set out what the ILO should do and then covered the role of member States. The Employers' amendment had made the proper linkages explicit.
- 1035.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not think that there could be a chapeau for Part III that did not mention the role of the ILO. As it stood, the structure was not logical, and should perhaps be referred to the Drafting Group, which could re-examine the whole structure of the document. Alternatively, if the Committee preferred to address the structure now, she proposed either to begin the chapeau with "the Conference calls on the member States" and end with a role for the ILO, such as "and calls on the ILO to mobilize all its means of action to support this.", or to begin with "the Conference calls on the ILO to support work with the member States to" and continue from there.
- 1036.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson questioned why there was a logical separation between Parts II and III, and asked the secretariat for clarification of its intent in structuring the document in that way.
- 1037.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson pointed out that there was a role for the ILO in implementing the tasks outlined below the chapeau, so perhaps Parts II and III should be combined.
- 1038.** The representative of the Secretary-General noted that Part II referred to the responsibilities of the ILO, which was composed of three organs as already mentioned. The Office had tried to separate the various responsibilities and in so doing had looked carefully at the chapeau as well. For example, Part III, directed to the member States, had used the operative "guaranteed". Since the Committee had now significantly expanded Part II, many earlier points were now sufficiently covered. Part IV was means of action. As Part II had now changed, perhaps the Committee could look at the document structure in a new light. The structure of the Declaration was similar to other documents produced by the ILO.
- 1039.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson observed that labour protection had not been addressed in Part II and, therefore, issues of key importance to the Worker members had not yet been addressed. She raised the question of whether any of the activities in Part III would be in the ILO's programme and budget. If that was not the case, it would not be acceptable to her group.
- 1040.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson suggested shortening both the document and the discussion by deleting Part III entirely, and just addressing the Declaration to the ILO which was how Part II was structured.
- 1041.** To facilitate a constructive discussion on the two chapeaux – of Part III and of Section A – the Chairperson said that three amendments had been submitted on the chapeau of Part III, Section A.

Submitted by the Government members of the EU Member States:

- A. Strengthening the ~~capacities~~ capabilities of all people to benefit from the opportunities of a changing world of work through:

Submitted by GRULAC (only affecting the French and Spanish versions):

-
- A. Strengthening the capacities of all people to benefit from the opportunities of a changing world of work through:
 - A. Renforcer les capacités de tous à tirer parti des possibilités offertes par un monde du travail en transition ~~mutation~~, grâce à:
 - A. El fortalecimiento de las capacidades de todas las personas para beneficiarse de las oportunidades de un mundo del trabajo en transición ~~mutación~~, a través de:

Submitted by the Worker members:

- A. Strengthening the capacities of all people to benefit from the opportunities of a changing world of work and ensuring equal access and opportunities for women and men through:
- 1042.** In respect of the amendment submitted by her group, the Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that she had previously raised her group's concerns about the failure of the document to mainstream gender equality. Gaps in access for men and women in terms of equal access and opportunities needed to be addressed, and the chapeau seemed to be an appropriate place to do it.
- 1043.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, explained their substitution of "capacities" for "capabilities", and said that "capabilities" was preferable as the aim was to strengthen people.
- 1044.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, explained that their amendment related to the French and Spanish versions of the text. The term "en transición" was correct, not "en mutación." Concerning the EU amendment, her group had an open mind, but she requested clarification on whether or not those two words were synonyms.
- 1045.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that it was impossible to discuss Part III without resolving who was the addressee. She was willing to discuss the amendments on the condition that they could assume that they related to member States. Regarding the EU amendment, she preferred "capacities" and did not support the amendment. She had no comments on the GRULAC amendment and did not support the amendment proposed by the Workers' group because it narrowed the scope of the entire chapeau. Although her group agreed with the sentiment of what was being proposed, it was not the right place to discuss that issue.
- 1046.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that her group was increasingly worried that their amendments were frequently refused as they were not in the "right place." She questioned why there could be no role for the ILO in Part III and why that was not the appropriate place to raise equal access between women and men. She also sought clarification on the use of the terms "capacity" and "capability". She believed that "capacity" was standard ILO terminology and had a slightly different meaning to "capability".
- 1047.** The Government member of Canada supported the Workers' amendment and proposed a subamendment to replace "and ensuring equal access and opportunities for women and men through:" by "ensuring gender equality in access and opportunities through:" She also sought clarification on the distinction between capacities and capabilities.
- 1048.** The secretariat explained that "capacities" had been deliberately chosen and approved by the editors. The main difference was that "capacity" covered the acquisition or possession of specific characteristics, whereas "capability" tended to suggest having or not having the wherewithal or the means to do something or not. When drafting the text, the Office had considered that "capacity" was the correct word.

-
- 1049.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, confirmed that they were comfortable with the Workers’ amendment, but that they also understood the Employers’ concern that it narrowed the scope of the chapeau. Her group proposed a subamendment to split the chapeau and introduce the equal access language as paragraph (i), which would make it one of the main actions to be undertaken and give it the right visibility. Regarding the EU amendment, her group preferred “capacities.”
- 1050.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson requested clarification from GRULAC concerning the intention of its subamendment. The Workers’ amendment aimed at highlighting the need for equal access to be followed by the subsequent issues, something that had already been referred to in a specific sense in Part II of the draft Declaration.
- 1051.** The Chairperson called attention to an EU amendment relating to Part IV to insert a sentence after the chapeau that read “the realization of equal opportunities and equal treatment for men and women”. That amendment might address the Workers’ concerns.
- 1052.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, expressed flexibility regarding their amendment and the use of “capacities” or “capabilities”. Regarding the Workers’ amendment, she noted that the Government member of Brazil’s description of their proposed subamendment had captured the EU amendment.
- 1053.** The Government member of New Zealand supported the Workers’ amendment as subamended by the Government member of Canada. He did not have a particular view on whether the question of equality should be addressed in the chapeau or as paragraph (i), but supported the nature of the amendment as subamended in either case.
- 1054.** The Government member of Switzerland supported the Workers’ amendment as subamended by the Government member of Canada but preferred to split it as suggested by GRULAC.
- 1055.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed to the issue of equal opportunity and equal treatment in a general sense. The Employers were ready to discuss amendments on substance. However, she suggested that Part III in its entirety be referred to the Drafting Group as the chapeau needed to be clarified before any subsequent text could be formally adopted. It was essential to know who Part III was aimed at.
- 1056.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that gender equality was covered elsewhere in the draft Declaration, for example in Part II, but that she would never oppose an active role for both the ILO and member States on gender equality, which was a major issue. As such, she supported the suggestions made by the Government members of Canada and New Zealand.
- 1057.** The Government member of Canada agreed to gender equality and access to opportunities. If the EU amendment on the next paragraph referred to by the Chairperson was adopted, her group’s subamendment should be included in the current text.
- 1058.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, would prefer to have a paragraph on gender equality rather than include it in the chapeau. He suggested that Parts II and III be referred to the Drafting Group.
- 1059.** The Chairperson noted the complexity of the issue and said that, according to procedure, each sponsor of an amendment had to be given an opportunity to present their amendment. If necessary, Part III could be referred to the Drafting Group.
- 1060.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed with the Government member of Mali. In the interest of time, it was better to refer the chapeaux of Parts II and III to the Drafting Group. She

agreed to withdraw the group's amendment on the understanding that the wording used in the EU amendment as subamended by the Government member of Canada was adopted.

- 1061.** The Employer spokesperson said that no text in Part III could currently be adopted by the group as it was not clear to whom Part III was addressed.
- 1062.** The Government member of Brazil said that the discussion was becoming frustrating. It was important that a decision be made on the chapeau of Part III, which was addressed to member States. It was obvious that the ILO needed to support member States upon their request. It was not clear why there were difficulties. They agreed with the Workers' suggestion to refer Part III to the Drafting Group.
- 1063.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, suggested wording for the chapeau to read "The Conference calls upon all its Members, taking into account national circumstances, to work individually and collectively, on the basis of tripartism and social dialogue, and with the support of the ILO, to further develop its human-centred approach to the future of work by:".
- 1064.** The Government members of Canada, Norway, Switzerland, United States, Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, and Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the EU proposal.
- 1065.** The Government member of Eswatini supported the EU proposal and suggested replacing "all its Members" by "all Members of the Organization" to make it more precise.
- 1066.** The Government member of Zimbabwe supported the EU proposal.
- 1067.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the EU proposal and the suggestion proposed by the Government member of Eswatini.
- 1068.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson reminded the Committee that there would be a proposal referring to the revised mandate of the ILO. The current proposal could be supported but would need to be subamended to add "to further develop its human-centred approach to the future of work" to make it consistent with the previous chapeau.
- 1069.** The Government member of China supported the EU proposal and the suggestion made by the Government member of Eswatini.
- 1070.** The representative of the Secretary-General clarified that the wording as proposed by the Government member of Eswatini would be checked and reflected during the editing process, if necessary.
- 1071.** The chapeau of Part A was adopted.
- 1072.** As a consequence, the remaining amendments fell.
- 1073.** Returning to the chapeau of Part III, Section A, the Chairperson summarized that the amendments from the Workers' group and the EU had been withdrawn and the one from GRULAC regarding the French and Spanish versions had been referred to the Drafting Group.

New paragraph before Part III, Section A, paragraph (i)

- 1074.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the EU Member States, introduced an amendment to insert a new paragraph to read “the realization of equal opportunities and equal treatment for women and men;”
- 1075.** The Government member of Canada suggested reworking the amendment to read “the realization of gender equality in equal opportunities and treatment”.
- 1076.** The Government members of Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Switzerland, and Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the EU amendment as reworked by the Government member of Canada.
- 1077.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the EU amendment as reworked by the Government member of Canada.
- 1078.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson drew attention to paragraph (i), which related to the “effective” realization of lifelong learning and suggested aligning the wording of the proposed new paragraph with paragraph (i) by adding “effective” before “realization”.
- 1079.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 1080.** The new paragraph before Part III, Section A, paragraph (i), was adopted.

Part III, Section A, paragraph (i)

- 1081.** The Chairperson said that four amendments had been submitted on the paragraph.

Submitted by the Worker members:

- (i) the effective realization of lifelong learning and quality free and public education for all;

Submitted by the Employer members:

- (i) the effective realization of quality general and vocational education and training for all and lifelong learning, as a shared responsibility ~~and quality education for all;~~

Submitted by the Government members of Switzerland and the United States:

- (i) ~~the effective realization of~~ lifelong learning and quality education for all;

- 1082.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew an amendment to insert “the right to” before “lifelong learning”.
- 1083.** The Employer spokesperson introduced the amendment, the purpose of which was to provide a more robust definition of education and also to highlight the shared responsibility for the realization of learning possibilities.
- 1084.** The Government member of Switzerland, also speaking on behalf of the Government member of the United States, introduced an amendment to simplify the text by using more direct wording to make it more readable and concise.
- 1085.** Regarding the amendment introduced by the Employers’ group, the Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that reference should be kept regarding free and public education for all but that the order should be different, so as it started with “lifelong learning”. Recalling the lengthy discussion on Part II, Section A, paragraph (iii), regarding shared responsibility, she

did not wish the discussion to be reopened and the text on shared responsibilities should not be repeated.

1086. The Employer spokesperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment proposed by the Government members of Switzerland and the United States.

1087. The amendment was adopted.

1088. The remaining amendments were considered withdrawn.

Part III, Section A, paragraph (ii)

1089. The Chairperson noted that four amendments had been submitted on the paragraph and would be considered in parallel.

Submitted by the Government members of Belarus and the Russian Federation:

- (ii) ~~universal, comprehensive and sustainable~~ establishing non-discriminatory national social protection systems; and

Submitted by the Government members of Canada and the United States:

- (ii) universal; access to comprehensive and sustainable social protection; and

Submitted by the Employer members:

- (ii) universal, comprehensive and financially sustainable social protection systems; and

Submitted by the Government members of Australia and the United States:

- (ii) universal, comprehensive and sustainable social protection, in accordance with national circumstances; and

1090. The Employer Vice-Chairperson explained that the amendment spelled out explicitly that it was about systems of social protection and that they needed to be financially sustainable.

1091. The Government member of the Russian Federation withdrew the amendment he had introduced.

1092. The Government member of Australia withdrew the amendment she had introduced.

1093. The Government member of Canada, also speaking on behalf of the Government member of the United States, introduced the amendment, which highlighted that there should be universal access to social protection.

1094. The Worker Vice-Chairperson pointed out that they had not proposed any amendments, as they were happy with the Office text. Regarding the proposed amendments, she did not support the insertion of only “financially” sustainable social protection, as it was limiting. Nor did she wish to limit the notion of universality to access, since coverage and other issues were being discussed. She thought that “systems” did not add anything.

1095. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that they did not support the use of the term “universal” when it was not qualified by something. Therefore, she was open-minded about accepting either the insertion of “, in accordance with national circumstances” or “systems”. It was also important that systems were “financially” sustainable. She did not know in what other way they were sustainable if not financially.

-
- 1096.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, stated that the group was satisfied with the Office text, but that the amendment proposed by the Government members of Canada and the United States was preferable. Sustainable social protection already included the notion of financial sustainability, so there was no need to spell it out.
- 1097.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed with GRULAC in that she was satisfied with the Office text, but could support the amendment proposed by the Government members of Canada and the United States.
- 1098.** The Government members of Australia, Liberia, and Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment tabled by the Government members of Canada and the United States.
- 1099.** The Government member of China supported the Office text, and suggested adding “affordable” before “sustainable”.
- 1100.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled that a number of member States supported the Office text, but could support the amendment proposed by the Government members of Canada and the United States. She requested clarification as to whether it would be limiting the notion of universal if “access to” was added, since it was just about access to the systems. She wanted clarity about what was being agreed.
- 1101.** The representative of the Secretary-General clarified that universal, comprehensive and sustainable social protection was the product itself. Universal access provided universal access to that product. Adding “access to” meant all would have effective access to social protection.
- 1102.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson appreciated the explanation and supported the subamendment proposed by the Government members of Canada and the United States.
- 1103.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed to remove “financially” from the amendment, in a spirit of compromise.
- 1104.** The amendment proposed by the Government members of Canada and the United States was adopted.
- 1105.** The amendment proposed by the Employers’ group fell.

Part III, Section A, paragraph (iii)

- 1106.** The Chairperson said that three amendments had been submitted on the paragraph and would be considered in parallel.

Submitted by the Worker members:

- (ii) ~~active~~ measures to support them through the increasing transitions they will face in working life.
 - (iii) active measures to support them through the ~~increasing~~ transitions they will face in working life.
 - (iii) active measures to support them through the increasing transitions they will face in working life, recognizing the need for a life-course approach.
- 1107.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendments. The first, to delete “active”, was proposed as it was superfluous and confusing. The second, to delete “increasing”, was proposed as it was preferable to just talk about transitions, not increasing or decreasing

transitions. The third was intended to reflect the reality that working life was no longer linear; people's working lives fluctuated in terms of working-hours, sabbaticals and other elements. That could be better expressed by using wording that was increasingly used in many reports about work-life balance, such as "life-course approach".

- 1108.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson pointed out that the Employers had not proposed any amendments as they were satisfied with the Office wording. She did not support the first amendment proposed by the Workers' group as she precisely did want measures to be active and activating. She could accept the second amendment, to delete "increasing", for the reason given by the Workers' group. Regarding the third amendment, they wished to hear Government views and to know whether the concept also applied to other regions outside the EU, since it would have to be dependent on the different national circumstances. If the Government members accepted the text, she would too.
- 1109.** The Government member of the United States could support the first amendment. He also supported the second amendment to remove "increasing". Regarding the third amendment, he thought that "life-course approach" was not commonly used, and suggested "increasing transitions they will face in their working lives", which would perhaps make it clear it was workers throughout their lives that were being referred to. He was not against the concept but against the construction of the phrase.
- 1110.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, proposed a subamendment to the first amendment proposed by the Workers' group to insert "effective" before "measures". She agreed with the second amendment to delete "increasing". For the third amendment, she did not support the term "life-course approach", as it could be confusing, and favoured the suggestion put forward by the Government member of the United States.
- 1111.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the first two amendments but not the third.
- 1112.** The Government member of Canada supported the EU subamendment to add "effective".
- 1113.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the EU subamendment and the suggestion put forward by the Government member of the United States.
- 1114.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson shared the view of the Employer Vice-Chairperson on the subamendment and the suggestion; the resulting text would be a good compromise.
- 1115.** Part III, Section A, paragraph (iii), was adopted as amended.

(iii) effective measures to support them through the transitions they will face throughout their working lives;

New paragraph after Part III, Section A, paragraph (iii)

- 1116.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new paragraph after paragraph (iii) to read "the promotion of diverse forms of work and employment". Further detail was needed to highlight that people could benefit from the changing world of work.
- 1117.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment. She queried what the ILO would be promoting with the inclusion of the text. The amendment was far too general and did not lead to any concrete action. There was a world full of diverse forms of work, many of which were not decent.

-
- 1118.** The Government members of Liberia, Switzerland, and Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment.
- 1119.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson felt that the amendment was a very important part of the human-centred approach. As the Workers’ group found the amendment too general, she suggested a subamendment to read “the promotion of freely chosen diverse forms of work and employment that promote decent work”.
- 1120.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that she had listened carefully to all the views and that Government members had raised valid points, however it was not clear if achieving decent work could be done through the promotion of diverse forms of work and employment. She did not support the subamendment.
- 1121.** The Government member of Eswatini suggested rewording the paragraph to read “the promotion of decent work in all freely chosen and diverse forms of work and employment”.
- 1122.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson appreciated the efforts but “freely chosen diverse forms of work” was not appropriate under Part III, Section A, particularly as similar text was included in Part II, Section C.
- 1123.** The Government member of the United States supported the amendment as subamended and suggested the rewording “in new and diverse forms of work”.
- 1124.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed with the suggestion made by the Government member of the United States.
- 1125.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson considered it to be a very sensitive issue. Care should be taken when talking about non-standard forms of work. She proposed a subamendment to replace “promotion” by “effective realization”, so that the text would read “the effective realization of decent work in new and diverse forms of work”. She inquired about the current status of certain terms in the text, for example working arrangements.
- 1126.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson endorsed the suggestion made by the Government member of the United States as it had merit. As the issue was of high importance to both the Workers’ group and the Employers’ group, the text should be referred to the Drafting Group.
- 1127.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, expressed concern about the placing of the new paragraph, since if it appeared in Part III, Section A, and Part III, Section C, addressed decent work, it would create a problem with the order.
- 1128.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the inclusion of “effective realization” but not of “freely chosen”. As the chapeau was future-oriented, the reference to decent work in diverse forms was pertinent.
- 1129.** The Government members of Canada, and Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the subamendment proposed by the Workers’ group.
- 1130.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that she would support the subamendment proposed by the Workers’ group if “in” was replaced by “through”.
- 1131.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the further subamendment proposed by the Employers’ group, which created a false causality. It was a highly sensitive issue for the Worker members.

1132. The Chairperson announced that although the Committee had come close to finding a solution, the amendment would be referred to the Drafting Group.

Part III, Section B

Chapeau

1133. The Chairperson said that seven amendments had been submitted on the chapeau.

Submitted by the Employer members:

- B. Strengthening the labour market institutions of work to ensure adequate protection of all persons in employment relationships, including in workers against a background of new and emerging forms of work, enjoy respect for their fundamental rights, consistent with ratified Conventions and national law and practice, and by promoting policies aimed at achieving the following. ~~All workers, regardless of their employment status or contractual arrangements, should be guaranteed:~~

Submitted by the Worker members:

- B. Strengthening the institutions of work to ensure adequate protection of all workers against a background of an increase in non-standard forms of work and new and emerging forms of work. All workers, regardless of their employment status or contractual arrangements, should be guaranteed:
- B. Strengthening the institutions of work to ensure adequate protection of all workers against a background of new and emerging forms of work. All workers, regardless of their employment status or contractual arrangements, should be guaranteed a universal labour protection floor, as the basis on which laws, regulations and collective bargaining can build, including:

Submitted by the Government members of the EU Member States:

- B. Strengthening the institutions of work to ensure adequate protection of all workers against a background of new and emerging forms of work. All workers, irrespective of the type and duration of their employment relationship, ~~regardless of their employment status or contractual arrangements,~~ should be guaranteed:

Submitted by the Government members of Australia and the United States:

- B. Strengthening the institutions of work to ensure adequate protection of all workers against a background of new and emerging forms of work. All workers, ~~regardless of their employment status or contractual arrangements,~~ should be guaranteed:
- B. Strengthening the institutions of work to ensure adequate protection of all workers against a background of new and emerging forms of work. All workers, regardless of their employment status or contractual arrangements, should be guaranteed, in accordance with national circumstances:

Submitted by the Government members of Canada and the United States:

- B. Strengthening the institutions of work to ensure adequate protection of all workers against a background of new and emerging forms of work. All workers, regardless of their employment status or contractual arrangements, should have assurances with respect to be guaranteed:

1134. The Employer Vice-Chairperson prefaced the introduction of the group's amendment by saying that it would need debate and might have to be referred to the Drafting Group. She explained that the reference to labour market institutions was needed as it was important to

address the employment relationship in new and emerging forms of work and the term “institutions” by itself was too broad.

1135. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced two amendments. The first covered an important issue for the ILO, namely protection in new and emerging, or non-standard, forms of work. It had been covered by the 2015 Meeting of Experts on Non-Standard Forms of Employment. Certain current forms of non-standard work resembled nineteenth-century work, and ILO standards should address them. It was also important that it was not just new forms of work that were addressed but current forms too as those were already priorities. The wording used in the amendment had been adopted in previous ILO documents and meetings. The second amendment sought to make the end of the chapeau aspirational, with the novel idea of a universal labour protection floor. The Declaration needed to be ambitious, as it could make a difference for the millions of insufficiently protected workers in new and emerging forms of work.

1136. The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the EU Member States, introduced their amendment and subamended it to read

- B. Strengthening the institutions of work to ensure a series of guarantees for all workers against a background of new and emerging forms of work. Respecting the autonomy of social partners and taking into account national circumstances, all workers should be provided with:

It was important that all workers were protected and provided with guarantees, while respecting the autonomy of the social partners and taking national circumstances into account.

1137. The Government member of Australia, also speaking on behalf of the Government member of the United States, introduced the first of two amendments. Qualifiers did not need to be introduced and a broader statement was better. The second amendment was withdrawn.

1138. The Government member of Canada, also speaking on behalf of the Government member of the United States, introduced an amendment, the idea of which was to combine a high level of commitment with flexibility.

1139. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the use of the word “guarantees”. She did not believe that the use of the term enjoyed wide support. The amendment proposed by the Workers’ group had empirical issues as, for example, OECD and other labour market statistics stated that there was no increase in non-standard forms of work. The notion of non-standard forms of employment was outdated as it implied that there was a single standard form of employment. It gave the impression that one form of work was favoured. The first amendment submitted by the Government members of Australia and the United States was not supported. The word “guarantees” needed to be deleted.

1140. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that, regarding the amendment introduced by the Employers’ group, it was not appropriate in the ILO context to speak of “persons in employment relationships”; “workers” was a better word. As explained by the secretariat, the term “worker” did not have a legal definition. “Worker” was inclusive and not related to a labour contract. The *OECD Employment Outlook 2019* said that non-standard forms of employment were increasing. Vulnerable and insecure forms of work had also increased. It was necessary to retain the notion of non-standard forms of work and not just new forms of work. In addition to new forms of work, the existing forms of precarious work required attention. A floor of rights was suggested for such forms of work, namely the universal labour protection floor and that should be discussed in the Drafting Group. Concerning the Employers’ amendment, it could also be discussed in the Drafting Group. The first

amendment submitted by the Government member of Australia and the United States was also a possibility.

- 1141.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that the original Office text seemed reasonable and balanced. The Employers' group and the Workers' group had divergent views and, if there was no consensus, the Section needed to be referred to the Drafting Group. The EU amendment as subamended was elegant and a good basis for discussion.
- 1142.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of Africa group, introduced notions of institutions of work and institutions of labour market. He requested clarification from the secretariat to explain the difference between non-standard forms of work and new, emerging forms of work.
- 1143.** The Government member of Australia said that he supported certain elements of the Employers' amendment. He did not support the first amendment submitted by the Workers' group. The EU subamended amendment required time to be reviewed. He did not support the Workers' second amendment. He did support the amendment proposed by the Government members of Australia and the United States.
- 1144.** The Government member of Liberia asked what the process was should there be no consensus on the amendments.
- 1145.** In reply to the request for clarification by the Government member of Mali, the representative of the Secretary-General said that the ILO had a definition of non-standard forms of work that would include temporary employment; part-time and on-call work; temporary agency work and other multiparty employment relationships; as well as disguised employment and dependent self-employment. The definition was broad and had been developed over time. There was no definition of "diverse forms of work" but the ILO had issued several documents addressing new and emerging forms of work which, however, would not necessarily be non-standard forms of work. The paragraph would seek to speak about current and future developments in terms of the traditional definition of work.
- 1146.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that it was necessary to look at the chapeau in the context of the following points. First, wages and maximum working hours were inherent in standard employment relationships and it was unclear who should look after the employment relationships in self-employment. It would be difficult if a broad term was used, such as one that included the self-employed. Second, the term "guaranteed" was difficult for a global document since that could only be achieved over time but, in this context, it would be not appropriate.
- 1147.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that the question raised by the Government member of Mali was totally appropriate since there were many issues around new forms of work. Certain forms of non-standard forms of employment had become standard although they were not well protected. It was vital to address all kinds of precarious and even not so precarious work, and therefore both standard and non-standard forms of work. She suggested referring the whole package under Part III, Section B, to the Drafting Group and continuing with the remaining amendments. The paragraph was too important to rush over and the Committee needed to get it right.
- 1148.** The Chairperson said that all amendments on Part III, Section B, including the chapeau and the paragraphs would be referred to the Drafting Group.
- 1149.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the EU Member States, withdrew an amendment on Part III, Section B, paragraph (vi).

Part III, Section C

- 1150.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced her group’s amendment “Promoting full, productive, freely chosen employment and decent work through:”. She said that the Committee would certainly know by now that the group always wished to refer to “full, productive, freely chosen employment and decent work for all”. That was a change that should be applied wherever appropriate throughout the draft Declaration.
- 1151.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced her group’s amendment which followed the wording of SDG 8 and read “Promoting economic growth, productive employment and decent work through:”. Merged with the Workers’ amendment, it would produce a good text for the chapeau.
- 1152.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson suggested following the wording of SDG 8 more closely, to read “Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all through:”.
- 1153.** The Government members of New Zealand, Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the subamended text of the chapeau.
- 1154.** The chapeau was adopted as amended.
- 1155.** As a consequence, two amendments fell.

Part III, Section C, paragraph (i)

- 1156.** The Chairperson said that four amendments had been received on the paragraph.

Submitted by the Employer members:

- (i) sound macroeconomic and fiscal policies frameworks that have decent work for all as their central objective;

Submitted by the Government members of Australia, Switzerland and the United States:

- (i) macroeconomic frameworks that promote sustainable growth and ~~have~~ decent work ~~for all as their~~ central objectives;

Submitted by the Worker members:

- (i) macroeconomic frameworks that have full employment and decent work for all as their central objective;

Submitted by the Government members of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico, Paraguay and Peru:

- (i) macroeconomic frameworks that have decent work for all as their key ~~central~~ objective;

- 1157.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the aim of her group’s amendment was to widen the scope from purely macroeconomic policies to “economic and fiscal policies”, which of course included macroeconomic policies. The second part of the sentence had been deleted because decent work had been dealt with elsewhere.
- 1158.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, introducing her group’s amendment, replied that sometimes it was necessary to repeat things, even if they had been mentioned elsewhere. It was essential

that macroeconomic policies should focus on full employment and generating decent work as their central objective. The group had a preference for “macroeconomic frameworks” rather than “economic policies”, which had a looser meaning, and could include policies that dealt with inflation, for example.

- 1159.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that the promotion of macroeconomic frameworks was very important, but perhaps other elements could be included in the paragraph. GRULAC was of the view that it would be more appropriate to make full employment and decent work a key objective, rather than the central objective of macroeconomic policies, since such policies had many other important objectives.
- 1160.** The Government member of the United States presented the amendment that he had submitted jointly with the Government members of Australia and Switzerland. The intention of the amendment was the same as the one submitted by the Government members of a number of Latin American countries. He suggested removing the reference to “full employment and decent work”, as that was included in the chapeau. If the Committee decided to retain the latter part of the paragraph, the final phrase should be “as a central objective”.
- 1161.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson questioned the use of the word “frameworks”. She agreed that as “decent work” was included in the chapeau, there was no need to include it in the paragraph.
- 1162.** The representative of the Secretary-General said that, with relation to macroeconomics, the Employment Policy Convention, 1964 (No. 122), was probably the most relevant instrument, and it referred to “the framework of a coordinated economic and social policy”.
- 1163.** The Government member of Argentina also felt that it was important to talk about economic and fiscal policies rather than just macroeconomic policies. More important than the policies themselves was what the policies resulted in or made possible. He therefore suggested the following wording: “sound economic and fiscal policies that enable sustainable growth, full employment and decent work for all”.
- 1164.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the inclusion of “full employment and decent work for all” was of great importance to the group. As it was not the case that macroeconomic policies always contributed to decent work, the point linking the two elements together needed to be spelled out as clearly as possible.
- 1165.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the following version of the text: “macroeconomic policies that have decent work for all as a central objective”.
- 1166.** The Government members of Canada, Switzerland, United States, Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the version.
- 1167.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson pointed out that there would be a problem of coherence if only half of the chapeau text was repeated in Section C, paragraph (i).
- 1168.** The Chairperson drew attention to the fact that Section C, paragraph (iii), dealt with “inclusive growth”.
- 1169.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that amendments had been submitted to Section C, paragraph (iii), that completely changed its meaning, while some of the wording of the paragraph was unacceptable to the Employers’ group. The Employers’ concerns would be

covered by the inclusion of the word “sound” to give “sound macroeconomic policies”, since that captured the notion of sustainability and of sustainable growth.

- 1170.** The Government member of Argentina said that he would withdraw his proposed text, though it had included “economic growth”. Full employment and decent work were linked to economic growth.
- 1171.** The Chairperson said that it was implicit that good macroeconomic policies would have a good effect on decent work.
- 1172.** The Government member of the United States said that his Government supported the inclusion of “sound macroeconomic policies”.
- 1173.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that her group wanted a simple and clear message that macroeconomic policies would be directed towards the generation of full employment and decent work for all. Introducing a qualifying word for macroeconomic policies added new elements of meaning that diluted the strength of the paragraph.
- 1174.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson recalled that Section C, paragraph (iii), referred to enterprise creation and formalization, and was not about macroeconomics. Her group therefore wanted paragraph (i) to deal with that subject explicitly. She said that the group was able to accept the GRULAC subamendment “macroeconomic policies that have decent work for all as a central objective”, or the suggestion made by the Government member of Argentina “sound economic and fiscal policies that enable sustainable growth, full employment and decent work for all”.
- 1175.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson preferred the GRULAC version.
- 1176.** The Chairperson put forward a suggestion combining various amendments as follows:
- (i) macroeconomic policies that enable economic growth, full employment and decent work for all as a central objective.
- 1177.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that “sustainable growth” should be included in the paragraph.
- 1178.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson read out the text as follows:
- (i) macroeconomic policies that promote sustainable growth and have full employment and decent work for all as central objectives;
- 1179.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson asked for “full employment” to be included, and the Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed.
- 1180.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that many of the elements in the suggested text were already in the chapeau. She presented a subamendment to read:
- (i) macroeconomic policies that have these aims as their central objective;
- 1181.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that individual paragraphs should be able to stand alone and be comprehensible without having to refer to the chapeau. The proposed subamendment would simply puzzle readers when it was extracted from the full text.
- 1182.** The Government members of Canada, United States, and Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the EU subamendment.

1183. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

1184. Part III, Section C, paragraph (i), was adopted as amended.

1185. As a consequence, the remaining amendments fell.

New paragraph after Part III, Section C, paragraph (i)

1186. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new paragraph to read:

- () trade, tax, industrial and sectoral policies that promote decent work, enhance productivity and facilitate structural transformation;

She proposed a subamendment to delete “trade, tax” at the beginning of the paragraph as macroeconomic policy would address those issues. It was important that the focus be on “industrial and sectoral policies that promote decent work, enhance productivity and facilitate structural transformation”.

1187. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment and did not support the subamendment. The deletion of “trade, tax” from the amendment made the text too narrow.

1188. The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew the subamendment.

1189. The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, considered the subamendment from the Workers’ group to be essential.

1190. The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, shared the GRULAC point of view.

1191. The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, wished to reintroduce the word “trade” but leave out “tax” which was covered by macroeconomic policy.

1192. The Government member of Argentina was open-minded as to whether or not “trade, tax” was included, as those words were not important to the meaning of the text.

1193. The Government member of the United States suggested ending the proposed paragraph after the word “productivity”. He considered that “facilitate structural transformation” was ambiguous. The suggested text would read “trade, industrial and sectoral policies that promote decent work, and enhance productivity”.

1194. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the suggestion.

1195. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed with the suggestion.

1196. The new paragraph was adopted as amended.

Part III, Section C, paragraph (ii)

1197. The Chairperson indicated that three amendments had been submitted on the paragraph.

Submitted by the Employer members:

- (ii) investment in public infrastructure and in strategic sectors, ~~including the green, care and rural economies;~~ and

Submitted by the Government members of Australia, Switzerland and the United States:

- (ii) investment in infrastructure and strategic sectors, ~~including the green, care and rural economies;~~ and

Submitted by the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico, Paraguay and Peru:

- (ii) investment in infrastructure and strategic sectors, including the sustainable green, care and rural economies; and

- 1198.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the main purpose of her group’s amendment was to ensure that investment was made in public infrastructure and that no individual sector was singled out, since strategic sectors varied from country to country. That said, the Employer members could support the amendment submitted by the Government members of Australia, Switzerland and the United States, and would not be averse to dropping the word “public”.
- 1199.** The Government member of Brazil, also speaking on behalf of the Government members of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico, Paraguay and Peru, introduced an amendment to replace “green” with “sustainable”. The term “green economy” was problematic and not accepted at the multilateral level. The term “sustainable” was preferred, as it included the social and environmental dimensions as well.
- 1200.** The Government member of Switzerland, also speaking on behalf of the Government members of Australia and the United States, introduced an amendment to delete the second part of the paragraph so that it read “investment in infrastructure and strategic sectors”.
- 1201.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed disappointment that the green, care and rural economies were no longer mentioned, as those sectors offered tremendous potential for job creation. The term “sustainable economy”, however, was not proper in English. She agreed that investment in infrastructure was important but emphasized that it should be both public and private investment. There were indeed many sectors that could contribute to the creation of decent work, but she preferred that a reference to the green, care and rural economies be retained, and noted that the list was not restrictive because it was preceded by the word “including”.
- 1202.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson could not support the listing of specific sectors and, in any case, disagreed with the sectors chosen. There were many other important sectors, such as energy and mining, depending on country-specific factors. She disagreed with using the word “sustainable” since all sectors should be sustainable and the notion was already understood from the chapeau. While she did not support the list of sectors, she proposed a subamendment to add “in” before “strategic sectors” to provide additional emphasis.
- 1203.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that she understood that there could be other strategic sectors and noted that the green sector could also imply energy and mining. She proposed a subamendment to use the wording “in other strategic sectors such as” to further emphasize that the list of sectors was not a restrictive list.
- 1204.** The Government member of Canada noted that there were few references to the green economy, climate change and the environment in the document. She supported keeping a reference to the green economy as well as the care economy and supported the Workers’ subamendment.
- 1205.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, preferred the original text of paragraph (ii). However, the EU could support the Employers’

subamendment “in strategic sectors”, but favoured retaining a reference to the green, care and rural economies. She noted that “green” was the proper word for the sector.

- 1206.** The Government member of Liberia concurred with the earlier statement that what might be a strategic sector in one country might not be in another country. Ending with the phrase “in strategic sectors” would allow countries to focus on sectors of their own choosing. Therefore, he supported the amendment submitted by the Government members of Australia, Switzerland and the United States, as subamended by the Employers’ group.
- 1207.** The Government member of Cuba, said that the ILO Centenary Declaration would be a long-standing document and that it was not possible to know which sectors would be of strategic importance in the future. Rather, a general framework was needed. He agreed with the Government member of Liberia and the Employers’ group that different countries had different sectoral strategies. He proposed a subamendment so that the paragraph would read “investment in infrastructure and in other strategic sectors as considered relevant to sustainable economies;”.
- 1208.** The Government member of Mexico said that the care and rural economies were both of fundamental importance in her country. If they were removed from the paragraph, they would no longer appear in the Declaration. She preferred the original Office text, as subamended by the Government members of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico, Paraguay and Peru, and the mention of the care and rural economies. The Workers’ subamendment adding “such as” could also help clarify that there were other strategic sectors, while still identifying a few key sectors.
- 1209.** The Government member of Argentina agreed with the notion of sustainable economies since that would cover the economic, social and environmental dimensions. The term “green economy”, however, had not been accepted at the multilateral level. If there was a need to refer to climate change in the paragraph, a reference to the Paris Agreement could be made, which did not use the term “green economy”.
- 1210.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, asked for clarification as to whether it was possible to add a subamendment to use the word “etc.” in order to keep the list of sectors open. That would be helpful because, in the future, there might be other sectors that needed to be considered.
- 1211.** The Chairperson clarified that the Workers’ subamendment adding “such as” likely achieved the same result.
- 1212.** The Government member of Australia preferred not to list any specific sectors since no one could know how the labour market would develop in the future.
- 1213.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, preferred to retain “the green, care and rural economies”. She noted that paragraph (ii) should be read in conjunction with the chapeau and therefore proposed a subamendment to add “in line with these aims” at the end of the paragraph.
- 1214.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson understood that each country had their own sector preferences and that the words “such as” allowed for that variety of choice. While it was useful to acknowledge the diversity of sectors, it was also important to prioritize. The care, green and rural economies would be important sectors over the long term and unlikely to disappear. The Workers’ group preferred not to include “in line with these aims” as proposed by the EU.

-
- 1215.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted the divergence among member States in the Committee regarding the choice of strategic sectors. The report of the Global Commission on the Future of Work singled out the green, care and rural economies, to the disappointment of many. If individual sectors were to be listed in paragraph (ii), it would be difficult not to mention other key sectors such as energy, mining, services and banking, among others. For many countries, those were key strategic sectors.
- 1216.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, stated that the care and rural economies would have a significant role to play in the future for a vast number of people in the world. However, as the Government member of Argentina had mentioned, the “green” economy was not an agreed term within the multilateral system and did not include the economic and social dimensions. Therefore it could be not accepted. She proposed a subamendment to replace “including the green” with “such as” so that the phrase would read “such as the care and rural economies”.
- 1217.** The Government member of Canada preferred that “green, care and rural economies” be retained, but suggested that, for the sake of compromise, the specific list could be dropped.
- 1218.** The Chairperson, noting the lack of consensus on Part III, Section C, paragraph (ii), referred the amendments on it to the Drafting Group.

*Part III, Section C, paragraph (iii), Parts IV and V
the resolution and titles*

- 1219.** All remaining amendments were referred to the Drafting Group.

Consideration of the draft Declaration and draft resolution

- 1220.** The Chairperson reported that the Drafting Group had conducted its work over two days and had considered 129 amendments to the draft Declaration as well as 28 amendments to the draft resolution. Despite sometimes challenging discussions, the Drafting Group had been able to agree on the majority of the text and its amendments. The consolidated text of the Drafting Group would now be considered by the Committee as per the agreed working method. It would begin with the draft Declaration through to the end of Part IV, then consider its titles before concluding with a consideration of Part V and the draft resolution. The Chairperson would flag whether paragraphs had or had not received consensus in the Drafting Group. As each portion of the text was adopted, any outstanding amendments would fall. In that respect, he noted nine amendments that had already been withdrawn in the Drafting Group.
- 1221.** The Chairperson turned to a consideration of each portion of the draft Declaration.

Preamble

- 1222.** The first and second preambular paragraphs were adopted.
- 1223.** With regard to the third and fourth preambular paragraphs, the Chairperson explained that they were the result of the Drafting Group splitting an earlier preambular paragraph into two parts. As for the fourth preambular paragraph, he explained that the Drafting Group agreed to replace “fragility and conflict” with “conflict, disasters and other humanitarian emergencies”. Furthermore, it had been edited by the secretariat to say “persistent” instead of “persisting” for purely grammatically reasons.

-
- 1224.** The third and fourth preambular paragraphs were adopted as amended.
- 1225.** The fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs were adopted.
- 1226.** Concerning the seventh preambular paragraph, the Chairperson explained that the Drafting Group had agreed to replace “sentiment” with “imperative”, and to use the term “reinvigorate the Organization”.
- 1227.** The seventh preambular paragraph was adopted as amended.
- 1228.** The Chairperson clarified that the Drafting Group had agreed to a new paragraph proposed by GRULAC, which it then split into the eighth and ninth preambular paragraphs.
- 1229.** The eighth and ninth preambular paragraphs were adopted as amended.
- 1230.** The tenth preambular paragraph was adopted.
- 1231.** Regarding the eleventh preambular paragraph, which read “Committing to a world of work free from violence and harassment”, the Government member of the Russian Federation did not think it belonged in the preamble and suggested it would be better placed later in the text.
- 1232.** The Government member of Canada recalled that its placement had been decided in the Drafting Group and had received strong support. She reiterated her support to keep the eleventh preambular paragraph in its current place.
- 1233.** Upon hearing further confirmation from the Chairperson, the Government member of the Russian Federation withdrew his suggestion.
- 1234.** The eleventh preambular paragraph was adopted.
- 1235.** The Chairperson noted that the twelfth preambular paragraph had been edited to add the word “also” after “Underlining”.
- 1236.** The twelfth preambular paragraph was adopted as amended.
- 1237.** Regarding the thirteenth preambular paragraph, the Chairperson pointed out that the Drafting Group had agreed to use the phrase “to reaffirm their unwavering commitment and to reinvigorate their efforts to achieve social justice” and to add “and 1944” at the end.
- 1238.** The thirteenth preambular paragraph was adopted as amended.
- 1239.** The Chairperson clarified that the fourteenth preambular paragraph had been edited to change “keen” to “desiring”.
- 1240.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, confirmed that the change was also acceptable in the French version.
- 1241.** The fourteenth preambular paragraph was adopted as amended.
- 1242.** The fifteenth preambular paragraph was adopted.
- 1243.** The Committee adopted the preamble as amended.

Part I

- 1244.** The chapeau of Part I was adopted.
- 1245.** Part I, Sections A to D were adopted.
- 1246.** The Chairperson noted that Part I, Section E, had been edited to read “over the past 100 years” instead of “over the last 100 years”.
- 1247.** Part I, Section E, was adopted as amended.
- 1248.** Part I was adopted as amended.

Part II

- 1249.** Part II, chapeau, and Part II, Section A, chapeau, were adopted.
- 1250.** The Chairperson stated that an amendment that had been submitted by the Africa group in relation to the 1986 Amendment to the ILO Constitution might be inserted as a new paragraph (i) under Part II, Section A, which reads:
- Complete, at the earliest opportunity, the process of ratification of the Instrument of Amendment to the ILO Constitution, 1986, in order to definitively democratize the functioning and composition of the governing bodies of the ILO
- 1251.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, had understood that the amendment had been referred in earlier plenary sittings to the Drafting Group and noted that there had been no discussion in the Drafting Group on this amendment.
- 1252.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, confirmed that their understanding was that the substance of the text had been formally adopted in plenary and had been supported by the Government members of China, Cuba, Switzerland, and also the Workers’ group and the Employers’ group. The amendment had been referred to the Drafting Group only to finalize where it should be placed in the draft Declaration. The Africa group was flexible as to whether the text was best placed in the draft Declaration or the accompanying resolution.
- 1253.** The Government member of Cuba reaffirmed their support for the amendment and believed that it added value to the draft Declaration.
- 1254.** The Chairperson asked the EU Member States if they supported the inclusion of the amendment.
- 1255.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, was of the view that the text would be more appropriate in the draft resolution. On the issue of substance, she reiterated her group’s understanding that the amendment had been referred to the Drafting Group for discussion on both the substance and appropriate location of the amendment. Recalling the support of the EU and its Member States for the addition of a new paragraph in the preamble regarding the desire to democratize ILO governance, she said that her group was supportive of the aim of the proposed amendment under consideration but had certain legal concerns which the text as currently drafted presented for some EU Member States. As such, she wished to propose a subamendment.

-
- 1256.** The Chairperson confirmed that the amendment had only been referred to the Drafting Group to finalize where it would be placed.
- 1257.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, contended that it was not possible to change the rules governing the amendments procedure during the process. In his view, it was not possible to subamend the text as its substance had already been formally adopted. He reiterated that the only issue at hand was where the text was best placed.
- 1258.** The Government member of Eswatini supported the amendment. The formulation of the text had indeed been discussed and concluded in the plenary and therefore it was not correct procedure to reopen the discussion.
- 1259.** The Government member of Brazil, stated that there had been previous discussion on the amendment. The amendment had only been referred to the Drafting Group to discuss where it would be best placed. She had stated very clearly that the amendment was not appropriate for the draft Declaration, but could be considered in the draft resolution.
- 1260.** The Government member of Nigeria supported the position of the Africa group.
- 1261.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, requested an explanation from secretariat. She suggested consulting the recorded minutes to determine whether the amendment had been referred to the Drafting Group only with respect to its placement or if it had been done to discuss substance. The EU was comprised of 28 Member States, and according to that Instrument of Amendment to the ILO Constitution, 1986, some countries were referred to as “socialist States of Eastern Europe”, which was no longer the case. Therefore they had a constitutional barrier to ratifying it. She requested that the secretariat clarify when the substance of the amendment had been adopted. Her group had drafted subamendments which were intended to avoid the difficulties that the amendment in its current form presented to some of the EU Member States.
- 1262.** The Chairperson requested confirmation that the issue for the EU Member States lay with the placement of the amendment.
- 1263.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, confirmed that that was among their issues. She expressed a preference for the amendment to be placed in the resolution, though not in its current form.
- 1264.** The Chairperson proposed postponing ruling on the item until the official record had been consulted.
- 1265.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, believed that the minutes confirmed his previous statement. When the amendment had been open for discussion, the Workers’ group and the Employers’ group had supported the text. A number of Government members that he had previously mentioned had also confirmed their support. Given that majority, he was of the opinion that the Chairperson had adopted the proposal by the Africa group and referred it to the Drafting Group purely to discuss where it should be placed. He reiterated that he was flexible and open-minded regarding the placement of the amendment, but was surprised by the opinion expressed by the EU and its Member States. He reminded the Committee that he had expressed from the outset that he was open to placing the text of the amendment in the resolution, and had not insisted that it be placed in Declaration itself. It was the secretariat’s idea to put it in the Declaration, and he requested the Chairperson to make a decision.

-
- 1266.** The Chairperson thanked the Government member of Mali and assured him that a decision would be taken.
- 1267.** The Government member of South Africa recalled that all African leaders who had spoken at the present Conference had reiterated the position of the African Union, which was agreed upon at its last meeting in Addis Ababa. The Africa group was the largest group within the ILO and was comprised of 55 member States. The Africa group had agreed upon the text and had been flexible enough to permit the text to go into either the Declaration or the resolution.
- 1268.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, reiterated that he was flexible regarding the placement of the amendment but could not agree to any subamendment. He understood that the reluctance from the EU and its Member States to accept the amendment stemmed from the reference to “socialist States”. He requested an explanation from the secretariat on the reference.
- 1269.** The representative of the Secretary-General addressed two points. First, regarding the request from the Government member of Ireland, he referred to the minutes which acknowledged the wide support from Government members, the Workers’ group and the Employers’ group for the Africa group amendment. Noting the complexity of the subject matter, the Chairperson had referred the amendment to the Drafting Group, to consider the proper placement of the amendment. Second, he addressed the issue of the Instrument of Amendment of the ILO Constitution, 1986. He recalled that the EU’s concerns related to the reference to “socialist States of Eastern Europe”. Article 7(3)(b)(i) of the instrument which read “During the International Labour Conference, the Government delegates representing States Members belonging to the different regions referred to in subparagraph (a) of this paragraph, or those which are attached to them by mutual agreement, or are invited to the corresponding Regional Conference under the conditions set out in paragraph 4 below, shall constitute the electoral colleges responsible for appointing the members to fill the seats assigned to each of the said regions. The Government delegates representing the States of Western Europe and those representing the socialist States of Eastern Europe shall constitute separate electoral colleges. They shall agree to divide between them the seats assigned to the region and shall select separately their representatives on the Governing Body.” With regard to the concerns of the EU and its Member States’, this was 1986 terminology which was no longer applicable.
- 1270.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, thanked the secretariat for the clarifications provided. She considered the draft resolution to be the most appropriate place for the amendment, and thanked the Africa group for its flexibility.
- 1271.** The Chairperson asked the Africa group if they could accept moving the paragraph to the draft resolution.
- 1272.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, confirmed that it was acceptable.
- 1273.** The Government member of the United Arab Emirates, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, supported keeping the text where it was, as it belonged in the Declaration.
- 1274.** The Government member of the United States stated that, without prejudice, he was of the view that governance issues should not be addressed in the Declaration.
- 1275.** The Government member of Switzerland supported moving the paragraph to the resolution.

-
- 1276.** The text was adopted and moved to the resolution.
- 1277.** Part II, Section A, paragraph (i), was adopted.
- 1278.** Part II, Section A, paragraph (ii), was adopted.
- 1279.** The representative of the Secretary-General informed the Committee that the secretariat had made editorial changes to Part II, Section A, paragraph (iii), breaking it into subparagraphs to enhance clarity and readability.
- 1280.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson pointed out that the text should not only address skills gaps, and suggested that it should read “skills, competencies and qualifications gaps”.
- 1281.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the view of the Workers’ group, and proposed a subamendment to delete “skills” before “gaps” and insert “in skills, competences and qualifications” after “gaps”. The Employers’ group also supported an earlier proposal from the Workers’ group to insert “the world of work” and delete “labour market needs”. She proposed introducing the words “enhancing workers’ and employers’ capacity”, as employers’ should also be included.
- 1282.** The Chairperson requested Committee members not to change agreed text to the extent possible.
- 1283.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson asserted that fresh eyes prompted new appraisals of the text. She noted that the phrase “responsive to the world of work” was inclusive. The Workers’ group did not support the Employers’ group’s proposal as the paragraph was about the needs of workers.
- 1284.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the subamendment.
- 1285.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, confirmed that her understanding was that any text that was not square bracketed or marked with an asterisk should remain.
- 1286.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, agreed with the Government member of Ireland. Reopening the discussion on text that had already been agreed would be counterproductive. She supported returning to the original text.
- 1287.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the editorial changes made by the secretariat were acceptable, but so was the original text.
- 1288.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the position expressed by the Government member of Brazil and advocated a return to the original text.
- 1289.** The Government member of Australia noted that the original paragraph had been seven lines long, and asserted that the Committee should not be looking at substance at this point. She nevertheless supported the secretariat’s editorial changes.
- 1290.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the subparagraphs had added clarity in some respects.
- 1291.** The Government member of New Zealand agreed with the Government member of Australia that the text had been improved.

-
- 1292.** The Government member of Switzerland thanked the secretariat for its efforts and supported the editorial changes it had made. She noted that the original text in French had lacked clarity.
- 1293.** The Government members of Norway and United States supported the position expressed by the Government member of Australia.
- 1294.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, agreed that the proposal of the secretariat had made the text more legible. He supported the changes.
- 1295.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that her recollection of the wording adopted in the Committee included her amendment to delete “skills”. The issue was that “skills gaps” was too narrow. If any edits were going to be made at this point, that change should also be made. She advocated reviewing the minutes for full clarification and was willing to drop any edits that had not been agreed in plenary.
- 1296.** The Chairperson queried whether the text could be adopted, subject to the minutes being provided.
- 1297.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that the editorial changes were acceptable, but as this was unbracketed text, it needed to be adopted swiftly. The Committee should not devote any more time to this discussion.
- 1298.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that it was an important issue for her group. “Gaps” should be non-specific or “skills gaps” should be changed to include “skills, competencies and qualifications gaps” so that the elements to be addressed would be clear. She would accept the outcome based on the minutes.
- 1299.** Referring to the earlier discussion, a member of the secretariat explained that the minutes indicated that during the discussion “skills” had initially been removed and then reinserted. The minutes referenced “skills gaps”
- 1300.** The Chairperson asked if, given the definitive answer provided by the minutes, the text could be adopted. As there were no objections, Part II, Section A, paragraph (iii,) was adopted as amended,
- 1301.** Part II, Section A, paragraphs (iv), (v) and (vi), were adopted.
- 1302.** The representative of the Secretary-General presented the text of paragraph (vii). Previous text, which had subsequently been deleted, had referred to the green, the rural and the care economies. Paragraph (vii) represented the secretariat’s response to a request from the Committee that the care economy and the rural economy should still feature in the draft Declaration. The new text, as edited by the secretariat, read as follows:
- (vii) achieving gender equality at work through a transformative agenda, with regular evaluation of progress made, that:
- ensures equal opportunities, equal participation and equal treatment, including equal remuneration for women and men for work of equal value;
 - enables a more balanced sharing of family responsibilities;
 - provides scope for achieving better work–life balance by enabling workers and employers to agree on solutions, including on working time, that consider their respective needs and benefits; and
 - increases investment in the care economy.

The text, which rearranged the wording of the original draft into smaller segments and subparagraphs, avoided use of the word “sector”, which had proved problematic during the discussions. A proposal to include the rural economy would be made when dealing with a paragraph later in the text.

1303. The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, questioned the placing of the additional text on the care economy in a paragraph primarily dealing with gender equality, since the issues surrounding that economy did not concern gender equality alone.

1304. The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, suggested replacing the word “increases” in the last phrase with “promotes”. The ILO did not itself invest in the care economy, and consequently could not increase its investment. However, it could promote such investment.

1305. The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that the EU was keen to include the reference to the green economy, as well as to the care and rural economies. They still had reservations about the placement of the reference, but they would not oppose the consensus in the room. They requested that their concerns concerning the placing of the reference be reflected in the report of the meeting.

1306. Part II, Section A, paragraph (vii), was adopted as amended.

1307. Part II, Section A, paragraphs (viii), (ix), (x), (xi), (xii) and (xiii), were adopted.

1308. The representative of the Secretary-General said that the secretariat proposed to insert wording in paragraph (xiv) to accommodate the Committee’s request for mention to be made of the rural economy. The proposed text read as follows:

(xiv) promoting the transition from the informal to the formal economy, while giving special attention to rural areas;

1309. The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that her group supported the mention of rural areas, but did not want it linked to the informal economy as, in her region, the informal economy was primarily an urban phenomenon. She suggested the wording “both in rural and in urban areas”.

1310. The Government member of Turkey shared GRULAC’s concerns with regard to the secretariat wording.

1311. The Government member of Liberia suggested the following wording:

(xiv) promoting the transition from the informal to the formal economy, while giving special attention to rural areas;

1312. The Government member of Brazil seconded the proposal put forward by the Government member of Liberia and subamended it to delete the word “special”.

1313. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the new wording gave the impression that no attention had been paid to rural areas in the past.

1314. The Chairperson proposed a subamendment to read “while giving due attention to rural areas”.

1315. Part II, Section A, paragraph (xiv), was adopted as subamended.

-
- 1316.** Part II, Section A, paragraphs (xv), was adopted with a deletion, suggested as an editorial change by the secretariat, of the words “measures of”.
- 1317.** Part II, Section A, paragraph (xvi), was adopted as amended.
- 1318.** The representative of the Secretary-General, introducing paragraph (xvii), said that the Drafting Group had requested that the term “fragile and conflict areas” should be replaced by “areas affected by conflict, disaster and other humanitarian emergencies”. The secretariat had also split the text into subparagraphs to make it easier to read.
- 1319.** Part II, Section A, paragraph (xvii), was adopted as amended.
- 1320.** The Chairperson invited the Committee to turn to Part II, Section B. The Drafting Group had agreed to the first sentence; a joint proposal for the second sentence had been submitted by the social partners, on which Government members were invited to comment. The text read as follows:
- B. social dialogue, including collective bargaining and tripartite cooperation, provides an essential foundation to all ILO action and contributes to successful policy and decision-making in its member States. Effective workplace cooperation was a tool to help ensure safe and productive workplaces, in such a way that it respected collective bargaining and its outcomes and did not undermine the role of trade unions.
- 1321.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that it was a complex matter of industrial relations. Workplace cooperation could be very useful in certain cases, but it was important to safeguard against it adversely affecting decisions taken at a higher level through social dialogue and collective bargaining. She called on the Government members to be willing to accept the text as it had been agreed by her group and by the Workers’ group.
- 1322.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that the second sentence should end after “productive workplaces”, with the remaining text deleted.
- 1323.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that although the wording seemed redundant, its sense was not. The substance of the sentence was important. The text captured the reality in the different regions of the world and was a direct quotation from the conclusions concerning the second recurrent discussion on social dialogue and tripartism, held at the 107th Session of the Conference, in 2018.
- 1324.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the first sentence provided a definition and stated what social dialogue did. The second sentence introduced the notion of workplace cooperation, and acknowledged that it could be helpful, but must not interfere with decisions taken by collective bargaining or decided by social dialogue.
- 1325.** The Government member of Argentina suggested that the text would be more readable if the two sentences were included as different paragraphs.
- 1326.** Part II, Section B, was adopted as two paragraphs.
- 1327.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the discussion on Part II, Section C, on OSH had been one of the most challenging substantive discussions at the ILO in some time. She introduced a subamendment together with the Workers’ group in an effort to find a compromise. The amendment was to have a statement of principle in the Declaration that read “Safe and healthy working conditions are fundamental to decent work.” In addition, she proposed an action-oriented paragraph to be included in the resolution requesting the Governing Body to consider, as soon as possible, proposals for including safe and healthy working conditions in the ILO’s framework of fundamental principles and rights at work.”

-
- 1328.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that her group would have preferred language that clearly identified OSH as a fundamental principle and right at work, but they had worked with the Employers' group to find a compromise that would combine the urgency of recognizing OSH as a fundamental right while also balancing the concerns of the Employers' group and some member States.
- 1329.** The Government members of Canada, China, Indonesia, Singapore, Switzerland, Turkey, United States, Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, and Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the Employers' and Workers' joint amendment to the draft Declaration in addition to the suggested addition to the resolution.
- 1330.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Norway, noted that from the beginning they had wanted to include the right to safe and healthy working conditions as a fundamental right at work as per the 1998 Declaration. However, they were pleased with the convergence among member States in the Drafting Group to elevate safe and healthy working conditions to a fundamental principle. That said, they proposed a subamendment to align the language between the two paragraphs proposed for the Declaration and the resolution, to both refer to "safe and healthy working conditions", which was more understandable by the general public, instead of "occupational safety and health", which was a more technical term. Her group saw this language as a compromise, but considered it to be a positive start of a process, grounded in social dialogue, towards the right to safe and healthy workplaces being recognized as a fundamental principle and right at work.
- 1331.** The Government member of New Zealand supported the joint Employer and Worker amendment as well as the EU subamendment.
- 1332.** The Chairperson observed that there was agreement by the Employers' group and the Workers' group to the EU subamendment.
- 1333.** Part II, Section C, was adopted as amended and the suggested language for the resolution was referred to the discussion on the resolution to be considered in due course.

Part III

- 1334.** The chapeau of Part III was adopted.
- 1335.** The chapeau of Part III, Section A, was adopted.
- 1336.** Part III, Section A, paragraphs (i), (ii) and (iii) were adopted.
- 1337.** The Chairperson indicated that Part III, Section A, paragraph (iv), included a suggested editorial change to replace "them" with "people".
- 1338.** Part III, Section A, paragraph (iv), was adopted.
- 1339.** Following discussions with the Workers' group, the Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew her group's amendment to add a paragraph that read "the [effective realization] of [decent work in/through new and diverse forms of work.]"
- 1340.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson thought that some Government members still needed to express their views on Part III, Section B, in its entirety. Regarding Part III, Section B, paragraph (ii), the Workers' group approved the EU amendment to use "statutory or negotiated".

-
- 1341.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed with the EU amendment to use “statutory or negotiated” because it could accommodate different national wage-setting systems.
- 1342.** The Government member of Switzerland noted that in her country, introducing a national minimum wage had been turned down in a national referendum in 2014, so it was difficult for her to accept a paragraph on the minimum wage. However, she could accept “statutory or negotiated” as a reasonable compromise.
- 1343.** The Government members of Australia, Canada, Indonesia, United States, Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, and Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the EU proposal.
- 1344.** The Government member of Sweden, speaking on behalf of Austria, Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Norway, agreed with the EU amendment. He noted that in their countries, social dialogue was a crucial part of their labour markets for achieving fair and balanced outcomes. In many countries, minimum wages were statutory, which created a minimum floor for workers. In other countries, the social partners had full autonomy to negotiate wages in defending their members’ interests. That was the case in the Nordic countries and in Austria. He noted that the wording in Part III, Section B, paragraph (ii), “statutory or negotiated” made sure that the labour market models in their countries were not affected. He further noted that the wording in the chapeau of Part III “taking into account national circumstances” also addressed their concerns.
- 1345.** The Government member of Singapore voiced similar concerns but concurred with the Government member of Sweden that the chapeau of Part III took into account national circumstances and that Part III, Section B, paragraph (ii), did not require minimum wage legislation. Instead, the purpose of Section B as indicated in its chapeau was to ensure adequate protection of all workers.
- 1346.** The Government member of the United States, seconded by the Government member of Australia, had concerns about Part III, Section B, paragraph (iii), on “maximum limits on working time”. It was difficult to require such limits because many people worked legitimately in independent services with long flexible working hours and his Government did not intend to regulate the working time of those individuals. He proposed a subamendment to add “, as appropriate” at the end of the paragraph. The subamendment was supported by the Government member of Liberia.
- 1347.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson pointed out that in the context of drafting a declaration, it was important to craft an aspirational document. She strongly objected to the addition of “as appropriate” as that would modify existing language. The paragraphs in Part III, Section B, had been carefully crafted. She did not wish to reopen the debate.
- 1348.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson responded that she agreed in general with adding “as appropriate” after maximum working hours, but the idea was already covered in the chapeau. The draft language applied primarily to workers with employment contracts.
- 1349.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, shared the Employers’ view. She understood the point being made by the Government member of the United States, but said that the Declaration should not introduce limits in that way. In any case, the phrase “taking into account national circumstances” was already included in the chapeau of Part III, which should cover those concerns.
- 1350.** The Government member of the United States said he respected the consensus in the room against his proposal and withdrew his subamendment.

-
- 1351.** Part III, Section B, was adopted as amended.
- 1352.** The Chairperson noted a suggested editorial change in Part III, Section C, paragraph (ii), to delete “other” from the phrase “other strategic sectors”, as well as suggested edits to Part III, Section C, paragraph (iii), adding “the” before “creation” and “the” before “transition”.
- 1353.** The chapeau and paragraphs (i)–(iv) of Part III, Section C, chapeau and paragraphs (i)–(iv) were adopted.
- 1354.** The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran referred back to the chapeau of Part III, which stressed that countries should work collectively to achieve the objectives of the Declaration. Promoting collective action required that countries refrained from taking unilateral economic measures. That was the rationale behind his earlier proposed amendment to add “, inter alia, by promoting multilateralism and refraining from unilateral economic measures which adversely affect the right to decent work and undermine social justice” after Part III, Section C, paragraph (iii).
- 1355.** The Chairperson noted that the text had been put to the Drafting Group and received no secondment there. It had also elicited opposition from a wide range of actors in the room.
- 1356.** The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran believed that the Committee plenary was the appropriate place to discuss amendments.
- 1357.** The Government member of the Syrian Arab Republic seconded the amendment proposed by the Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Unilateral economic measures constituted a stumbling block to collective efforts towards achieving social justice. Therefore, the Declaration should clearly state that countries should not impose unilateral economic measures.
- 1358.** The Government member of the Russian Federation supported the position of the Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran, both in terms of substance and procedure. Many elements in that amendment were relevant and some of its ideas were reflected in the draft Declaration, except for a mention of the negative effects that unilateral economic measures might have on countries. Such measures could block resources to individual countries and hinder economic growth and decent work. The concerns of the Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran should be reflected in the text.
- 1359.** The Government member of the United States opposed the entirety of the amendment. The issue of multilateralism was already addressed in other parts of the document. In addition, the amendment was a political statement and should not be included in a Declaration on the future of work and the ILO.
- 1360.** The Government member of Canada underlined Canada’s support for multilateralism but agreed with the Government member of the United States that the Centenary Declaration should not be politicized. The goal was to deliver a positive, aspirational text and she did not support the amendment proposed by the Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran.
- 1361.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the Drafting Group had paid due attention to the proposal of the Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran. She appreciated the amendment’s support for decent work, but the multilateral system was adequately dealt with elsewhere.
- 1362.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran was not present in the Drafting Group, and that his amendment therefore deserved

consideration in plenary. That said, the issues were already addressed by language on collective action and multilateralism and she did not support the amendment.

- 1363.** The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran added that Part III defined the responsibility of governments in tackling challenges in the world of work. In line with efforts to achieve SDG 8, countries should refrain from unilateral economic measures that adversely affected other countries, given the interconnectedness of national economies. The amendment was not political in nature but for the betterment of national economies and to serve the objectives of the Declaration.
- 1364.** The Government member of Australia did not support the amendment.
- 1365.** The amendment was withdrawn.

Part IV

- 1366.** Part IV, Sections A and B were adopted.
- 1367.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted the whole of Part IV, Section C, consisted of only one sentence and was difficult to read and understand. She did not wish to make any changes to the text but requested that the Section be edited to make it more readable.
- 1368.** The Government member of the Syrian Arab Republic agreed with the proposal to split the Section and suggested adding a phrase “prioritize countries coming out of conflict or crisis”.
- 1369.** The Chairperson reminded the Committee that the text for Part IV, Section C, was the result of a difficult negotiation and that it was preferable not to introduce any substantive changes at this stage, even if it was possible for the Committee members to do so.
- 1370.** The Government member of the Syrian Arab Republic withdrew his suggestion.
- 1371.** The representative of the Secretary-General proposed an edited version of Part IV, Section C, to address the concerns raised.
- 1372.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed with the proposal as it did not change any of the substance. She returned to the issue raised by the Government member of the Syrian Arab Republic, and noted that the issues raised were in a preambular paragraph that addressed conflict and post-conflict situations, among other issues.
- 1373.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of Africa group, suggested the insertion of semi-colons or colons in the last part of the French text. He agreed with the editing proposed by the secretariat.
- 1374.** The Chairperson said that the secretariat would carefully check the French version.
- 1375.** Part IV, Section C was adopted as amended.
- 1376.** Part IV, Section D was adopted.
- 1377.** Part IV, Section E was adopted.
- 1378.** The Government member of Brazil said that the Part IV, Section F, was too long and requested that the secretariat suggest editorial changes in order to reduce it. He expressed his flexibility around the issue and was also open to leaving the text as it was.

-
- 1379.** The representative of Secretary-General said that the secretariat had previously attempted to suggest edits to Section F but that it had not been possible. The suggestion from the secretariat was to leave the text as it was.
- 1380.** Part IV, Section F, was adopted.
- 1381.** The Chairperson reminded the Committee that before addressing Part V, the titles in the draft Declaration would need to be discussed. Two amendments had been proposed to the title of the original Office text. The first amendment proposed by the Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, inserted “for the Future of Work We Want, 2019” after “ILO Centenary Declaration”. The second amendment, submitted by the Employers’ group deleted “ILO Centenary Declaration” and inserted “Declaration concerning the aims and purposes of the International Labour Organization in the 21st century”.
- 1382.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson preferred the EU amendment as it was shorter.
- 1383.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced their amendment which was inspired by the Declaration of Philadelphia. She believed that the text was more solemn and made a clear reference to the Centenary. However, the Employers’ group was flexible in that regard.
- 1384.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the Employers’ group amendment as it might suggest that the draft Declaration was trying to change the aims and purposes of the ILO as set out in the Declaration of Philadelphia.
- 1385.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the EU and its Member States, introduced their amendment. From the outset of the Committee, it had been agreed that the draft Declaration should speak to the outside world. Therefore a plain, short and simple title was best. There had been many rich and lively debates during the Committee because its members had been debating the “future we want” and were speaking about shaping the future, through the human-in-command and the human-centred approach for example. She did not want the title to be reactive.
- 1386.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, indicated her preference for a simpler version and proposed a subamendment to read “ILO Centenary Declaration for the Future of Work”.
- 1387.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the title as subamended by GRULAC.
- 1388.** The Government member of Canada supported the EU amendment as subamended by GRULAC.
- 1389.** The Government member of the United States supported the amendment proposed by the Employers’ group since it provided a clear title and gave an indication of the content.
- 1390.** The Government member of Switzerland supported the EU amendment as subamended by GRULAC.
- 1391.** The Government member of China indicated a preference for a succinct title and supported the original text put forward by the Office. Alternatively, he could also lend his support to the EU amendment as subamended by GRULAC.

-
- 1392.** The Government member of the Russian Federation supported the original version proposed by the Office because the title should correspond to the content. He did not support the amendment submitted by the Employers' group.
- 1393.** The Government member of New Zealand supported the original Office text. He could also support the EU amendment, as subamended by GRULAC as his second choice.
- 1394.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated her preference for a less generic title. The Workers' group preferred the EU proposal as it suggested that humans would be in the centre and could influence the future.
- 1395.** After due consideration, the Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the original title as proposed by the Office since an institutional title would be appropriate. She withdrew the Employers' group amendment.
- 1396.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, requested clarification as to whether the title proposed by the EU and subamended by GRULAC would be better drafted as "for the Future of Work" or "on the Future of Work". GRULAC's preference was for the title to "ILO Centenary Declaration on the Future of Work".
- 1397.** The Government member of the United States supported the title as proposed by the Office.
- 1398.** The Government member of Liberia supported the amendment as subamended. The original Office title did not reflect the substance of the Committee's discussion, whereas the "Future of Work" spoke to the world.
- 1399.** The Government member of Turkey supported the title in the original Office text.
- 1400.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed wholeheartedly with the Government member of Liberia and preferred to keep "Future of Work" in the title. Their preferred version was "ILO Centenary Declaration for the Future of Work".
- 1401.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson reiterated that she was flexible regarding the title.
- 1402.** The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran expressed a preference for the inclusion of "Future of Work".
- 1403.** The Chairperson noted the consensus that had been reached around the title "The ILO Centenary Declaration for the Future of Work, 2019".
- 1404.** The title was adopted as amended.
- 1405.** The Government member of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the EU Member States, suggested a title for Part I of the draft Declaration to read "A human-centred approach to decent work".
- 1406.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson suggested that it would be simpler to follow the model of the Declaration of Philadelphia, and simply number the parts of the Declaration with roman numerals.
- 1407.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed with that proposal.
- 1408.** The Government members of Canada, China, United States, Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, Ireland, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Mali, speaking

on behalf of the Africa group, supported the Workers' proposal to follow the model of the Declaration of Philadelphia and use roman numerals.

1409. The amendments to propose titles for each part of the Declaration all fell.

Discussion of the draft resolution

1410. The representative of the Secretary-General introduced a resolution prepared by the secretariat to implement the Centenary Declaration, which would cover the essential issues that had emerged from the Committee's discussions and potentially replace Part V of the text. Those essential issues were, first, to invite the Governing Body to ensure the follow-up and review of the Declaration; secondly, to invite the Director-General to take the Declaration into account when formulating his proposals for the programme and budget; thirdly, to accelerate the ratification of the Instrument of Amendment to the ILO Constitution, 1986; and fourthly, to include the question of safe and healthy working conditions in the ILO's framework of fundamental principles and rights at work. He reminded the Committee that the Governing Body would be examining the Programme and Budget proposals for 2020–21 at its 337th Session (October–November 2019) of the Governing Body.

1411. He presented a revised version of the secretariat's draft resolution, which read as follows:

The General Conference of the International Labour Organization, meeting at its 108th Session, 2019,

Having adopted the Centenary Declaration, invites the Governing Body to ensure the follow-up on, and regular review of, the implementation of the ILO Centenary Declaration and:

1. requests the Governing Body to consider, as soon as possible, proposals for including safe and healthy working conditions in the ILO's framework of Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work;
2. invites the Governing Body to request the Director-General to take due account of the Declaration, to have its priorities reflected in terms of the content and structure in the 2020–21 and future Programme and Budget proposals for consideration by the Governing Body with appropriate resources being allocated to these;
3. calls for the completion, at the earliest opportunity, of the process of ratification of the Instrument of Amendment to the ILO Constitution, 1986, in order to definitively democratize the functioning and composition of the governing bodies of the ILO;
4. invites the Governing Body to request the Director-General to submit to the Governing Body proposals aimed at promoting greater coherence within the multilateral system.

1412. The Government members of China, and Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the new draft resolution.

1413. The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, wished to subamend the text by adding "within existing mechanisms" after "and regular review of", in paragraph 1 and to replace "calls for the completion" by "calls for the ILO to complete" in paragraph 3.

1414. The Government member of Zimbabwe said that he did not believe it was useful to restrict Governing Body action in that manner. He did not support the addition of "calls for the ILO to complete", as it was member States that ratified Conventions, not the ILO.

1415. The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the resolution as drafted.

-
- 1416.** The representative of the Secretary-General assured GRULAC that the choice of words in paragraph 3 had been made on a purely grammatical basis. In the chapeau of the draft resolution, it was the General Conference of the ILO that was the operative organ. The Conference was effectively the ILO, and it would not make sense for the ILO to call on itself to complete ratification of the Instrument of Amendment of the ILO. While the desire to include the words “within existing mechanisms” was understandable, it should be borne in mind that the Centenary Declaration was a text that was designed to provide guidance to the ILO for many years to come, and restricting the Governing Body to only making use of existing mechanisms was overly limitative. Future situations might require different approaches than those currently in use.
- 1417.** The Government member of Cuba said that the region had a number of concerns already in respect of the follow-up mechanisms of the ILO. While not wishing to constrain the flexibility of the ILO, subamendments should be taken seriously.
- 1418.** The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, asked for clarification regarding the existing ILO follow-up mechanisms and whether the Centenary Declaration would lead to the establishment of new mechanisms.
- 1419.** The Government member of the Russian Federation said that particular attention should be paid to the implementation of the Centenary Declaration, but it should not lead to the creation of new mechanisms with reporting and monitoring obligations.
- 1420.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the Committee had produced a very rich Centenary Declaration. A call for reinvigoration of the ILO had been made. It would not be reasonable to limit the possibilities of action from the very start, and tie the Governing Body’s hands to prevent it from taking any action that might be decided on a tripartite basis. It should have the freedom to establish new mechanisms as it saw fit.
- 1421.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that she believed the drafting of the resolution had captured all the points very concisely. While she shared GRULAC’s opinion that additional layers of follow-up, reporting and monitoring should not be added, the Centenary Declaration differed from the 1998 Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work in that it did not have a built-in follow-up mechanism. The Governing Body would decide on mechanisms for future follow-up.
- 1422.** The representative of the Secretary-General said that the resolution put two safety nets in place to protect against a multiplication of follow-mechanisms. In the first place, the resolution invited the Governing Body to ensure follow-up and monitoring. Thus, any decision would be subject to tripartite decision. Secondly, the Governing Body would also be present to scrutinize any allocation of funds when examining the Organization’s programme and budget. The resolution placed the Governing Body firmly in the driving seat.
- 1423.** The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, having listened to the explanations given by the secretariat, agreed to support the amended text submitted by the secretariat.
- 1424.** The Government member of Cuba said that he would not block the consensus, but he wished GRULAC’s concerns to be noted in the report of the meeting.
- 1425.** The Chairperson turned to the adoption of the resolution as a whole. He recalled that the text had been consolidated by the secretariat to reflect earlier discussions and he observed that there were no additional objections.
- 1426.** The resolution was adopted.

1427. The Chairperson turned to the adoption of the Declaration as a whole. He noted that the Committee had adopted the Declaration paragraph by paragraph and that there were no further objections.

1428. The Declaration was adopted as amended.

Closing remarks

1429. The Chairperson said the Committee's substantive work had come to a close. A Centenary Declaration and resolution had now been adopted for proposal to the Conference. The documents would reinforce the ILO as the global authority on labour and employment matters.

1430. The Employer Vice-Chairperson expressed her sincere thanks to everyone who participated in the discussions and contributed to reaching a satisfying conclusion on such an important document. Ultimately, the Committee had been able to shape a tripartite consensus on many important and complex topics as they looked forward to the future world of work. The document was important for the ILO and the Committee demonstrated that the foundation of the ILO, social dialogue, worked and could ensure good outcomes. The Declaration did not favour one constituent over another since all partners had to find a compromise with the shared goal of a reinvigorated, stronger and improved Organization. The process to reach consensus on the outcome document, including the pre-conference preparations and working methods, could have been improved. With the resolution, it would be possible to develop a framework for action with concrete proposals to follow up on the Declaration through the ILO Governing Body and the programme and budget. The Declaration could also reinforce the commitment expressed by Governments for the 2030 Agenda.

1431. The Worker Vice-Chairperson wondered what quote from the Declaration might best symbolize the achievement of the Committee. Though it was perhaps too much to expect the Declaration to rise to the visionary level of the Declaration of Philadelphia, it nonetheless contained a noble mission statement: "Calling upon all constituents of the ILO to reaffirm their unwavering commitment and to reinvigorate their efforts to achieve social justice and universal and lasting peace to which they agreed in 1919 and 1944." She thanked all the members of the Committee who in their different ways and capacities contributed to a positive outcome. The Committee showed that true progress could only be made when there was genuine social dialogue. She acknowledged in particular all the workers, the cleaners, the security and cafeteria staff, the interpreters and the Office staff, who had made the work of the Committee possible. The ILO had a proud history as well as a bright future as captured in the report of ILO's Global Commission on the Future of Work and the adopted Declaration.

1432. The Government member of Mali, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, thanked the Chairperson for his work. Tripartite social dialogue was not an easy task, especially with this particular outcome document. Indeed, there had been moments when the outcome of the Declaration might have been in doubt. However, the Committee had achieved a successful result. Thanks were due to the Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson, who had maintained a spirit of compromise in debates on very complex issues. The spokespersons of the regional groups had also made concessions, and that had been necessary. The Government members had also made important contributions and he thanked in particular the member States of the Africa group for their trust and support.

1433. The Government member of Brazil, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, expressed gratitude and appreciation for the Committee's efforts. The Chairperson had displayed exemplary diplomatic skills during the many long hours of deliberations. The two Vice-Chairpersons

had had many interesting debates, which had outlined for the rest of the Committee where the main points lay. Special thanks were due to the Government members of Mali and Ireland, together with other Government members. The process had been lengthy but had also been an excellent learning experience, one which had taken place in a constructive atmosphere of tripartism. It had led to an important and substantive Declaration.

- 1434.** The Government member of Romania, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, thanked all the members of the Committee for their hard work. The ILO Centenary had provided a unique opportunity to set the agenda for a decent future of work. It had also been a chance to show the outside world the value of tripartism and social dialogue, which the EU viewed as a crucial and effective way to find sustainable solutions. Regarding the Declaration, the EU and its Member States particularly welcomed the document's emphasis on, among others, the affirmation that safe and healthy working conditions were fundamental to decent work, the promotion of skills, gender equality, equal treatment for persons with disabilities, the promotion of decent work in global supply chains, and the provision of social and labour protection. More emphasis could however have been given to the effects of climate change on the world of work. In closing, he noted that the EU Member States had come to the Conference with the goal of declaring safe and healthy working conditions to be a fundamental right, and were prepared to further the tripartite process through the ILO in the future.
- 1435.** The Government member of Switzerland noted that after two weeks of difficult and intense negotiations it was now time to look back at what had been achieved at such a crucial moment of the Conference. The goal had been for a concise, readable, comprehensive and visionary Declaration. She appreciated the dedication of all and the consensus achieved through compromise. During the negotiations everyone had demonstrated flexibility and a constructive spirit. Regarding the working methods, she wished to state that social dialogue and tripartism were values that needed time to function, something that had been lacking in the preparations of the Committee's work. In conclusion, she thanked all the members of the Committee and said that her Government would support the Declaration.
- 1436.** The Government member of Burkina Faso was touched to have taken part in such a historic event and witnessed the adoption in the Committee of the Centenary Declaration and resolution. Alongside the Africa group, they wished to fight for a better human-centred future of work. Burkina Faso would play its role to achieve the aims of the Declaration. He congratulated the Chairperson and thanked the Coordinator of the Africa group who had helped consensus to be reached in their group. The Declaration would most assuredly feed the hopes of people in the world of work around the globe and he hoped future generations who contributed to its implementation would recognize their hard work.
- 1437.** The Government member of China applauded the efforts and achievement of the Committee. He was proud that ASPAG had nominated a very capable and able Chairperson for such a historic Committee and asked the ILO to continue to provide support to ASPAG and its member States.
- 1438.** The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago expressed her gratitude to the Committee of the Whole; it had provided a unique opportunity to reaffirm the relevance of the ILO's social justice mandate and Decent Work Agenda, and chart a path that would enable the Organization to meet new challenges as it entered its second century. She wished to reaffirm the principles enshrined in the ILO Constitution and the Declaration of Philadelphia (1944). The fundamental principles of social justice, freedom of expression and association remained irrefutable and would continue to guide the work of the ILO. The Centenary Declaration served to reaffirm their commitment to decent work and the realization of the SDGs. The world of work was undergoing major changes, and there were several forces transforming it, from technology to climate change to the changing character of production

of employment. To respond effectively to those new challenges, the ILO Centenary Declaration would serve as an invaluable instrument to guide their key decisions and consolidate a human-centred approach to development. As they looked to the future, she was optimistic that all nations would continue to be strengthened as they stood united and committed to achieving their shared development objectives. She finished with a quote from Mr Kofi Annan, former Secretary-General of the United Nations: “More than ever before in human history, we share a common destiny. We can master it only if we face it together.”

- 1439.** As the only African country to have been part of the ILO since its founding, the Government member of Liberia thought it appropriate to be allowed to make some parting comments. He thanked his own President for having given him the opportunity to participate in the meeting on the future of work, a future he hoped he would be part of. It was clear during the deliberations that constituents sometimes had different goals, but there had been a shared overall objective. He appreciated the contributions of all Committee members who recognized the importance of the document and gave their fullest thoughts to the debates. He thanked the Chairperson and gave special recognition to his colleagues from the Africa group, in particular for having been steadfast on the important issue on democratization of the ILO.
- 1440.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, thanked the Chairperson for his patience and talent and the Office for its support. The social partners were thanked for helping to reach an agreement. The Declaration, though not perfect, reflected a tripartite vision. It showed the transparency and commitment of everyone to produce a high-quality Declaration. She was pleased with its contents, especially the inclusion of youth employment and the integration of gender. It set a relevant agenda for many years to come.
- 1441.** The Government member of Canada welcomed the Declaration. It was a product of tripartism and defined key issues to be dealt with in coming years. The Chairperson was thanked for his leadership and tact. He recognized that the spirit of compromise and collaboration of the Committee had advanced the goal of social justice.
- 1442.** The Chairperson thanked the members of the Committee for their trust, confidence and kind words. He thanked the secretariat, in particular the representative of the Secretary-General, for their support and guidance during the sometimes difficult discussions.
- 1443.** The representative of Secretary-General congratulated all the members of the Committee and noted that while the outcome document was historic, it was the in-depth tripartite discussions themselves that had contributed to renewing the ILO. It was a privilege to have taken part in the adoption of a historic Declaration. He thanked the Chairperson for his extraordinary skill in guiding the work of the Committee to a successful conclusion.
- 1444.** The Chairperson declared closed the last sitting of the Committee of the Whole.