



► Record of Proceedings

5B(Rev.1)

International Labour Conference – 110th Session, 2022

Date: 25 July 2022

Reports of the Standard-Setting Committee: Apprenticeships

Summary of proceedings

Contents

	Page
Introduction	5
Opening statements	6
General discussion on the proposed Conclusions	10
Points 1 to 3	10
Points 4 to 7	12
Points 8 to 23	15
Points 24 to 27	18
Discussion of the amendments to the proposed Conclusions.....	21
Part A. Form of the instrument.....	21
Point 1	21
Point 2.....	21
Part B. Content of the instrument.....	22
Preamble	22
Point 3, chapeau.....	22
Point 3(a)	22
New clause before (b).....	30
Point 3(b)	32
Point 3(c).....	36

Point 3(d)	44
New clause after (d)	47
New clause before (e)	48
Point 3(f)	49
New clause after (f)	50
Section I. Definitions, scope and implementation	51
Point 4, chapeau	51
Point 4(a)	51
Point 4(b)	55
Point 4(c)	55
Point 4(d)	56
Point 5	56
Point 6	59
Point 7	61
Section II. Regulatory framework for quality apprenticeships	61
New point before point 8	61
Point 8	63
Point 9	65
Point 10	71
Point 11, chapeau	72
Point 11(a)	73
New clause after (a)	74
Point 11, clauses (b) and (c)	74
Point 11(d)	74
Point 12, chapeau	76
Point 12(a)	78
New clause after (a)	79
Point 12(b)	80
Point 12(c)	81
Point 12(d)	83
Point 12(e)	84
Point 12(f)	85
Point 12(g)	86
Point 12(h)	86

Point 12(i)	88
New clause after (i)	89
Point 12(j)	90
Point 12(k)	91
New clause after (k)	91
Point 13.....	91
New point after 13	93
Point 14, chapeau	95
Point 14(a)	97
Point 14(b).....	100
Point 14(c).....	100
Point 14(d).....	101
Point 14(e)	101
Point 14(f).....	103
New clause after (f).....	104
Point 15, chapeau	106
Point 15(a)	107
Point 15(b).....	107
Point 15(c).....	108
Point 16.....	108
Point 17.....	111
New point after 17	112
Section III. The apprenticeship agreement.....	113
Point 18.....	113
Point 19, chapeau	114
Point 19(a)	115
Point 19(b).....	115
New clause after (b).....	121
Point 19(c) and (d)	122
Point 20.....	122
Section IV. Equality and diversity in quality apprenticeships	122
New point before 21	122
Point 22.....	127
New point before 23.....	128

Point 23.....	129
Section V. Promotion of quality apprenticeships and international cooperation.....	131
Point 24, chapeau	132
Point 24(a)	132
Point 24(b)	133
New clause after (b)	133
Point 24(c).....	133
New clause after (c)	134
Point 24(d)	135
New clause after (d)	135
Point 24(e)	137
New clause after (e)	138
Point 24(f).....	139
New clause after (f)	139
Point 24(g)	140
Point 24(h)	142
New clause after (h)	143
Point 24(i)	143
New clause after (i)	144
New point before 25.....	144
Point 25, chapeau	145
Point 25(a)	145
Point 25(b)	147
Point 25(c).....	149
Point 26, chapeau	150
Point 26(a)	150
Point 26(b)	150
New clause after (b)	151
Section VI. Traineeships	152
Discussion of the draft resolution	152
Closing statements	153

Introduction

1. At its first sitting the Committee elected its Officers as follows:

Chairperson: Mr Luis Claudino de Oliveira (Government member, Portugal)

Vice-Chairpersons: Mr Scott Barklamb (Employer member, Australia)
Ms Amanda Brown (Worker member, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)

2. At its seventh sitting the Committee appointed Mr M. Muhyiddin (Government member, Indonesia) as reporter and at its eighth sitting, it appointed the members of the Drafting Committee ¹ as follows:

Government members: Mr P. Vieira (United States of America), substituted at the second meeting by Mr A. Sage (Australia)
Mr P. Tekapso (Cameroon)
Mr N. Islam Bhuiyan (Bangladesh)

Employer members: Ms V. Sánchez (Argentina)
Mr J. Denys (Belgium)
assisted by Ms S. Winet and Mr M. Espinosa,
International Organisation of Employers (IOE)

Worker members: Ms M. Agostinho Mendes (Switzerland)
Mr F. Gomes (Portugal)
Ms H. Mouttou (Morocco)

3. The Committee held 23 sittings.
4. In his opening remarks, the Chairperson said that the discussion of the Standard-Setting Committee on Apprenticeships provided the unique opportunity to promote quality standards for apprenticeships and to create workplaces of the future that could make a lasting impact on the lives of people around the world. He reminded Committee members to keep in mind the importance of dialogue, as well as of practising the art of compromise for the greater good throughout the discussions.
5. The deputy representative of the Secretary-General (Chief, Skills and Employability Branch, Employment Policy Department) presented an overview of the Office reports. He explained the historical evolution of the ILO instruments related to apprenticeships. Two previous instruments, the Apprenticeship Recommendation, 1939 (No. 60), and the Vocational Training Recommendation, 1962 (No. 117) had been superseded by the Human Resources Development Recommendation, 1975 (No. 150), and subsequently by the Human Resources

¹ Pursuant to article 9 of the Standing Orders of the International Labour Conference, the Drafting Committee reviews the drafting of any instrument referred to it in accordance with the Standing Orders or by special decision of the Conference, and ensures agreement between the texts of such instrument in the official languages of the Conference. The Drafting Committee also advises on drafting questions which may be referred to it by the Conference or a committee in the course of the examination of any such instrument.

Development Recommendation, 2004 (No. 195). Due to these juridical replacements, any existing ILO instruments did not address apprenticeships comprehensively.

6. He explained that the regulatory gap had been identified by the Standards Review Mechanism Tripartite Working Group (SRM TWG) in 2016. To address that regulatory gap, the Governing Body had decided at its 334th Session (October–November 2018) to place on the agenda of the 110th Session of the International Labour Conference a standard-setting item on apprenticeships with a double discussion procedure. To prepare the first discussion to be held at the 110th Session, the Office had prepared two reports entitled *A framework for quality apprenticeships*. [Report IV\(1\)](#), published in December 2019, described the laws and practices in different countries, and included a questionnaire to Member States, inviting them to submit their views after consultation with the social partners. [Report IV\(2\) \(revised\)](#), published in January 2022, contained a summary of the replies to the questionnaire which, together with the Office's commentary, formed the basis of the proposed Conclusions to be considered by the Committee.
7. The views of constituents contained in Report IV(2) (revised) emphasized the importance of creating an enabling environment to promote quality apprenticeships; involving the social partners in the design and implementation of policies and systems; and ensuring equality and diversity in the provision of apprenticeships.
8. The proposed Conclusions covered the following six areas:
 - (a) the definition of relevant terminologies and the scope and implementation of a possible instrument or instruments;
 - (b) the regulatory frameworks and governance arrangements required for the promotion of quality apprenticeships;
 - (c) the content of apprenticeship agreements;
 - (d) the appropriate measures necessary to ensure that apprenticeships were inclusive and “left no one behind”;
 - (e) the role of international cooperation; and
 - (f) issues pertaining to traineeships.

Opening statements

9. The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled the challenges posed by a changing world of work, such as inequality, youth unemployment, climate change, fast-moving technologies, demographic shifts, migration and globalization. The global pandemic had made the need for a just transition even more imperative. The Committee should focus on building on previous ILO work such as lifelong learning, to provide equitable access to quality education and learning, with the goal of developing an international framework for skills development and providing pathways from unemployment or underemployment to decent work and relevant skills. An international framework could offer templates and protective systems for workplace learning and upskilling, offer a brighter future for young people, and contribute to the pursuit of social justice.
10. People would be changing jobs with increasing frequency, starting new careers, and seeking further training throughout their lives. It was imperative to address the needs of trainees, to tackle the risks of exploitation, and to improve diversity and social inclusion in access to apprenticeships and training. Access to work-based learning had to be available to all workers

employed in insecure forms of work in the informal economy in order to foster a transition to the formal economy.

11. High-quality training and education for apprenticeships should be well designed, offering both on-the-job and off-the-job training by qualified professionals, with apprentices receiving recognized qualifications. Potential career or educational pathways to facilitate access to further vocational and higher education should be clearly defined through career and vocational guidance offered before, during and after the apprenticeship. Protections necessary for decent work should be addressed, and relationships between apprentices or trainees and employers clearly defined in order to guarantee mutual understanding. Given that countries adopted various frameworks for apprenticeships and traineeships, clear definitions would be vital as a foundation for sharing best practices and building mutual cooperation.
12. She expressed concerns about the structure of the conclusions, and the distinction between the different forms of workplace learning, given the similarities of the kinds of situations faced by apprenticeships and traineeships. An alternative structure should be considered, one in which the measures relevant to all of those in workplace learning are brought together, and this part would then be followed by the provisions related to apprenticeships alone.
13. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that responsibility was a key theme in apprenticeships since the majority of apprentices would be young people. The core of any apprenticeship system must therefore be developing the youth of any nation, and equipping young people for a lifetime of employment and employability. Everyone could benefit from the employability and vocational skills that quality apprenticeships could deliver and were considered an investment by the community in future generations. Quality apprenticeships were thus a mechanism for discharging the fundamental responsibilities of one generation to another. The Recommendation had to support accessibility to apprenticeships by a greater number of communities to meet not only their intergenerational responsibilities, but also their responsibilities to adult workers wanting to reskill and upskill in order to change occupations or enhance their employability.
14. He highlighted as a second theme the opportunities quality apprenticeships can provide. Many countries had nascent, outdated, or underutilized apprenticeship systems or no apprenticeship systems at all. The Committee should focus on helping countries to harness the benefits that quality apprenticeship systems can deliver, creating opportunities for these countries to substantially increase living standards, development, and employability through the improved skills and services that apprenticeships could deliver. Member States should seize the opportunity to reflect and improve on existing apprenticeship systems.
15. The Recommendation should be positive, practical and pragmatic (the three “Ps”). With regard to the first P, quality apprenticeships were overwhelmingly positive for young people, other jobseekers and employers, and for communities as a whole. With regard to practicality (the second “P”), the proposed addition of traineeships detracted from the focus and utility of the draft document. The final “P” was pragmatism: The Recommendation needed to be pragmatic in recognizing the need to convince more employers to offer apprenticeships, and the importance of employers perceiving apprenticeships as an attractive and rewarding option.
16. With regard to the Preamble, positivity and encouragement were important. The message needed to be conveyed that quality apprenticeships were a well-proven tool for countries to apply education and training to labour market needs.

17. The Government member of Argentina noted that a Recommendation was important for generating regulations in educational and vocational training systems, and enhancing policies on protection, promotion of employment, and skills development. In relation to points 1 to 3, quality learning processes should be thought of as subsystems in national qualification systems, and in vocational and continuing training policies. That implied a comprehensive perspective on the various learning modalities and processes in force in each country and the institutions and actors involved (public and private). The quality learning schemes within each country needed to be in tune with the sectoral industrial relations systems. Tripartite social dialogue should be the institutional political framework for defining the system of quality apprenticeships.
18. The Government member of Japan noted that it was important for countries to improve and strengthen human resources development policies, since diverse human resources could play an active role in achieving sustainable growth. Quality apprenticeships have proven to be one way to improve human resource development. However, in Japan, the training of skilled workers via apprenticeships did not fit the current legal system. Vocational training was mainly provided directly by companies and focused on the skills required for jobs in those companies. It was the public sector that was mainly responsible for the skills development of unemployed people. He concluded that it was necessary to take the national circumstances of each country into account as human resource development policies differed across countries, and each country should be able to adapt measures accordingly.
19. The Government member of Türkiye remarked that the COVID-19 pandemic increased global youth unemployment. Countries tended to strengthen and update their vocational training systems, including apprenticeships, and active labour market programmes in order to match the needs for a qualified workforce and reduce unemployment. He noted that the adoption of an instrument on apprenticeships would also contribute to a better understanding of apprenticeship systems and provide a framework for Member States to create, adapt and develop their own legislative efforts. He further explained that apprenticeships had long been an integral part of Turkish labour market regulations and had undergone a significant reform process during the last two decades. He stressed that different national circumstances should be taken into account and a framework should be created that enabled transitions between formal and non-formal education and apprenticeships, including recognition of pre-apprenticeships, access to the labour market as well as to further education. All those issues should be addressed within the concept of decent work.
20. The Government member of the United States of America supported the implementation of effective strategies for strengthening skills and lifelong learning systems, including through the development and expansion of quality apprenticeship programmes. The United States was revitalizing its system of registered apprenticeship programmes enabling employers to develop their future workforce, and individual workers to obtain paid work experience, classroom instruction, and a portable occupational credential. He emphasized that the Recommendation should provide an effective road map for the design, regulation, and implementation of such programmes, while also preserving sufficient flexibility to accommodate Member States' varying national circumstances and priorities. It should promote equity, greater access to rewarding and decent work for broad segments of the global workforce, particularly for those facing persistent barriers to entering the labour market.
21. The Government member of Switzerland noted that Switzerland had significant experience in integrating apprenticeships into its vocational education and training system. A high-quality system was an asset in facing the challenges of technological, ecological and social

transformations. That particularly applied to learning, as quality apprenticeships could be a central pillar for education systems that were robust, effective and flexible and in line with the needs of individuals, businesses and society. An ILO standard-setting instrument should take into account different national circumstances, and a non-binding instrument in the form of a Recommendation was useful in that respect. There was no one-size-fits all model that could be exported everywhere. The involvement of the social partners in the development and implementation of apprenticeship policies, frameworks, systems and programmes was welcome. However, the special role played by the private sector's own initiative in the area should be emphasized and a private sector commitment to learning should be based on long-term benefits and not on State financial incentives. He warned against diluting the specific notion of apprenticeship and therefore apprenticeships and internships should not be covered by the same Recommendation.

22. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its Member States,² said that Türkiye, North Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Albania aligned themselves with the statement. The EU and its Member States acknowledged and supported the pivotal role of quality apprenticeships in tackling unemployment, in particular youth unemployment. Quality apprenticeships provided lifelong learning opportunities, thus contributing to reducing skills mismatches, promoted green and digital transitions, responded to rapid change in labour market needs, and could contribute to the formalization of the economy. Therefore, apprenticeships needed to be promoted as an attractive learning pathway among young people, their families and employers.
23. The EU had just held the sixth edition of the European Vocational Skills Week, which had highlighted the benefits of apprenticeships. There was a need to ensure equal access to apprenticeships and adequate social protection and safe working conditions for apprentices. All relevant stakeholders, in particular the social partners, needed to be actively involved in the design and implementation of regulatory frameworks for quality apprenticeships. The EU had also adopted the Council Recommendation on a European Framework for Quality and Effective Apprenticeships in order to ensure minimum standards. In addition, the European Pillar of Social Rights set out a number of principles to develop skills that were relevant for the labour market. With the Youth Guarantee, the EU aimed to ensure that all young people received a good-quality offer of employment, continued education, an apprenticeship or a traineeship within four months of becoming unemployed or leaving formal education.
24. The Government member of Australia welcomed the development of a new international labour standard on quality apprenticeships as an essential step to further the ILO's Decent Work Agenda. Having a robust apprenticeships framework, the Government of Australia welcomed the opportunity to share insights and exchange knowledge on quality apprenticeships. Flexibility was a key attribute for the quality apprenticeships standard to fully accommodate the variety of ways in which national law and practice could implement quality apprenticeship systems. It was also essential that the standard was robust enough to provide meaningful normative guidance as well, especially because there was no one-size-fits all approach to quality apprenticeships. He questioned the normative coherence of including internships and other work experience arrangements alongside structured apprenticeships,

² 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.

and noted the need for clarification on the terms “traineeship” and “internship” in relation to quality apprenticeships.

25. The Government member of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela noted that his Government provided to workers and young people all the conditions to ensure the transition from education to decent work, including by harmonizing legislation with practice. His country promoted various policies for collective, integral, continuous, and permanent training and self-training and implemented a training scheme aimed at enhancing the skills of workers and thus productivity.
26. The Government member of Canada acknowledged the ILO’s efforts towards formulating an international standard on quality apprenticeships. However, given the wide-ranging legal and social contexts as well as differences in the quality of learning around the world, the recommendations proposed ought to be flexible and adaptable to facilitate their application. Adequate social and occupational protection for apprentices as well as efforts to build an inclusive apprenticeship system were key. Partnerships with employers’ and workers’ organizations were also essential to ensure that apprentices had sufficient possibilities for work experience, which could in turn facilitate a smooth transition to work. Collaboration with social partners and all relevant stakeholders was central for developing and implementing proactive and inclusive policies and programmes that met the current and future needs of workers as well as the labour market.
27. The Government member of China noted that apprenticeships were an important policy tool for the reform of the vocational training system. The Recommendation on apprenticeships would be vital for implementing quality apprenticeships, reforming global vocational training while ensuring full and productive employment and entrepreneurship for young people. In recent years, the Government of China had attached great importance to vocational training. Since 2019, various initiatives had been implemented to upgrade the vocational training system. He supported the ILO’s efforts to play a leading role in the field of training and employment, in coordinating policy with Member States and in providing technical assistance in formulating training and employment policies. He also supported the quality apprenticeship system advocated by the ILO and would explore its implementation in line with China’s national circumstances. The proposed Recommendation should take account of differences in national training systems, focus on cooperation with social partners, further improve policy support for training, and build an apprenticeship system closely linked to the labour market.
28. The Government member of Indonesia noted that quality apprenticeships should be inclusive and non-discriminatory, and that collaboration between governments and social partners was essential for this. Human resources with high productivity were key to every investment since no country would succeed in attracting investments without a pool of talented workers. In essence, a good investment contributed to five fundamental goals: job creation; transfer of knowledge and technology; human capacity development; productivity enhancement; and national economic development.

General discussion on the proposed Conclusions

Points 1 to 3

29. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, noted with appreciation the efforts to eliminate ambiguities in definitions in the draft, given that countries had diversified regulatory, legal and institutional frameworks. Certain key terms,

including apprenticeships, traineeships, assessment, certification, qualification, intermediary and diversity should be clearly defined and applied. A quality apprenticeship should ensure mobility of skills through recognized qualifications. The Preamble should also include additional strategies for re-entry of beneficiaries into emerging job opportunities following COVID-19. He noted the need to embrace informal apprenticeship, and that it should focus on women, youth and persons with special needs. The collaboration between governments, employers, workers, and development partners in catalysing apprenticeships should regulate apprenticeship durations, payments, insurance, dispute resolution, family conditions, and subsistence allowances where applicable. The development of quality apprenticeships should be shaped by data-based evidence on industry demand. The apprenticeship system should be designed to minimize vulnerability and enhance a safe occupational environment and be based on global standards. He asked how apprenticeship standards could be repurposed to enable a more predictable apprenticeship supply chain that was driven by labour market intelligence; to what extent the standard could influence the development of flexible national, regional and global qualification frameworks; and how apprenticeships standards could take account of the needs of youth given the rapidly changing technological and economic environment. The instrument should promote gender equality, diversity and inclusivity.

30. The Government member of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland welcomed the development of a new Recommendation, which would be an opportunity to share good practice and agree on a reference point for policymakers, employers and worker representatives as they looked to develop or improve their current systems. A Recommendation was an appropriate type of instrument, given the range of different training, labour market and social protection systems in place around the world. It was crucial that the Recommendation recognized the importance of employers in designing apprenticeships that met skills needs, and in supporting a quality experience for the apprentice, covering labour market entry and career progression. Employers should be encouraged, through apprenticeships, to value and develop a diverse talent pool with the right skills for their business. The strong focus on quality was welcomed as apprenticeships would deliver improved skills and productivity for employers, sustained employment and improved career earnings for apprentices, and therefore economic and fiscal returns for taxpayer investment. The Recommendation should emphasize the opportunity to support people who were at a disadvantage or under-represented in the labour market. The ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (1998), as amended in 2022 (the 1998 Declaration), was a crucial foundation for the Recommendation. It would also be helpful for the Preamble to contain a reference to the ILO Centenary Declaration for the Future of Work, 2019 (Centenary Declaration).
31. The Government member of Senegal said that Senegal aligned itself with the statement by the Africa group. Levels of unemployment had reached worrying levels, largely due to inadequate training. For developing countries, especially in Africa, young populations were particularly neglected. Apprenticeships were one means of enabling labour market stakeholders to create a space where young people were welcomed and could develop their competencies, and thus facilitate their entry into active working life. He recommended the development of a legal instrument that was flexible and capitalized on the experiences of different countries, as was the case with other Recommendations. Clear definitions of apprenticeship, traineeships and internships would be useful.
32. The representative of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) described the OECD's commitment to supporting countries in implementing and strengthening quality apprenticeship systems. Apprenticeships could engage young people

in education and training, smoothing their transitions into the labour market, and providing relevant upskilling and reskilling opportunities to adults. However, a lack of international definitions and data gaps impeded a clear view of participation in apprenticeships and their design and outcomes. Better data was the first step for designing better apprenticeship policies and practices. Apprenticeships could also support the green transition. Through the interaction between workplaces and classrooms, apprentices could be equipped with technical and transversal skills that had become crucial to greener labour markets and societies. Moreover, good-quality apprenticeships fostered knowledge exchanges and eco-innovation systems.

33. The representative of Education International stated that education should not be a commodity but was a right for all, as had been noted by the ILO Technical meeting on the future of work in the education sector. He said that technical and vocational education and training (TVET), and strong public institutions, were vital, as were dedicated mentors with professional qualifications and experience who could support apprentices and trainees along their pathway of learning. Developing work-based and lifelong learning was dependent on free, quality State education. Certified, internationally recognized qualifications at the end of apprenticeships and traineeships enabled workers to move from one place to another without discrimination.
34. The deputy representative of the Secretary-General acknowledged that traineeships, internships, and apprenticeships are, in many countries, terms that are used interchangeably; hence for the purposes of the current discussion, the terms “traineeship” and “internship” were treated as synonyms when referring to any form of on-the-job learning which enabled a person to acquire work experience and competencies with a view to enhancing their employability.
35. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed that the Recommendation must be positive and practical. It would need to be flexible and adaptable to national circumstances and social realities in different countries. She emphasized the importance of focusing on decent work in workplace learning because of significant exploitation in this area. There was a risk in not extending coverage of the instrument to other forms of work-based training: providing an instrument which would apply only to the few and leaving those unregulated is a clear danger. The standard should aim to cover all the diverse forms of workplace learning, including both traineeships and apprenticeships, while allowing for some provisions to apply only to one or the other. She welcomed the fact that the discussion this year and next year would focus attention on the need for cooperation between countries on traineeships and apprenticeships. She agreed that making apprenticeships more attractive to young people would be dependent on three key elements: quality education, protections and rights.
36. The Employer Vice-Chairperson welcomed the fact that the discussion so far had provided a positive foundation, specifically the near-universal commitment to work towards a Recommendation. But he also noted the concerns about addressing different concepts in a single instrument. Countries have adopted different definitions and arrangements on traineeship, internship and apprenticeships. He concluded that these different concepts should not be conflated.

Points 4 to 7

37. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that the text generally offered sound definitions to support the discussion of quality apprenticeships. However, he expressed concerns over the definition of “traineeship” in point 4(e). He did not support the expansion of the scope of the

instrument beyond apprenticeships to address traineeships or any other form of non-apprenticed arrangements, as doing so could compromise the aim of developing a practical and pragmatic instrument. He also pointed out that the Governing Body at its 334th Session had placed on the agenda of the International Labour Conference a standard-setting item relating to apprenticeships, without any reference to traineeships or any other forms of arrangements. Therefore, he did not support the inclusion of proposed point 4(e) or 27 as it expanded the scope of this discussion on apprenticeship. He also noted that point 4(e), as drafted, was too open-ended and could refer to a vast range of different forms of training and on-the-job learning.

38. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the Office had sought to offer definitions that would meet the needs of the diverse systems operating across Member States. A traineeship in one country was a placement in another. The same terminology was used with different expectations. Clear definitions were needed which could also be understood across different systems. The definition of apprenticeships would need to include traineeships, as the Committee had been requested by the Governing Body to fill the regulatory gap, particularly on apprenticeships but also for other modalities of work-based training. There was a pressing need to provide trainees with protection, including ensuring that they were provided with educational support where that was appropriate, as well as workplace protection. Trainees and apprentices needed protection from abuse. The right to freedom of association and collective bargaining for all workers, including apprentices and trainees, was key to guaranteeing protection from such abuse.
39. The reference to the provisions of the instrument being implemented through national laws, policies and programmes and collective agreements was rightly made. The instrument should prompt an upsurge in discussions about best practices and problem-solving. The guidance must be relevant and useful in all country circumstances, be practical but also aspirational. References in the text to “having regard to national circumstances” were superfluous, given that this would be a Recommendation. The aim should be to provide the foundations on which countries could build or adapt their own models of apprenticeship and traineeship, for the benefit of both workers and employers. The Committee should consider replacing “competencies” with “capabilities” throughout the text. Capabilities was more positively oriented around the holistic growth of the individual worker and less binary in nature, suggesting that the worker would develop the fullest set of skills that should serve them throughout their life and employment.
40. The pandemic had ravaged education systems around the world, disrupting the education of a generation. Rebuilding would require special attention and investment by States and employers. In this regard, a recognized qualification was critical and the European Framework for Quality and Effective Apprenticeships demonstrated a good example which brought together workers, employers and educational institutions and set a high standard for a recognized qualification.
41. She mentioned that social dialogue, including collective bargaining, was vital in implementing quality apprenticeship. In cases where unions were excluded from work-based learning, abuses were observed, and apprentices and trainees were more vulnerable than others in the workplace. She gave an example from Pakistan – where unions and employers had worked with education institutions in a company to attract more female apprentices – to demonstrate how much could be achieved when unions and employers worked together.
42. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, noted that a clear differentiation between traineeships and apprenticeships was needed. In some cases,

apprenticeships are a dual arrangement between training institutions and workplaces and there is the risk that within the workplace, the apprentice could be regarded as a trainee. In the context of this document, it would be important to define the term “apprenticeships” and “traineeships” to avoid any confusion between the two terms. Regarding the term “competencies”, if the term “capabilities” had a more positive connotation, it could be used throughout the instrument. He noted that it is important to include in national qualification frameworks the levels of apprenticeships to bridge the gap between qualifications and industry needs. The Recommendation would need to ensure a proper focus on assessment and certification.

43. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that North Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Albania aligned themselves with his statement. The definitions in the proposed Conclusions should be such as to ensure that the same understandings of the key terms were shared by all members of the Committee. Apprenticeships should combine learning in vocational education and training institutions with substantial work-based learning in companies and would need to lead to recognized qualifications. They should also be based on an agreement defining the rights and obligations of the apprentice and the employer, including appropriate pay or compensation in line with national requirements. Even though reference to remuneration was made in other points of the proposed Conclusions, this should be an integral part of the definition of apprenticeships. Such compensation should be in line with national or sectoral requirements or collective agreements.
44. He agreed that it would be important to include a clear definition of the term “apprenticeship” and clarify the scope of the instrument. Despite the importance of quality traineeships, the Committee should focus its discussion on apprenticeships, as traineeships were diverse and followed different implementing practices. Regarding the implementation of quality apprenticeships, national approaches may also differ. Apprenticeships could be implemented by laws and regulations issued at the appropriate institutional level but also by collective agreements, policies and programmes, in line with national industrial relations systems and education and training practices.
45. The Government member of the United States said that workers of all ages and career stages could benefit from occupational upskilling and reskilling, and thus the instrument should be relevant to workers of all ages. Quality apprenticeships would often lead to better job quality and outcomes for workers over their lifetimes, so the primary focus of apprenticeship systems should be on improving the quality of jobs. Apprenticeships were a unique and specific form of learning, with their own sets of challenges and benefits, so the scope of the instrument should be limited to apprenticeships and exclude coverage of traineeships. Given that apprenticeships involved a structured training approach under which apprentices received compensation, expanding the scope of the instrument to include traineeships could dilute its impact, particularly given that trainees in some countries did not receive any compensation or minimum stipends. Remuneration was a fundamental attribute of any quality apprenticeships.
46. The Government member of Canada reiterated the importance of having a flexible instrument that could be applicable to the wide range of national and subnational circumstances. Regarding the term “intermediary”, it would be important for this definition to remain broad to capture the variety of global apprenticeship stakeholders, including all relevant organizations. The term “intermediary” could also include equity-seeking organizations that supported the success of apprentice–employer relationships, or host enterprises, as the case may be. He noted that in Canada, as in many other countries, the

term “traineeships” was not covered under the umbrella of apprenticeships. Rather, traineeships would fall under the umbrella of work-integrated learning or experiential education opportunities. As traineeships spanned many sectors and varied in requirements and complexity, including traineeships would make the scope of the instrument too broad. Issues specific to traineeships could be handled in a specific report or instrument which would explore and address those issues and how best to remedy them.

47. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted the comments about the importance of clear definitions, which would be an important part of the discussions, acknowledging that there were different viewpoints. She reiterated that the instrument needed to make a real difference to the many people in worked-based learning who faced extremely difficult situations.
48. The Employer Vice-Chairperson recalled the statements by the representatives of the EU and its Member States on the need to focus on apprentices and of the United States on the unique and specific nature of apprenticeships, and said that the discussion should proceed with that focus. This was not to discount concerns regarding other forms of work and training, but those concerns could be addressed through other instruments and other discussions. They should not be added at the last minute to the present discussion and thus potentially detract from the utility of apprenticeships in the many countries that needed assistance in that area.

Points 8 to 23

49. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that a competent authority was a useful way of providing unity and coherence to the regulatory framework. It was helpful to have an overarching competent authority, not only to oversee the whole regulatory framework but also to work with other State partners. She welcomed the Office’s inclusion of social partners in many of the points in the proposed Conclusions. Unions could provide insights into how regulations can contribute to developing skills, providing quality training and protecting against the apprenticeships and traineeships being used to replace labour.
50. Every country had its own definition and rules, and every sector was different. Collective bargaining and the inclusion of the social partners was thus essential. She underlined the importance of written agreements. Apprenticeships were complex and in some ways the arrangements were more complex than those of trainees given that they included educational institutions and off-the-job training. In terms of equality, she mentioned the need for positive action to promote gender equality in accessing work-based learning. Affirmative action and promotive language would not fix those problems alone. Equality could only be addressed if access to apprenticeships was broadened so as to be available to all, including people without independent financial means. Apprenticeships must therefore offer proper and adequate remuneration. She stressed the importance of paying special attention to making workplaces accessible to those with disabilities and ensuring inclusion of indigenous persons, refugees and migrant workers. Competent authorities and the social partners working together would be best placed to discuss the necessary actions in their sectors.
51. She suggested that in some cases it might be appropriate for governments to take the lead on quality apprenticeships, for example in state-owned enterprises, or in companies receiving government procurement contracts or subsidies. With regard to traineeships, it would be important to focus on the needs of poor people, people in informality or in substandard traineeships. She noted that there were more traineeships available than apprenticeships and that traineeships were supposed to ease the path from education to work. Although many governments currently made a distinction between the two, there was a need to examine how far some of those institutions could be applicable to both. Traineeships were often used

to supply cheap or unpaid labour and many university graduates across Europe had undertaken at least one traineeship. Many were paid at a very low level and only 27 per cent led to an offer of employment. The difficulty of not including trainees would be that new pathways would not open up for them. The importance was for all trainees to have basic protections. So while recognizing that discussions would be difficult over the subsequent days, she said that she would seek to persuade other governments that it was important to not make the distinction at this time.

52. The Employer Vice-Chairperson drew attention to points 24–25 and the need to start talking about promotion before talking about regulation – and thus perhaps to amend the order of the instrument. He said it would be more logical to promote apprenticeships and then address their regulation as a matter of chronological accuracy and in terms of messaging. This was not to discount the importance on the matters contained in points 8–23. The details would be considered in the discussions on amendments. He would seek to provide guidance and support to governments in a range of circumstances but with an emphasis on micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs), which were still suffering the consequences of the pandemic.
53. He recognized from the discussion so far the importance of apprenticeships to young people and people in other stages of the life course. Any measure taken to support training and upskilling should be available to both young people and to others concerned. In the promotional stage it would be important to overcome the stigma sometimes associated with apprenticeships, both for young people but also for parents. The aim during the discussions to come would be to include appropriate, constructive, and useful language throughout for implementation by social partners at the national level.
54. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that North Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Albania aligned themselves with his statement. He stated that his group welcomed the proposed Conclusions as they covered regulatory frameworks for quality apprenticeships. Such frameworks were crucial for ensuring high standards that adequately met labour market needs. He agreed with the proposal that each apprenticeship should be based on an agreement between employer, apprentice and, where appropriate, the vocational education and training institution. It was important to have or to designate public authorities with clear responsibilities for regulating apprenticeships. The regulatory framework should be based on a fair and equitable partnership approach, including a transparent dialogue among all relevant stakeholders. He emphasized the importance of paying particular attention to gender equality, as well as rights such as appropriate pay or compensation, and limited, reasonable and regular working hours. Apprenticeships needed to be further promoted with particular attention to small and medium-sized enterprises. Apprentices needed to be given detailed advice and guidance before and during their apprenticeship and under no circumstances should be seen as a cheap labour force.
55. An apprenticeship agreement should clearly define the parties' roles, rights, and obligations. It was crucial that teachers or in-company trainers and mentors could update their skills, knowledge and competencies, according to up-to-date teaching methods. All relevant stakeholders, especially social partners, should be involved in the design and implementation of the regulatory framework. Apprenticeship systems and programmes had to be regularly monitored to ensure their quality and effectiveness.
56. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that his group viewed the establishment of independent offices as necessary for the development of

training programmes focused on apprenticeships. The establishment of agencies responsible for the quality of training, the qualifications framework, and appropriate qualification standards, was necessary. It was also imperative for governments to provide skills development policy documents focused on inclusivity.

57. The Government member of Canada stated that in her country the regulatory framework, programme, or regime of each jurisdiction was unique and reflected provincial and territorial conditions. She highlighted the importance of finding a balance between the needs of different stakeholders and ensuring that the system was appropriately regulated. Apprenticeships generally combined systematic and long-term training in the workplace, with technical training to enable apprentices to acquire all necessary competencies for a specialized job. For certain jurisdictions it was rare but possible that training of apprentices relied solely on on-the-job learning. In Canada social dialogue had concluded that social inclusiveness, adequate pay, social coverage as well as the need to recognize qualifications were important. Being recognized as an employee with similar rights and benefits influenced the productivity of apprentices.
58. Quality apprenticeship programmes were made up of different elements. It was important to establish such programmes at the local level based on the contributions of industry partners, in order to obtain a better understanding of the needs and conditions of the labour market and the concepts of public security and public interest.
59. The Government member of Argentina agreed with the need to establish the general requirements for admission and the conditions that had to be fulfilled in an apprenticeship contract. Efforts to build and provide mechanisms for the recognition of prior learning would be possible using a public scheme. For an apprentice, it is vital that the apprenticeship be based on standards that clearly defined the occupational growth potential. These standards should be validated from a sectoral point of view through social dialogue and should be recognized in the labour market. Additionally, the standards must describe accurately the abilities and knowledge that would be developed during the contractual term and the competencies that needed to be evaluated or assessed at the end of the apprenticeship. The use of technology to facilitate training should be encouraged to guarantee the quality of apprenticeships, so that they led to decent work opportunities.
60. The Government member of the United States asserted that regulations were best administered by government regulatory agencies, with input from employers' and workers' organizations. Occupational training and labour market expertise of both workers and employers' organizations was an important element that should be included in point 11 of the proposed Conclusions. The establishment of a clear nexus in the proposed instrument between the competencies required for an occupation and the minimum duration of an apprenticeship would be desirable.
61. Member States generally did not have uniform apprenticeship laws, regulations, and promotional measures. The instrument should retain enough flexibility to allow members to take actions that were in accordance with their national laws and circumstances. The establishment of uniform enterprise-wide ratios could prove difficult to administer by Member States, a complication arising due to collective bargaining agreements. Instead, there should be flexibility within the ratio of off-the-job learning to on-the-job learning to account for the unique needs of different industries.
62. Remuneration in apprenticeship programmes should be increased to reflect the progressive acquisition of occupational competencies by the apprentice. Both the enterprise providing on-the-job training to the apprentice and any educational or training institution providing off-

the-job training to the apprentice should adhere to all applicable national laws governing equal employment opportunity. Member States should take affirmative measures to prevent discrimination, violence, harassment, or intimidation against apprentices in either the workplace or the classroom.

63. The Worker Vice-Chairperson highlighted the discussion centred around the need for regulatory frameworks on social equality and a good understanding of the apprenticeship agreement. This would ensure the development of decent occupation-specific standards set by governments with the involvement of social partners.

Points 24 to 27

64. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that governments which aimed at establishing good quality apprenticeships should take steps to promote and integrate them within and across their systems. Since many micro and small economic units would not have the capacity to serve in the role suggested by the conclusions, the need for public infrastructure and the importance of tripartite relationships to ensure that adequate conditions exist for the support of apprentices should be restated in this part of the conclusions.
65. Cost-sharing between governments and employers was important but this should not include cost-sharing by workers. Apprentices at the nascent stage of their career could not afford to bear the cost of their own training. She noted that by receiving payments, apprentices would be able to harness opportunities to move from informality to formality.
66. National and international cooperation, sharing good practices and having good labour market information were also important. Yet, the development of the apprenticeship system must also be responsive to the needs and aspirations of the individual worker as well as to the rapidly changing world of work. Technologies should be harnessed in the world of work but there must also be adequate data protection for workers. Workers' organizations should play a role in the governance of data protection.
67. Accredited intermediaries such as TVET institutions could play a useful role, but the regulatory framework should ensure that they are appropriately evaluated, especially if they receive public funds.
68. Subsidies should be within the purview of the regulatory framework in order to guarantee that enterprises which received subsidies would deliver adequate training and support. The apprentice must have access to complaints procedures so that their rights were protected.
69. The Worker Vice-Chairperson emphasized that creating pathways for workers from the informal to the formal economy is crucial to the impact of the instrument. She pointed out that strong public TVET institutions should provide off-the-job education and training to provide a route to recognizing qualifications, and thus promote the transition from informality to formality.
70. International cooperation and solidarity are crucial, which should take place between the competent authorities so that governments could access the best policy examples regarding all aspects of quality apprenticeship.
71. People in traineeships and internships need protections too. Work-based learning situations needed to be seen as a continuum ranging from apprenticeships at one end of the spectrum to short-term internships at the other. The current text which extends protections into this continuum is the appropriate tool to promote the move from informality to formality.

72. The need for agreements or contracts was critically important. These should set out the objectives of traineeships and the rights and obligations of the parties to the agreement in clear language, including rights of trainees to organize in unions and to collectively bargain. The key issue was that everyone should have a good understanding of the terms of the agreement.
73. She noted that 83 out of the 92 governments that responded to the questionnaire in the preparatory work for the Committee agreed that there should be a clear and recorded agreement between trainees and employers. There was also a very high approval rate for trainees having other protections, such as protection from discrimination and violence and harassment, and occupational safety and health (OSH).
74. She concluded that this standard was critical to the future of work. Approaches that exclude large groups of young and vulnerable workers from the protections offered by the standard should be avoided. The inclusion of traineeship in the standard was important so as not to exclude from coverage those who need it most.
75. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that the Employers' group wanted to give the promotion of quality apprenticeships more prominence in the texts. To this end, the Employers' group proposed moving points 24 and 25 upwards to comprise a new section II, and current section II would become a new section III. The aim was to provide a more logical sequence. The details of this suggested change would be outlined in detail during the subsequent discussion of amendments.
76. He emphasized the important role of quality apprenticeships in promoting the transition from the informal economy to the formal economy and seizing the opportunities apprenticeships may provide to bridge the informal and formal economies. He also suggested that the instrument should help to overcome possible stigma and play a significant role in combating the notion that apprenticeships were in some way a lesser path than more academic educational tracks.
77. The remainder of section V would become a new section VI, which would address promotion of quality apprenticeships through international collaboration and would include key considerations relevant to federal systems and other issues regarding domestic cooperation. He identified Federal-State relationship as a key element that makes apprenticeship systems work. He also restated that point 27 on traineeships should not be included in the conclusions.
78. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group noted the need for labour market information systems to underly quality apprenticeships. He also called for more clarity on the definition of traineeship. He suggested to provide clear definitions on traineeship and apprenticeship.
79. The Government member of Sweden, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, the candidate countries North Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Albania, as well as Georgia, recognized the pivotal role of apprenticeships in tackling unemployment, particularly youth unemployment, its contribution to reducing skills mismatch, and to facilitate the transition from the education system to the labour market.
80. She highlighted the importance of promoting apprenticeships as an attractive learning pathway in national policy and of recognizing and valuing competencies acquired through apprenticeship. She also stressed the crucial role of international cooperation in helping ILO Member States to learn from each other in all aspects of quality apprenticeship. While it is important to ensure quality traineeships, she wished to focus this discussion on apprenticeships and suggested a separate discussion of traineeships.

81. The Government member of Switzerland noted the importance of creating robust models allowing sectoral and qualitative analyses of apprenticeships which would complement the quantitative and financial aspects which were emphasized so far. He also highlighted the need to motivate and support companies to engage in apprenticeship which he considered as important as financial or tax incentives.
82. The Government member of the United States wished to clarify his understanding that one of the Recommendation's aims was to promote the transition to the formal economy, that is, providing access to apprenticeships to individuals in the informal economy, and not to establishing apprenticeships in the informal economy.
83. On points 24 to 27, he reiterated the position that the scope of the proposed instrument should be limited to apprenticeships and not include traineeships, expressing concern that expanding the scope of the instrument could dilute its impact.
84. The Government member of Argentina agreed that apprenticeships and traineeships should be an integral part of national educational and employment policy based on sound labour market information and analysis. She stressed that the informal economy needs to be formalized, with a focus on micro-enterprises and policies to develop entrepreneurship and skills of workers through offering quality apprenticeships. She also believed that traineeship should be included in the instrument, as this form of workplace learning also needed specific support.
85. The Government member of Canada, regarding item 24, used the Red Seal programme as an example, which sets the common standards to assess the skills of tradespeople across Canada. The provincial and territorial apprenticeship authorities provide the training and trade certification to meet the Red Seal standard.
86. All parties should assist apprentices in achieving the full scope of practice that responds to the changing nature of work and skills in demand. This allows for a highly skilled workforce with a transferable skill set and is continuously adaptable to new job requirements. He noted that building partnerships was key to apprenticeships' success regionally, nationally, and internationally
87. The Government member of Zimbabwe, aligning herself with the statement made by Kenya on behalf of the Africa group, emphasized the importance of creating an enabling environment for the promotion of quality apprenticeship. The aspect of incentives should be the responsibility of tertiary institutions, industry, and government, as these key players played an important role in promoting quality apprenticeships and international cooperation. This hinged on having strong tripartite partnerships, most importantly between the private sector and quasi government organizations. She referred to the strong private and public partnership practiced in the apprenticeship system in Zimbabwe.
88. Apprenticeship training should be oriented towards creating a labour force with high capabilities, as well as promoting small enterprises and enabling the growth of industries. The national strategies mentioned in point 24 should be intrinsically linked to fundamental principles and rights recognized as key to promote in workplaces, but also for every human being, including but not limited to, health and safety, gender equality, non-discrimination, and protection against gender-based violence and sexual harassment at workplaces.
89. Finally, she stated that traineeships and apprenticeships should not be combined in the same instrument. The interchanging of some key focus areas could cause ambiguity and may dilute the key focus on the core intention of promoting quality and decent apprenticeships.

90. The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran said that the fast-paced technological progress induced accelerated changes in skills needs. Consequently, apprenticeships could provide training using the latest technologies and require substantially less time to adjust training programmes to changing needs.
91. Referring to the experience in her country, she said decisions would only be taken promptly if there was a dynamic institutional coordinating presence. Therefore, it was necessary to create an enabling environment by developing and implementing strategies, mainstreaming quality apprenticeships in national development strategies, encouraging the social partners, providing incentives, encouraging intermediaries, undertaking awareness-raising activities, using new technologies and innovative methods, and giving stakeholders the opportunity to make recommendations.
92. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said she was pleased to hear the Governments' statements that focused on the transition from the informal to the formal economy and that this was very important and critical to the discussion. She concluded that the relevant texts, in particular on point 25, needed to be examined in the light of this view.
93. The reputation and high stakes of apprenticeships needed to be assured. If apprenticeships still had some kind of stigma or if it were seen as less important or less valuable than other forms of qualification and training, this instrument should contribute to overcome such perceptions.
94. She disagreed with the logic suggested by the Employers' group in terms of dealing with promotion of apprenticeships before dealing with the content of the framework, but suggested that this point would be explored further when those proposals would be examined in detail.

Discussion of the amendments to the proposed Conclusions ³

Part A. Form of the instrument

Point 1

95. No amendments were received to point 1, which was therefore adopted.

Point 2

96. The Worker Vice-Chairperson invited Government members to take the floor in case they considered the instrument should take the form of a Convention or a Convention and a Recommendation.
97. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that the Committee should work towards a Recommendation given that there were no amendments proposed by Governments.
98. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed with the form of instrument to be a Recommendation.
99. Point 2 was adopted.

³ The proposed Conclusions are included in [pages 137–142 of Report IV\(2\) \(revised\)](#). All amendments by point can be found on the [Committee's webpage](#).

Part B. Content of the instrument

Preamble

Point 3, chapeau

- 100.** No amendments were received to the chapeau of point 3, which was therefore adopted.

Point 3(a)

A.41

- 101.** The Government member of Canada, speaking also on behalf of Switzerland and the United States, introduced an amendment to remove “youth” from “global youth unemployment”. He highlighted that the situation applied to workers of all ages and the removal would make it more age inclusive.
- 102.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment. He acknowledged that the challenges mentioned affected individuals across all age groups, and apprenticeships could help adults as well. His group had also submitted an amendment proposing to swap clause (a) with clause (b) so that the Preamble started with a positive note before describing challenges.
- 103.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson endorsed the amendment while recognizing in particular that young workers were vulnerable to unemployment and underemployment.
- 104.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, spoke in favour of the amendment.
- 105.** The amendment was adopted.

A.21 and A.44

- 106.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment (A.44) to insert “including the just transition to a zero-carbon economy and digitalization” after “world of work” stressing the impact of just transition on skills mismatches and labour market needs. She proposed to subamend it by replacing “to a zero-carbon economy” with “towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all” to widen the focus from the impact of climate change to the process of a just transition and implications for skills demand. She explained that the same argument was applied with regard to “digitalization”, while also noting that technologies themselves were neither good nor bad.
- 107.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States as well as Canada, introduced an amendment (A.21) to insert “and the challenge of climate change” after “world of work”. He echoed the Workers’ group’s concerns over climate change which must be mentioned in the Preamble.
- 108.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson pointed out that he supported the subamendment. He elaborated that if the purpose of clause (a) was placing the instrument in its context of various transformations in the world of work, other factors than climate change are transforming the world of work as well, such as changes in demography and supply chain, pandemic, and geopolitical trends. However, since the subamendment referred to the theme which would be on the agenda of the International Labour Conference in 2023, he supported the subamendment to help frame the outcome of that work.

109. The Worker Vice-Chairperson reiterated the reason for which the Workers' group preferred the term "just transition" over "climate change". The former encompassed the latter and includes the needs and processes of responding to climate change which has important skills implications.
110. The Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, stated that his group preferred the original text. It was not appropriate to single out climate change and digitalization as the only drivers of transformations in the world of work causing skills mismatches. Doing so would miss out many other drivers of such changes. He insisted that if it were not possible to list these factors exhaustively, it was preferable to not mention them at all.
111. The Government members of Brazil, Saudi Arabia and Panama echoed the statement of the Africa group and their preference for the original text. They supported that text as it avoided listing the exhaustive factors transforming the world of work which could differ from one country to the other.
112. The Employer Vice-Chairperson along similar lines considered that the Committee could not tackle down a single set of global mega trends that applied universally to all, and that it therefore was better to stick to the text prepared by the Office.
113. The Government member of India aligned with the Africa group and the Employers' group in supporting the original text prepared by the Office. He noted that he supported another amendment (A. 77) which proposed removal of "as well as crises such as COVID-19 pandemic".
114. The Government member of Saudi Arabia, speaking on behalf of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) countries, echoed this argument stating that COVID-19 was not a cause of skills mismatches because skills mismatches predated the pandemic. Rather, the pandemic was an occasion when people recognized skills mismatches.
115. The Government member of the United States supported the subamendment and inclusion of "just transition", but proposed a further subamendment to include "the need for" before "just transition". He noted that the language as it stood implied that a just transition was already under way when in fact there was still much work to be done.
116. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the text "towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all" was good language. She also agreed with the subamendment suggested by the United States because it set out what was necessary in terms of skills changes. While understanding the Africa group's viewpoint, she reiterated the importance of "just transition" for the Workers' group and insisted on retaining it.
117. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States as well as Canada, stated that it was important to mention mega trends in the Preamble. As the text read "including", it did not mean they had to be exhaustive in the list of such megatrends. In the spirit of consensus, the EU Member States and Canada might withdraw their amendment and support the amendment proposed by the Workers' group as subamended by the United States, which would read "including the need for a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all, a zero-carbon economy and digitalization".
118. The Government member of Canada proposed a further subamendment to replace "including" with "such as" to make the list of megatrends more open, which he hoped would help build consensus among Committee members.

119. The Employer Vice-Chairperson expressed his concern that the discussion was going beyond what the Employer's group could support and the objective of the instrument. Recalling that the purpose of the clause was to recite changes in the world of work, he suggested refraining from making value judgements on the transformation processes.
120. The Government member of the United Kingdom, seconded by the Government member of Canada, proposed a further subamendment to the amendment proposed by the Workers' group, to move "a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies" to the end of clause (a).
121. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment proposed by the United Kingdom because it changed the meaning of the text. For the Workers' group, a just transition was about skills mismatches, not change for employment. She agreed that it was not helpful to have a long list of issues, but insisted on a need for just transition. She referred to the agreed-upon *ILO Guidelines for a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all* (2015), and therefore would expect that the topic was not controversial. While noting diverging opinions, she strongly demanded that those significant and important matters were included in the text.
122. The Government members of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Canada, reiterated their willingness to withdraw their amendment for the sake of building consensus among Committee members, which however did not materialize. One of their main arguments was that the text was too descriptive so they expected that the subamended text might help overcome some of the reluctance.
123. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated they would support the amendment proposed by the EU Member States to include "and the challenge of climate change" (A.21). He explained that originally, he would not have supported that amendment, but upon reflection he believed that adding to the text "and the challenge of climate change" was perhaps the best balance considering the need to include something significant as an example alongside being precise and not exhaustive.
124. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to add "such as the challenge of climate change" after the text "world of work" which she thought could be accepted by those objecting to listing factors.
125. The Government members of the United States and France, on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the Workers' group's subamendment because they believed that the proposed text addressed the concerns raised by both Workers' and Employers' groups.
126. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed to pluralize the word "challenge" into "challenges".
127. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported this subamendment and suggested to add "those resulting from" between "such as" and "the challenges of climate change".
128. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported that subamendment.
129. Given that the Employers' and Workers' groups and several Government members supported the subamended text, the Chairperson suggested to adopt it.
130. The Government member of Zambia objected to the adoption of the text as subamended and stressed that climate change was not an example of rapid transformation in the world of work and therefore should not be included in the text. He reiterated the views of the Africa group as expressed by the Government member of Uganda and proposed to retain the original text.

- 131. The Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the view of the Government member of Zambia that the challenges of climate change were not an example of the transformations in the world of work. It was a driver of those transformations and therefore could not be mentioned as an example. Furthermore, he underlined the importance of exhaustiveness of the list of factors if the Preamble were to mention some of them. He highlighted unequal trade between developed and underdeveloped countries as the most significant factor for the Africa group. He reminded the Committee of the principle of not listing factors if they were not exhaustive. He proposed to bracket this further subamendment and discuss it later.
- 132. At the request of the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons, the discussion of amendments A.44 and A.21 as subamended was deferred to a later sitting. When resuming the discussion, the Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, accepted the text.
- 133. The amendment proposed by EU Member States (A.21) was adopted as subamended and the Workers' group amendment (A.44) fell.

A.88

- 134. The Government member of Argentina, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Brazil and Chile, proposed an amendment to delete "and that" before "rapid transformations" and replace it with "Existing inequalities are compounded by". She suggested to also insert "Those circumstances" between "the COVID-19 pandemic" and "result in skills mismatches". She explained that there were certain structures and inequalities which created different opportunities and this issue could be alleviated by apprenticeships.
- 135. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment because he was not convinced that it was factual. He also stated that the proposed amendment would highlight negative aspects of the transformations in the world of work while there would also opportunities arising from the transformations.
- 136. The Government members of India, Saudi Arabia and Zimbabwe did not support the amendment because it negativized rapid transformations in the world of work.
- 137. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, noting an increasing inequality.
- 138. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, endorsed the amendment because he considered it appropriate and justified.
- 139. In view of the comments provided, the Government member of Argentina maintained its position emphasizing that unemployment and underemployment were high in labour markets; hence inequality in the access to employment should be mentioned as a starting point of the discussion.
- 140. The Worker Vice-Chairperson observed that rapid transformations in the world of work had increased existing inequalities although not all the transformations in the world have had a negative impact on the world of work. She acknowledged that the existing opportunities would also increase and proposed reformulation of the wording which might be more acceptable to other members of the Committee.
- 141. The Employer Vice-Chairperson remarked that the discussion was proceeding from wrong assumptions about how the discussion should be framed. He stated that it should focus on the opportunities apprenticeships could offer, stating that the original text was on the right path in framing the Preamble.

142. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, proposed to add “and inequalities persist.” before “Rapid transformation” which would then read: “unemployment and underemployment rates continue to be high and inequalities persist.”, emphasizing that the intention of the proposed amendment was to look at the challenges faced in the world of work, particularly those pertaining to apprenticeships.
143. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed to shift the sentence around to read “rapid transformations in the world of work are compounding existing inequalities”. She pointed out that this statement was factual and needed to be included in this Preamble.
144. The Government member of the Philippines proposed to borrow the following language from the conclusions concerning inequalities and the world of work that the Conference had adopted at its 109th Session (2021) that addressed both the opportunities and challenges of the transformation: “Climate change, digitalization, globalization and demographic shifts are transforming the world of work and, while some may present opportunities, they also generate challenges that may contribute to a widening of inequalities.”
145. The Government member of Bahamas supported that proposal.
146. The Government member of Zambia stated that there were two issues in the clause under discussion: high unemployment and underemployment and skills mismatch. Those two challenges needed to be taken into account in the proposal made by the Government member of the Philippines.
147. The Worker Vice-Chairperson preferred the concept of “inequality is growing” rather than “persisting”. She also suggested to make the sentences simpler and clearer.
148. The Government member of Argentina agreed on the formulation that “inequalities are growing” and suggested deferring the discussion of amendment A.88 to a later sitting and trying to find concise wording until then.
149. The Employer Vice-Chairperson observed that the amendment added no value to the discussions related to skills and apprenticeships. He encouraged everyone to concentrate on the core of the Committee’s mandate.
150. The Worker Vice-Chairperson saw the Preamble as setting the scene for the situation and challenges faced. She suggested including “that economic inequality continues to grow” if overall consensus exists and confirmed by Office data. Otherwise, she would be comfortable with the term “persists” and emphasized that reference to inequality should be retained.
151. The Chairperson deferred the consideration of the amendment to a later sitting as there was no consensus.
152. When resuming the discussion, the Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the word “persists” was an incontestable proposition as inequalities decreased in some countries.
153. The Worker Vice-Chairperson insisted that inequalities were not only “persisting”, but “growing” as the gap between the richest and the poorest was increasing globally, and required an urgent response.
154. In the spirit of consensus, the Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, proposed to keep the word “persists”.
155. The Government members of Argentina, Brazil and Chile accepted the proposal.
156. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

A.77

157. The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of the Government member of Türkiye, introduced an amendment to remove “as well as crises such as COVID-19” as it was not clear that the COVID-19 pandemic by itself resulted in skills mismatches. Additionally, COVID-19 was only temporary, and the instrument should be timeless.
158. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, saying that there was no reference to the Spanish flu in the ILO Constitution or in the Treaty of Versailles. Drawing lessons from this precedence, he asked the Committee to construct the text of the clause carefully without making references to specific crises of the moment.
159. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced a subamendment to remove just “such as COVID-19” and keep the term “crises” as she believed that crises drove changes in the world of work.
160. The Government member of the United States objected to this subamendment, noting that the inclusion of crises by itself was not specific enough.
161. The Government members of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and India supported the amendment proposed by the United States as skills mismatch existed before the COVID-19 pandemic and statements should not be too predictive.
162. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the subamendment introduced by the Worker Vice-Chairperson, noting that the COVID-19 crisis was temporary and should not be placed in such an instrument, but “crises” could be kept.
163. The Government member of the United States pointed out that the term “crises” might be encompassed in the concept of rapid transformation.
164. The Worker Vice-Chairperson aligned her position with the majority that the term “crises” did not need to be spelled out.
165. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed with the Government member of the United States.
166. The amendment was adopted and an amendment submitted by the Workers’ group to the same sentence (A.45) fell.

A.2 and A.46

167. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert “shifts in supply and demand, leading to” before “skills mismatches”, as this more accurately expressed the transformations in the world of work.
168. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace “result in” with “exacerbate”, because the matters mentioned worsened rather than caused skills mismatches. Skills mismatches and shortages existed throughout the world prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.
169. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that while he did not support the amendment proposed by the Workers’ group, which was too specific, he supported the amendment by the Employers’ group.
170. The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew her amendment and supported the Employers’ group’s amendment.
171. The amendment introduced by the Employers’ group was adopted.

A.3 and A.47

- 172.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert “and skills shortages” between “mismatches” and “requiring”. Shortages of skilled people were evident in numerous countries around the world, according to a survey conducted by the IOE and the ILO Bureau for Employers’ Activities, and thus it would be relevant to mention “skills shortages” as well as mismatches.
- 173.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment to insert “and a need for new skills,” between “mismatches,” and “requiring”. However, she noted that since the amendment proposed by the Employers’ group made the same point she could accept their proposed amendment.
- 174.** The Government member of Saudi Arabia noted that the concept “skills mismatches” embraced “skills shortages”, thus considering that the amendment was redundant.
- 175.** The Government member of France speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, noted that “skills shortages” would be a useful addition and supported the amendment.
- 176.** The amendment by the Workers’ group was withdrawn and the amendment by the Employers’ group was adopted.

A.73

- 177.** The Government member of Saudi Arabia introduced an amendment to insert “recognizing” before “skills mismatches”. The Government members of Bahrain, Kuwait, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates seconded the amendment.
- 178.** Given that a previous amendment proposing to remove the words “as well as crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic” had been adopted, the amendment was withdrawn.

A.48 and A.90

- 179.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add “and decent work” at the end of the clause in order to emphasize the importance of having a reference to decent work in the Preamble.
- 180.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, agreeing that reference to decent work should be made early in the document.
- 181.** The Government member of India supported the amendment. The reference to Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 8 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development would give weight to the Preamble.
- 182.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment.
- 183.** The Government member of Argentina, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Brazil and Chile, therefore withdrew their proposed amendment to delete the word “full” and replace it with the word “decent” before “productive and freely chosen employment.
- 184.** The amendment by the Workers’ group was adopted.

A.1

- 185.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment to move clause (b) before clause (a), so that the positive aspects of apprenticeships would be highlighted before attention was drawn to the challenges.

- 186. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment as it would detract from the logical flow of the Preamble which would first address the problems before discussing solutions.
- 187. The Government members of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Argentina did not support the amendment as they agreed with the argument put forward by the Worker Vice-Chairperson.
- 188. The amendment was withdrawn.

A.30

- 189. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add the following new clause (a): “note that Members have committed to effective lifelong learning and quality education for all;” She argued that this had been discussed in the Human Resources Development Convention, 1975 (No. 142), Recommendation No. 195 and the general discussion on skills at the 109th Session (2021) of the Conference, which had provided backdrop particularly for apprenticeships. It would be relevant to set out this commitment from Member States in the Preamble.
- 190. The Employer Vice-Chairperson raised the question of whether this was a statement of facts, and in particular, whether governments in all countries had committed to funding lifelong learning and quality education for all. He wanted to listen to the views of Government members.
- 191. The Government members of Brazil, Bangladesh and India did not support the amendment as it was not entirely relevant to the instrument under discussion.
- 192. The Government member of the United States said that he supported the amendment, as apprenticeships were a part of lifelong learning.
- 193. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment for the reasons presented by Brazil, although he acknowledged the argument submitted by the Worker Vice-Chairperson.
- 194. The Government member of Argentina supported the amendment on the basis that apprenticeships were an embodiment of the education and training system.
- 195. The Government member of Chile supported the amendment on the basis that the definition of lifelong learning comprised both on-the-job and off-the-job training.
- 196. The Government member of Saudi Arabia suggested a subamendment to replace the word “committed”, which was not appropriate. The subamendment was not seconded and therefore fell.
- 197. The Government member of Kenya proposed a subamendment to read “Members recognize the importance of effective lifelong learning and quality education”, thus removing the reference to commitment.
- 198. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that she believed the amendment to be factually correct and requested the assistance of the secretariat to review the commitments made by Member States. Her understanding was that they had committed to effective lifelong learning and quality education for all in the conclusions adopted by the Conference its 109th Session (2021) after the general discussion on skills and lifelong learning.

- 199. The Government member of Panama supported the original amendment on the basis that knowledge changed over time, reinforcing the need for lifelong learning, which required a commitment by all stakeholders.
- 200. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and the Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment.
- 201. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that she would prefer to receive a clarification from the secretariat before making a decision on the amendment.
- 202. The Chairperson said that the secretariat would require time to look into the request and proposed to resume the discussion on the amendment at a later sitting.
- 203. When resuming the discussion, the representative of the Secretary-General (Deputy Director-General, Management and Reform) clarified that there were many statements from Member States recognizing the importance of lifelong learning. An example was the Preamble of Recommendation No. 195, which recognized “that lifelong learning contributes significantly to promoting the interests of individuals, enterprises, the economy and society as a whole,” and called on “governments to renew their commitment to lifelong learning”.
- 204. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment.
- 205. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not object to the subamendment but mentioned that it could be redundant as a similar point was already made in another section of the text.
- 206. The Government members of Australia and Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the subamendment.
- 207. The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 208. Point 3, clause (a) was adopted as amended.

New clause before (b)

A.96

- 209. The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew an amendment (A.31) and introduced an amendment to insert a new clause before (b) that read: “recall the need to prevent and eliminate abuses, and recognize the obligation to respect, realize and promote freedom of association and collective bargaining;”. She explained that workers experienced abuses due to regulatory gaps and that it was imperative to stress this obligation in the Preamble, even though reference to the relevance of ILO instruments for the protection of apprentices and trainees was made in clause (e).
- 210. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment. He reiterated that the proposed instrument should be positive, practical and pragmatic. He strongly emphasized that the proposed amendment would cast apprenticeships in an even more negative light, giving a misleading impression of the scope of abuse taking place. The Office reports did not stress that this was an issue. Moreover, he considered the amendment redundant in the light of the subsequent clause (e).
- 211. The Worker Vice-Chairperson clarified that making reference to the relevance of international labour standards was different from recognizing the obligation to respect and promote them.
- 212. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and the Government member of Saudi Arabia, speaking also on behalf of Oman and Qatar, did not support the amendment as the issue was already covered in another clause.

213. The Government member of India did not support the amendment.
214. The Worker Vice-Chairperson reiterated the importance of the amendment given the abuses and regulatory gaps reported on apprenticeships and that apprentices were denied their rights. She suggested deferring the discussion to a later sitting
215. The discussion was deferred to a later sitting when clause (e) would be considered.
216. When resuming the discussion, the Worker Vice-Chairperson reiterated that it was important to recognize the difficulties that apprentices faced and to include the role of the ILO in working to eliminate such abuses of labour protections and workers' rights in the Preamble.
217. The Employer Vice-Chairperson argued that the amendment was unnecessary. Freedom of association and collective bargaining, which he supported, were already referenced in point 3(g) and in point 15. He also expressed a concern that with the insertion of that text, the Preamble might give a negative and misleading impression that apprenticeships were associated with abuse. He suggested to focus on positive opportunities that apprenticeships could offer and how to make the system work well to realize the training opportunities and benefits.
218. The Government member of Canada, seconded by the Government members of Australia and the United States, proposed to replace "eliminate abuses" with "address labour rights violations".
219. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment.
220. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment or the subamendment. While he recognized the importance of protecting labour rights, he observed that the text already contained sufficient references to them. For instance, in clauses (c), (d) and (e).
221. The Government member of New Zealand supported the subamendment by Canada. Protection of apprentices was one of the objectives of the instrument and it was not inconsistent to include it in the Preamble.
222. The Government members of Cuba and Saudi Arabia, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, agreed with the Africa group that the Preamble already covered fundamental rights sufficiently.
223. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, recalled the need to respect and promote freedom of association, and supported the text as subamended.
224. The Employer Vice-Chairperson asked the secretariat whether "respect, realize and promote" was a standard way of referring to freedom of association and collective bargaining in recent ILO documents. He recalled that "effective recognition of the rights" was more frequently used language.
225. The representative of the Secretary-General clarified that the words used in the 1998 Declaration were "respect, promote and realize".
226. The Government members of Zambia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Türkiye aligned themselves with the Employer Vice-Chairperson, since the issue was already sufficiently and adequately covered in other parts of the instrument.
227. The Government member of New Zealand reiterated support for the amendment because it related to an important principle. He believed that what Workers' group referred to more than

pure labour rights violations, since apprentices could be subject to physical abuse, harassment, and violence.

- 228. The Worker Vice-Chairperson was surprised that the text had caused so much controversy. She reiterated the importance of recognizing difficulties and exploitative situations that people faced and set a standard to deal with those problems.
- 229. The Government member of Türkiye supported the first part of the text that recalled the need to prevent and address labour rights violations. However, given that a high proportion of apprentices in Türkiye were secondary-level students, he could not accept the second part of the text. In order to reach consensus, he proposed a subamendment seconded by the Africa group to delete “and recognize the need to respect, promote and realize freedom of association and collective bargaining”.
- 230. The Government member of Argentina did not support the subamendment.
- 231. The Employer Vice-Chairperson observed that not every apprenticeship arrangement was an employment contract. Therefore it was not accurate to discuss apprentice rights as labour rights.
- 232. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, regretted the deletion of the mention of “freedom of association and collective bargaining”, but stated he could accept the subamended text in the spirit of consensus.
- 233. The Worker Vice-Chairperson regretted that they did not have support and hoped they could continue the discussion in the following year’s discussion.
- 234. The representative of the Secretary-General clarified that amendments were not carried over from the first discussion to the second. After the first discussion, the Office would draft the proposed text of the Recommendation to be considered by the Conference the following year. During the second discussion, the proposed text would be subject to the same amendment process and the Workers’ group, as well as other Committee members, would have the possibility to submit their amendments on that occasion.
- 235. The amendment was withdrawn.

Point 3(b)

A.49

- 236. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add “the promotion and development of” after “recognize that” and “by governments” after “apprenticeships”. With regard to the first addition, she argued that the original formulation gave a very individualistic connotation to apprenticeships as a single entity responsible for effective and efficient responses to the challenges and opportunities of the changing labour market. Quality apprenticeships should be viewed through a systemic lens. The addition of “by governments” was essential for preventing an impression that the responsibility of quality apprenticeships lay on individual apprentices or individually designed apprenticeships. The proposed amendment would therefore clarify government responsibilities in promoting and developing a quality apprenticeships framework and other systemic aspects of the instrument.
- 237. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the addition of “the promotion and development of” but not the addition of “by governments” since the promotion and development of quality

apprenticeships was a shared responsibility. Therefore, he proposed a subamendment to remove the words “by governments”.

- 238. The Government members of India, Bangladesh and Brazil supported the subamendment, noting that the promotion and development of quality apprenticeships was a shared responsibility among governments and workers’ and employers’ organizations.
- 239. The Government member of Argentina did not support the subamendment because the collective responsibility was dependent on and linked to systemic regulations, which was primarily the responsibility of government.
- 240. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support either the amendment or the subamendment as he preferred the clear and concise original text.
- 241. In the spirit of consensus, the Worker Vice-Chairperson accepted the subamendment.
- 242. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

A.83

- 243. The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of the Government member of Canada, introduced an amendment to add “lead to decent work,” after “apprenticeships can”. Quality apprenticeships could often lead to better job quality, better life outcomes for workers, and therefore decent work. He also noted that while the link to decent work was already made in the previous clause it would still be useful to include it in clause (b) which focused on solutions.
- 244. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, the Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Saudi Arabia and Oman supported the amendment.
- 245. The amendment was adopted.

A.52

- 246. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace “constitute” with “contribute to” before “effective and efficient responses”, as the word “contribute” would more appropriately convey the overall message of the clause.
- 247. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment as he noted that “contribute to” diluted the point of the clause.
- 248. The Government member of Oman supported the amendment as the new wording was more comprehensive.
- 249. In response to the comments made by the Employer Vice-Chairperson, the Worker Vice-Chairperson clarified that the word “contribute” would fit better in the context of the rest of the sentence than “constitute”, as apprenticeships would be one of the solutions to the current challenges in the labour market, rather than being the only one.
- 250. The Government members of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Argentina supported the amendment based on the clarification provided by the Worker Vice-Chairperson.
- 251. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that he could agree to the amendment.
- 252. The amendment was adopted.

A.53

- 253. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add “systemic” before “resilience”, stating that it was important to address resilience at the systemic rather than the individual level.
- 254. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, noting that a broader notion of “resilience” should be used because one of the benefits of qualified apprenticeship was employability of workers which established personal resilience. Qualified apprentices would also, in turn, engender resilience of enterprises and beyond.
- 255. The Worker Vice-Chairperson clarified that the proposed amendment aimed to avoid placing any negative connotation to the term “resilience”, which had sometimes been used negatively, such as in situations of forced labour where people had been told that they should be more resilient.
- 256. The Government member of Saudi Arabia did not support the amendment.
- 257. The Employer Vice-Chairperson highlighted that in June 2021 the Conference had adopted a Global Call to Action for a human-centred recovery from the COVID-19 crisis that is inclusive, sustainable and resilient (Global Call to Action). Therefore, the term “resilient” was used with a positive connotation in high-level ILO documents.
- 258. The Government member of Brazil said that she preferred the original text although the concerns raised by the Worker Vice-Chairperson were valid.
- 259. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to replace “systemic resilience” with “economic resilience”.
- 260. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and the Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment.
- 261. The amendment was withdrawn.

A.54

- 262. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace “current and future” before “labour market needs” with “worker and” to highlight workers’ needs as well.
- 263. The Government member of Zambia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the proposed amendment as she preferred that the focus on current and future labour market needs be retained.
- 264. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, and supported by the Government member of Canada, proposed a subamendment to retain “current and future” and to insert “worker and” before “current”.
- 265. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment or the subamendment.
- 266. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that she could agree to retention of the words “current and future”.
- 267. The Employer Vice-Chairperson expressed concern about inserting “workers” before “labour market needs” as it might imply that training systems would provide skills with little pathways into work.
- 268. The Government member of the United States, seconded by the Government member of Saudi Arabia and the Government member of Senegal, speaking on behalf of the Africa group,

submitted another subamendment so that the text would read: “current and future worker, employer and labour market needs”.

- 269.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that she could accept the subamendment.
- 270.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson requested to defer the discussion of the amendment as subamended, as it contained ambiguity as to the meaning of the word “worker” in that context.
- 271.** When resuming the discussion, the Worker Vice-Chairperson reiterated that the intention of their amendment was to highlight that quality apprenticeships contributed to workers’ personal development, as reflected in the text of Recommendation No.195. She proposed to replace “worker, employer and” with “worker needs for personal development” in order to align the text with the wording of the Recommendation.
- 272.** The Government member of the United States supported the proposal. He was flexible with whether “employer and” was retained or not, and wished to make the clause as inclusive as possible.
- 273.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed with focusing on worker needs for personal development if it also included workers who were not working. He preferred to retain “employer and” so that their needs were also included.
- 274.** The Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, noted that workers and employers were part of the labour market; therefore, he suggested to subamend the text to read “current and future needs of apprentices and employers and labour market needs”.
- 275.** The Government members of New Zealand and Saudi Arabia, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, as well as the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons, supported the proposed text.
- 276.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.

A.72

- 277.** The Government member of Argentina, speaking on behalf of the Government members of Brazil and Chile, introduced an amendment to add “according to national circumstances and regulations” at the end of clause (b), after “labour market needs”.
- 278.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment as the Preamble should set the scene for that framework. The operative clauses would ensure that the instrument be implemented according to national circumstances.
- 279.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed with the Worker Vice-Chairperson and recalled that the conclusions would provide guidance to implementation according to national laws and regulations.
- 280.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed that issues of national circumstances should be discussed in different parts of the text.
- 281.** The amendment was withdrawn.
- 282.** Point 3, clause (b) was adopted as amended.

Point 3(c)**A.55**

- 283.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendment to insert “effective” before “framework”.
- 284.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as the need for effectiveness was implicit. He said that including too many qualifiers would lead to the text becoming dense and hard to follow.
- 285.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment, on the understanding that the term “effective” referred to the framework as a whole.
- 286.** The Government member of Argentina also supported the amendment.
- 287.** The amendment was adopted.

A.58

- 288.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert “well-regulated” before “equitably funded,”. She explained that “well-regulated” was good terminology because the work of the Committee was about regulation, and it applied both to the content and to the extent of regulation.
- 289.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment because a reference to regulation belonged to clause (d) rather than (c) which was about other concepts. He could accept the insertion of “well-regulated” in clause (d).
- 290.** The Government members of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States; and Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment as it added clarity and value to the clause.
- 291.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson disagreed with the proposal of the Employers’ group to insert the words in clause (d) because the value of the qualifier was in clause (c) which described the overall framework. She pointed out the strong support from the governments for this wording in the responses to the questionnaire.
- 292.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson accepted the amendment.
- 293.** The amendment was adopted.

A.4 and A.60

- 294.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment (A.4) to replace “equitably” with “sustainably”. He believed that the term “equity” was ambiguous and the term “equitably funded” might beg the question by whom this would be assured. Noting that the amendment submitted by the Workers’ group (A.60) also suggested to remove “equitable” and replace it with “sufficiently”, he preferred the term “sustainable” over “sufficiently funded”, since sustainability was an important basis for a quality apprenticeship system and reflected stability, consistency, and reliability in the system. He pointed out that the meaning of being sustainable already encompassed the notion of “sufficiently funded”.
- 295.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed with the removal of the term “equitably”. However, she preferred “sufficiently funded” over “sustainable” as the replacement. She believed that the term “sufficiently funded” provided a more precise and clear meaning to the clause.

- 296. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported both amendments, and therefore proposed a subamendment to include “, sustainable, sufficiently funded” before “inclusive”.
- 297. The Government members of Canada, India and Bangladesh, as well as the Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment proposed by France.
- 298. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

A.57

- 299. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace the text “apprenticeships” with “them” to refer to both apprenticeships and traineeships. She explained that this amendment related to other amendments that the group proposed. Thus, she requested to defer the discussion on this amendment as it would be better to revisit it once the Committee had discussed traineeships.
- 300. The Employer Vice-Chairperson also agreed to defer the discussion. He noted that it would be more efficient to discuss this amendment once other amendments for the same clause were discussed and agreed upon.
- 301. When the Committee decided, at a later sitting, to remove the references to traineeships and trainees from the entire text (see paragraphs 529–536 below), the amendment fell.

A.61

- 302. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert “socially” before “inclusive”. She noted that the term “socially inclusive” highlighted the importance of ensuring an inclusive apprenticeship system particularly for those workers and young people who may not necessarily have all the required educational qualifications needed to access apprenticeships.
- 303. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, while agreeing with the views expressed by the Workers’ group, did not support the amendment as the term “inclusive” already addressed the concerns raised by them. On the contrary, he noted that the term “socially” could be misinterpreted as it was ambiguous and the meaning of the term varies between national contexts. He argued that the amendment may be counterproductive as it could limit the scope of what “inclusive apprenticeships” ought to be, depending on how different governments would interpret the term “socially”.
- 304. The Government members of Bangladesh, and France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment, as they concurred with the views put forward by the Employers’ group. The Government member of Bangladesh requested further clarification on the term “socially inclusive” if it was to be included in the clause.
- 305. Responding to the questions and concerns expressed by the Employers’ group and Government members, the Worker Vice-Chairperson reiterated that “socially inclusive” was intended to cover class discrimination alongside other forms of discrimination and disadvantages. However, she understood the views of Government members and invited the secretariat to provide text that was used more frequently in those circumstances which could be applied.

- 306. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, proposed a subamendment to include “, including socially inclusive” after “inclusive”. That would keep the text sufficiently broad while also highlighting the concerns of the workers.
- 307. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment, stating that Article 1(a) and (b) of the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111) had already well addressed class or social distinctions. He cautioned that the Committee should not redraft a powerful and long-standing concept in one of the fundamental Conventions.
- 308. The Chairperson asked the secretariat to provide clarification.
- 309. The representative of the Secretary-General proposed to retain the word “inclusive” and add “all forms of” before “discrimination”, which would read: “inclusive and free from all forms of discrimination”.
- 310. The Worker Vice-Chairperson accepted the proposal made by the secretariat.
- 311. The Government members of Bangladesh, Namibia, Oman, Saudi Arabia and Singapore did not support the text suggested by the secretariat, preferring the original text as it gave a comprehensive meaning.
- 312. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the text suggested by the secretariat.
- 313. The Employer Vice-Chairperson maintained his group’s position to keep the original text, emphasizing that it was clear in its intent as preambular text.
- 314. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, accepted to keep the original text in the interests of consensus.
- 315. The subamendment and the amendment were not adopted.

A.62

- 316. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add “and exploitation” after “discrimination”, emphasizing the importance of recognition in the preambular paragraph of various forms of exploitations which apprentices and trainees had been experiencing, and the need to eliminate those exploitative practices.
- 317. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, explaining that he could understand the concerns, however, the right way to frame it would be to apply the language which was reflective of the tone and approaches of the Organization over a century of operation.
- 318. The Government member of Saudi Arabia, speaking on behalf of GCC countries, supported the amendment, noting that issues of exploitation went hand in hand with discrimination due to lack of law enforcement. Adding the word “exploitation” to “discrimination” would add more protection to the workers.
- 319. The Government members of Argentina, Bangladesh, India, Islamic Republic of Iran, Oman and Panama, France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment.
- 320. The Employer Vice-Chairperson reiterated his objection to the amendment because the proposed term was intemperate and unparliamentary. He requested the secretariat to inform the Committee of the frequency of the use of the term “exploitation” in Conventions and Recommendations.

- 321. The Worker Vice-Chairperson pointed out that there was a clear support for the amendment from Government delegates and emphasized that exploitation affected many people that the instrument was seeking to help, and that was the reason for which the Committee discussed regulating apprenticeships.
- 322. When resuming the discussion at a later sitting, the representative of the Secretary-General, in response to the question by the Employer Vice-Chairperson, stated that the term “exploitation” had been commonly used in both past and recent instruments, such as the Protocol of 2014 to the Forced Labour Convention, 1930, the Indigenous and Tribal Populations Recommendation, 1957 (No. 104), the Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment (Disabled Persons) Recommendation, 1983 (No. 168), and the Employment Policy (Supplementary Provisions) Recommendation, 1984 (No. 169). He made particular mention of paragraph 36(g) of Recommendation No. 104, which was relatable to young apprentices.
- 323. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment because the use of the term “exploitation” in ILO instruments was not contemporary and associated with unique vulnerabilities. He considered that the term would be inappropriate in the context of a contemporary learning environment.
- 324. The Government member of New Zealand did not agree with that view of the term “exploitation”. Instead, he felt that it recognized a contemporary problem which everyone was aware of and had to be dealt with.
- 325. The Government members of Australia, Argentina, Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and the United States agreed with the Government member of New Zealand and supported the amendment.
- 326. The amendment was adopted.

A.5 and A.27

- 327. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add “and diversity” after “to promote gender equality”, noting a structural difference in points 21 and 22 of the proposed Conclusions. He argued that it was important to note both gender equality and diversity.
- 328. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, proposed an amendment to include “and balance” after “to promote gender equality”, highlighting the importance of gender balance among apprentices. As he fully supported the amendment proposed by the Employers’ group, he proposed to include it by subamending his group’s amendment to read “promote gender equality and balance, and diversity”.
- 329. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment proposed by France which combined the two amendments.
- 330. The Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, objected to both amendments because the word “balanced” was subsumed by the word “equality”. He also added that the notion of “diversity” was already encompassed in the phrase “free from discrimination”.
- 331. The Government members of Bangladesh, India and Namibia aligned with the Africa group.
- 332. The Government member of Saudi Arabia supported the subamended amendment because equality and balance were distinct notions, and hence proposed to keep both words.

- 333. The Employer Vice-Chairperson suggested deferring the discussion to allow time for more reflection. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed.
- 334. When resuming the discussion, the Employer Vice-Chairperson reminded the Committee that the amended point 21 read “Members should take appropriate measures to promote gender equality and balance in apprenticeship and in access to apprenticeships.” and the Committee had also adopted the title of section VI, which read “Equality and diversity in quality apprenticeships”. On that basis, he supported clause (c) to read “to promote gender equality, balance and diversity”.
- 335. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed on being consistent with agreed language.
- 336. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the views of the Employers’ group.
- 337. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, proposed to delete “and diversity” to remain consistent with the text of point 21.
- 338. The Government member of Brazil clarified that the inclusion of the term “balance” in point 21 and the inclusion of the term “diversity” in the chapeau of point 22 were two separate matters. She proposed to insert “and” before “balance” to be coherent with other parts of the text.
- 339. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, proposed to add “in accordance with national laws” after “diversity”.
- 340. The Chairperson noted that there seemed to be agreement in the Committee on the text “to promote gender equality and balance, and diversity” without the addition proposed by the Africa group.
- 341. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

A.6

- 342. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete “to provide appropriate remuneration and social protection coverage” because the phrase failed to recognize the diversity of apprenticeship systems and arrangements, including transfer of money to apprentices (such as compensation, stipend, and allowances), that exist throughout the world. Furthermore, it was not appropriate to include them in the Preamble, as the substantive description on the concept was included in subsequent points (point 14). He cautioned that if the original wording were to be retained in the clause, it might be disturbing to education and training arrangements.
- 343. The Worker Vice-Chairperson dismissed the amendment and stressed the importance of making these statements in the Preamble because it reflected the expectations of the framework and what should be provided for apprentices. She further pointed out that remuneration was indeed provided to apprentices in many countries, and that the original phrase enjoyed support from many Government members.
- 344. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment. He acknowledged the importance of remuneration and social protection for apprentices and suggested the Committee to identify an appropriate way of describing various forms of remuneration, rather than omitting the whole phrase.
- 345. The Government member of the United States also opposed the removal of remuneration and social protection from the preambular provision. He referred to remuneration in

apprenticeships as a fundamental attribute of quality apprenticeships. Similarly, he requested that the reference to social protection coverage be retained.

- 346. The Government members of India and Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment.
- 347. The amendment was withdrawn.
- 348. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, withdrew an amendment (A.66) to support instead the amendment proposed by EU Member States, because it also reflected the intention of the Africa group.

A.22 and A.67

- 349. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, introduced the amendment to replace “remuneration” with “pay or other compensation”. He asked the secretariat to clarify the scope of the term “remuneration”, recognizing that various forms of payment, including stipend and transportation tickets, were provided in different systems of apprenticeships in different countries.
- 350. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace the word “appropriate” with “adequate” making it read “adequate remuneration” to ensure that apprentices would have sufficient payment in order to engage in apprenticeship who otherwise might not have had access to apprenticeships. She assured that the language was in line with existing ILO discussions and instruments.
- 351. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment from the Workers’ group because the qualifier “adequate” did not fit in the many diverse practices of payment to apprentices across countries. Moreover, adequacy could not become an overall qualifier because it is becoming very subjective. He further highlighted that also the Minimum Wage Fixing Convention, 1970 (No. 131), did not contain an absolute characterization of a minimum wage. Rather, he suggested to mention that there should be a payment, and this payment should be considered to be in line with the law in practice, also recalling other instruments and provisions.
- 352. He proposed to subamend the amendment by EU Members States by replacing “pay or other compensations” with “allowances, stipends, remuneration, or other forms of payments having regard to national laws and practices” in order to reflect the diversity of practices.
- 353. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment as she felt it inappropriate for a preambular paragraph. She also disagreed with listing different kinds of titles of payment or compensations and mentioning national laws and practice in the Preamble.
- 354. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, objected to the subamendment proposed by the Employers’ group and stated that replacing “remuneration” with “pay or other compensation” would encompass the list proposed by the Employers’ group.
- 355. The Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the subamendment proposed by the Employers’ group, as it might cause confusions on the meaning of different payments on the list.
- 356. The Government member of Argentina did not support the amendment “pay or other compensation”. The notion of compensation might be abused, as for example, when compensation was not in monetary terms, but in kind.

357. The Government member of Brazil supported the original amendment since it covered much of the language in the general sense and avoided listing. She asked for clarification on the difference between “adequate” and “appropriate”. Asking what was the purpose of replacing one by the other.
358. The Government member of Canada did not support the subamendment proposed by the Employer Vice-Chairperson, but rather supported the amendment proposed by EU Member States as it was more global and inclusive and avoided listings.
359. The Government member of Cameroon observed that, according to the Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100), which concerned equality of payment, the term “remuneration” includes “the orderly basic salary, minimum salaries, and all other perks that are paid directly or indirectly by the employer to the worker for the employment of the latter”. A real problem was that, generally, the apprentice was not considered to be a worker. If considered a worker, then the Labour Code would need to be applied with all the consequences that entailed. This might prevent employers from promoting apprenticeship.
360. The Government member of India did not support the amendment “pay or other compensation” since it might imply that the labour law would be applied to apprenticeships. India supported the original wording of “remuneration”.
361. The representative of the Secretary-General clarified that Article 1(a) of Convention No. 100 defines “remuneration” to include “the ordinary basic or minimum wage or salary and any additional emoluments whatsoever, payable directly or indirectly, whether in cash or in kind”. In Paragraph 4(1) of Recommendation No. 60, “remuneration” was referred to as “in cash or otherwise”.
362. The Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, in the 2012 General Survey, observed that “remuneration” under the Conventions they were looking at included “wage differentials regiments, cost of living allowances, dependency allowances, travel allowances or expenses, housing or residential allowances. It also includes benefits in kind, such as the provision of accommodation or food, and it includes all allowances paid under social security schemes financed by the undertaking or industry concerned”.
363. The term remuneration had been used before in ILO instruments relating to apprenticeships, namely in Recommendations Nos 60 and 117. The usage and definition of remuneration in ILO instruments was broad enough to encompass many different forms of compensation.
364. The Worker Vice-Chairperson summarized the two issues to be addressed. The first concerned replacing “remuneration” with “pay or other compensation” proposed by the EU and its Member States and the second, replacing “appropriate” with “adequate”, proposed by the Workers’ group.
365. Based on the secretariat’s review of definitions and usage, the term “remuneration” was more comprehensive than “compensation” since it referred to any pay or benefit that someone receives from their employer.
366. The word “adequate” in association with “remuneration” was in line with terminology used in previous instruments and statements, including, in addition to those already cited, the Centenary Declaration and Recommendation No. 117, as well as the G20 report *Key Elements of Quality Apprenticeships*, 2012, prepared by the Task Force on Employment.
367. The Employer Vice-Chairperson suggested that both “appropriate” and “adequate” were subjective terms. Should a qualifier be required, the original wording by the Office was

preferred. His group needed more time to consider the amendment proposed by EU Member States, as well as other issues and considerations raised during the discussion.

- 368. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, noted that the distinction between “appropriate” and “adequate” was relatively weak, both in English and French, and both terms are subjective. It was their understanding that “adequate” provided greater protection to apprentices and better reflected the intention of the clause. Regarding remuneration, their understanding of the secretariat’s explanation based on Convention No. 100 was that the scope of the term remuneration did not cover, for example, stipend grants given by States for apprentices. Therefore, they reiterated their proposed amendment to namely replace “remuneration” by “pay or other compensation”, which given agreed language, covered that kind of modality.
- 369. Given the rather broad definition of remuneration provided by the secretariat, the Government member of the United States, preferred to retain the Office’s original formulation. The term “remuneration” was used quite often in the document, and they could perhaps add “grants” or “government stipends” or another term that would cover the concerns of EU Member States. They had no strong preference regarding “appropriate” or “adequate”, but apprentices should be paid a fair wage that could sustain them. Therefore if “adequate” was deemed to be stronger than “appropriate” they could support “adequate”.
- 370. The Government member of Oman, speaking also on behalf of Saudi Arabia and Qatar, wished to either support the suggestion of EU Member States to not retain only the word “remuneration”, or find another word to reflect the way that their Governments supported the apprenticeship system.
- 371. The Government member of Gabon aligned herself with the Africa group. She reflected that “adequate” and “appropriate” were similar in definition but “appropriate” in her view was more adequate as it brought out the fairness of remuneration.
- 372. In an attempt to reach consensus, the Government member of Canada proposed to use “fair” instead of “appropriate” or “adequate”.
- 373. At a later sitting, when the Committee reached an agreement on the text at the beginning of point 14(a) to read: “receive adequate remuneration or other financial compensation”, the Committee agreed to adopt the Workers’ group’s amendment to insert “adequate” as subamended to also insert “or other financial compensation,” after “remuneration”.
- 374. Consequently, the amendment submitted by EU Member States fell.

A.7

- 375. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add “and productivity” at the end of the clause, after “employment outcomes”. One key benefit of apprenticeships for employers was their instrumental role in improving productivity. Upon completion of an apprenticeship, the consequently highly skilled and productive worker would make a strong and positive contribution. It was important to reflect this positive effect of apprenticeships.
- 376. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment. The language of the clause read that apprenticeships should be inclusive, free from discrimination, provide appropriate remuneration and social coverage, and lead to recognized qualifications. To include productivity in that way did not seem to reflect that they were talking about the productivity of the employers, rather it appeared to talk about the productivity of the individual. The Preamble text was for a quality framework and how apprentices could benefit from the process. It was not the right place for the word “productivity”.

- 377. The Government member of India shared the views of the Workers' group and did not support the amendment. Apprenticeships were a training process and linking them to productivity was not the right onus.
- 378. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, also shared the Workers' group's opinion and did not support the amendment. Improving productivity was indirect and too far from quality apprenticeships for that particular clause.
- 379. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment but wished to note that the Centenary Declaration mentioned "productive" and "productivity" 11 times. Without productivity there were no sustainable enterprises and jobs, no capacity for providing employment, social progress or social goods, and that a reference to the productive good and positive aspects of apprenticeship systems would be important.
- 380. The amendment was withdrawn.
- 381. Point 3, clause (c) was adopted as amended.

Point 3(d)

A.34

- 382. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add "consider that sometimes those in work-based learning are used to replace workers;" at the beginning of clause (d) as a reminder that employers had occasionally made use of apprenticeship systems to obtain cheap labour or to replace their existing employees for cost-cutting reasons. Such a statement could encourage governments to better regulate apprenticeship systems, including internships to ensure that existing workers were not replaced. The amendment was intended to reflect also the resolution concerning the youth employment crisis adopted by the Conference at its 101st Session (2012) which observed that "Education, training and lifelong learning foster a virtuous cycle of improved employability, higher productivity, income growth and development", and also highlighted that "such mechanisms can run the risk, in some cases, of being used as a way of obtaining cheap labour or replacing existing workers", and encouraged governments to regulate and monitor "apprenticeship, internship and other work-experience schemes, including through certification, to ensure they allow for a real learning experience and not replace regular workers".
- 383. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, suggesting that it added an unduly negative and anecdotal connotation to the Preamble without necessarily offering a solution or enhancement to the overall instrument. It was important to frame the instrument in ways that would attract employers to engage with the apprenticeship systems, and expressed concerns that the amendment may discourage employers from using apprenticeship systems.
- 384. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment as he found the wording too vague.
- 385. The Government members of Oman, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, Brazil and India agreed with the concerns raised by the Employers' group and did not support the amendment.
- 386. The Government member of Brazil observed, however, that the concerns raised by the Workers' group were very important and should be included elsewhere in the proposed Conclusions.

- 387.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment noting insufficient support. However, she stressed that her group would come back to the matter later, as the issue of bringing in trainees and apprentices to replace existing workers for cost-cutting reasons was a fact the Workers' group was aware of.

A.8

- 388.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add "appropriately" before "regulated" as government regulations were sometimes overly complex benefiting neither apprentices nor employers.
- 389.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment noting that the word "appropriately" added ambiguity and confusion to the overall meaning of the clause. Moreover, "appropriately" also gave a negative connotation to the concept of regulation. At the same time, she echoed the concerns raised by the Employers' group and suggested to address it in other operative parts of the proposed instrument.
- 390.** The Government member of India did not support the amendment as the term "appropriately" was vague and could be subject to interpretation. In certain contexts, low levels of regulation could be considered appropriate while in some other contexts, high levels may be considered appropriate.
- 391.** The Government member of the United States did not support the amendment noting that government regulations were generally formulated based on the inputs from various stakeholders involved and therefore, adding the word "appropriately" was not necessary.
- 392.** The Government member of Oman, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, did not support the amendment as the term "appropriately" in relation to regulation was confusing and imprecise. He noted that it was important to make the apprenticeship system more attractive and sustainable and therefore, it was important to avoid ambiguity in the Preamble.
- 393.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment but he cautioned that there were inconsistencies in the approach to the discussion citing qualifiers such as "appropriate" and "adequate" in relation to remuneration.

A.86

- 394.** The Government member of Argentina, speaking also on behalf of Brazil and Chile, introduced an amendment to add "within the framework of social dialogue," after "regulated", noting that States had responsibility over establishing regulation which should be based on consensus achieved through social dialogue.
- 395.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 396.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment, stating that the proposed amendment raised more questions than it answered as to the nature of the regulation regarding how it should be devised and implemented. He added that if the purpose was to emphasize the benefits of working with social partners, he would suggest a subamendment to replace the text of the amendment "within the framework of social dialogue," by ", including by involving all relevant stakeholders, especially social partners" to be inserted after "regulated".
- 397.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment, but would be open to doing so if the wording were improved. As it stood, the amendment could be misinterpreted in different jurisdictions.

- 398. The Government member of Argentina stated that she was open to the possibility of improving the wording of the amendment.
- 399. The Government members of Argentina and the United States supported the subamendment proposed by EU Member States.
- 400. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment, emphasizing that social partners had a special place in the framework of social dialogue and therefore the words should be retained.
- 401. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, insisted that the subamendment was necessary as the initial amendment was far too ambiguous in relation to the regulatory role that the State had to play regarding apprenticeships.
- 402. The Government member of Uganda did not support the subamendment and preferred the amendment as originally proposed by the Government member of Argentina, highlighting that the Preamble was to provide the context. Details of how the regulation should be formulated would be addressed in a later part of the proposed Conclusions.
- 403. In view of comments provided by the Government members of Uganda and of South Sudan, the United States withdrew its support for the subamendment, preferring the amendment as originally proposed by Argentina.
- 404. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, mentioned that he could support the original text without the amendment in the interests of consensus.
- 405. The Government member of Zambia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, clarified that he supported the amendment as originally proposed by the Government member of Argentina, not the original text.
- 406. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, emphasized that the ambiguity brought about by the amendment on the sharing of the roles between the government and social partners regarding regulation was not acceptable. He added that the inclusion of "involving social partners" was acceptable, and alternative wording was welcomed.
- 407. The Government member of the United States, seconded by EU Members States, proposed a further subamendment to replace "within the framework of social dialogue," by ", including through social dialogue" after "regulate".
- 408. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the further subamendment proposed by the Government member of the United States.
- 409. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

A.87

- 410. The Government member of Argentina, speaking also on behalf of Brazil and Chile, introduced an amendment to add after "providing" the phrase "relevant initial and continuous vocational training services", deleting "benefits, and", and replacing "protection" with "protecting" because training should be relevant to the needs in the workplace.
- 411. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment as he preferred the original structure of the clause and was concerned that the addition would confuse and detract from the overall message.

412. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment as she had concerns about the deletion of “benefits”.

413. The amendment was withdrawn.

A.9

414. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add “to potential apprentices and employers, particularly micro, small and medium-sized enterprises” after “apprenticeships” with the intention of directing consideration of the audience to whom the measures should be focused.

415. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced a subamendment to replace the word “particularly” with “including” because she would like to avoid putting a sole focus on MSMEs and discourage other employers.

416. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment proposed by the Worker Vice-Chairperson.

417. The Government members of the United States and France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment as subamended.

418. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

A.70

419. The Workers’ group had submitted an amendment to replace the “apprenticeships” at the end of the clause by “work-based education and training system” to make the focus of the point slightly broader than just “apprenticeships”. However, taking into account the Committee’s decision concerning traineeships (see paragraphs 529–536 below), the Worker Vice-Chairperson said that if Committee members preferred to retain the term “apprenticeships”, she could also support it.

420. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, and the Government members of Canada and Uganda preferred the use of the term “apprenticeships”.

421. The amendment was not adopted.

422. Point 3, clause (d) was adopted as amended.

New clause after (d)

A.10

423. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendment to insert a new clause to read: “emphasize the importance of openness to lifelong learning and adaptation;”. This would broaden the focus of the instrument to explicitly include other possible pathways to decent work such as through adult apprenticeships, in the Preamble. He referred to the discussion of the need to adapt and embrace new ways of working during the Conference in 2021. The amendment was proposed to implicitly read “emphasize the importance of openness to lifelong learning and adaptation to changing labour market circumstances”, as apprenticeships should equip people to be more robust and flexible to changing circumstances.

424. The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed concern about the inclusion of the words “and adaptation” or any additional texts.

- 425. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment. There was no link between the concept of adaptation and the subject of discussion, and the proposed wording was too vague and broad.
- 426. The Government member of Oman, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, said he could support the amendment except the words “and adaptation”, and thus proposed a subamendment to read “emphasize the importance of openness to lifelong learning”.
- 427. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Canada supported the subamendment.
- 428. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment and proposed to further add “quality education for all” so that the text would read, “emphasize the importance of quality education for all and openness to lifelong learning”. Quality education was both a precursor and part of lifelong learning. Both were necessary to realize the full benefits of apprenticeship. It was also aligned with SDG 4.
- 429. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment also with reference to SDG 4. He recalled that employers rely on an educated and work-ready workforce.
- 430. The Government members of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Australia supported the subamendment.
- 431. The Government member of Oman, speaking also on behalf of Saudi Arabia and Qatar, did not support the subamendment as all education should be of quality.
- 432. The Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, objected to the subamendment as not all skills were acquired through education. In Africa, there were apprenticeships entirely done on-the-job. He did not consider quality education relevant to a Recommendation on apprenticeships.
- 433. The Chairperson asked to the Government members of Oman and Uganda if they would be willing to join the consensus.
- 434. The Government members of Oman and Uganda and the countries they represented aligned themselves with the consensus. The Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, wanted to put on record that some developing countries did not only focus on young people, but also on those people who had dropped out of school long ago and also needed skills. The Committee was not only considering a dual system, where training would be done both off-the-job and on-the-job. For the purpose of progress, however, they would join the consensus.
- 435. The amendment was adopted as subamended and the new clause was adopted.

New clause before (e)

A.11

- 436. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new clause which he subamended to replace “through” by “quality” and to delete “TVET-systems”. The new clause would thus read, “recognize that quality apprenticeships can support entrepreneurship, self-employment, job creation and the growth and sustainability of enterprises”. The purpose was to emphasize some of the important benefits of effective apprenticeship systems and was not subject to the type of objections as were raised, for example, with regard to the addition of “productivity” in an earlier clause.

- 437. The Worker Vice-Chairperson welcomed the subamendment and proposed a further subamendment to add “employability and transition to the formal economy” after “self-employment” so that the text would read: “recognize that quality apprenticeships can support entrepreneurship, self-employment, employability and transition to the formal economy, job creation and the growth and sustainability of enterprises;”.
- 438. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, proposed a further subamendment to remove the terms “self-employment” and “transition to the formal economy” on the basis that the term “employability” includes both concepts.
- 439. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the text as further subamended.
- 440. The Government member of Uganda speaking in support of the subamendment proposed by the Africa group, reiterated that employability covered both self-employment and paid employment. The definition of employment encompassed work for both pay or profit. The self-employed who worked for profit were thus also covered by the concept of employability.
- 441. The Government member of Cameroon supported the argument of the Government member of Uganda and added that employability also included job creation.
- 442. The Government member of Burkina Faso explained that the term “employability” encompassed: (1) an employee employed by an enterprise; (2) the self-employed/employer; and (3) the notion of becoming more efficient and productive at work. It also included the transition to the formal economy to some extent.
- 443. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the further subamendment proposed by the Africa group. The inclusion of “the transition to the formal economy” was an important additional element to acknowledge that the transition to the formal economy benefited both the individuals and economy.
- 444. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the Africa group’s subamendment. It was important to retain the word “self-employment” as it encompassed individuals who would otherwise not be accounted for if removed. He also supported the view expressed by the Worker Vice-Chairperson regarding the importance of retaining “transition to the formal economy”.
- 445. The Government members of Brazil and Chile did not support the further subamendment on the basis that each term addressed different and helpful additional notions.
- 446. In a spirit of compromise, the Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, withdrew the subamendment.
- 447. The amendment was adopted as subamended by the Employers’ and the Workers’ groups. Therefore, the new clause was adopted.

Point 3(f)

A.81

- 448. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert “, the Private Employment Agencies Convention, 1997 (No. 181), before “the Human Resource Development”, emphasizing the importance and relevance to the instrument of the regulation of intermediaries such as private employment agencies and their recruitment and placement practices.

- 449. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment as it considered the addition relevant.
- 450. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment as he agreed that reference to private employment agencies was relevant and useful.
- 451. The amendment was adopted.
- 452. Point 3, clause (f) was adopted as amended.

New clause after (f)

A.36

- 453. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert after clause (f) a new clause to read: "recall the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights;". Reference to these important international standards was relevant in providing context to the instrument.
- 454. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment but suggested inserting the new clause before clause (e).
- 455. The Government member of Cameroon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment as it was part of the objective they were all pursuing.
- 456. The Government members of Chile and the United States agreed with EU Member States that the clause should be inserted before clause (e).
- 457. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not object to the amendment, but was concerned about its imprecision. He felt that a standardized recourse to recitation of instruments was creeping in. That type of general recitation was a dangerous precedence that would not help the Committee to develop a substantive and specific instrument.
- 458. The amendment was adopted as subamended. Therefore the new clause was adopted.

A.37

- 459. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new clause to read: "note that this instrument in no way diminishes the protection afforded to apprentices and trainees under international labour standards." It was important to clarify that the instrument would be complementary to existing labour standards and could in no way weaken or supersede them.
- 460. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment noting that a Recommendation could never weaken another standard if it was not explicitly mentioned in one of its provisions. Therefore, he believed that the proposed additions were unnecessary. Raising such issues in the Preamble might generate confusion. Nevertheless, to respond to the Workers' group's concerns, he proposed a subamendment for the clause to read: "note that this instrument is not intended to diminish the protection afforded to apprentices and trainees under existing laws or regulations."
- 461. The Government member of Zambia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment or the subamendment. A Recommendation could never diminish protection provided by existing laws or regulations. As there were no existing international labour standards that offered protection to apprentices, the logic of the amendment was unclear.

- 462. The Government member of New Zealand did not support the amendment or the subamendment noting that such clause could easily be misinterpreted.
- 463. The Government member of Brazil, agreed with the views expressed by the Government members of Zambia and New Zealand.
- 464. The Worker Vice-Chairperson requested the secretariat for advice on the relevance of including the clause.
- 465. The representative of the Secretary-General read article 19(8) of the ILO Constitution⁴ and said that it was not a good practice to introduce such a clause because international labour standards were mutually reinforcing and did not affect each other's normative value. In fact, introducing such a clause could undermine the coherence of the instrument by indicating that one labour standard might contradict another and consequently lower the protection offered by other international labour standards.
- 466. The amendment was withdrawn.

Section I. Definitions, scope and implementation

- 467. As there were no amendments to the title of section I, it was adopted.

Point 4, chapeau

- 468. As there were no amendments to the chapeau, it was adopted.

Point 4(a)

A.65

- 469. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, introduced an amendment to replace the text of the clause with: "a form of on-the-job training that may be supplemented by off-the-job training and that fulfils the following criteria: (i) it is governed by an apprenticeship agreement which clearly defines the rights and duties of the employer and apprentice; (ii) it enables an apprentice, through employer-led training, to acquire competencies required to work in an occupation; (iii) the required competencies should be clearly defined at the beginning of the training; (iv) the competencies should be defined by sector or occupational skills councils; (v) at the end of the training there is an assessment of the apprentice's competencies to work in an occupation; and (vi) it leads to a recognized qualification".
- 470. He explained that the purpose of the proposal was to operationalize the term apprenticeship by making reference to competence acquisition in the workplace, the role of the employer and the apprentice, and assessment and certification leading to a recognized qualification for labour mobility.
- 471. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment. While she could support many of the elements of the proposal, a definition should be as minimal as possible, and she did not feel comfortable in particular with the notion of apprenticeship as on-the-job training

⁴ "In no case shall the adoption of any Convention or Recommendation by the Conference, or the ratification of any Convention by any Member, be deemed to affect any law, award, custom or agreement which ensures more favourable conditions to the workers concerned than those provided for in the Convention or Recommendation."

which might be supplemented by off-the-job training. Rather, she considered a structured, off-the-job educational element a central part of apprenticeship.

- 472.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, stating that he preferred the original text; he was also concerned about the statement on the off-the-job element of training, which he considered fundamental to apprenticeship arrangements.
- 473.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and the Government member of India also did not support the amendment, aligning themselves with the statements of the Worker and Employer Vice-Chairpersons.
- 474.** The Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, introduced a subamendment to delete in the first sentence “on-the-job” and “may be supplemented by off-the-job training”, and to insert after the word “training”, “that could be both on- and off-the-job or entirely on-the-job”. He expressed concern about developing an instrument that did not recognize the reality in developing countries, including in Africa, where people often drop out of school, while others want to undertake apprenticeship training without further schooling and enrolling in educational institutions. He highlighted three elements of the concept “apprenticeship” which distinguishes apprenticeship from other forms of work-based learning: clear understanding of the competencies to be acquired; agreement on the form of assessment; and recognized qualification.
- 475.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment. She stressed that off-the-job learning was a fundamental requirement of apprenticeships and must be delivered within a structured educational framework. It does not meet that basic criterion of apprenticeship as we see it distinct from other forms of workplace learning such as traineeship.
- 476.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson also did not support the subamendment, reiterating his preference for the original formulation. He explained that he would not favour splitting the definition into separate subsections, and that the Office text would address the elements related to competence and qualification. However, he admitted that his group had not yet examined the issue of on-the-job and off-the-job training, though there tends to be a strong support for trade schools. He also reported of enterprises investing in the excellence of off-the-job learning facilities, though he was aware that this was not possible in all national contexts. He suggested to look into accommodating potentially any system where training would be completely on the job, at least in a transitional way.
- 477.** The Government member of Oman, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Qatar and Saudi Arabia, agreed with the Worker and Employer Vice-Chairpersons in preferring the original text.
- 478.** The Government member of the Philippines also supported the original text and considered the current definition of apprenticeship to cover all the relevant aspects.
- 479.** The Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, noted that the amendment and the subamendment lacked support, but referred again to the risk of excluding some potential apprentices. Insisting on a dual system would imply that all those who did not have the relevant school certificate could not join a vocational training institute and would therefore be excluded. That was not consistent with lifelong learning and was against the idea of inclusion. In his country, some people who could not write had the ability to learn trades in apprenticeship without attending schools.
- 480.** The Chairperson explained that subsequent amendments would provide the opportunity to continue discussing the points raised.

481. The amendment was not adopted.

A.38

482. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace the text of clause (a) with: “the term ‘apprenticeship’ should be understood as a form of work-based learning involving off-the-job and on-the-job training enabling the apprentice to acquire the competencies required to work in an occupation. It should be governed by a written apprenticeship agreement and offer structured training that leads to a recognized qualification;”.
483. The reference to apprenticeship agreements had been moved from the first sentence to avoid excluding those without a written agreement, given that countries used different forms of agreements. The proposed text would represent the minimum criteria for apprenticeships. The objective was to broaden the scope of the protections the instrument should be providing for, which would be discussed in relation to regulatory systems and the other proposed improvements to the apprenticeship landscape. She stated that her group understood the caution expressed by the Africa group concerning the provisions for improved apprenticeship arrangements. She thinks it is very important that apprenticeship includes educational matters, both for higher level apprenticeship skills that relate to the actual work to be done, and for more general aspects of education. Her group wanted to pay heed to this aspect in some other provisions of the instrument.
484. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment. The Office’s definition had been developed on the basis of practices around the world, supported by responses to the questionnaire and background research. Regarding the concern over lack of written agreements in apprenticeships, he said that the instrument under discussion was a Recommendation and should thus provide aspirations or goals, and recommend a model. Hence, one of the priorities for reforming national practices in apprenticeship might be introducing proper written arrangements.
485. The Government members of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Oman, speaking also on behalf of Qatar and Saudi Arabia, did not support the amendment as it did not add clarity. Educational issues were an important part of apprenticeships, and the original text gave a better definition of apprenticeships in linking it to education. The second part of the amendment was too prescriptive for that section of the instrument.
486. The Government members of Zimbabwe and Mali supported the original text because it was broader and took account of the generality and diversity of apprenticeship programmes in different countries. In contrast, the amendment excluded education, which in most countries was a critical aspect of apprenticeship programmes.
487. The Government member of India supported the amendment, saying that apprenticeships should be treated as a form of training and not a form of education.
488. The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment.
489. An amendment submitted by the Government member of Lesotho (A.97) was not seconded and fell.
490. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Argentina, Brazil and Chile withdrew the amendments they had submitted (A.13, A.91 and A.92).

A.24 and A.84

- 491. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, introduced an amendment to add at the end of the clause the words “while being paid or otherwise compensated;” after “qualification”. He stressed the importance of including remuneration in the definition of “apprenticeship”.
- 492. The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of Canada, introduced an amendment to add the words “and remunerated” between the words “structured” and “training”. He emphasized that remuneration was a fundamental attribute of quality apprenticeships and should be included in the definition. He said that he understood that the coverage of remuneration was broad, but he would be open if there was a request to list other forms of compensation.
- 493. The Employer Vice-Chairperson recalled that the discussion on point 3(c) had yet to be finalized. The outcome of those discussions would have an impact on considerations related to point 4(a) and so he suggested postponing the discussion.
- 494. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the substance of the amendments. She suggested a subamendment to replace “or” with “and” in the amendment proposed by EU Member States, as some forms of compensation would come from sources other than employers. She emphasized that compensation was not an alternative to remuneration.
- 495. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, noted that the two amendments discussed had the same intention.
- 496. When resuming the discussion after adopting point 3(c), the Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, suggested to use the language that had been agreed upon: “remuneration or other financial compensations”.
- 497. The Employer Vice-Chairperson reminded the Committee that point 21(b) already mentioned remuneration and did not see the need to also include it in point 4(a).
- 498. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, insisted on inserting the agreed text.
- 499. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed to insert “remunerated or otherwise financially compensated training”.
- 500. The amendment submitted by the United States and Canada was adopted as subamended and the amendment submitted by EU Member States fell.
- 501. The Government member of Argentina, speaking also on behalf of Brazil and Chile, withdrew an amendment that only concerned the Spanish version (A.93).

A.94

- 502. The Government member of Argentina, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Brazil and Chile, introduced the amendment to delete the word “recognized” before the word “qualification” and to add “recognized in the labour market” after it. She emphasized the need for training that added value to the labour market through recognized qualifications.
- 503. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed that qualifications had to be recognized and asked to hear the views of other members.
- 504. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that he appreciated the intent of the amendment, which was to highlight the relevance of qualifications and that they are based on current and future

labour market needs. However, he did not support the amendment because there was a second element of recognition of qualification which related to occupational licensing. Reference to labour market recognition would introduce a restrictive element.

- 505.** The Government member of Australia did not support the amendment and concurred with the reasons provided by the Employer Vice-Chairperson. The word “recognized” meant recognition in the context of national, regional and sectoral qualifications frameworks. The issue of utility or value in the labour market could be better dealt with in other sections of the instrument.
- 506.** The Government member of India did not support the amendment as he found it narrower in scope than the original text.
- 507.** The Government member of Oman, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, did not support the amendment, as respective qualifications frameworks in countries would take account of the recognition of qualifications.
- 508.** The Government members of Niger and Mali did not support the amendment as the recognition of qualifications was already a formal process that took into account the views of various stakeholders.
- 509.** The Government member of Bangladesh and the Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, also did not support the amendment as the reference to the labour market was not relevant.
- 510.** The amendment was withdrawn.
- 511.** Point 4, clause (a) was adopted as amended.

Point 4(b)

- 512.** As there were no amendments to point 4, clause (b), it was adopted.

Point 4(c)

A.85 and A.14

- 513.** The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of Canada, introduced an amendment (A.85) to insert the word “workplace” before “preparedness” with the aim of clarifying exactly what apprentices were being prepared for.
- 514.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment (A.14) to insert “for work” after “their preparedness” to be more accurate, as pre-apprenticeship programmes could encompass such things as diversity training, sexual harassment training and safety training, and were not contingent on a particular workplace but were transferable between workplaces.
- 515.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that it was helpful to have a reference to “workplace preparedness” but did not wish to lose the importance of critical educational skills and competencies. She proposed a subamendment to the amendment proposed by the United States and Canada, to replace “or” with “and” before “meeting”. That would cover the formal entry requirements, which were the educational aspects of apprenticeships, as well as readiness for work.
- 516.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that he understood that pre-apprenticeship programmes were optional and not a requirement for formal entry into apprenticeships. They

were an asset that could accelerate the apprenticeship but were not required, and therefore he did not support replacing “or” with “and”.

- 517.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that it was not clear why pre-apprenticeship programmes were not part of inbuilt apprenticeship programmes. Preparedness should relate to the main apprenticeship programmes.
- 518.** The Government members of Canada and the United States did not support the subamendment, primarily because apprenticeship programmes did not always come with formal entry requirements, and pre-apprenticeship programmes were just one means of entry into formal apprenticeship programmes. Regarding “workplace” or “for work”, they preferred “workplace” but were flexible on the matter.
- 519.** The subamendment to replace “or” with “and” was not adopted.
- 520.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed a preference for “workplace preparedness” given the broader aspects of training for apprenticeships.
- 521.** The amendment suggesting “preparedness for work” (A.14) was withdrawn and the amendment suggesting “workplace preparedness” (A.85) was adopted.
- 522.** Point 4, clause (c) was adopted as amended.

Point 4(d)

- 523.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew an amendment (A.15).

A.39

- 524.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert “by qualified assessors,” after “assessing and certifying a person’s competencies,” as it was imperative that qualified assessors carried out those functions.
- 525.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, the Government members of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, Bangladesh, Canada and India, supported the amendment.
- 526.** The amendment was adopted.
- 527.** Point 4, clause (d) was adopted as amended.
- 528.** Point 4 was adopted as amended.

Point 5

A.17, A.26, A.63 and A.82

- 529.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, as well as the Government members of France, on behalf of EU Member States, Kenya, on behalf of the Africa group, and Canada, on behalf of Switzerland and the United States, had submitted amendments to delete “and traineeships”. While acknowledging the importance of protecting trainees, they noted that including traineeships in the instrument was outside the scope of the mandate of the Committee and could result in diluting focus of the instrument. The standard had to stand on its own as a quality framework for apprenticeships.
- 530.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, recognized that the decent work deficit among interns and trainees was not acceptable. While traineeships were intuitively close to the theme of apprenticeships, it was nonetheless a

separate matter which required special attention and analysis. Mixing the two topics might risk the weakening of the instrument, by making it less clear and effective. He recalled that the Governing Body, at its 334th Session (October–November 2018) had mandated the Committee to work on an instrument specifically on apprenticeships to update Recommendation No. 60 and Recommendation No.117. Neither of the two instruments included a reference to traineeships. Including the issue of traineeships in the instrument would mean reviewing that mandate. EU Member States thus preferred to deal with the issue of traineeships in another discussion.

- 531.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendments and urged other Committee members to reconsider the importance of providing protection to trainees in the instrument. She pointed out that point 27 included only the most basic workplace rights and that there was no ILO standard for the decent treatment of trainees. She expressed her concern that it would take a long time to set up a separate discussion on trainees. She recalled that the resolution *The youth employment crisis: A call for action* adopted by the Conference at its 101st Session (2012) recommended that ILO Member States give serious consideration to a spectrum of technical and vocational education and training, including apprenticeships, other work-experience schemes and work-based learning. Traineeships should be included in such considerations. She was also concerned that setting a standard for apprenticeships only might cause counter impacts for other arrangements. She stressed that trainees included the most vulnerable such as young people and the unemployed, who might not have the qualifications to access apprenticeships. She clarified that, according to her group's understanding, trainee referred to someone engaged in on-the-job training and work-experience. She believed those trainees needed a route to productive decent work, transition to formality and higher qualifications.
- 532.** The Government members of India, Saudi Arabia and Bangladesh supported the amendment because the aim was to generate a regulatory framework for quality apprenticeships and the Committee should adhere to the objective.
- 533.** The Government member of Australia welcomed the clarification provided by the Workers' group on the term "traineeships", especially exclusion of short-term vocational placements from traineeship. He supported the Workers' group's proposal to continue the discussion at the next session of the Conference. The Government member of New Zealand supported the suggestion.
- 534.** The Government members of Togo and France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, saw the merit of taking up the issue of traineeships on another occasion, but not at that particular session of the Conference. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, suggested the possibility of submitting a proposal for a tripartite meeting on traineeships to the Governing Body.
- 535.** The Government member of Brazil supported the amendment.
- 536.** The amendments were adopted. As a result, all the amendments referring to "traineeships" or "trainees" in points 3 and 4 were either adopted or fell.⁵

⁵ The following amendments concerning the deletion of "traineeships" or "trainees" were adopted: A.12, A.16, A.23, A.25, A.64, A.78 and A.79. The following amendments proposing to insert "traineeships" or "trainees" fell: A.28, A.40, A.42, A.50, A.56, A.68 and A.69.

A.43

- 537. The Government member of Oman, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, introduced an amendment to replace “all” with “eligible”.
- 538. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment and suggested to allow for the broadest possible application of this instrument. He also raised concern over the ambiguity of eligibility criteria.
- 539. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, India and New Zealand did not support the amendment for the reasons stated by the Employers’ group.
- 540. The amendment was withdrawn.

A.18

- 541. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace “and sectors of economic activity” by “in the public as well as private sectors” to clarify that the instrument would cover both the public and the private sectors. The public sector was a very important source of a significant number of apprenticeships.
- 542. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment because she considered that the original text was all encompassing.
- 543. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, questioned whether all sectors of economic activity included the public sector.
- 544. The representative of the Secretary-General explained that the Office had drafted the text to refer to all public and private enterprises by using the term “all sectors of economic activity”.
- 545. The Government member of Chile preferred the original wording.
- 546. The Government member of the United States remarked that he would support the amendment unless the original text already encompassed both the public and the private sectors.
- 547. The Employer Vice-Chairperson reiterated the intention of the amendment saying that the instrument should apply to apprentices irrespective of whether they were working for the State or for-profit enterprises.
- 548. The Worker Vice-Chairperson pointed out that the wording “all enterprises” already covered everything it was intended to cover and found the amendment unnecessary. Additionally, she requested clarification about the informal economy, as issues around informal apprenticeships might have potential implications on the discussion.
- 549. The representative of the Secretary-General referred to the Transition from the Informal to the Formal Economy Recommendation, 2015 (No. 204), which noted that informal work occurred in the private and the public sectors. He clarified that the original wording captured the full set of circumstances in which apprentices could be engaged. Thus, the reference to all sectors of economic activity fully covered both public and private sectors, as did the reference to all enterprises.
- 550. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that she considered the original text to be clearer and more encompassing.
- 551. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed with the Worker Vice-Chairperson’s statement.

- 552. The amendment was withdrawn.
- 553. Point 5 was adopted as amended.

Point 6

A.19

- 554. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert “and policies” after “regulations” and “incentives” after “collective agreements,”. He noted that “policies” were, like regulations, important means of implementing quality apprenticeship systems and therefore should be included here. Incentives, on the other hand, played an important role in encouraging both jobseekers and companies to engage with the apprenticeships system.
- 555. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, noting that it would be more appropriate to include a reference to incentives in the promotional parts of the instrument. She also noted that “policies” was already part of the original text.
- 556. The Government members of India, Bangladesh and Brazil did not support the amendment, echoing the arguments of the Worker Vice-Chairperson, and preferred the original text.
- 557. The Government member of Argentina did not support the amendment, as incentives could be part of government policies and therefore it was not necessary to add the word to the clause.
- 558. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment, as incentives could increase the likelihood of the standard being implemented.
- 559. The Government member of Cameroon supported the amendment, noting that incentives were an important measure that positively contributed towards the implementation of the standard.
- 560. The amendment was not adopted.

A.20

- 561. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment to insert “social dialogue including” and “and tripartite cooperation” before and after “collective agreements”, respectively. He noted that both social dialogue and tripartite cooperation were as critical as collective agreements and the proposed amendment thus reflected the full range of action necessary for implementing quality apprenticeships. The proposed amendment also aligned with the commitments made in Part II(B) of the Centenary Declaration, which noted the need for social dialogue, including collective bargaining and tripartite cooperation, as “an essential foundation of all ILO action”.
- 562. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment. She believed that it was unnecessary, as subsequent clauses made the point. She understood the importance of social dialogue and tripartite cooperation and suggested that it would be more appropriate to discuss them in the operative and regulatory parts of the Conclusions. She could consider supporting reference to “social dialogue” alone if it gathered support from other members of the Committee.
- 563. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment. He also noted that adding the term “social dialogue” alone could

give the wrong impression that social dialogue alone would be sufficient for implementation of the standard.

- 564.** The Government members of the Philippines, Bangladesh, India and Cameroon did not support the amendment, for the reasons expressed by the Worker Vice-Chairperson. The Government member of India noted that social dialogue and tripartite cooperation were already covered by point 7.
- 565.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson urged the members of the Committee to consider supporting the amendment. Rejecting the amendment implied rejecting the commitments made in the Centenary Declaration and numerous other ILO documents that stressed the importance of social dialogue and tripartite cooperation. He also disagreed that point 7 was an appropriate basis for rejecting the proposed amendment as it did not propose a full range of means of action to implement the standard. Supporting the amendment was key to fully embedding the role of social partners and ensuring the widest possible means of implementation.
- 566.** The Government member of Cameroon noted that apprentices would not be covered by collective agreements, and hence the inclusion of “social dialogue” was justified.
- 567.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to delete “and tripartite cooperation” after “collective agreements” from the amendment.
- 568.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the original text should be retained, as neither the proposed amendment nor the subamendment had received support from members of the Committee.
- 569.** The Government member of the United States, seconded by the Government member of Australia, proposed a further subamendment to add “, including through social dialogue and tripartite cooperation.” after “practice”.
- 570.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the further subamendment, but supported the subamendment proposed by the Employer Vice-Chairperson.
- 571.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the further subamendment proposed by the Government member of the United States, stating that the proposed wording changed the meaning, given that social dialogue and tripartite cooperation were processes while laws, regulations, collective agreements, policies and programmes were written documents.
- 572.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson emphasized that the Centenary Declaration had been carefully phrased to state that social dialogue included both collective agreements and tripartite cooperation, and had been adopted at the highest level of governments, workers and employers as a reflection on a century of practice and values and of how to work together in the new century. The wording should not be reformulated by the Committee. However, he said that he could accept the further subamendment.
- 573.** In the spirit of consensus, the Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Bangladesh, India and Kenya said that they could also accept the further subamendment.
- 574.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the further subamendment.
- 575.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson concluded that she needed to reconsider the situation, given that some governments did not support the further subamendment.

- 576.** When resuming the discussion at another sitting, the Employer Vice-Chairperson insisted on adopting the subamendment, highlighting that the group had made a concession to take out “tripartite cooperation” in the spirit of consensus.
- 577.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson reiterated that her group preferred the original text, recalling that social dialogue as a process could not give effect to an international instrument.
- 578.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed with the Workers’ group and preferred the original text.
- 579.** The Chairperson clarified that the amendment did not receive support from other members of the Committee and was therefore not adopted.
- 580.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson reiterated his position citing industry skills councils as an example of the role that social dialogue plays in giving effect to this instrument. He emphasized that social dialogue was one of the fundamental mechanisms of the ILO.
- 581.** Point 6 was adopted.

Point 7

- 582.** As there were no amendments to point 7, it was adopted.

Section II. Regulatory framework for quality apprenticeships

- 583.** As there were no amendments to the title of section II, it was adopted.

New point before point 8

A.151

- 584.** The Government member of Argentina, speaking also on behalf of Brazil and Chile, introduced an amendment to insert a new point to read: “Members should incorporate quality apprenticeships within all of the current and future education, vocational training and employment policies”.
- 585.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson saw merit in the amendment and supported it.
- 586.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson cast doubt on the amendment because it would incorporate the role of apprenticeships in absolutely every policy on education, vocational training and employment, even those quite unrelated to apprenticeships.
- 587.** The Government member of India did not support the amendment for the same reasons given by the Employer Vice-Chairperson. He deemed it impractical to bring quality apprenticeships to all current and future education policies.
- 588.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment because the wording was too broad and generic. He proposed a subamendment to delete “all of” and insert “vocational” before “education” which would be more consistent with the subject matter.
- 589.** The Government member of New Zealand supported the subamendment.
- 590.** The Government member of Brazil pointed out that the English version of the amendment did not capture the intention of the original Spanish version, which did not include the notion of “all current and future”. Instead of “should incorporate”, it could read “align in a systematic way”.

591. The Government member of Argentina confirmed the language translation issue and clarified the intention of the amendment.
592. When resuming the discussion at a later sitting, the Chairperson presented a new English translation of the amendment: "Members should align quality apprenticeships with their education, vocational training and employment policies". The purpose was to systematically link these different areas of policy.
593. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to replace "align" by "promote", and "with" by "within". The word "promote" had two separate and relevant meanings: to publicize, but also to attach importance to. The later conveyed the additional notion that members should be encouraged to attach priority to quality apprenticeships within those key policy areas.
594. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a further subamendment to retain "align" in addition to "promote" before "apprenticeships". It was important to align quality apprenticeships with the more general framework of education, vocational training and employment policy. "Promote" was acceptable but not in replacement of "align".
595. The Government member of India supported the subamendment of the Employer Vice-Chairperson.
596. The Government member of Singapore also supported the Employer Vice-Chairperson's subamendment to only use the word "promote" as it provided flexibility for the broad scope of apprenticeships.
597. The Government member of the Philippines supported the subamendment of the Employer Vice-Chairperson to use only the word "promote".
598. The Government member of France speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, preferred the word "incorporate" that had been used in the initial English version instead of "align" or "promote", as he considered that "promote" was too weak compared to "incorporate". Furthermore, the translation into French of "align" was problematic. He proposed a further subamendment to insert "relevant" before "education".
599. The Government member of Argentina supported the wording "align and promote" as well as the further subamendment proposed by EU Member States to insert "relevant". She did not support the use of "incorporate" as it suggested that a framework was required.
600. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the further subamendment proposed by EU Member States. The word "align" was overly strong. He could support, if required, the use of "promote and incorporate" on the basis that apprenticeships should be incorporated into the wider education, vocational training and employment systems, but should not be subordinate to it, as implied by "align".
601. The Worker Vice-Chairperson was not in favour of the use of "promote" alone. She preferred "align and promote" and asked the secretariat for suggestions. She also proposed the word "integrate" as a possible alternative to "incorporate".
602. The representative of the Secretary-General suggested that the use of "incorporate and promote" was the most appropriate. The word "align" connoted shaping apprenticeship policies to existing policies.
603. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Mali, South Sudan and Argentina supported the suggestion made by the secretariat.
604. The amendment was adopted as subamended and the new point was adopted.

Point 8**A.111**

- 605.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, proposed an amendment to insert “have or” after “Member should”, taking into account the situation of some EU Member States.
- 606.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson felt that the amendment was unnecessary and sought clarification from the secretariat on the word “establish”. He understood that in ILO instruments, the term referred to the first-time establishment and existing arrangements.
- 607.** The representative of the Secretary-General confirmed the interpretation of the Employer Vice-Chairperson. For instance, the word “establish” was used in the Social Protection Floors Recommendation, 2012 (No. 202), to refer to contemporaneous as well as future changes associated with it.
- 608.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the intention of the amendment.
- 609.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, thanked the secretariat for the explanation and withdrew the amendment.

A.98

- 610.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment to insert “through social dialogue and tripartite cooperation” after “establish regulatory frameworks for quality apprenticeships”. He stated that social dialogue and tripartite cooperation were fundamental in ensuring the functioning of apprenticeship systems.
- 611.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment and preferred the original text. The obligation was on Member States to decide on the process of establishing the regulatory framework for quality apprenticeships.
- 612.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment because the proposed text implied that the establishment of regulatory frameworks for quality apprenticeships could only be done through social dialogue and tripartite cooperation. He pointed out that the second sentence of point 8 was sufficiently precise.
- 613.** The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran supported the amendment.
- 614.** The Government member of India and the Government member of Cameroon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment and echoed the arguments provided by EU Member States.
- 615.** The amendment was withdrawn.

A.127

- 616.** The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran introduced an amendment, seconded by the Government member of Chile, to include “and intermediaries” after “workers’ organizations”. She stressed the important roles intermediaries played in the design, implementation and monitoring of quality apprenticeship systems.
- 617.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson objected to the amendment, stating that it was the role of the government, with the involvement of employers’ and workers’ organizations. It was not the role of intermediaries.

- 618. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Cameroon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment.
- 619. The amendment was not adopted.

A.143

- 620. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment to insert “and regulatory frameworks” at the end of the point because of the importance of ensuring the participation of employers’ and workers’ organizations in the design of the regulatory framework.
- 621. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment.
- 622. The Government member of Bangladesh did not support the amendment because the involvement of workers’ and employers’ organizations in the regulatory process was a constitutional matter of each country.
- 623. The Government member of India did not support the amendment and considered it redundant.
- 624. The amendment was adopted.

A.161

- 625. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, proposed an amendment to split point 8 into two clauses (a) and (b). After an introductory phrase “Members should establish:”, clause (a) would retain the original text of point 8 while clause (b) would read “a national qualifications framework to facilitate the classification and recognition of competencies acquired through apprenticeships”. He remarked that the added text explained an important operationalization aspect of the apprenticeships framework.
- 626. The Employer Vice-Chairperson concurred with the reference put forward by the Africa group with regard to national qualifications frameworks. He introduced a subamendment to the proposed clause (b) to read: “national qualifications framework or systems to facilitate the recognition of competencies acquired through apprenticeships”.
- 627. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed with the rationale of the amendment proposed by both the Africa group as subamended by the Employers’ group. However, she noted a conceptual issue of putting together the regulatory framework and the national qualifications framework or system in one sentence. She requested to improve the formulation.
- 628. The Government members of Mali, Namibia and South Sudan, and Oman, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, supported the amendment as subamended.
- 629. The Government members of Brazil, Singapore, New Zealand, and France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment and preferred the original text.
- 630. The Government of Canada, seconded by the Government member of Australia, proposed to have the text of clause (b) as a new point.
- 631. The Government member of Brazil proposed another subamendment to delete the term “national” because in federal countries not all qualifications and frameworks were determined at the national level.

- 632. The Government members of Australia, the United States, Chile and Canada, and Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, as well as the Worker Vice-Chairperson, supported the further subamendment.
- 633. The Employer Vice-Chairperson expressed his reservation on the removal of “national”, noting the merit of unified national qualification systems, including portability of skills certificates across subnational units. If the text was going to be a separate point, he suggested to mention the roles of employers’ and workers’ organizations in both points.
- 634. The Government member of Malawi was in favour of maintaining the term “national”, explaining that the national qualifications framework enhanced the recognition of competencies and indicated a clear pathway for apprentices to move up.
- 635. The representative of the Secretary-General proposed a new formulation for the text of point 8 that combined the two possible clauses or points: “Members should establish regulatory frameworks for quality apprenticeships, and qualifications frameworks or systems to facilitate the recognition of competencies acquired through apprenticeships. Representative employers’ and workers’ organizations should be involved in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of quality apprenticeship systems, policies, programmes and frameworks.”
- 636. The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons and the Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the proposed text.
- 637. The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 638. Point 8 was adopted as amended.

Point 9

A.153

- 639. The Government member of Argentina introduced an amendment to delete the entire point 9 as the essence of the point would already be included in point 10.
- 640. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, highlighting the important roles of authorities in charge of apprenticeships.
- 641. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment either and preferred the original text because points 8, 9 and 10 defined the sequence of a process for regulating apprenticeships.
- 642. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, echoed both Vice-Chairpersons, noting the crucial roles of designated authorities in apprenticeships.
- 643. The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran did not support the amendment.
- 644. The Government member of Argentina explained once more the intention and rationale behind the amendment. However, due to the lack of support from the Committee members, she withdrew the amendment.
- 645. Another amendment (A.112) was withdrawn.

A.128

- 646. The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran, seconded by the Employers’ group, introduced an amendment to replace “one or more authorities” with “an authority” on the

basis that a single authority ensured consistency, unity and alignment and would lead to better outcomes for learners and businesses in the education system and the community.

- 647. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, which offered an aspirational element to the instrument. He explained the need to achieve regulatory and institutional consistency, unity and coherence to improve outcomes for learning and businesses, and that a single administrative authority would contribute to achieving that goal.
- 648. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that referring to a single authority could encourage coherence but wished to hear the views of Government members.
- 649. The Government members of Singapore and India and France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, preferred the original text on the basis that “one or more” did not imply the need for the creation of more authorities and was less restrictive.
- 650. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, also preferred the original text. He noted that the decision to include “an authority” instead of “authorities” depended on the specific institutional arrangements in a given country. For instance, a federal state would prefer the word “authorities” and not just “an authority”. Therefore, the Africa group could remain flexible.
- 651. The Government member of Malawi supported the views of the Africa group and preferred the original text. She noted that the term “authorities” would be more appropriate especially in the context of skills councils where there was often more than just one authority.
- 652. The Government member of Oman, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, also preferred the original text.
- 653. The Worker Vice-Chairperson preferred the original text, but also noted that coherence between multiple authorities was an important factor to consider.
- 654. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, preferred the original text but at the same time, thanked the Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran for putting forward the amendment which had facilitated very meaningful conversations.
- 655. The amendment was withdrawn in the interest of reaching consensus.

A.136

- 656. The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of the United Kingdom and Canada, proposed an amendment to insert “governmental” before “authorities” and to replace “in which representative employers’ and workers’ organizations should be represented” with “which shall seek advice and input from employers’ and workers’ organizations with respect to current apprenticeship policies, regulations and trends”. He noted that regulation was essentially a function of the government and that in his country the regulation of apprenticeship systems was best administered by the government’s regulatory agencies. With regard to the second part of the amendment, he acknowledged that in order for apprenticeship systems to achieve optimal impact, it was necessary to seek advice and input from employers’ and workers’ organizations.
- 657. The Worker Vice-Chairperson preferred the original text but could support the addition of the word “governmental” before “authorities”. However, she did not support the latter part of the amendment noting that “seeking input” was insufficient as it did not necessarily imply effective representation of employers’ and workers’ organizations.

- 658. The Government member of India shared the Employers' group's concern. If autonomous authorities could be considered as governmental, India could support the addition of "governmental" before "authorities", and he requested the secretariat to provide clarification on that issue. He also proposed a subamendment to delete "current" as it implied that the scope of discussion, advice and input was limited to current apprenticeship policies and trends and excluded future and past policies.
- 659. The Government member of Saudi Arabia, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, supported the amendment noting that the appropriate regulatory authority was indeed "governmental". It was for the government to lead, while seeking input and advice from the employers' and worker's organizations.
- 660. The Government member of the United States clarified that "governmental authorities" included independent and autonomous entities appointed as regulatory authorities in a given country. He proposed a further subamendment to replace the word "governmental" before "authorities" with "appropriate" to address the concerns raised by the Employers' and Workers' groups. He requested the secretariat to provide further clarification on the subject. He also supported the subamendment of the Government of India to remove the word "current".
- 661. The Government member of Singapore supported the subamendments proposed by the Employers' group and the United States.
- 662. The representative of the Secretary-General explained that since the clause started with "Members should establish" and Members would in that case be governments, what they would establish would be "governmental authorities". He concluded that therefore, inserting "governmental" before "authorities" was redundant.
- 663. The Worker Vice-Chairperson preferred the original text and did not support the subsequent amendment as subamended. With regard to the addition of either "governmental" or "appropriate" before "authorities", she noted that the term "authorities" was sufficient given the explanation provided by the secretariat. She reiterated that representation was the key point, and it did not just involve "seeking advice or inputs" from the employers' and workers' organizations.
- 664. The Employer Vice-Chairperson shared the views expressed by the Workers' group and reiterated the importance of adequate representation of workers' and employers' organizations for building and implementing quality apprenticeship systems in Member States.
- 665. In the spirit of consensus, the amendment was withdrawn.

A.160

- 666. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, introduced an amendment to insert "or commissions" after "more authorities" and subamended it to insert "including occupational or sector skills councils," after "regulating apprenticeships,". He explained that occupational or sector skills councils ensured representation of the employers' and workers' organizations and social dialogue in apprenticeship systems, which could integrate the intention of an amendment submitted by the Employers' group (A.100).
- 667. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the inclusion of "commissions" as the representative of the Secretary-General had provided a clarification on the broad meaning of authorities. He did, however, support the subamendment as he considered the inclusion of occupational or sector skills councils to be a very positive addition, although he did not

necessarily agree with the Africa group's explanation. When an industry skills council structure was done properly with institutional continuity and commitment, it could be a very productive and well-regarded mechanism. He did not agree that it addressed his group's motivation behind the other amendment as occupational and skills councils did not account for all of the areas in which authorities should engage with employers' and workers' organizations on the mechanics of apprenticeship systems. He wished to ensure that social partners were not excluded from representation at the highest levels.

- 668.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed with the Employers' group regarding "commission" and preferred the original text. Regarding the subamendment, they were very keen to include reference to occupational or sector skills councils but were not sure about their role in regulating apprenticeships as implied in the proposed text.
- 669.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that it did not support the Africa group's subamendment to include occupational or sector skills councils as it was too specific and not the right place in the text. They could support the notion of adding "or commissions" but thought it could be reworded. He asked for further clarification from the Africa group on the intended meaning.
- 670.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that his group would be ready to remove the "commissions", but it was important to emphasize the need to include occupational sector skills councils as a critical second level support to regulatory frameworks.
- 671.** The Government members of Brazil, India and Türkiye did not support the amendment for the same reasons as the EU and its Member States. The Government member of India thought the wording suggested that the Member State should establish one or more authorities responsible for elevating and regulating apprenticeships, including occupational or sector skills councils.
- 672.** The Government member of Malawi expressed support for the amendment as subamended. Occupational and sector skills councils were not higher-level regulatory bodies, but regulation occurred at different levels.
- 673.** The Government member of Egypt agreed with the Africa group, in that it should be made clear that the regulating body should be responsible for reviewing the contracts of quality apprenticeships and helping all other bodies to fulfil their obligations.
- 674.** The Government member of Uganda also supported the Africa group and noted that apprenticeships were an employer-led form of work-based learning. Leadership was provided through occupational or sector skills councils and included setting standards and regulating apprenticeships. Adding skills councils simply meant adding one more regulating authority to the text.
- 675.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson explained that the role of regulatory authorities could be broader than regulating, including also coordination and support in the delivery of quality apprenticeships. That was the intent behind another amendment his group had submitted (A.99). Occupational skills councils could also be seen in that context.
- 676.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson reiterated support for the establishment of sector skills councils but was not convinced that point 9 would be the right place as it focused on regulation. Her group suggested including the reference to skills councils in another section.

- 677.** In view of comments provided, the amendment proposing the insertion of “commission” was withdrawn under the understanding that a subamendment to insert “occupational and sector skills councils” would be introduced in the relevant section of the Conclusions.

A.113

- 678.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States introduced an amendment to insert “supervising and” before “regulating”, and “within Members’ legislative framework,” after “apprenticeships,”, noting that supervision was an essential element of quality apprenticeships, and its supervision and regulation should occur within the legislative framework.
- 679.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the insertion of the word “supervising”, as it would be helpful to have an oversight and stricter regulation, but did not support the insertion of “within Members’ legislative framework,”. It was already implicit that each Member State would establish or designate one or more authorities within their legislative framework.
- 680.** The Government member of the United States supported the amendment, as it provided necessary clarification.
- 681.** The Government members of India and Singapore supported the first part but not the second part of the amendment as it was prescriptive and there could be other means through which supervision and regulation could be carried out, not necessarily always within the legislative framework.
- 682.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment, as “regulating” encompassed “supervising”.
- 683.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the second part of the amendment, noting that the addition of “within Members’ legislative framework” would bring the concept of contingency and variability of practice into the instrument, but proposed a subamendment to replace “supervising” with “overseeing”, which was a more constructive, appropriate and less paternalistic term.
- 684.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson reiterated that the second part of the amendment was not necessary and recalled that regulatory frameworks would include design and implementation as well as monitoring and evaluation of the system which implied both oversight and supervision.
- 685.** The Government member of Saudi Arabia, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, did not support the subamendment and preferred the original wording. Replacing “supervising” with “overseeing” would make the government more an observer than a regulator.
- 686.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, requested the secretariat to clarify if adding a reference to Members’ legislative framework would improve the original text. He introduced another subamendment to replace “supervising” by “monitoring”, which was already used in point 17 of the proposed Conclusions.
- 687.** The representative of the Secretary-General clarified that although the insertion of “within Members’ legislative framework” would do no harm, it was not necessary as Member States could not do anything outside their legislative framework, be that through the formal process of legislation, through the process of subordinate legislation or through the process of designation of authority.
- 688.** The Government member of Brazil supported the subamendment proposed by EU Member States, but did not support the insertion of “within Members’ legislative framework”.

- 689. The Government member of Cameroon did not support the amendment, emphasizing that the term “regulating” encompassed “monitoring,” “supervision” and “surveillance”.
- 690. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, thanked the secretariat for the explanation regarding the redundancy of the insertion, requested that the explanation be included in the summary of proceedings, and withdrew the proposal to insert “within Members’ legislative framework”.
- 691. The Worker Vice-Chairperson preferred “supervising” to “overseeing” because regulation was just one part of “supervision” of the whole structure.
- 692. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that “supervising”, “overseeing” and “monitoring” had similar meanings, but he preferred “monitoring”. However, taking into account the argument put forward by the African group that the word “regulating” implied all of those actions, the Employers’ group withdrew its support for the amendment.
- 693. The Government member of Namibia supported the Africa group’s position to keep the original text of the Office.
- 694. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, asked the secretariat to clarify whether the notion of supervision was included in the concept of regulation.
- 695. The representative of the Secretary-General said, that on the basis of his personal experience in public administration, regulating included monitoring and supervision.
- 696. The amendment was not adopted.

A.99

- 697. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert, after “regulating”, “, coordinating and supporting the delivery of quality apprenticeships”. The concept of regulation did not include the coordination of the different elements of an apprenticeship system, which was critical.
- 698. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment because it added the important roles of coordination and delivery of quality apprenticeships.
- 699. The Government member of Saudi Arabia, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, and the Government member of Singapore, did not support the amendment. The delivery of quality apprenticeships should not depend solely on the designated regulatory authority, but should be a collective effort coming from all sectors which was not captured by the proposed amendment.
- 700. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the emphasis on coordination, but noted that other terms characterizing the nature of the regulatory framework could also be included.
- 701. The Government members of Australia, Switzerland and the United States supported the amendment for the reasons given by the Employers’ and Workers’ groups.
- 702. The Government member of Uganda did not support the amendment. On the basis of the secretariat’s explanation that regulation encompassed supervision, in his view coordination was one of many supervisory functions and did not need to be explicitly included.
- 703. The Government member of India asked to clarify whether supervision, coordination and supporting were implied in the term regulation.

- 704.** The Government members of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States; Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Egypt and Saudi Arabia did not support the amendment.
- 705.** In view of the issues raised regarding regulation and its scope, and the lack of support from Government members, the Worker Vice-Chairperson said it would be preferable to retain the original text.
- 706.** The amendment was not adopted.

A.100 and A.114

- 707.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert “or consulted on an ongoing basis” after “represented”. Employers’ and workers’ organizations could not always be represented in governmental authorities. In cases where they were not represented, they should be consulted to provide constructive inputs to apprenticeship systems.
- 708.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, introduced an amendment to replace “represented” with “involved”. The purpose of the amendment was to open up the range of possibilities for cooperation with the social partners.
- 709.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that she preferred the original text because the word “represented” would include any other kind of consultation or involvement, while the words “consulted” or “involved” would not necessarily include representation.
- 710.** The Government member of Cameroon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, also endorsed the original text.
- 711.** The amendment proposed by the Employers’ group was withdrawn.
- 712.** The amendment proposed by EU Members States was not adopted.
- 713.** Point 9 was adopted without amendment.

Point 10

- 714.** In view of the discussions held under point 9 concerning the proposals to insert the words “governmental” and “commission”, two amendments with the same purpose in point 10 (A.137 and A.159) were withdrawn.

A.145

- 715.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendment to insert “are adequately funded” after “responsibilities”. There had been experiences of regulatory authorities not being adequately funded, which meant that they had not been able to properly fulfil their duties and obligations. It was important to include a clear statement on that matter.
- 716.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Brazil supported the amendment.
- 717.** The amendment was adopted.
- 718.** An amendment (A.101) was withdrawn by the Employers’ group.

A.102

- 719.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment to insert “coordinating” before “or delivering”. Although some might argue that the coordinating role was implicit in the notion

of regulation, it needed to be made explicit so as to provide clear guidance to those who would use the framework at the national level.

- 720.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment, as it had already been discussed that the list in the original text already included coordination. She therefore preferred the original text drafted by the Office.
- 721.** The Government member of Switzerland supported the amendment.
- 722.** The Government member of India did not support the amendment, for the reasons outlined by the Worker Vice-Chairperson and recalled that a similar amendment (A.99) had not been adopted for the same reason.
- 723.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment and asked to include in the summary of proceedings that Member States clearly recognized that coordination was implicit in the idea of regulation.
- 724.** Point 10 was adopted as amended.

Point 11, chapeau

A.146

- 725.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment to insert “ensure that these competent authorities” after “Members should” in order to be coherent with the text of point 10, which set out the responsibilities of the competent authorities, and in this clause would set out the process for the recognition of occupations.
- 726.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not oppose the amendment but expressed concern that it could make the text ambiguous. He pointed out that his group had submitted another amendment on the topic (A.103).
- 727.** The Government members of India, France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Brazil did not support the amendment
- 728.** The amendment was withdrawn.
- 729.** Another amendment (A.115) was withdrawn.

A.103

- 730.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment to insert “tripartite” before “process”, as it would be vital that authorities at the national level worked with workers’ and employers’ representatives in recognizing an occupation as being suitable for apprenticeships. He explained that trades were characterized by excellence and rigour and implied a serious responsibility. It was important that access to apprenticeships was not solely the business of government or educators. It was vital for them to work together with workers’ and employers’ organizations to mutually agree on which apprenticeships would be the correct pathway for certain skills sets.
- 731.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment. She did, however, caution against use of the word “tripartite” and proposed a subamendment to insert “, in which representatives of workers’ and employers’ organizations are represented,” after “process”.
- 732.** The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran supported the amendment.

- 733. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment.
- 734. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the subamendment, but proposed inserting the text after “quality apprenticeships”.
- 735. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that he preferred the proposal of the Workers’ group.
- 736. The Government member of Saudi Arabia, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, said that he did not support either the amendment or the subamendment.
- 737. The Government members of the United States and France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the subamendment.
- 738. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

A.130

- 739. The Government member of Canada, speaking also on behalf of the Government member of the United States, proposed an amendment to replace “an” with “a skilled trade or”. In some jurisdictions there existed specific and separate regulations for each skilled trade or occupation.
- 740. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 741. The Employer Vice-Chairperson expressed caution that the use of “skilled trade” could limit the variety of job choices deemed suitable for apprenticeships, and that new occupations arising in the future might be excluded. He proposed a subamendment to add “field” after “a skilled trade” to read “a skilled trade, field or”.
- 742. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that she understood the argument put forward by the Employer Vice-Chairperson but that there might be an alternative to the word “field”.
- 743. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, questioned the relevance of the term “skilled trade” at present and asked the secretariat for advice.
- 744. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the subamendment.
- 745. The representative of the Secretary-General said that the term “skilled trade” was commonly used in English.
- 746. The Government members Australia and Saudi Arabia, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, said that they preferred the original text.
- 747. With a view to moving the discussion forward, the Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the subamendment.
- 748. The amendment was adopted.
- 749. The amendments proposing to insert “skilled trade or” before “occupation” in clauses (a) and (d) of point 11 (A.131 and A.133) were also adopted.
- 750. The chapeau of point 11 was adopted as amended.

Point 11(a)

- 751. An amendment proposed by the Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran to include “and prior learning” after “competences” (A.129) was not seconded and therefore fell.

752. Point 11, clause (a) was adopted.

New clause after (a)

A.139

- 753.** The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of Switzerland, introduced an amendment to insert after clause (a), a new clause which read “the occupational, training and labour market expertise of both workers’ and employers’ organizations;”. It was an important element to be included as the process for determining whether an occupation was suitable for a quality apprenticeship frequently involved input from, and consultations with, employers’ and workers’ organizations, which had expertise in the domain and could provide insights into whether an apprenticeship was a viable or preferred vehicle for attaining occupational competency. That was consistent with the general thrust of the instrument, in particular in point 8.
- 754.** The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons supported the amendment.
- 755.** The Government members of Cameroon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Brazil did not support the amendment as the importance of consulting the social partners was already included in the chapeau.
- 756.** The Government member of Saudi Arabia supported the amendment, but recognized that it would be repeating the same idea as in the chapeau.
- 757.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson pointed out that the introductory sentence was solely about the process that Members should adopt and not the substance. The Government members of the United States and Switzerland had identified one of the key factors to be taken into account, which was the expertise of the employers’ and workers’ organizations.
- 758.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson recognized the points made so far but noted that the original text flowed well and did already state that a process should be adopted which took into account the expertise of workers’ and employers’ organizations. However, given that they the text adopted at the 110th Session would not be the final one, she could support the amendment.
- 759.** In the spirit of consensus, the Government members of Cameroon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that they could support the amendment.
- 760.** The Government member of Australia supported the amendment.
- 761.** The amendment was adopted and the new clause was adopted.

Point 11, clauses (b) and (c)

762. As there were no amendments to clauses (b) and (c), they were adopted.

Point 11(d)

A.116

- 763.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, proposed an amendment to delete “and employment potential” before “in that occupation”. He requested clarification from the secretariat as to whether the concept of “employment potential” was

implicit in the term “current and future demand for skills”. He also proposed a subamendment, to add after “for skills” the phrase “and the wide range of emerging occupational fields, new production processes and services in that occupation”, which was the text proposed in an amendment submitted by the Employers’ group (A.104).

- 764.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson thanked the EU Member States for having engaged constructively with their proposed amendment. He supported the subamendment but suggested that the sentence could end after “and services” noting that including “in that occupation” would limit the scope of the instrument. That would be in line with the chapeau of point 11 and took into account the current and future demand for skills, and the wide-ranging set of emerging new occupational fields and new production processes and services. Regarding the deletion of “and employment potential”, he preferred to wait for the clarification from the secretariat.
- 765.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that she would also like to wait for clarification from the secretariat. She did not support the subamendment as she felt the text did not fit in the clause.
- 766.** The representative of the Secretary-General clarified that “employment potential” was already encapsulated by “future demand for skills”.
- 767.** Considering the explanation provided by the secretariat, the Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of India and Oman, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, said that they would prefer to retain the original text and did not support either the amendment or the subamendment.
- 768.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that he also preferred the original text and noted that adding “and the wide range of emerging occupational fields, new production processes and service” could lead to a temptation to list other relevant aspects, such as climate change, and therefore it would be best to stick to the original text.
- 769.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that he would also agree to keep the original text. However, he urged the Committee to bear in mind the content discussed under the proposed subamendment as he hoped to discuss it further as a stand-alone proposition under the amendment submitted by his group (A.104). He cautioned against rebuttal on the basis of repetition or implication because clarity was important for all potential users of the Recommendation.
- 770.** In the spirit of consensus, the Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States withdrew the subamendment.
- 771.** The amendment was not adopted.

A.104

- 772.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert “the wide range of emerging occupational fields, new production processes and services;” stating that when recognizing an occupation as being suitable for apprenticeships, consideration should be given as to how the world of work was changing. Some areas where an apprenticeship was formerly applicable might become subject to the need for higher qualifications, for example, while other areas that had traditionally been less skilled might in time benefit from apprenticeships. The proposed amendment was about taking a wider perspective of the processes envisaged in the chapeau of point 11.

- 773.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the insertion of “the wide range of emerging occupational fields,” as it could impact the current and future demands for skills pointed out in clause (d). Her group did not support the insertion of “, new production processes and services;” because the word “new” would actually reduce the timelessness of the instrument. It would be important not to look in details of the actual production process but rather at the occupation as a whole.
- 774.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment.
- 775.** In response to the concern raised by the Worker Vice-Chairperson, the Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to replace “new” by “and evolving” so that the text would read: “the wide range of emerging occupational fields, and evolving production processes and services;”.
- 776.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Australia supported the subamendment.
- 777.** The Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment and preferred the original text. The issues around emerging occupational fields had already been discussed. Evolving production processes and services was just one of the factors that determined skills demand, and thus it was not appropriate to include them in the text.
- 778.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 779.** Point 11, clause (d) was adopted as amended.
- 780.** Point 11 was adopted as amended.

Point 12, chapeau

A.140 and A.117

- 781.** The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of the Government Member of Canada, introduced an amendment to insert “by taking measures in accordance with national, and where applicable, subnational laws”. Not all Member States had apprenticeship-related laws and regulations that established the full range of occupation-specific standards for quality apprenticeships that were elaborated in the clauses of point 12. In many countries a variety of laws, regulations and practices addressed those issues. Therefore the intention of the amendment was to account for varying national circumstances. He proposed to subamend the proposal by adding “and practices” after “laws” in order to incorporate a similar amendment (A.117) submitted by EU Member States.
- 782.** The Government member of Canada asked the secretariat to clarify if the word “national” meant competent authorities, because in that case it would not be necessary to include the reference to subnational laws.
- 783.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment as subamended because it served the same purpose as the amendments submitted by EU Member States (A.117).
- 784.** In response to the question by the Government member of Canada, the representative of the Secretary-General said that the secretariat understood the words “national law” or “national practices” to cover the entire nation and thus to encapsulate laws at federal, provincial or

state level. On that basis, there would be no need to include the reference to “subnational” because it was part of the national system.

- 785.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment as subamended and said that the reference to subnational laws would not need to be removed. The conclusions concerning skills and lifelong learning adopted by the Conference at its 109th Session (2021) referred to “comprehensive and coordinated national and, where appropriate, subnational policies and strategies”.
- 786.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment. She said there was no need to refer to national or subnational laws. Such text was redundant because the instrument would be a Recommendation and therefore it could only be given an effect through national legislation and practices. It would also send the wrong signal to the international community as the Recommendation should be aiming at a broader, higher level.
- 787.** The Government member of Singapore supported both amendments (A.140 and A.117) but preferred the one submitted by EU Member States.
- 788.** The Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, preferred the original text for the reasons given by the Worker Vice-Chairperson. The proposed words would not be necessary in point 12, because point 6 already stated that “Members may give effect to the provisions of this instrument through national laws and regulations, [...] consistent with national law and practice”.
- 789.** The Government member of India preferred the Office text. Given the clarification provided by the representative of the Secretary-General, Member States would take actions in accordance with national legislations or laws, and thus the proposed words would be redundant.
- 790.** The Government member of Saudi Arabia, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, supported the amendment. Concerning the point raised by the Worker Vice-Chairperson on sending a wrong signal, he said that each region and country had specific requirements.
- 791.** The Government member of the United States said that such redundancy would make it clear that provisions following point 12 were in accordance with all applicable laws and that would be beneficial to the wide variety of stakeholders who would use the Recommendation.
- 792.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed that the proposed words would be a positive addition to the text. The Employment and Decent Work for Peace and Resilience Recommendation, 2017 (No. 205), the Domestic Workers Recommendation, 2011 (No. 201), and Recommendation No. 195 contained similar wording. It would be important to acknowledge the different circumstances and realities in countries.
- 793.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson asked for clarification from the secretariat as to whether other instruments included similar language.
- 794.** The Legal Adviser clarified that the expression frequently used in international labour standards was “national laws or regulations”. That was confirmed and approved by the Governing Body in 2005. The term “subnational” might have been included in conclusions from general or recurrent discussions at recent Conference sessions, but it was not used in standards. He noted that point 6, which already referred to national laws, regulations, collective agreements, practices, and the equivalent, had been adopted. For evident reasons, international labour standards could not go into such degree of detail and try to capture all national specificities (referring, for instance, to state, cantonal, provincial or communal laws). By the same logic, there was no need to go into detail about national, regional, or local

practices. By the same logic, there was no need to go into detail about national, regional, or local practices.

- 795.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson confirmed her preference for the original text.
- 796.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to remove the words “and, where applicable, subnational”.
- 797.** The Government member of Cameroon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment as subamended in order to move forward.
- 798.** The Government member of Canada stated that if the word “national” meant competent authorities she would also support the subamendment to remove the words “and, where applicable, subnational.”
- 799.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, withdrew their amendment.
- 800.** The amendment submitted by the United States and Canada was adopted as subamended.
- 801.** Two amendments (A.118 and A.147) were withdrawn.

A.119 and A.135

- 802.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, proposed an amendment to remove “occupation-specific” before “standards” stating that this would be logical and consistent with the rest of point 12.
- 803.** The Government member of Switzerland, speaking also on behalf of Australia, Canada and the United States, introduced an amendment, to insert “and general, as appropriate” after “occupation-specific”, as standards regulating apprenticeships might not all be occupation-specific but in some cases general or transversal.
- 804.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that it would be helpful, for the sake of clarity, to retain reference to “occupation-specific”. The elements listed in the clauses of point 12, apart from the first one, would in many cases be occupation-specific.
- 805.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that he preferred the amendment to insert “and general, as appropriate” after “occupation-specific” because it gave an accurate picture of the breadth of the matters listed in point 12 and would be a positive foundation for presenting the Recommendation to those who would implement it.
- 806.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, as well as the Government members of India and Kenya, also supported the amendment.
- 807.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, withdrew the amendment.
- 808.** The amendment submitted by the Government members of Australia, Canada, Switzerland and the United States was adopted.
- 809.** The chapeau of point 12 was adopted as amended.

Point 12(a)

A.148

- 810.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment to replace “taking account of” by “in accordance with” noting that the original phrase implied that the Conventions referred to

were but one factor, among others, to be taken into consideration rather than key considerations. Consequently, “in accordance with” was more appropriate in that context.

- 811.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment noting that “taking account of” was more appropriate language since the Committee was working towards adopting a Recommendation; “in accordance with” was a stricter term and implied a legally binding commitment not suitable for a Recommendation.
- 812.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment asserting that combating child labour was a priority for EU Member States and therefore language aimed at enforcing it was to be welcomed.
- 813.** The Government members of Argentina, Canada, Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, Oman, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, and the United States all supported the amendment.
- 814.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment in a spirit of consensus, but maintained his view that “in accordance with” was not appropriate language in the context of a Recommendation.
- 815.** The amendment was adopted.
- 816.** Point 12, clause (a) was adopted as amended.

New clause after (a)

A.149

- 817.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new clause after clause (a) to read: “safety and health measures;”, arguing that it was of utmost importance to enforce such measures, in particular because apprentices tended to be younger and be less aware of health and safety measures than others in the workplace. It was important that safety and health measures be considered on an occupation-specific basis which justified its inclusion as part of point 12.
- 818.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment as it was a positive addition to the text and reflected the discussion concerning the inclusion of a safe and healthy working environment in the framework of fundamental principles and rights that was taking place in the General Affairs Committee during the same session of the Conference.
- 819.** The Government member of Canada supported the amendment. In view of the discussions taking place in the General Affairs Committee, she proposed a subamendment to add, “, taking into consideration the Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 1981 (No. 155), and the Promotional Framework for Occupational Safety and Health Convention 2006 (No. 187)”, after “health measures”.
- 820.** The Government members of the United States, Australia and Switzerland supported the amendment and subamendment as it added clarity to the text.
- 821.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment and subamendment. He proposed a further subamendment to insert “occupational” before “safety and health measures” in order to avoid being too restrictive.
- 822.** The Government member of Türkiye supported the further subamendment proposed by France.

- 823.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the further subamendment. She also proposed a further subamendment to replace the phrase “taking into consideration” by “in accordance with” noting that the newly proposed wording would be consistent with the language adopted as part of the amendment A.148 under point 12(a).
- 824.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson in principle supported the amendment and subamendments. However, he sought the secretariat’s opinion on whether the Conclusions of the Committee could make reference to a text which had not yet been adopted by the Conference and thus might be subject to change.
- 825.** The Legal Adviser stated that the General Affairs Committee had adopted the resolution that recognized both Convention No. 155 and Convention No. 187 as fundamental within the meaning of the 1998 Declaration. The resolution would be submitted to the Conference plenary for adoption on Friday, 10 June.
- 826.** The Employer and the Worker Vice-Chairpersons supported the amendment and subamendments.
- 827.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, explained that the original EU proposal was to put in “occupational” at the beginning, without reference to the Conventions. He asked whether or not reference should also be made here to the Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138), since this also had OSH provisions and was also a fundamental Convention.
- 828.** The representative of the Secretary-General explained that Convention No. 138 was not referred to as an OSH Convention. There are several other Conventions that have OSH measures in them that are similarly not referred to as OSH Conventions. Conventions Nos 155 and 187 were the two designated OSH Conventions to become fundamental. It would therefore be appropriate to refer just to those two Conventions.
- 829.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed on the language of clause (a) after the explanation of the secretariat.
- 830.** The amendment was adopted as subamended and the new clause was adopted.

Point 12(b)

- 831.** Two amendments (A.150 and A.163) were withdrawn.

A.152

- 832.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment to replace “the” by “any” before “educational”, stating that the text included concepts that would assist with the transition from informal to formal and recalled that not every apprenticeship would need an educational qualification for entry.
- 833.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment, sharing the view that the word “any” would allow more flexibility regarding the qualifications needed to enter apprenticeships.
- 834.** The amendment was adopted.

A.164

- 835.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, proposed an amendment to insert “, if” before “needed”, stating that it would be useful to make the criteria for entering apprenticeship systems more flexible, opening the door to those who had vocational experience, not just to those with formal educational qualifications.
- 836.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to replace “qualifications” by “attainments”, to provide additional flexibility.
- 837.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a further subamendment to insert “, attainments” after “qualifications” instead of replacing the word “qualifications” in order to encompass a broader range of circumstances, while the insertion of “if” would provide flexibility.
- 838.** The Government members of Canada and France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the further subamendment proposed by the Employer’s group.
- 839.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 840.** Point 12, clause (b) was adopted as amended.

Point 12(c)

A.105

- 841.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment to delete clause (c) because ratios were old-fashioned and anti-competitive and would not necessarily lead to more and better apprenticeships. Employers needed flexibility in how they structured their workforce in view of specific circumstances and market demands.
- 842.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment. She asserted that it was essential to keep the word “ratio” to ensure that safety and health measures were maintained, that the learning and training environment was appropriately supervised and that the misuse of the apprenticeship system and inappropriate substitution of apprentices for regular workers was prevented.
- 843.** The Government members of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, Cameroon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, Chile and Canada, did not support the amendment due to concerns about potential and existing abuses that could lead to the replacement of workers by apprentices.
- 844.** The amendment was withdrawn.

A.162 and A.121

- 845.** The Government member of Australia, speaking also on behalf of Switzerland, introduced an amendment (A.162) to insert “the supervision of apprentices by qualified staff and the nature of supervision required, which may include” before “the ratio”. It was important that apprenticeship standards include requirements relating to apprentices’ vocational and workplace supervision. He also highlighted the evolving nature of supervision as apprentice competencies extended. He asked to consider the amendment submitted by EU Member States (A.121) at the same time.
- 846.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, introduced an amendment to replace “ratio” by “appropriate balance between apprentices and”.

- 847.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed that it was important to provide more detail on supervision in the clause. However, she did not agree with the insertion of “which may include” as the purpose of point 12 was, among other things, to prevent abuses in apprenticeships. She did not support the deletion of “ratio”, which had a specific meaning that was useful with regard to OSH and the prevention of abuses.
- 848.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment to delete “ratio”, but did not support the amendment submitted by Australia and Switzerland. He explained that the idea of an appropriate balance between apprentices and other workers in the workplace was the correct notion to take forward.
- 849.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, suggested merging the two amendments so that the text would read: “the supervision of apprentices by qualified staff and the nature of supervision required, which may take into account the appropriate balance between apprentices and workers in the workplace”. The word “ratio” only covered the numerical consistency, whereas the word “balance” would set a clear target and was very much in the spirit of the amendment proposed by Australia and Switzerland.
- 850.** The Government member of Argentina expressed concern that adding “supervision” at the start of the sentence might suggest that the purpose of supervision would be to ensure that the appropriate balance or ratio existed. Supervision had a broader scope.
- 851.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed with the Government member of Argentina and did not support the further subamendment introduced by EU Member States, as she believed that the new wording lost sight of the other elements, which were the reasons for keeping the notion of ratio or balance between apprentices and workers.
- 852.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the further subamendment introduced by EU Member States as it appropriately merged the desired concepts.
- 853.** The Worker-Vice Chairperson preferred to return to the core sense of the original text, the ratio of apprentices to workers. The focus should be on the need for an appropriate proportion of apprentices for occupational health reasons and to prevent abuse. She could support the words “appropriate balance”, proposed in the amendment, as that concept was aimed at ensuring that there were sufficient workers to be able to properly support apprentices and that the work was done effectively. The proposed words related to supervision would be better placed elsewhere.
- 854.** The Government member of Uganda said that the amendment submitted by Australia and Switzerland did not address all of the reasons for which “ratio” was included – to ensure that training took place, as well as to avoid exploitation. The issue of supervision was addressed well in clause (i); therefore he aligned with the Workers’ group in preferring the original text, though he could support the amendment proposed by EU Member States.
- 855.** The Government member of Australia, seconded by the Government member of the United States, proposed a further subamendment so that the text would read “the supervision of apprentices by qualified staff and the nature of supervision required, including”, as he felt that the question of supervision was not otherwise sufficiently addressed in the clause.
- 856.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that she could support the amendment submitted by EU Member States, as it proposed appropriate wording. The notion of supervision was important but could be dealt with in another clause.

- 857. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, insisted that the issue of supervision was important and proposed to have two separate clauses so that both amendments could be included.
- 858. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, the Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Australia, Argentina, Canada and Switzerland supported the subamendment.
- 859. Both amendments were adopted as subamended.

A.110

- 860. The Government member of Oman introduced an amendment to delete “also” and replace “micro, small and medium” by “eligible”, arguing that it was better to leave it to each Member State to decide on the application of the Recommendation. The proposed amendment made the application more flexible.
- 861. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment since it was important to make explicit reference to micro, small and medium-sized enterprises in order to promote discussions concerning the needs of such enterprises.
- 862. The Worker Vice-Chairperson also did not support the amendment.
- 863. The amendment was withdrawn.
- 864. Point 12, clause (c) was adopted as amended.

Point 12(d)

A.122

- 865. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, introduced an amendment to replace “minimum and maximum” with “general” stating that “minimum and maximum” was too restrictive. Many factors influence the duration of the apprenticeship and it therefore needs to vary.
- 866. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment and wanted to include a sense of the shortest expected time and the longest expected time, but was flexible on the exact wording.
- 867. The Government member of Australia supported the intention of the amendment and suggested a subamendment to replace “general” with “expected”.
- 868. The Worker Vice-Chairperson seconded the subamendment by Australia.
- 869. The Government member of Cameroon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment, preferring the Office text.
- 870. The Government members of Colombia and of Argentina did not support the amendment. The original text was clearer and more precise. Having a specific minimum and maximum would also help in preventing abuses.
- 871. The Government member of the United States did not support the amendment. They were open to different wording, but it was important to include a specific minimum duration for apprenticeships to ensure that apprentices receive sufficient training to acquire the necessary competencies.
- 872. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, expressed a need for more flexibility and suggested a further subamendment to add “expected minimum

and maximum" before "duration", reading "the expected minimum and maximum duration of the apprenticeship;".

- 873. The Government member of Canada seconded the subamendment by EU Member States.
- 874. The Government members of Australia and Cameroon, the Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment by EU Member States.
- 875. The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 876. Point 12, clause (d) was adopted as amended.

Point 12(e)

A.109

- 877. The Government member of Oman, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, introduced an amendment to remove clause (e). He reasoned that rather than allowing apprentices with faster than average progress to complete the apprenticeship early, the apprentice could be provided with additional recognition through reward mechanisms or additional certifications. Allowing exceptions would increase the administrative burden. Members should be allowed to autonomously decide whether they felt that was necessary.
- 878. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment. They stressed the importance of allowing for flexibility in a contemporary apprenticeship system. There was a risk of some apprentices not completing their qualifications because they did not do so on time, and equally, there were those who would already have relevant experience which should reasonably allow them to shorten the period of the apprenticeship. This did not mean promoting shortened apprenticeships, but rather allowing for flexibility.
- 879. The Government member of the United States, supported by the Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment for the reasons already mentioned.
- 880. The Government member of Cameroon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment. He mentioned that clause (e) was covered by clauses (b) and (d), and was redundant.
- 881. The Government member of Oman, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, withdrew the amendment.
- 882. The amendment was withdrawn.

A.123

- 883. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced an amendment to replace "normal" by "general". In order to be consistent with the language used for clause (e), he proposed a subamendment to replace the word "general" by "expected".
- 884. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, Employer Vice-Chairperson, as well as the Government members of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Togo supported the subamendment.
- 885. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

A.106

- 886. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add “recognized” before “prior learning” to emphasize that only prior learning assessed within the national qualifications framework would be recognized.
- 887. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment and felt that the addition of the word “recognized” introduced ambiguity.
- 888. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment.
- 889. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment.
- 890. The amendment was withdrawn.

A.124

- 891. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced an amendment to delete “any” before “prior learning”.
- 892. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, Employer Vice-Chairperson, as well as the Government members of South Sudan and Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment.
- 893. The amendment was adopted.
- 894. Point 12, clause (e) was adopted as amended.

Point 12(f)

A.141

- 895. The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of Australia, introduced an amendment to insert “relevant occupational competencies and” before “labour market needs”. He emphasized that the content of apprenticeship learning outcomes and curricula should also be based upon the required occupational skills and competencies in addition to the labour market needs which could be transitory in nature.
- 896. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 897. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the additional text, but proposed to insert “and the education and training needs of apprentices” after “relevant occupational competencies”, as she felt it necessary to highlight apprentices’ needs for education and training which supplemented apprenticeship training.
- 898. The Government member of Canada preferred the original amendment, arguing that when people chose a vocation, it would mean that they had met their education and training needs already.
- 899. The Government members of Singapore and Oman agreed with Canada and preferred the text proposed in the amendment.
- 900. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the subamendment.
- 901. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment as it seemed logical to look at occupational competencies, which were the core, education and training needs of

apprentices, which were supply-driven, and labour market needs, which were demand-driven.

902. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

Point 12(g)

A.107 and A.125

- 903.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment (A.107) to replace the text of the clause by “the combination of off-the-job learning and on-the-job learning” and noted that the word “balance” proposed in the amendment submitted by EU Members States was more effective than “combination”.
- 904.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, introduced an amendment (A.125) similar to the one by the Employers’ group, but using “appropriate balance between” instead of “combination of”. He noted that “ratio” was too prescriptive and “appropriate balance” gave more flexibility.
- 905.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson preferred the wording proposed by EU Member States, although her group’s preference would be to retain “ratio” in the text.
- 906.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, preferred the term “appropriate balance”.
- 907.** The Employers’ group’s amendment (A.107) was withdrawn and the EU Members States’ amendment (A.125) was adopted.
- 908.** Point 12, clause (g) was adopted as amended.

Point 12(h)

A.142

- 909.** The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of the Government member of Australia, proposed an amendment to insert “access to” at the beginning of the sentence which would provide flexibility.
- 910.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson preferred the original text. Member States should provide “vocational guidance and career counselling” services to apprentices, rather than relying on apprentices to access to those services.
- 911.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson also preferred the original text and found the term “access to” to be ambiguous. He also enquired whether that term was intended to include online vocational guidance and career counselling.
- 912.** The Government members of Canada, Singapore and France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment.
- 913.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, also supported the amendment as it put the focus on both the process and the beneficiary and therefore was all encompassing in nature.
- 914.** The Government member of the United States clarified that it was important that apprentices had access to vocational guidance and career counselling, be it provided by Member States, as indicated in the chapeau of the point, or by other entities.
- 915.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.

916. The amendment was adopted.

A.144

917. The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of the Government Member of Switzerland proposed an amendment to add “, and other supportive services as appropriate” after “career counselling”, noting that services such as childcare, transportation, funds for equipment, and tuition fees assistance might be necessary for apprentices. The broad terminology could accommodate diverse national circumstances.
918. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment because “other supportive services” were very different from vocational guidance and career counselling and would therefore dilute the key focus of the clause. It would also open the question of who would finance those services.
919. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment agreeing that other supportive services would be of great assistance for people to access apprenticeship training.
920. The Government member of Switzerland mentioned case management and mentoring as examples of other supportive services.
921. The Government member of Brazil found that the words “other supportive services” lacked clarity and asked whether access to those services was part of apprentices’ rights.
922. The Government member of the United States clarified that the amendment was not intended to entitle apprentices with a new right, but to provide them with the opportunity to be guided to additional services depending on the national context.
923. The Government member of Singapore supported the amendment as it would enable States to determine what supportive services were to be provided based on national circumstances.
924. The Government members of Colombia and Brazil did not support the amendment and preferred the original text because they felt the terms “other supportive services” were ambiguous and might lead to misinterpretation.
925. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, acknowledged the positive intent of the amendment, but suggested to explore alternative formulations to remove the ambiguity.
926. The Government member of Argentina supported the amendment and remarked that the “other support services” were complementary to employment and training policy implementation.
927. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to replace “supportive” with “government” to read “, and other government support service as appropriate” to enhance clarity of the text.
928. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment, saying that there could be other support services provided by non-governmental entities.
929. The Government members of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and the United States did not support the subamendment, sharing the view of the Workers’ group.
930. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed another subamendment to replace “government” with “established”.

- 931. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of the United States did not support the new subamendment, pointing out that the intention of the Employers' group was not clear.
- 932. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that he could support the amendment as initially proposed.
- 933. The amendment was adopted.
- 934. Point 12, clause (h) was adopted as amended.

Point 12(i)

A.154

- 935. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment to insert ", including pedagogical qualifications" after "trainers". It would be helpful to mention explicitly pedagogical qualifications as they were required in addition to expertise in apprentices' training.
- 936. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the proposal because trades training would not work in practice if the clause placed too much emphasis on pedagogical qualifications. It could result in the exclusion of some of the best trainers with decades of experience, many of whom possessed pedagogical qualifications in spite of not having university degrees.
- 937. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, proposed a subamendment to replace "qualifications" by "knowledge" to address the Employers' group's concern.
- 938. The Government member of Switzerland, seconded by the Government member of Canada, proposed another subamendment to replace "qualifications" with "competencies".
- 939. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment because it was implicit in the original text that teachers would have the pedagogical qualification to instruct students.
- 940. Addressing the concerns expressed by the Employer Vice-Chairperson, the Government member of Canada, seconded by the Government member of Switzerland, proposed a further subamendment to add "and andragogical" after "pedagogical" stating that the word "andragogical" referred to educating adults who typically would be self-directed learners, which was common in apprenticeships.
- 941. The Worker Vice-Chairperson accepted the further subamendment, mentioning that the proposal was helpful and in line with her view on the competencies required for coaching apprentices.
- 942. The Employer Vice-Chairperson remarked that the group had no objection to the concept introduced but stressed that the instrument should be written in plain language. Therefore, he requested the Committee members to revisit the clause with simpler terms.
- 943. The Government member of Oman supported the view of the Employers' group.
- 944. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the proposal to replace "qualifications" with "competencies", but did not support the addition of "and andragogical" because the term would be unfamiliar to most people.

- 945. The Government member of Colombia agreed with the Africa group that teachers, by definition, are supposed to have pedagogical qualifications. Therefore she preferred to keep the original text for simplicity.
- 946. The Government member of Australia, seconded by the Government member of Canada, proposed to replace “pedagogical and andragogical” with “teaching and adult learning”.
- 947. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the proposal.
- 948. The Government members of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, Argentina, Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Namibia, Saudi Arabia and the United States, as well as the Employer Vice-Chairperson, preferred the original text.
- 949. The Worker Vice-Chairperson reiterated the importance of teaching competencies, but withdrew the amendment given the lack of support.

A.134

- 950. The Government member of Australia, also speaking on behalf of the Government member of Switzerland, introduced the amendment to add “and supervising staff” after “in-company trainers”. The instrument should regulate qualifications and expertise of workplace supervisors of apprentices in addition to teachers and in-company trainers.
- 951. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 952. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment. He expressed concern over the impracticality and inflexibility that such text might engender in day-to-day operations.
- 953. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment.
- 954. The Government members of Argentina, Colombia and Senegal did not support the amendment.
- 955. The amendment was withdrawn.
- 956. Point 12, clause (i) was adopted.

New clause after (i)

A.108

- 957. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new clause to read: “dispute resolution mechanisms;”. Drawing attention to examples of disputes that could arise in apprenticeships, he found it necessary that dispute resolution mechanisms be part of the regulatory framework.
- 958. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment because a framework for dispute resolution would already be in place and multiplicity in dispute resolution mechanisms could prevent effective and speedy settlement of problems.
- 959. The Government member of the United States did not support the amendment because he felt it was out of place given the chapeau of the point. He was concerned that this amendment might preclude apprentices from using dispute resolution mechanisms that were provided by law.

- 960. The Government member of India did not support the amendment, stating that there might be a provision for redressal of grievances in apprenticeships in relevant laws.
- 961. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment and pointed out that the subject could be discussed in point 19, which mentioned dispute resolution.
- 962. The amendment was withdrawn.

A.156

- 963. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new clause to read: “the appropriate ratio of apprentices to teachers, taking into account the need to ensure quality education and training”. She felt that occupation-specific standards for teaching and training were helpful, noting differences in the kind of instructions, ranging from detailed one-to-one coaching to a larger classroom teaching.
- 964. The Employer Vice-Chairperson recalled the previous discussion on the term “ratio” and reminded the Committee that it had been agreed to replace it with “appropriate balance”. Before expressing his group’s stance on the amendment, he invited government members to share their views on it because the amendment would have financial implications in the vocational education and training budgets.
- 965. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the intention of the amendment, noting the importance of providing apprentices with sufficient guidance, supervision and assistance. In line with the previous discussion, he proposed a subamendment to replace “ratio of apprentices to teachers” with “balance between apprentices and teachers”.
- 966. The Government member of Canada supported the subamendment.
- 967. The Government member of Brazil did not support the subamendment because determining what was an appropriate balance between apprentices and teachers would be ambiguous in practice, and setting a standard on it was prescriptive.
- 968. The Government member of Colombia echoed the statement by the Government member of Brazil, adding that the balance between apprentices and teachers in educational settings could not be applied to training in enterprises.
- 969. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, pointed out that the term “appropriate” provided the necessary flexibility to accommodate different realities and practices.
- 970. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment proposed by EU Member States.
- 971. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, while surprised that governments had not reacted to the considerable budgetary implications of the clause, did not object to the amendment as subamended.
- 972. The amendment was adopted as subamended and the new clause was adopted.

Point 12(j)

A.155

- 973. The Government member of Argentina, speaking also on behalf of Brazil and Chile, introduced an amendment to insert at the beginning of the clause “the mechanisms for

certifying the apprentice's prior capacities and competencies and", and at the end of the clause "during the apprenticeship agreement". The amendment was intended to give value to the prior capacities and competencies acquired and to adopt a mechanism to ensure that prior learning could be recognized.

- 974.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment highlighting that the mechanism for certifying the prior capacities and competencies had been dealt with in clauses (b) and (e). Furthermore, the terms "competencies acquired" implied those learned during the apprenticeship.
- 975.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, while acknowledging the intention of the amendment, agreed with the Employers' group.
- 976.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, shared the views of the Worker and Employer Vice-Chairpersons.
- 977.** The amendment was withdrawn.
- 978.** Point 12, clause (j) was adopted without amendment.

Point 12(k)

- 979.** As there were no amendments to clause (k), it was adopted.

New clause after (k)

A.158

- 980.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, introduced an amendment to add a new clause after (k) to read "the establishment of occupational or sector skills councils". Acknowledging the guidance provided by the secretariat during the discussion of point 4(a), he suggested that the amendment be discussed under point 24.
- 981.** The consideration of the amendment was deferred to be done in conjunction with point 24 (see paragraphs 1502–1505 below).
- 982.** Point 12 was adopted as amended.

Point 13

A.207, A.248 and A.255

- 983.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, introduced an amendment to replace the text of the point by the following, as the original text did not express clearly that the apprentices' consent should be required to be transferred from one company to another:

Members should take measures to ensure that transferring an apprentice from one enterprise to another is only possible with the apprentice's consent.

- 984.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson presented two amendments (A.248 and A.255) to replace the text of the point with the following text:

Members should take measures to ensure that there is a fair and transparent process by which an apprenticeship can be completed in more than one enterprise, when this is considered necessary for the completion of the apprenticeship. This process should be subject to the apprentice's consent and should guarantee equal-level training.

985. Her group was uncomfortable with the word “transferring” as it implied that the apprentice was a purely passive participant. She highlighted the importance of ensuring a fair and transparent process because apprentices lacked bargaining power. She stressed the importance of ensuring, in case of transfer, that the same quality level of training would be provided in the second enterprise. She preferred the formulation proposed by EU Member States – “is only possible with” – to the text suggested in her group’s second amendment (“this process should be subject to”).
986. The Employer Vice-Chairperson felt that the original text was prescriptive in nature and might work against the interest of apprentices. He urged Committee members to consider positive reasons for which apprentices might need to be transferred, citing cases of a group training model and company takeover. In a group training model the hiring entity sent apprentices to practical training offered by multiple enterprises. Restrictive transfer procedures might actually put apprentices at risk of being laid off in cases of corporate takeover. The insertion of “equal-level training” was ambiguous and redundant as point 12 already set the standards for apprenticeship training that applied to all enterprises. On those grounds he did not support any of the three amendments.
987. The Government member of Malawi, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the first part of the text proposed by the Workers’ group and further suggested to replace the word “completed” with “undertaken”.
988. The Government member of Colombia stated that she agreed with the original text in principle, but she could support the first part of the text proposed by the Workers’ group.
989. The Government member of Singapore supported the text proposed by EU Member States because the key concern was on consent of apprentices. She felt that the amendments proposed by the Workers’ group were too prescriptive.
990. The Worker Vice-Chairperson reiterated the rationale behind the first part of the proposed text, stressing the importance of a fair and transparent process and consent of apprentices when several enterprises were involved in the completion of apprenticeship training.
991. The Government member of Saudi Arabia, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, preferred the text proposed by EU Member States.
992. The Government member of Argentina stated that the text proposed by the Workers’ group encompassed the apprentice’s consent which was also the key point of the amendment proposed by EU Member States. She proposed that the Committee advanced discussion on that basis.
993. The Government members of Brazil, Chile and Colombia echoed the statement by Argentina.
994. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, maintained that their text was clearer with regards to the nature of consent of apprentices. The first part of the text proposed by the Workers’ group was ambiguous in that regard, and also thought that it might be misunderstood as if consent of apprentices was needed only when the transfer was in relation to the completion of apprenticeships.
995. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed changing the order of the sentences in their proposal in order to address the concerns raised by EU Member States, so that the text would read: “Members should take measures to ensure that there is a fair and transparent process by which an apprenticeship can be undertaken in more than one enterprise, subject to the apprentice’s consent, when this is considered necessary for the completion of the apprenticeship.”

- 996.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported that text.
- 997.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson further suggested moving “subject to the apprentice’s consent” to a second sentence.
- 998.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not agree with that change.
- 999.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, reiterated that the ambiguity remained as there were two opposite expressions in the same clause. Either the consent of the apprentice was absolute, or they could still be transferred from one company to another when it was considered necessary. He believed the only way to resolve the issue was to consider the consent of the apprentice as necessary or absolute.
- 1000.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not agree with the need for having the consent of apprentices, observing that most workers did not have veto power over the transfer of the ownership of their employing entity.
- 1001.** The Government member of Malawi supported the first part of the text proposed by the Workers’ group, but not the second. If the consent of apprentices were to be prioritized, it would be difficult to manage apprenticeships in most African countries.
- 1002.** The Government member of Uganda was in favour of the text as subamended by the Workers’ group, which contained all the key elements – consent of apprentice, a fair and transparent process, and the possibility of the apprenticeship being conducted in more than one enterprise.
- 1003.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that he could accept the text as subamended, but wondered what would happen if an apprentice needed to move from one company to another and did not agree.
- 1004.** The representative of the Secretary-General, read, as a reference, the text on transfer of apprentices contained in Recommendation No. 117:
- It should be possible by agreement among all parties concerned to transfer an apprentice from one undertaking to another when this is considered necessary or desirable for the completion of his training.
- 1005.** The Government member of Cameroon referred to regulatory authorities responsible for apprenticeships under point 9, and asserted that those authorities would intervene in case of disagreement between enterprises and apprentices.
- 1006.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the text contained in Recommendation No. 117, and proposed to replace “his” with “that”.
- 1007.** The first amendment proposed by the Workers’ group (A.248) was adopted as subamended and the other two amendments (A.207 and A.255) were not adopted.
- 1008.** Point 13 was adopted as amended.

New point after 13

A.253

- 1009.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new point to read: “Each member should take measures to ensure the effective protection and promotion of the human rights of apprentices”. She noted that the proposed text was in alignment with the Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189), and highlighted the need to protect the human rights of apprentices given their vulnerability.

- 1010.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment since the reference to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights had already been inserted in point 3 to be part of the Preamble. Moreover, he believed that making an imprecise and impractical reference to human rights in the section of the instrument dedicated to regulatory framework could lend itself to misinterpretation.
- 1011.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment proposed by the Workers' group.
- 1012.** The Government member of Singapore agreed with the views expressed by the Employers' group that the amendment would result in inserting a repetition.
- 1013.** The Government members of Canada, Brazil, Central African Republic, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, Türkiye, and Chile did not support the amendment.
- 1014.** The amendment was withdrawn.

A.251 and A.252

- 1015.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed two amendments to insert the following new points:

In taking measures to ensure that apprentices and employers enjoy freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining, Members should protect the right of apprentices and employers to establish and, subject to the rules of the organization concerned, to join organizations, federations and confederations of their own choosing. (A.251)

Each Member should, in relation to apprenticeships, take the measures to respect, promote and realize the fundamental principles and rights at work, namely:

- (a) freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining;
- (b) the elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labour;
- (c) the effective abolition of child labour; and
- (d) the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation. (A.252)

- 1016.** The first amendment was intended to make sure that it was clearly stated in the Recommendation that apprentices and employers should both enjoy freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining. The second was related to the obligation of States to take measures to respect, promote and realize the fundamental principles and rights at work. For the Workers' group it was critical to include such texts, particularly in relation to freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining. Apprentices often, in practice, could not join trade unions and hence were not covered by collective agreements. She gave an example of a factory in Asia, where the union had successfully negotiated a collective agreement which set limits on the use of contract workers and provided a pathway to convert precarious workers into permanent ones. But the management subsequently hired 40 apprentices on three-year apprenticeships. There was no training or educational institute involved, and their wages were set at 40 per cent lower than those of permanent workers. They were, in fact replacing permanent workers. But as soon as the union challenged this, the response was that the union had no right to raise the issue as the apprentices could not be members of the union.
- 1017.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendments as he considered that those matters were already covered in the Preamble, in point 3(e). The 1998 Declaration, the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization (2008), as amended in 2022, and the Centenary Declaration all addressed the rights to freedom of association and collective

bargaining as well as the four fundamental principles spelled out in the second point proposed. The text in the Preamble was a stable formulation, framed by the Organization at its highest levels, aspects of which should not be singled out in other parts of the instrument. He also argued that the proposed new point would not address situations such as that provided in the example by the Worker Vice-Chairperson.

- 1018.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, supported the concerns raised by the Workers' group and proposed a subamendment to make the text more concise, by keeping only the sentence "Each Member should, in relation to apprenticeships, take the measures to respect, promote and realize the fundamental principles and rights at work".
- 1019.** The Government members of Canada, Türkiye, Brazil, Australia, Colombia, and Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the subamended text put forward by EU Member States.
- 1020.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that she could also support the subamendment introduced by the EU Member States as it encapsulated the contents of the two proposed amendments texts.
- 1021.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment and asked whether the other members of the Committee might reconsider their positions, taking into account that the proposed text would try to apply a paradigm contingent upon employment to apprenticeship arrangements, which in some countries were not employment-based.
- 1022.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson argued that international labour standards applied to apprentices regardless of the type of contract, as had been made clear by decisions of the Committee on Freedom of Association and other ILO supervisory bodies.
- 1023.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson reiterated that the Employers' group did not agree that the fundamental principles and rights at work would apply to apprenticeship arrangements around the world which might not always be employment relationships.
- 1024.** The first amendment (A.251) was not adopted and the second (A.252) was adopted as subamended.
- 1025.** A new point was therefore adopted.

A.254

- 1026.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson asked the secretariat if the text for a new point concerning the eligibility of enterprises to carry out apprenticeships proposed in an amendment submitted by her group (A.254) should be dealt with when considering point 15, which stipulated the conditions under which an enterprise may offer apprenticeships.
- 1027.** The secretariat confirmed that it was indeed the case.
- 1028.** The amendment was withdrawn.

Point 14, chapeau

A.171

- 1029.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert "including providing financial support and incentives" after "measures,". He said that the various measures listed in point 14 carried with them financial implications and Governments would potentially step

in to help employers fulfil their obligations in those areas to promote apprenticeships. It was well established in a number of countries, such as France, India and the United Kingdom, that governments provided financial support and incentives to encourage and support employers, in particular smaller ones, to participate in apprenticeships.

- 1030.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not disagree with the thrust of the amendment but said that point 14 was not the right place to insert that text as the point related to entitlements and provisions for apprentices, rather than support for employers.
- 1031.** The Government members of France, speaking on behalf the EU and its Member States, Kenya, Switzerland and the United States did not support the amendment.
- 1032.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson argued that in some national contexts, a number of the items listed under point 14 would only be possible with the financial support of the Government. The proposed text would send a clear signal and help to make the Recommendation positive, practical and pragmatic.
- 1033.** The amendment was not adopted.

A.249, A.172 and A.218

- 1034.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete “, having regard to national circumstances” (A.249). To take into account the amendment submitted by the Employers’ group to insert “laws and” before “circumstances” (A.172), she proposed to subamend her group’s amendment in light of the advice previously provided by the secretariat about the fact that the reference to national laws and regulations had been inserted in point 6. The amended text of the chapeau would read: “Members should take measures through the means set out in point 6 to ensure that apprentices:”.
- 1035.** The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Canada and Türkiye, introduced an amendment (A.218) so that the clause would read: “Members should take measures, in accordance with national laws and circumstances, to ensure that apprentices:”.
- 1036.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that of the three proposed amendments, he preferred the one put forward by Government members as the text was more accurate, practical and useful for those working at national level.
- 1037.** The Government member of the United States said that not all Member States had in place apprenticeship laws and regulations that covered the full range of items elaborated in point 14. Those items were in some cases covered by other laws. The aim of the amendment was to make the text as clear as possible, even to users of the Recommendation not familiar with the legal language used in such texts.
- 1038.** The Government members of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, Brazil, Colombia and Singapore, also supported the amendment introduced by the United States, Canada and Türkiye.
- 1039.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson asked if “in accordance with” meant to the greatest extent possible given national circumstances, or only to the extent that national law provided for. That would be helpful in relation to how the Recommendation would be implemented by governments. The purpose of the subamendment she had proposed was to look beyond existing laws and consider potential adaptations that could be inspired by the Recommendation.

- 1040.** The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Canada and Türkiye, reiterated that the intent of their amendment was that apprentices' entitlements should not only be covered by apprenticeship laws. The full range of rights to which apprentices were entitled as listed in point 14 could be covered by many other laws.
- 1041.** On the basis of that clarification, the Worker Vice-Chairperson could support the amendment.
- 1042.** The amendment proposed by the United States, Canada and Türkiye (A.218) was adopted.
- 1043.** The amendments introduced by the Workers' group (A.249) and by the Employers' group (A.172) were not adopted.
- 1044.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew another amendment (A.250).
- 1045.** The chapeau of point 14 was adopted as amended.

Point 14(a)

A.208

- 1046.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, introduced an amendment (A.208), to replace "remuneration" with "pay or other compensation". He said that was a core issue for EU Member States, who had suggested the same change in other parts of the text. However, having heard previous discussions on the matter and the explanations provided by the secretariat, it was understood that "pay or other compensation" might embrace payment in kind in some countries, which should not be included in the Recommendation. The EU Member States therefore withdrew the proposed amendment in preference for the original word "remuneration" in the current clause and in other parts of the text.

A.173 and A.246

- 1047.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace "appropriate remuneration" by "an allowance, a stipend, remuneration or other forms of payment, as appropriate", (A.173). In light of previous discussions, he subamended the text to be inserted after "remuneration" to read "or other compensation, which". There was a range of practices and arrangements throughout the world regarding apprenticeships that needed to be taken into account. It was possible to make an exhortation, encouragement or aspiration for compensation or payments that were appropriate and could be increased across different stages of the apprenticeship that would be applicable in all circumstances. He emphasized the importance for his group of avoiding the risk of disincentivizing and detracting from the goal of supporting more apprenticeships. The proposed text was relevant to a wide range of national circumstances and had great practical relevance.
- 1048.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support either the subamendment. She preferred the term "remuneration" which, as defined by the secretariat, included indirect and direct payments, and other benefits. It would be the appropriate term, and had been used in other standards. It would help broadening participation in apprenticeships, ensuring access to those who might not otherwise be able to receive better paid work.
- 1049.** The Government member of the United States did not support the subamendment, echoing the Worker Vice-Chairperson as the broad understanding of remuneration would be sufficient.

- 1050.** The Government member of Cameroon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that on the basis of wide consultations among African governments, there was strong support for the amendment because remuneration was generally understood to refer to a salary or wage which implied a direct link between an employer and employee. An apprentice was not, however, an employee. Therefore, the word “remuneration” would not be pertinent in all African countries. For the Recommendation to be effective in Africa, it would be important to insert the additional words proposed in the subamendment to make the meaning clearer, even if it was somewhat redundant.
- 1051.** The Government member of Colombia said that the term remuneration could create difficulties, as it implied an employment contract. An apprenticeship contract was not an employment contract, and in Spanish the term remuneration was quite restrictive. If the word remuneration was used, a further subamendment would need to be included, qualifying the term by stating that remuneration did not have the status of a salary, or something along those lines.
- 1052.** The Government member of Brazil supported the amendment as subamended.
- 1053.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson emphasized that it was important to account for diversity in the forms and types of remuneration in various countries, for practical reasons. He cited the definition of the term “remuneration” as defined in the 2012 *General Survey on the fundamental Conventions concerning rights at work in light of the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, 2008*. The definition was contingent on whether a wage was provided, and implied that only apprentices in employment were covered.
- 1054.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that based on the wording of Recommendation No. 117, which dealt with remuneration with respect to apprenticeships, the term was broad enough to cover all circumstances.
- 1055.** The Government member of Chile supported the amendment as subamended, acknowledging that there were various forms of payment, both monetary and non-monetary, provided to apprentices in different countries.
- 1056.** The Government member of the United States echoed the arguments presented by the Workers’ group. He suggested that the secretariat circulate a definition of the term “remuneration” based on international labour standards to all representatives before continuing the discussions on the matter.
- 1057.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed that it was important to acknowledge the variations in definitions of the term “remuneration”.
- 1058.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, asked whether there was any risk in including the term “or other compensation”. He said that the Africa group would be able to support the subamendment if that term was included. Otherwise, they would be able to accept the term “remuneration” as it had been used in various ILO instruments and papers.
- 1059.** The Government member of Uganda recognized that there were different approaches to remunerating or compensating apprentices. He drew attention to the definition of the term “remuneration” in the Protection of Wages Convention, 1949 (No. 95), and Convention No. 100, in which it was defined as a form of payment by an employer to employee, for work done. That would effectively not include apprentices in some jurisdictions where they were not considered employees.

- 1060.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that remuneration was the correct term; it had been used in relation to apprentices before and did not necessarily indicate there was an employment relationship. While different words were used among countries, the Recommendation needed to set high standards that could accommodate all the different understandings and circumstances and be applied in all countries. Apprentices too often faced exploitation and it was important to move on from payment in kind and make a clear statement about proper payment, which was remuneration.
- 1061.** The Government member of Cameroon wished to make it clear that he was not in any way opposed to apprentices receiving financial remuneration. The point was to be clear and take into account varying national circumstances. He suggested another subamendment so that the text would read “remuneration or other financial compensation”.
- 1062.** The Government member of Colombia supported the further subamendment proposed by the Government member of Cameroon. The term “financial compensation” could allay the concerns of the Workers’ group that “compensation” alone might be seen as diluting the need for financial payment.
- 1063.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the use of “or other financial compensation”.
- 1064.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the proposed text and introduced another amendment (A.246), to replace “appropriate” by “adequate” so that the clause would read: “receive adequate remuneration or adequate other financial compensation”.
- 1065.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that introduction of the word “adequate” opened up a different discussion. They should first characterize how the payment was made, and then discuss the qualifiers such as “appropriate” or “adequate”.
- 1066.** The Government member of Brazil requested the Workers’ group to explain why the term “adequate” was preferred to “appropriate”.
- 1067.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the Workers’ group proposal, noting that the term “appropriate” could be subjective, whereas “adequate” was more aligned with the overall objective of the point.
- 1068.** The Government members of Canada and Australia also supported that proposal.
- 1069.** The Government member of the United States supported the inclusion of “other financial compensation” and the replacement of “appropriate” by “adequate”.
- 1070.** The Government member of Colombia supported the text as amended, but not the use of “adequate” twice in the same phrase.
- 1071.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that it was not their intention to insert “adequate” twice, but reiterated the importance of using that term to ensure that apprenticeships were accessible by a wide range of people.
- 1072.** The Government member of Brazil shared the views expressed by the EU and its Member States and also supported the text, but with the term “adequate” only once.
- 1073.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, also supported the text as amended.
- 1074.** The amendment proposed by the Employers’ group (A.173) was adopted as subamended and the amendment proposed by the Workers’ group (A.246) was adopted.

A.219

- 1075.** The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of Australia and Canada, introduced an amendment to replace “adjusted” with “increased” and to add, at the end of the clause, “to reflect the progressive acquisition of occupational competencies by the apprentice”. He noted that the use of “adjusted” could include a decreased remuneration, which was certainly not the intention, as the apprentices progressed through the apprenticeship programme. The term “increased” was therefore more suitable.
- 1076.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, the Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Kenya, on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment.
- 1077.** The amendment was adopted.
- 1078.** Another amendment (A.174) to clause (a) was withdrawn.
- 1079.** Point 14, clause (a) was adopted as amended.

Point 14(b)

A.209, A.259 and A.260

- 1080.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, introduced an amendment (A.209) to delete the word “specified” and insert “specified by national legislation and collective agreements” after “limits”. He explained that the original text was vague as it did not specify how the maximum hours were decided.
- 1081.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment and withdrew the two amendments submitted by her group (A.259 and A.260) because all the issues they addressed were covered in the EU Member States’ amendment.
- 1082.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment as he preferred the original wording. He recalled point 6 already indicated various means through which Member States would give effect to the provisions of the instrument, including national laws, regulations and policies and collective agreements.
- 1083.** The Government members of Oman, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, South Sudan, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, Argentina, and Australia supported the amendment.
- 1084.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to replace the word “and” with “or” to provide a choice of means.
- 1085.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the subamendment as it diminished the scope of coverage and did not increase protection for apprentices.
- 1086.** The amendment proposed by the EU Member States (A.209) was adopted.
- 1087.** Point 14, clause (b) was adopted as amended.

Point 14(c)

A.175

- 1088.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace “with pay” by “during which they should continue to receive the remuneration or other financial compensation

referred to in clause (a), where applicable". The amendment was proposed with a view to align it with the formulation in point 14, clause (a).

- 1089.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the amendment was unnecessary and she preferred the straightforward formulation of the original text. The term "pay" covered remuneration and other financial compensation as specified in clause (a). The words "where applicable" were not necessary.
- 1090.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed to delete ", where applicable".
- 1091.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, highlighted two issues. First, apprentices might have the status of a student in some countries, hence the entitlement for paid holidays would not apply to them. If holiday entitlement was the case, the secretariat could suggest a text to cover it. The other issue was related to the clarity and specificity of the amendment. He agreed with the employers on the use of "remuneration or other financial compensation" that had been agreed upon by the Committee. However, the formulation of the text was unnecessarily complex. He proposed a further subamendment to simplify the entire clause which would read "are entitled to holidays with remuneration or other financial compensation".
- 1092.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a further subamendment to insert "adequate" between "with" and "remuneration".
- 1093.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, and the Government members of Brazil and Canada supported the further subamendments proposed by EU Member States and the Workers' group.
- 1094.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 1095.** Point 14, clause (c) was adopted as amended.

Point 14(d)

A.176

- 1096.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to modify clause (d) that he subamended to read: "are entitled to be absent due to illness or accident with adequate remuneration or other financial compensation".
- 1097.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment, even though they preferred the original text.
- 1098.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 1099.** Point 14, clause (d) was adopted as amended.

Point 14(e)

A.177 and A.243

- 1100.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment (A. 177) to delete "the same" before "protection", replace "the same" before "training" by "relevant", and delete "as others in the workplace". He explained that what mattered to apprentices was relevance of training, not equivalence. Training must be given in accordance with occupational needs and appropriate national standards or workplace context.

- 1101.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson presented a similar amendment (A.243), which differed from the Employers' group's amendment only in the absence of the term "relevant". She asked for clarification from the secretariat on whether there existed different levels of training and protection and whether lower levels applied to apprentices. Rather, she stressed that apprentices should receive a higher level of training and protection because of their inexperience and vulnerability. She recalled that the Committee had not concluded the discussion on an amendment to the Preamble which stated that no provisions within the Recommendation would lower the protection provided to apprentices by other instruments. She did not support the insertion of "relevant" because it narrowed the options for the training.
- 1102.** The deputy representative of the Secretary-General recalled that the clause that the Worker Vice-Chairperson referred to was at the beginning of the document which set the scope of the instrument. Therefore, point 14(e) could not override it or be interpreted as providing lower protection. He observed that the protection and training needed for apprentices would be different from, but not less than, those provided in the workplace.
- 1103.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson clarified that the intention of her group was to ensure that the protection for apprentices was not less than the protection provided to others.
- 1104.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, sought clarification on the scope of the term "protection".
- 1105.** The Government member of Uganda observed that every person in the workplace irrespective of contractual status was exposed to occupational hazards in the same way. Apprentices should therefore receive the same training on OSH as other workers.
- 1106.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed with the Workers' group and stated that the rights of apprentices should not be different from those of other workers. For clarity, the EU Member States proposed a subamendment to replace the entire clause with: "are afforded at least the same protection and receive at least the same training as others in the workplace;". He believed that the term "relevant" was subjective and therefore not appropriate in that context.
- 1107.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson indicated that his group had no difficulty with the idea of the equivalent protection and training. However, he opposed the wording "at least the same" as it was not compatible with workplace practices. Referring to the amendment proposed by his group (A.177), he agreed to remove the word "relevant" to align with the Workers' group amendment (A.243). He further observed that the phrase "as others in the workplace" was vague. Thus, he proposed three alternative wordings: "as other comparative", "as other comparable employees", or "as others undertaking comparable work".
- 1108.** The Government member of Brazil observed that the amendment proposed by the Workers' group was simpler and clear, and therefore she preferred it.
- 1109.** The Government members of Bangladesh, France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Singapore, as well as the Employer Vice-Chairperson, supported the amendment (A.243).
- 1110.** The amendment proposed by the Workers' group was adopted and the one proposed by the Employers' group was not adopted.
- 1111.** Another amendment submitted by the Employers' group (A.178) was withdrawn.
- 1112.** Point 14, clause (e) was adopted as amended.

Point 14(f)**A.242**

- 1113.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace the entire clause with “enjoy conditions that are not less favourable than those applicable to others in the workplace with respect to employment injury protection;”. The intention was to ensure that apprentices did not receive a lower level of protection. She preferred “employment injury protection” over “work-related injuries” because it covered not only injuries caused by accidents in the workplace, but also diseases which might be contracted or developed due to workplace matters.
- 1114.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson argued that the amendment was unnecessary because it did not offer practical guidance to the users of the instrument. He preferred the original text. He pointed out that the entitlement of apprentices to compensation for work-related injuries must be considered in the light of national circumstances and compensation systems.
- 1115.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment and proposed a subamendment to replace the word “enjoy” with “are entitled to” as the word “enjoy” was vague and inappropriate for the instrument.
- 1116.** The Government members of Singapore and Brazil supported the original text.
- 1117.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson opposed the use of the word “employment-based injury protection” because apprentices were not employees in many countries. The original text was succinct and covered a wider range of circumstances. He emphasized that work-related injuries covered both employment-related injuries and those incurred during apprenticeship arrangements that were not characterized as a form of employment.
- 1118.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson reiterated that work-related injuries failed to cover illnesses contracted at, or due to, work. She stressed that it was important that apprentices be entitled to compensation due to workplace injuries or diseases contracted at work. She supported the subamendment proposed by the EU Member States.
- 1119.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, preferred the original text.
- 1120.** The Government member of the United States preferred the original text. Seconded by the Government members of Australia, and Saudi Arabia, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, he proposed another subamendment to keep the original text and just add “and illness” at the end.
- 1121.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment made by the Government member of the United States.
- 1122.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of India, France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the proposal made by the Government member of the United States.
- 1123.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.

A.168

- 1124.** Another amendment submitted by the Government member of Oman, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, was withdrawn.
- 1125.** Point 14, clause (f) was adopted as amended.

New clause after (f)**A.241**

- 1126.** The Worker Vice Chairperson withdrew an amendment proposing to insert a new clause (A.240) and introduced an amendment to insert a new clause after (f) which read “have access to a comprehensive complaints and grievance mechanism.”. Apprentices were typically inexperienced and vulnerable and might not have access to such mechanisms.
- 1127.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, while understanding the intention of the amendment, pointed out that the matter raised by the Workers’ group was addressed in point 19(b).
- 1128.** The Worker-Vice Chairperson clarified that the intent of the amendment was to ensure that governments would put in place other measures than those dealt with in point 19(b), which identified the terms, provisions and entitlements that applied to an apprenticeship agreement. The purpose was to ensure that a comprehensive complaints and grievance mechanism existed.
- 1129.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to replace “a comprehensive” with “an effective”, and “grievance” with “dispute resolution”. Such modifications would allow for two types of disputes: those related to contractual issues that were addressed in point 19(b), and those that were beyond the scope of apprenticeship contracts such as a dispute over the grade given to a final qualification exam, or concerning the apprenticeship system as a whole.
- 1130.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the subamendment as it could help move towards consensus.
- 1131.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the subamended text. He noted that apprentices might not necessarily be industry workers and should be afforded a process that allowed them to be treated fairly in terms of grievances, complaints and disputes.
- 1132.** The Government member of Australia supported the amendment as subamended by the Employers’ group.
- 1133.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that her group was a little uncomfortable with the term “dispute resolution” as it did not entirely deal with the dynamics of an apprentice in the workplace, but in the spirit of consensus accepted the proposed subamendment.
- 1134.** The Government member of India, seconded by the Government member of Bangladesh, proposed another subamendment to use the words “an effective complaints and grievance mechanism” instead of “dispute resolution”, which was covered by point 19(b).
- 1135.** The subamendment proposed by India and Bangladesh was not adopted due to lack of support.
- 1136.** The amendment was adopted as subamended and the new clause was adopted.
- 1137.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew an amendment proposing another new clause (A.239) as provisions on remuneration had already been included in the text.

A.169 and A.244

- 1138.** The Government member of Oman, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, introduced an amendment (A.169) to insert after clause (f), a new clause to read: “are entitled to paid maternity, paternity and parental leave.”. Considering lifelong learning, they believed it was

essential to provide standard benefits so that people of all age groups could participate in apprenticeship programmes.

1139. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new clause to read: "are entitled to social security and maternity protection." and expressed support for the amendment submitted by the GCC countries. She explained that both texts were important as the one suggested by the GCC countries addressed leave arrangements with the employer while the amendment proposed by her group concerned social security and protection, which covered a wider range of protections than leave entitlements.
1140. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the GCC countries' amendment (A.169) as the proposal did not reflect the diversity in apprenticeship arrangements. He stated that apprentices would be entitled to paid maternity, paternity, and parental leave when employed and would thus meet the prerequisites for paid leave. However, he maintained that such employment-based benefits might not be applicable in countries where apprentices had the status of students.
1141. The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran supported both amendments with preference for the one proposed by the Workers' group because social security had a broader meaning.
1142. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, noted that the right to social security was necessary, including maternity and paternity protection. He proposed to combine the two texts in one clause to read: "are entitled to social security, in particular maternity, paternity and parental leave".
1143. The Government member of Brazil proposed another subamendment so the clause would read "are entitled to social protection coverage", to use the same words as in point 3(c). The details of such coverage should be left to national authorities.
1144. The Government member of Türkiye seconded the proposal by Brazil and pointed out that in his country social security coverage for apprentices did not include maternity and paternity leave and he therefore could not support the inclusion of those leave arrangements in the text.
1145. The Government member of the United States preferred to keep the two clauses separate as he thought that social protection did not encompass such leave arrangements. He supported "social protection coverage" in the Workers' group's amendment and proposed to subamend the other amendment so that the clause would read "are granted equal access to paid maternity, paternity and parental leave" to avoid inadvertently creating entitlements since the chapeau of the point referred to "national laws".
1146. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the United States' proposal and suggested another subamendment to the Workers' group's text to replace "are entitled to" with "have access to". He recalled that the wording used in the conclusion of the recurrent discussion on social security in 2021 was "access to social protection". Similarly, he proposed to replace in the text introduced by the GCC countries, "are granted equal" with "have access to". Granting access sounded paternalistic as it implied a higher authority gave access to people. Considering the diverse social protection needs of apprentices whose ages and career stages differed, he believed that "equal" access to social protection would be inadequate.
1147. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed with keeping the two clauses separate. On the leave entitlements, she accepted the further subamended text because equal access to those leave entitlements was ensured by the text of the chapeau. She noted that the Government

member of Brazil had suggested the use of “social protection”, which was not the same as social security. She preferred to use the latter in the text as social security focused on financial and other types of protections or measures on several issues including maternity, whereas social protection related to care and care-related services and entitlements.

- 1148.** Both the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons agreed to the subamended text of the clause that read: “have access to paid maternity, paternity and parental leave”.
- 1149.** The Government members of Oman, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, and France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, also supported the subamendment.
- 1150.** In the spirit of consensus, the Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the subamendment, even though he felt that “access to” was inferior to “entitlement”. He also preferred the term “social security” to be used in the clause proposed by the Workers’ group.
- 1151.** The amendment proposed by the GCC countries was adopted as subamended.
- 1152.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson asked the secretariat to clarify the difference between “social protection” and “social security”.
- 1153.** The representative of the Secretary-General explained that “social protection” was usually used in a wider sense within the United Nations system and it was often used to express “social security” beyond employment-related illness, as well as housing, education and other matters, which was sometimes taken to be more relevant to the most excluded people in the society. He added that Recommendation No. 202 stated that “for the purpose of this Recommendation, social protection floors are nationally defined sets of basic social security guarantees which secure protection aimed at preventing or alleviating poverty, vulnerability and social exclusion”. Hence, he understood that “social security” was what the new clause was intended to address.
- 1154.** In view of clarification provided by the secretariat, the Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a further subamendment to replace “social protection” with “social security” and add “and maternity protection;”. She emphasized the importance of maternity protection and relevant arrangements in the workplace, such as breastfeeding and other particular risks and hazards, which would be slightly different from other financial elements of paid maternity, paternity and parental leave.
- 1155.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed with the proposal to introduce the new clause and indicated that the Maternity Protection Convention (No. 183) and Recommendation (No. 191), 2000, could be the basis for implementing the clause.
- 1156.** The amendment was adopted as subamended and the new clause was adopted.
- 1157.** Point 14 was adopted as amended.

Point 15, chapeau

A.170

- 1158.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace “prescribe the” with “create the enabling”, noting that the proposed phrase was more pragmatic and practical, and it highlighted the positive aspects of quality apprenticeships which he considered important.

- 1159. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, stating that the chapeau was key to link the regulatory framework with the steps that Members would take. Moreover, she pointed out that an enabling environment was largely covered by point 24.
- 1160. The Government members of Canada, France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Türkiye did not support the amendment, sharing the views of the Worker Vice-Chairperson.
- 1161. The amendment was withdrawn.
- 1162. Point 15, chapeau was adopted without amendment.

Point 15(a)

- 1163. An amendment submitted by the Employers' group (A.182) was withdrawn.

A.179

- 1164. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert "incentives encourage" before "enterprises" and to replace "may" with "to" before the word "offer", arguing that it was the right place in the instrument to indicate the vital role that incentives could play in supporting and facilitating enterprises in offering apprenticeships. He acknowledged that not every apprenticeship would operate on an incentive basis.
- 1165. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as that was not the right place in the instrument to address incentives. Clause (a) of point 15 was intended to prescribe the conditions under which enterprises may offer apprenticeships. It concerned the regulation, eligibility and expectations of enterprises. The incentives should rather be discussed under section V, in particular in point 24, which dealt with promotion of apprenticeships.
- 1166. The Government member of the United States supported the amendment because incentives would need to come not only from governments but from all stakeholders. He nonetheless indicated flexibility regarding the proposal to discuss incentives in another section of the proposed Conclusions.
- 1167. The Government members of Argentina, Canada, France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and New Zealand did not support the amendment, sharing the view of the Workers' group.
- 1168. The Government member of Colombia supported the amendment while also expressing flexibility on dealing with incentives in another section.
- 1169. Given that there had been some support for the amendment, the Employer Vice-Chairperson requested that discussion of the amendment be deferred to allow consideration of alternative wording.
- 1170. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that although she preferred the original text, she was not opposed to deferring the discussion to consider an alternative formulation.
- 1171. When resuming the discussion, the amendment was not adopted.

Point 15(b)

- 1172. An amendment submitted by the Employers' group (A.181) was withdrawn.

A.183

- 1173.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert “in consultation with social partners” after the word “training”, and proposed a subamendment to introduce the word “developed”, so that the text would read: “developed in consultation with social partners”. This would provide for the role of social partners in developing up-to-date skills training.
- 1174.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as it would change the intent of clause (b), which was to prescribe the conditions under which educational and training institutions could provide off-the-job training. With the proposed amendment, the text would mean that training needed to be developed in consultation with the social partners, and governments could therefore only prescribe the conditions under which educational and training institutions could provide off-the-job training in those circumstances. The involvement of social partners was set out in points 8 and 9.
- 1175.** The Government members of New Zealand and Singapore agreed with the Worker Vice-Chairperson and did not support the amendment as subamended.
- 1176.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment, in agreement with the statement by the Worker Vice-Chairperson. He did not see how the text as amended could be operationalized in EU Member States.
- 1177.** The Government member of the United States requested clarification from the secretariat on what exactly was encompassed by “off-the-job training”.
- 1178.** The representative of the Secretary-General said that “off-the-job training” referred to theoretical or academic training, generally in an educational institution of some form, such as a technical college, as opposed to the day-to-day on-the-job instruction received from a master craftsperson or other supervisor.
- 1179.** The amendment was withdrawn.
- 1180.** Point 15, clause (b) was adopted.

Point 15(c)

- 1181.** Two amendments submitted by the Employers’ group (A.184 and A.185) were withdrawn.
- 1182.** Point 15, clause (c) was adopted.

Point 16

A.225

- 1183.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Canada and Türkiye, introduced an amendment to insert the words “, where appropriate,” between “measures” and “to” and to remove the word “continuously”. The amendment was proposed in order to make the text more realistic with regard to government resources.
- 1184.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment. The point on development of capacity-building was important, and the amendment made the text too tentative for a Recommendation on that subject.

- 1185.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment and agreed with the Worker Vice-Chairperson on the proposed insertion of the words “where appropriate”. As for the word “continuously”, it did not imply the requirement for continuous acceleration or increasing of funding. Rather, the Recommendation encouraged some level of continuity and stability with regard to the capacity of government agencies, employers’ and workers’ organizations, and others involved in apprenticeship systems.
- 1186.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment. He did not object to the removal of the word “continuously”, but did not support the inclusion of “where appropriate”.
- 1187.** The Government member of Singapore supported the amendment, as people who would read the Recommendation may not be aware of the fact that it was not legally binding.
- 1188.** The Government member of Argentina said that the amendment was not appropriate for a Recommendation and did not support it.
- 1189.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment.
- 1190.** The amendment was withdrawn.

A.187, A.210 and A.211

- 1191.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment (A.187) to insert the words “enterprises, particularly micro, small and medium-sized enterprises,” after “organizations,” as it was important to emphasize capacity-building of enterprises. The aim was to support enterprises in understanding how to access the apprenticeship system, what was expected of them, what their commitment entailed, and for how long. It might take the form of associations supporting small or microenterprises to work with, or host, apprentices, thereby enabling those enterprises to be part of the apprenticeship system.
- 1192.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment. The proposed insertion did not fit in well in the clause if there was a distinction to be drawn between building the capacity of organizations – government agencies, employers’ and workers’ organizations – and developing the knowledge and competencies of individuals such as teachers, trainers and other experts involved in apprenticeships. She recognized the importance of supporting MSMEs, but that should be included in another point of the Recommendation.
- 1193.** The Government member of New Zealand supported the comment by the Workers’ group and suggested that point 25 would be a better place to deal with the subject.
- 1194.** The Government member of Argentina suggested that all entities that intervened in apprenticeship systems should be strengthened, including enterprises. She also raised the question of whether strengthening educational institutions or intermediaries should also be considered.
- 1195.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson suggested restructuring point 16, building on the idea proposed by the EU Member States in two amendments (A.210 and A.211), to split the point in two. That would allow the various amendments to be taken into account and cover the different entities of the apprenticeship system whose capacity needed to be strengthened, as elements of the regulatory framework. His group could accept to include teachers, in-company trainers, and other experts in the point. He therefore proposed a subamendment to reconstruct the point so that it would read:

Members should take measures to continuously develop and strengthen the capacity of:

- (a) government agencies;
- (b) employers' and workers' organizations;
- (c) enterprises, particularly micro, small and medium-sized enterprises; and
- (d) teachers, in-company trainers and other experts involved in apprenticeships.

- 1196.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that her group preferred the split of point 16, as suggested by the EU Member States in amendments A.210 and A.211, into two points to read:

Members should take measures to continuously develop and strengthen the capacity of government agencies, and employers' and workers' organizations.

Members should ensure that teachers, in-company trainers and other experts involved in apprenticeships can update their skills, knowledge and competencies according to the latest teaching and training methods.

- 1197.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the grouping of clauses in one or two points was not the issue, but the importance of the inclusion of MSMEs in one of them. Point 16 could be moved entirely into section V, on promotion, if necessary.
- 1198.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that the purpose of their amendments was to clarify both the wording and the substance. The text would first refer to organizations and subsequently to individuals. It distinguished between the roles of the two groups without modifying the main intention of the point.
- 1199.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that, in light of that explanation, it would make sense to mention enterprises, including the smallest enterprises. Regarding the second proposed point, it was clearly important to update the skills of teachers, in-company trainers and others and he would not object to its inclusion, but questioned whether it belonged in a section about the regulatory framework. He asked to put the flexibility of the Employers' group on the record.
- 1200.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that she did not agree with the inclusion of MSMEs in the first proposed point. While appreciating the important role of enterprises, that was not the place for them, as the point was about capacity-building of infrastructure.
- 1201.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said the original text was preferable, as it referred to government agencies, as well as to employers' and workers' organizations, thereby including the entities that added value to the apprenticeship framework.
- 1202.** The Government member of the United States proposed a further subamendment that might address the various concerns which had been raised, to add at the end of the first proposed point, after "organizations", ", enterprises, and all other stakeholders."
- 1203.** The Government member of the United Kingdom said that he could accept the original text, or as it stood following the subamendment proposed by the Employer Vice-Chairperson, assuming that point 16 would apply to capacity-building of the mentioned organizations in relation to apprenticeships, not in general terms.
- 1204.** The Government members of Brazil, Canada, Chile and Colombia preferred the original text, as it was straightforward and concise.
- 1205.** In the interest of reaching consensus, the three amendments (A.187, A.210 and A.211) were withdrawn.
- 1206.** Two other amendments (A.188 and A.261) were withdrawn.

A.224

- 1207.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Canada and Türkiye, introduced an amendment to replace “involved in” with “to support quality”. The amendment aimed at strengthening the text and clarifying the reason for strengthening the capacity.
- 1208.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the amendment created ambiguity as it was not clear whether it would be to support apprenticeships which were already in the quality apprenticeship framework, or to bring apprenticeships into the quality framework. To add clarity, she proposed a subamendment to reword the new text so that it would read: “to improve the quality of”.
- 1209.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that his group was comfortable with the original text, which was centred on the various targets of the measures, while the amendment addressed the purpose of the measures. The original text provided greater precision and clarity. He did not support the amendment or the Workers’ group subamendment.
- 1210.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment as subamended by the Workers’ group, as it increased clarity and precision.
- 1211.** The Government member of Switzerland did not support the amendment, stating that it was redundant to insert a reference to quality apprenticeships when the Recommendation was about quality apprenticeships.
- 1212.** The Government members of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Saudi Arabia, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, preferred the original text. They all found it clearer.
- 1213.** The Government member of Canada, who had been one of those to submit the amendment because quality assurance was an ongoing process and the proposed amendment brought forward that meaning in the point, said that in the spirit of consensus he could also support the original text.
- 1214.** The amendment was withdrawn.
- 1215.** Point 16 was adopted without amendment.

Point 17

A.205

- 1216.** The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of the Government member of Canada, introduced an amendment to insert after “evaluated” the words “by recognized authorities”, noting that it was important to clarify who would monitor and evaluate apprenticeship systems and programmes.
- 1217.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment but recalled that in point 11, it had been agreed to use “competent authorities” and therefore, for the sake of consistency, he suggested to replace “recognized” with “the competent”.
- 1218.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Brazil, Canada and the Islamic Republic of Iran supported the amendment as subamended.
- 1219.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.

1220. An amendment (A.235) was withdrawn.

A.189

- 1221.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add, at the end of the text: “, including through the regular publication of high-quality and user-responsive apprenticeships statistics, to the extent consistent with the capacities and resources of national authorities. Effective evaluation should also include quality assurance and outcome-based evaluation of teachers and trainers in both the public and private providers”. Apprenticeship-related statistics were vital for measuring outcomes and impact.
- 1222.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as it was too detailed for the purpose of the instrument. Moreover, the evaluation of teachers and training courses was a very complex topic and there were many variables to consider depending upon the specific national circumstances. Therefore, such details should be left to the competent authorities in each country and should not be made part of an international standard.
- 1223.** The Government member of Türkiye, agreed with the Workers’ group and did not support the amendment, noting that while the intent of the amendment was positive, the proposed text was too detailed.
- 1224.** The Government member of the United States, seconded by the Government member of Switzerland, proposed as a subamendment, to delete “of teachers and trainers”. While evaluation and monitoring needed to focus on apprenticeship programmes, the amendment included the evaluation and monitoring of teachers and trainers, which would be very complex and difficult in practice.
- 1225.** The Government members of Argentina, Brazil, France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment or the subamendment, as the text would be too prescriptive to be included in a Recommendation.
- 1226.** The amendment was withdrawn.

A.234

- 1227.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment to add at the end of the point: “The results of monitoring and evaluations should be used to adapt the systems and programmes accordingly.” That would be critical to improve the standards and ensure quality.
- 1228.** The Government member of the United States supported the amendment.
- 1229.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, indicated flexibility regarding the amendment, although he did not see the added value of the proposal.
- 1230.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 1231.** The amendment was adopted.
- 1232.** Point 17 was adopted as amended.

New point after 17

A.190

- 1233.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new point to read:

Members should implement effective and sustainable financing models, including incentive schemes for enterprises and learners and performance-based funding for education and training institutions.

1234. He suggested deferring the discussion of the amendment to be considered under section V.

Section III. The apprenticeship agreement

1235. As there were no amendments to the title of section III, it was adopted.

Point 18

A.212 and A.263

- 1236.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, introduced an amendment (A.212) to replace the words “enterprise or an intermediary,” with “employer”. Agreements should be signed only by an apprentice and an employer to avoid the apprentice being involved in a triangular relationship that could cause confusion.
- 1237.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, as the clarity it provided would be helpful for apprentices.
- 1238.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment. Apprenticeships were not always employment relationships, as was the case in many countries in Africa and Latin America. Even in a clear employment model for apprenticeships, contracts were often not concluded solely between the apprentice and the employer, but also included training institutions or in some cases the apprenticeship authority, and the triangularity in that context was not a source of vulnerability but rather a source of protection and an inherent part of the apprenticeship system. The effect of the amendment would therefore be reductive and would lead to a text which would not take account of the range of national circumstances where apprenticeships were not based on an employment relationship.
- 1239.** The Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that he supported the replacement of “enterprise” with “employer” and the deletion of “intermediary”. He introduced a related amendment (A.263), which proposed to add “or an intermediary” at the end of the point, and to replace “an educational or” before with “a training institute”. He echoed the Employer Vice-Chairperson, arguing that where national law allowed, an intermediary could also be a party to such agreements.
- 1240.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and the Government member of Türkiye supported the amendment.
- 1241.** The Government member of Colombia did not support amendment A.212, as the word “employer” could be confusing in some parts of the world, where an apprenticeship contract was not an employment contract, but could accept amendment A.263.
- 1242.** The Government member of Brazil supported the amendment put forward by the Africa group to add “or an intermediary”, but did not support the proposed amendment to insert the word “employer” for the reasons expressed by the Government member of Colombia.
- 1243.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the proposal to add “or an intermediary” at the end of the clause. She said that the term “employer” was used as a convenient label and was widely understood, and did not necessarily indicate an employment relationship.

- 1244. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that he preferred the wording of amendment A.263 as it was submitted, retaining the word “enterprise”, as he found it to be the least ambiguous formulation.
- 1245. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, agreed for the sake of consensus to the use of the word “enterprise” instead of “employer” as in the original text. However, EU Member States did not agree with deleting “and educational or”.
- 1246. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed with the EU Member States. She asked whether the word “enterprise” applied to all public sector institutions, or should the text read “the enterprise or employer” or similar, to ensure that the public sector was included.
- 1247. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, agreed to subamend his group’s amendment by retaining the words “an educational or” as in the original text.
- 1248. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that he preferred not to add “or employer”, as suggested by the Workers’ group, as use of the word “enterprise” was consistent with point 5 as agreed previously.
- 1249. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that point 5 referred to enterprises or sectors of economic activity, which did include the public sector.
- 1250. The Government member of Colombia suggested adding, as had been done in another point, “public or private sector”.
- 1251. In response to the concern of the Workers’ group, the representative of the Secretary-General said that there were two options: to add “enterprise or public authority” or to retain the word “enterprise” and add an explanatory footnote.
- 1252. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson preferred the first option, to insert “or public authority” in the point instead of a footnote.
- 1253. The amendment proposed by the Africa group was adopted as subamended.
- 1254. The amendment proposed by EU Member States (A.212) was not adopted.
- 1255. An amendment submitted by the Islamic Republic of Iran (A.165) was not seconded and therefore fell.
- 1256. Point 18 was adopted.

Point 19, chapeau

A.233

- 1257. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to include “, as a minimum” after “agreement” with a view to ensuring that apprentices were clear about their roles, rights, obligations, and any other matters related to the relationship between them and the organizations where they worked. The words “as a minimum” would allow other elements to be added to the agreement.
- 1258. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, which he found redundant and unnecessary
- 1259. The Government members of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Brazil did not support the amendment.
- 1260. The amendment was withdrawn.

1261. Point 19, chapeau was adopted without amendment.

Point 19(a)

1262. An amendment submitted by the Workers' group (A.232) was withdrawn.

1263. Point 19, clause (a) was adopted.

Point 19(b)

A.213

1264. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, introduced an amendment to insert “, unless otherwise regulated by law,” before “provisions” and proposed a subamendment to insert “or collective agreements” after “law”.

1265. The Worker Vice-Chairperson understood that the agreement would set out all the relevant conditions and terms that were important for apprentices to understand. She believed the amendment was unnecessary because anything regulated by law or collective agreements would naturally be included in the agreement, but asked other Committee members to share their views.

1266. The Employer Vice-Chairperson observed that the agreed text of point 6 already stated explicitly that Members would give effect to the provisions of the instrument “through national laws and regulations, collective agreements, policies, programmes, and other measures consistent with national law and practice”.

1267. The Government member of Australia supported the amendment as subamended. He emphasized that, from their perspective, the term apprenticeship agreement needed to have the consent of the parties to the arrangement. In their system, several relevant matters would not necessarily be governed by the contract of employment but would instead derive from a statute or collective agreement. In that context, the contract of training would not necessarily include all the terms since they would be stated elsewhere in the labour law framework.

1268. The Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment. It was an established practice for employment contracts to state the duration, pay, hours of work, leave entitlements and so on, even though such provisions were already established by law. To ensure that apprentices were not exploited, the agreement should spell out their rights and obligations. To exclude such a provision from the instrument would conflict with clause (a), which stated that the agreement would clearly specify the roles, rights and obligations of the parties.

1269. The Government member of the United States supported the amendment as subamended. The points raised by the Africa group were well taken. He pointed out that clause (b) was not prohibitive and parties to the agreement could include additional provisions if so desired.

1270. The Government member of Brazil agreed with the Africa group and did not support the amendment.

1271. The Worker Vice-Chairperson underlined the importance of apprentices being aware of all relevant provisions of the agreement, whether or not these were also stated elsewhere in laws or collective agreements. She did not support the amendment and proposed a subamendment to insert “, including those regulated by law or collective agreements” after “apprenticeship agreement”.

- 1272. The Government member of the United Kingdom did not support the subamendment proposed by the Workers' group but supported the amendment as subamended by EU Member States.
- 1273. The Employer Vice-Chairperson preferred the original text.
- 1274. The Government member of Brazil asked the Government member of France to clarify if the idea was that some elements could not be negotiated or could not be included in the apprenticeship agreement.
- 1275. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, explained that the idea was to ensure that the provisions of the agreement could not contradict laws or collective agreements. However, in the spirit of consensus, he withdrew the amendment.
- 1276. Two amendments submitted by the Employers' group (A.180 and A.191) were withdrawn.

A.214

- 1277. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, introduced an amendment to insert "pay of other compensation" after "duration" and subamended it to read "remuneration and other financial compensation" in order to align with language already agreed upon by the Committee.
- 1278. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment as subamended.
- 1279. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

A.231

- 1280. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert "and its periodicity" before "working hours". She explained that it was important to clearly articulate when apprentices would be paid in addition to what they would be paid.
- 1281. The Government member of Australia supported the intent of the amendment but, seconded by the Government member of Brazil, suggested a subamendment to use "frequency" instead of "periodicity".
- 1282. The Government member of Canada, seconded by the Government members of Switzerland and the United States, introduced another subamendment to replace "periodicity" with "intervals".
- 1283. The Employer Vice-Chairperson thought that "frequency" was more appropriate and asked the secretariat for advice.
- 1284. The representative of the Secretary-General said that "frequency" was clearer.
- 1285. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed to replace "periodicity" with "frequency".
- 1286. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

A.215

- 1287. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, introduced an amendment to include "rest time, breaks," before "leave entitlements". He suggested that the apprenticeship agreement should include as many protections as possible given the vulnerability of apprentices.

- 1288.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, noting that point 14(b) had already addressed limitations on working hours.
- 1289.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment. Both total working time and the pattern of work within that time were important.
- 1290.** The Government member of Canada supported the amendment, reaffirming that apprentices were vulnerable due to a lack of knowledge.
- 1291.** The Government member of Australia also supported the amendment.
- 1292.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson argued that the amendment was impractical. He also reminded the Committee of the importance of consistency of language and asked the secretariat to check the appropriate terminology.
- 1293.** The representative of the Secretary-General explained that regarding hours, the text earlier in the document had referred to “work hours”, so the same could be used in clause (b) for consistency. Regarding “leave entitlements”, other provisions in the document referred to “holidays with pay”, “absence due to illness or accident” and “parental leave”. The secretariat proposed “holidays and leave entitlements” instead of “leave entitlements”. With regard to “dispute resolution”, other points referred to “dispute resolution mechanisms”. With regard to “adequate”, the secretariat felt that, given the nature of the clause, it was not necessary to include that word in clause (b). The proposed text could therefore read: “contains provisions relating to the apprenticeship duration, remuneration or other financial compensation and its frequency, work hours, rest time, breaks, holidays and leave entitlements, occupational safety and health, social security, dispute resolution mechanisms and the termination of the apprenticeship agreement;”.
- 1294.** He reminded the Committee that they were not drafting the final Recommendation but providing guidance to be given to the Committee that, in the following year, would have the opportunity to refine the wording.
- 1295.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that he wished to omit “entitlements”, to be consistent with point 16 that only referred to “holidays and leave”. He proposed to insert in the proposed text “in accordance with national circumstances” after “contains provisions”, which was the wording used in the introductory text to point 16 and was appropriate in clause (b).
- 1296.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the text proposed by the secretariat was satisfactory and did not support the subamendment proposed by the Employers’ group. As the clause was a statement on apprentices’ conditions of work, it would not be helpful, but confusing, to include “in accordance with national circumstances”. She would also prefer to keep “entitlements” as it added clarity.
- 1297.** The Government member of Singapore supported the subamendment put forward by the Employers’ group.
- 1298.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said it was important to mention “entitlements” when talking about leave and holidays. It was also essential that provisions contained in an agreement were included within the framework of national legislation and capacity; therefore it would be important to retain “in accordance with national circumstances”.
- 1299.** The Government member of Australia, agreeing with the Government member of France, also preferred the inclusion of “entitlements” and supported the inclusion of “in accordance with national circumstances”.

- 1300.** The Government member of the United Kingdom supported the amendment as subamended by the Employers' group. The United Kingdom had apprenticeship agreements which were governed by law, as well as a commitment statement for which they provided a template. It was up to the employer and apprentice to decide what was included. Therefore, it was important to give that flexibility for the system to work and avoid bureaucratic burdens. He strongly supported the inclusion of "in accordance with national circumstances".
- 1301.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, introduced a further subamendment to insert "laws and" after "in accordance with national" to read "in accordance with national laws and circumstances".
- 1302.** The Government member of Egypt did not support the further subamendment proposed by the Africa group.
- 1303.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the further subamendment proposed by the Africa group as it introduced clarity and precision. However, in the interest of consensus, the EU and its Member States could be flexible about that subamendment.
- 1304.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson requested clarity from Government members on their understanding of "in accordance with national laws and circumstances".
- 1305.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, suggested reverting to the text proposed by the secretariat.
- 1306.** The Government member of Australia, in response to the Worker Vice-Chairperson, said that he understood the inclusion of "in accordance with national circumstances" not to be about limiting the provision of entitlements but rather about providing flexibility in the manner of their provision. For some countries, these matters were primarily the subject of statutory regulation.
- 1307.** The Government member of Argentina, seconded by the Worker Vice-Chairperson, did not support the inclusion of "and circumstances" as national circumstances were not always in line with national laws and the term "circumstances" was ambiguous.
- 1308.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that he could not agree to any text that differed from that agreed upon in relation to point 16.
- 1309.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, in response to the Worker Vice-Chairperson, said that their concern was to ensure that the provisions drawn up in contracts would not be weaker than those stipulated in national laws.
- 1310.** The Chairperson recalled that in the chapeau of point 16 the Committee had agreed to the wording: "Members should take measures in accordance with national laws and circumstances". With a view to achieving consensus, he suggested using the same wording and retaining "entitlements".
- 1311.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson thanked the Government members of Australia and France for the clarifications. Noting that other Government members had yet to respond, there seemed to be consensus that the phrase was not about limiting entitlements but, rather, about how the provisions would be implemented. She could support the inclusion of "in accordance with national laws and circumstances".
- 1312.** The Government member of Cameroon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, also supported the inclusion of "in accordance with national laws and circumstances" but did not

support the inclusion of “entitlements”. He explained that “entitlements” was commonly used with reference to salaried employees and not apprentices.

- 1313. In an effort to move the discussion forward, the Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a further subamendment, to delete both “and circumstances” and “entitlements”.
- 1314. The Government member of the United Kingdom mentioned that in his country many of the provisions mentioned were covered by employment laws and contracts. He preferred the formulation “in accordance with national laws and circumstances” but was flexible on the matter. In a spirit of consensus, he supported the further subamendment proposed by the Employer Vice-Chairperson.
- 1315. The Worker Vice-Chairperson also supported the further subamendment.
- 1316. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

A.262

- 1317. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, introduced the amendment to insert “the competencies to be acquired at the end of the training, the form of assessment and the certification to be attained by the apprentice,” after “social security;”. He explained that the apprenticeship agreement should be specific on what competencies had to be acquired, assessed, and certified.
- 1318. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment as it was important to set out the certification process the apprentice would go through and what competencies were expected to be acquired. She pointed out that her group had submitted a similar amendment to insert a new clause after (b).
- 1319. The Employer Vice-Chairperson suggested that some of the issues had been covered under point 12. He proposed a subamendment to insert “a training plan setting out” before “the competencies”.
- 1320. The Government member of Chile argued that the agreement was not the best place to exhaustively list which skills would be acquired. That should be done in the training plan.
- 1321. The Government member of Argentina thought they should refer to the professional profile that was the subject of the contract, independently of whether there would be a training plan that set out the skills to be acquired.
- 1322. The Government member of Switzerland appreciated the intention but thought it was sufficient to refer to the certification to be attained by the apprentice as regulated by national standards which would encompass all the elements mentioned such as the training plan and competencies to be acquired.
- 1323. The Government member of the United States supported the language of the amendment in general and thought it was a helpful addition but that it should be a separate clause.
- 1324. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, remarked that the question of the skills to be acquired should be set out before the apprenticeship began and was not something to be included in the agreement. Therefore, they did not support the amendment of the Africa group or the subamendment from the Employers’ group.
- 1325. The Government member of Brazil acknowledged that it was important to guarantee that the apprentice knew what competencies they would be acquiring when they signed the

agreement, but it might not be contained in the agreement itself. The Committee needed to find a better place for the proposed text.

- 1326.** The Government member of Canada shared the sentiments of the Africa group in that the knowledge of competencies, assessment and certification were critical for successful apprenticeships. However, that should not be part of the apprenticeship agreement. He did not support the amendment.
- 1327.** The Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, reiterated that an apprenticeship agreement was about training to acquire certain competencies. The dispute resolution mechanism mentioned in the clause should not only apply to remuneration, but to cases where an apprentice would complain that they were not getting the training that was promised. His group had been open to discuss other language and they felt strongly that the text proposed in their amendment should be included in the agreement.
- 1328.** The Government member of Brazil did not support the subamendment noting that the proposed changes were too prescriptive and implied obligations on parties who were not signing the agreement, such as schools or training institutions.
- 1329.** The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran supported the views expressed by the Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, noting that it was important to include the training plan in the agreement.
- 1330.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson reminded the Committee that they were not yet drafting the instrument but rather developing guidance for its drafting. Given the fact that most Committee members agreed on the underlying concepts, but not on the precise text, he suggested that the precise wording be left to the Drafting Committee.
- 1331.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed with the Employers' group. Moreover, she added that when repositioning and reformulating the proposed text, her preference would be to place it as a separate clause and to also include "educational support" and "a certification process to identify qualifications" as proposed in her group's amendment (A.230).
- 1332.** The Government members of Switzerland and Argentina agreed with the views expressed by the Africa group and the Workers' group.
- 1333.** The Government member of Uganda reiterated that, since the Committee had in general agreed on the substance of the text, the secretariat could provide guidance on the position and formulation of the text.
- 1334.** The amendment was withdrawn with the understanding that the text would be combined with the one proposed in amendment A.230 to be discussed at a later stage, after the secretariat would have provided advice.

A. 257

- 1335.** The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of the Government member of Australia, proposed an amendment to insert "equal employment opportunities for both on- and off-the-job training," before "and the termination", noting that it was important for the apprenticeship agreement to explicitly have provisions concerning non-discrimination. The proposed amendment was also in line with points 21, 22 and 23 that highlighted equality and diversity in quality apprenticeships.
- 1336.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment noting that the issue of equal opportunities was not a contractual matter but rather one of statutory rights and protections.

He suggested the amendment was superfluous, impractical and would encourage litigation by apprentices.

- 1337.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment noting that many private and public sector organizations already had some kind of anti-discriminatory or equal opportunities policies in place. It was important to ensure that those policies would also be applied to apprentices.
- 1338.** The Government members of Chile and Brazil agreed with the Employers' group and did not support this amendment. They reminded the Committee that matters relating to discrimination and equality were already included in point 14(e).
- 1339.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment, stating that the proposed amendment did not resemble usual national provisions.
- 1340.** The Government member of Saudi Arabia, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, did not support the amendment since the matter was covered elsewhere in the Recommendation.
- 1341.** The Government member of the United States, seconded by the Government member of Australia, proposed a subamendment to replace "equal employment opportunities" with "non-discrimination" to explicitly state that there should be no discrimination.
- 1342.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment while indicating flexibility to include it in section IV if the Committee preferred.
- 1343.** The Government member of the United States indicated their willingness to discuss the provision under section IV.
- 1344.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment or subamendment.
- 1345.** The amendment was not adopted.
- 1346.** The Government member of Australia, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Switzerland, Türkiye and the United States, withdrew amendment A.256 while stating for the record their belief in the importance of flexibility in the implementation of point 6 of the proposed Conclusions regarding the modalities through which the instrument could be implemented. In some countries at least, some of those matters, for instance OSH and social security, were not negotiable within the context of the apprenticeship agreement, but rather had a statutory basis.
- 1347.** Point 19, clause (b) was adopted as amended.

New clause after (b)

A.230

- 1348.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced the amendment they had mentioned when discussing A.262 and subamended it to take into account that discussion. The new proposed clause would read: "identifies qualifications to be achieved, educational support to be provided, and tasks and work to be performed;"
- 1349.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment for the text to read "provides a training plan which identifies qualifications to be achieved and competencies to be acquired, the general nature of off-the-job training and any additional educational support to be provided".

- 1350.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, proposed a further subamendment to place “competencies to be acquired,” before “qualifications to be achieved,” and to delete “the general nature of off-the-job training”.
- 1351.** The Government member of Switzerland supported the further subamendment of the Africa group and introduced a further subamendment, seconded by the Government member of Australia, to delete “provides a training plan which”.
- 1352.** The Government member of Brazil supported the further subamendment proposed by Switzerland.
- 1353.** The Government member of Canada proposed a further subamendment to replace the text of the new clause with “identifies competencies, certifications or qualifications to be obtained and any additional educational support provided;”.
- 1354.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the further subamendment as far as it went, but believed it was important to also state specifically in the text the tasks and work the apprentices would be performing.
- 1355.** The Government member of Canada highlighted that competencies were often found in occupational standards, training plans, log sheets and other sources; therefore, the apprentice would be aware of the tasks and work required.
- 1356.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, as well as the Government members of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the text as subamended by the Government member of Canada.
- 1357.** The amendment was adopted as subamended and the new clause was adopted.

Point 19(c) and (d)

- 1358.** As there were no amendments to clauses (c) and (d), they were adopted.
- 1359.** Point 19 was adopted as amended.

Point 20

- 1360.** Two amendments submitted by the Employers’ group (A.192 and A.193) were withdrawn.
- 1361.** An amendment submitted by the Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran (A.166) fell due to lack of secondment.
- 1362.** Point 20 was adopted.

Section IV. Equality and diversity in quality apprenticeships

- 1363.** As there were no amendments to the title of section IV, it was adopted.

New point before 21

A.220

- 1364.** The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of the Government of Canada, introduced an amendment to insert a new point that read: “Members should take affirmative measures to prevent discrimination, violence, harassment or intimidation against apprentices in either the workplace or the classroom”. It was extremely important for apprentices to be able to learn in a safe environment, free from violence, harassment, intimidation and discrimination.

- 1365.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment as a useful addition.
- 1366.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the substance of the new point but suggested that it would be more logical to insert it after point 23 and to subamend the proposed text to read: “Members should take measures to prevent discrimination, violence and harassment against apprentices in both on-the-job and off-the-job learning”.
- 1367.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment and did not support the Employers’ group’s subamendment. The proposed text should remain as originally formulated and be the first point in section IV because of its importance.
- 1368.** The Government member of Brazil supported the amendment. She requested clarification regarding how “intimidation” was addressed in the ILO context, and preferred the terminology “both on-the-job and off-the-job learning” suggested by the Employers’ group.
- 1369.** The Government member of Türkiye supported the subamendment by the Employers’ group.
- 1370.** The Government member of Chile supported the wording of the subamendment proposed by the Employers’ group but thought that the new point should be the first in section IV.
- 1371.** The Government member of Canada, seconded by the Government member of the United States, and supported also by the Government members of Australia, Brazil and Kenya, on behalf of the Africa group, maintained the importance of retaining both “affirmative” and “or intimidation”. To simplify the text, he suggested to delete “in either the workplace or the classroom”.
- 1372.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson asked the secretariat whether the words “affirmative” and “intimidation” appeared in the Violence and Harassment Convention, 2019 (No. 190).
- 1373.** The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran supported to keep the word “affirmative” as it added value to the text.
- 1374.** The Government member of the United Kingdom emphasized the importance of including “affirmative” and supported Canada’s subamendment.
- 1375.** The Government member of Chile supported Canada’s subamendment.
- 1376.** The representative of the Secretary-General said neither the word “affirmative” nor “intimidation” explicitly appeared in Convention No. 190. The word “affirmative” as used in the Private Employment Agencies Recommendation, 1997 (No. 188), explicitly states: “private employment agencies should be encouraged to promote equality in employment through affirmative action programmes”. The word “intimidation” also appeared in other instruments, such as in the Forced Labour (Supplementary Measures) Recommendation, 2014 (No. 203), when it refers to “protection from intimidation and retaliation”.
- 1377.** When resuming the discussion at another sitting, the Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the substance of the points in section IV was important, not their order. He emphasized the importance of being consistent in wording and noted that neither “affirmative” nor “intimidation” were used in Convention No. 190. He noted that the Employers’ group was fully supportive of efforts to tackle discrimination, violence and harassment against apprentices. He suggested, as a subamendment, replacing the word “affirmative” with “effective”, which was used in the Employment Relationship Recommendation, 2006 (No. 198), Employment Policy Recommendation, 1964 (No. 122), and the Communications within the Undertaking Recommendation, 1967 (No. 129). The inclusion of “or intimidation” was inconsistent with the language used by the ILO in relation to adopted standards.

- 1378.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson continued to prefer the term “affirmative”, which meant more than “effective” and was more conducive to taking action. She also said that intimidation was a serious issue in workplaces and preferred to retain the word in the text.
- 1379.** The Government member of the United States thanked the Workers’ group for their support to the changes proposed by them in the amendment. However, recognizing the concerns raised by the Committee that “affirmative” could be confused with other concepts or that it did not have an equivalent term in other languages, particularly Spanish, he could agree to use of the term “effective” instead. Regarding the use of the term “intimidation”, he was not aiming to reference other Conventions. Convention No. 190, although focused on harassment, did not explicitly mention intimidation. Intimidation was distinct from harassment and deserved an explicit mention in the Recommendation. He wished to retain reference to intimidation, as it was a very common and serious issue at the workplace and might be pertinent to apprentices who were generally young and inexperienced.
- 1380.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that the terms “effective” and “harassment”, respectively, were preferable. He believed that “affirmative” was mostly a North American term and was not used in the same way in most European countries. With regard to “intimidation”, given the explanation provided by the secretariat and considering that it was not used in Convention No. 190, he argued that intimidation was a type of harassment and therefore the term “harassment” encompassed intimidation.
- 1381.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, seconded the views expressed by the Government member of France in relation to use of the term “harassment” as encompassing intimidation. However, he preferred “affirmative” to “effective” as it made more sense as a qualifier for the term “measures”.
- 1382.** The Government member of Brazil, supported by the Government members of India and Chile, preferred the terms “effective” and “harassment”. She noted that “effective” measures could lead to “affirmative” measures, and, as explained by the secretariat intimidation was a type of harassment.
- 1383.** The Government member of Colombia said that she also preferred the terms “effective” and “harassment” for the reasons outlined by the Government member of Brazil. In Spanish “effective” was more common, and she argued that using the term “intimidation” could make the sentence complex and unclear.
- 1384.** The Government member of Canada thanked the Workers’ group and the Government member of the United States for supporting the initial amendment. In the spirit of consensus, he agreed to support the text as recently subamended by the Employers’ group. He clarified that it had not been the intention to rewrite Convention No.190, but that intimidation was a very serious issue, which was why they had stressed the need to include it explicitly.
- 1385.** The Government member of the United States echoed the concerns of the Government member of Canada with regard to intimidation. However, in the spirit of consensus he agreed to remove the word “intimidation”.
- 1386.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson thanked the Committee members for the fruitful discussion and for their flexibility.
- 1387.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson also thanked the Committee members for the insightful discussion, which had led to consensus and the inclusion of a new point dedicated to important issues.

1388. The amendment was adopted as subamended and the new point was adopted.

A.216 and A.229

- 1389.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, introduced an amendment (A.216) to insert “and balance” after the words “gender equality”. The term “gender equality” focused on inequalities between men and women, in particular in terms of payment, but did not encompass unequal representation of men and women at workplaces. It was therefore important to add “and balance”.
- 1390.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment which was similar to an amendment (A.229) submitted by the Workers’ group, proposing to add “and in access to apprenticeships” at the end of the clause. There was evidence that, despite measures being taken, there was still inequality in terms of pay and conditions, and in terms of access and balance in some occupations and sectors. It was important for active steps to be taken to open equal opportunities for men and women.
- 1391.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment submitted by EU Member States as it seemed to be more precise than the one submitted by the Workers’ group.
- 1392.** The Government member of Guyana supported the amendment submitted by the Workers’ group, as the primary issue to be tackled was not “balance” but “access”.
- 1393.** The Government members of Argentina, Chile and Colombia supported the amendment introduced by EU Member States.
- 1394.** The Government member of Malawi said that “balance” was a different concept than “equality” and supported the inclusion of “balance”. In addition, for balance and equality to happen, access to apprenticeships was needed. Hence, she supported inclusion of “access” as well.
- 1395.** The Government member of Cameroon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and the Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed with the Government member of Malawi.
- 1396.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that inclusion of both amendments would lead to redundancy, but he could accept the inclusion of both.
- 1397.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced a subamendment to avoid ambiguity. The point would read: “Members should take appropriate measures to promote gender equality and balance in how apprenticeships are accessed and delivered”.
- 1398.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that she appreciated the attempt to clarify the language, but did not support the subamendment introduced by the Employer Vice-Chairperson.
- 1399.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the subamendment proposed by the Employers’ group. Consensus had been reached on combining both amendments.
- 1400.** The amendments were adopted.

A.221

- 1401.** The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Australia and Israel, introduced an amendment to add at the end of the clause the following text, in order to give some examples of concrete measures for promoting gender equality that would provide useful guidance: “including measures such as ensuring

adequate recruitment strategies, equal remuneration, the same level of quality assignments and number of hours on the job, and access to appropriate supportive services to improve retention”.

- 1402.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment as it was too prescriptive, and the concepts listed too subjective. Many of the additions were implicit in national anti-discrimination laws given effect under Convention No. 111. He also highlighted the fact that many governments lacked the fiscal space to implement the proposed text.
- 1403.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment. Inclusion of concrete examples would be helpful, especially the final point around retention.
- 1404.** The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran also supported the amendment.
- 1405.** The Government member of Brazil did not support the amendment as the text was too prescriptive for a Recommendation.
- 1406.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed that the wording was too specific for a Recommendation and did not support it. The danger in providing such a list was that some items may be left out, creating legal insecurity.
- 1407.** The Government members of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, Colombia, India, and Turkey did not support the amendment.
- 1408.** The Government member of the United States understood the concerns that had been shared by Committee members, but taking into account the recognized gender inequality issues, it would be useful to provide at least some examples of concrete measures that Members could take to address those issues. The intention was not to make the list prescriptive or exhaustive, so he proposed to replace “including” with “for example, through measures such as”.
- 1409.** The Government member of Singapore said that she would prefer not to include the list, but could agree to the proposal made by the Government member of the United States.
- 1410.** The Government member of Argentina said that the proposed text as subamended was clearly not aimed to be prescriptive, and while perhaps not precise enough from a technical point of view, could serve as inspiration for governments to adopt such measures. In particular she agreed with the inclusion of “appropriate support services”, as the lack of such services hindered women’s access in many countries.
- 1411.** The Government member of Australia supported the text as subamended.
- 1412.** The Government member of Chile said that the amendment highlighted means of tackling gender inequality, and that including those examples could be interpreted as a political signal from the Committee of how seriously it took the matter. He therefore supported the amendment as subamended.
- 1413.** The Government member of Malawi did not support the amendment or subamendment. The proposed measures were useful ideas for countries, and Governments present had taken note of them, but were not necessary to be included in the Recommendation.
- 1414.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment, as those specific examples touched upon important and critical means of promoting gender equality and balance.
- 1415.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment or the subamendment. The proposed examples were subjective, imprecise and impossible to implement and evaluate. A Recommendation should contain texts like the original version of point 21, based on which

experts should identify good practices and share them with governments as technical resources. The detailed description proposed by the amendment was not appropriate.

1416. The Government members of Burkina Faso and Guyana also did not support the subamendment.

1417. The amendment was not adopted.

A.167

1418. An amendment submitted by the Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran was not seconded and therefore fell.

1419. Point 21 was adopted as amended.

Point 22

A.194, A.195, A.196, A.197, A.198, A.199, A.200, A.201

1420. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add at the end of the introductory text: “persons in vulnerable situations or belonging to disadvantaged groups.”, as well as seven amendments to delete clauses (a) to (g). The intention of the amendments was to encourage countries to identify the priorities to be applied in the apprenticeship context at their national level, not to imply that people listed in clauses (a) to (g) were not vulnerable.

1421. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendments, as the new proposed text for the point allowed for flexibility at national and international levels. She added that as identification of vulnerable groups could change over time depending on social circumstances, it would be difficult to include a list. A broad and inclusive text would be more appropriate.

1422. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the proposed text but introduced a subamendment to insert “in accordance with national laws” after “take measures”, as different jurisdictions would identify the priority groups differently.

1423. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the proposed text, stating that having a broader approach rather than a list-based approach would be better, as anticipating all vulnerable populations would be difficult. He noted that the subamendment would not be necessary if the amendment was adopted.

1424. The Government member of Brazil supported the addition of “in accordance with national laws” to the original text, but did not support the amendments, stating that coherence between the text and the Preamble, where concerns about human rights had been mentioned, would be needed. She added that listing at least some disadvantaged groups was important.

1425. The Government members of Chile, Guyana and Türkiye supported the amendment as subamended.

1426. The amendment was adopted as subamended and the seven amendments to delete the clauses were adopted.

1427. All the other amendments to point 22 (A.206, A.217, A.222, A.223, A.227 and A.228) fell.

A.264

- 1428.** The Government member of Kenya speaking on behalf of the Africa group introduced an amendment to remove the word “, diversity”. The intention of the text would not be affected as long as “social inclusion” remained.
- 1429.** The Worker and the Employer Vice-Chairpersons asked the secretariat to provide recent examples of tripartite agreed text on that matter.
- 1430.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, explained that “diversity” was a broad term which encompassed many things. There were many types of diversity – of origin, background, religion and so on – and its inclusion in the point was a good thing. In response to the Vice-Chairpersons’ request, he cited point 23(e) of the Conclusions concerning inequalities and the world of work that had been adopted by the Conference in December 2021, which included the words “promoting equality, diversity and inclusion”. He consequently did not support the amendment.
- 1431.** The representative of the Secretary-General added that the term “diversity” had also been used recently by tripartite agreement in the Global Call to Action adopted by the Conference in June 2021. It referred to “execute across the public and private sectors, a transformative agenda for equality, diversity, and inclusion, aimed at eliminating violence and harassment in the world of work and discrimination on all grounds”.
- 1432.** The amendment was withdrawn.
- 1433.** Point 22 was adopted as amended.

New point before 23

A.202

- 1434.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new point that read “Members should actively promote ‘adult apprenticeships’ for experienced individuals wanting to change industry or occupation, upgrade their skills or enhance their employability.” One of the key messages was that apprenticeship pathways needed to be accessible not just to young people in the middle to final years of secondary schooling, but also to adults and those who seek to change careers.
- 1435.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the notion and the amendment, but wondered whether it had not already been discussed and included in the text.
- 1436.** The Government members of Australia, Bangladesh, Canada and Colombia, France speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Saudi Arabia, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, supported the amendment as a constructive addition.
- 1437.** The Government member of the United States supported the addition and concept but asked if the Employers’ group might be open to removing the term “adult” because of the different connotations attached to the word in different jurisdictions.
- 1438.** The Government members of Brazil and India and Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment but agreed with the Government member of the United States regarding the removal of the term “adult”.
- 1439.** The Government member of Morocco believed that the relevant reference was to lifelong learning rather than adult apprentices.

- 1440.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to replace “adult apprenticeships for experienced individuals” with “apprenticeships for adults and experienced individuals” in order to actively promote apprenticeships for adults.
- 1441.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment as subamended.
- 1442.** The Government member of Malawi welcomed the overall statement but wondered if the mention of adults and experienced individuals did not narrow the scope of the point unnecessarily.
- 1443.** The Government member of Morocco wondered whether they were talking about validating professional experience for people to obtain a formal qualification in order to then be able to change job or sector.
- 1444.** The Government members of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Members States, Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, Saudi Arabia, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, and India supported the subamendment proposed by the Employers’ group.
- 1445.** The amendment was adopted as subamended and the new point was adopted.

Point 23

A.203

- 1446.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace “, especially for persons in the informal economy” with “as a means to facilitate the transition from the informal to the formal economy”, to make clear that the role of quality apprenticeships was not to sustain participation in the informal economy but to facilitate the transition from the informal economy to the formal economy.
- 1447.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed that the amendment was helpful, but proposed a subamendment to replace “as a means to facilitate the transition from the informal to the formal economy” with “, for informal workers and persons in precarious and insecure forms of work as a means to facilitate the transition from the informal to the formal economy to ensure that persons do not fall back into the informal economy”.
- 1448.** The Government member of Switzerland welcomed the addition from the Workers’ group but proposed to replace “to facilitate the transition from the informal to the formal economy, and to ensure that persons do not fall back into the informal economy”, by “to facilitate a successful transition from the informal to the formal economy”.
- 1449.** The Government member of India noted that the text had become overly complex and supported the Employers’ group’s amendment.
- 1450.** In the spirit of consensus, the Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Members States, could support the latest proposal, but highlighted that workers in precarious and insecure forms of work could also be in the formal economy.
- 1451.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendments proposed by the Workers’ group and the Government member of Switzerland. Apprenticeships were regulated and therefore neither insecure nor precarious; the text was misplaced and failed the test of practicality.
- 1452.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled that the discussion was on ensuring equality and diversity in quality apprenticeships. It was about the diverse groups and the vulnerabilities and disadvantages they faced. She stressed the importance of assisting workers in precarious

and insecure forms of work in making the one-way transition into formal and secure forms of work. She introduced a further subamendment to add “and from insecure to secure work” after “from the informal to the formal economy”.

- 1453.** The Government members of Australia, Switzerland, Argentina, Canada and the United States, and France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the further subamendment.
- 1454.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed to delete “for informal workers and persons in precarious and insecure forms of work” as it was redundant.
- 1455.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson contended that it was useful to explicitly mention those involved.
- 1456.** The Government member of Saudi Arabia, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, and the Government member of Bangladesh supported the proposal by the Employers’ group.
- 1457.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced a subamendment to include, after the word “apprenticeships”, the wording “as a means to facilitate the successful transition from insecure to secure work in both the informal and the formal economy”.
- 1458.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported that proposal.
- 1459.** The Government member of Zambia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the essence of the subamendment introduced by the Employer Vice-Chairperson, but proposed to delete the words “formal education and training, including”.
- 1460.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the subamendment introduced by the Employer Vice-Chairperson.
- 1461.** The representative of the Secretary-General noted a degree of ambiguity in the latest text, as it implied promoting access to quality apprenticeships in the informal economy and promoting the transition from insecure to secure work in the informal economy. That did not reinforce the long-standing approach of seeking the transition from the informal to the formal economy.
- 1462.** The Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group stated that many factors were responsible for the existence of the informal economy and that people should be able to have a satisfactory, secure job even in the informal economy.
- 1463.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed with the representative of the Secretary-General that promoting security in the informal economy was not the intention, and suggested returning to the previous text.
- 1464.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed to create a stand-alone point on security and insecurity at work.
- 1465.** The representative of Secretary-General suggested reversing the reference to “insecure and secure” and “informal and formal” so that the text would read “as a means to facilitate the successful transition from the informal to the formal economy and from insecure to secure work”.
- 1466.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson supported that suggestion.
- 1467.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.

A.204 and A.226

- 1468.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert “including” before “through recognition of prior learning”.
- 1469.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not object to the amendment, but noted that her group had submitted an amendment (A.226) to insert a new point to read “Members should take measures to recognize prior learning as assessed by qualified teachers”.
- 1470.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment.
- 1471.** The Government member of Uganda said that the new point proposed by the Workers’ group was unnecessary, as recognition of prior learning had already been addressed under the new point 13(c).
- 1472.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson added that point 4(d) already mentioned qualified assessors.
- 1473.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson requested the secretariat to confirm whether the concepts covered by the proposed amendment were already covered. The representative of the Secretary-General provided confirmation.
- 1474.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment.
- 1475.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the process of effectively recognizing skills acquired informally through formal qualifications was a key way of bridging the gap between informality and formality. Qualified teachers and assessors would be needed to do that work. It was important to send a strong signal to countries with high levels of informality.
- 1476.** Point 23 was adopted as amended.

Section V. Promotion of quality apprenticeships and international cooperation

A.281

- 1477.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace the title of section V with “Promotion of quality apprenticeships through international and domestic cooperation” to reflect the importance of effective cooperation between subnational units, states, cantons and provinces in the education and training system.
- 1478.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, because the section covered issues other than the promotion of quality apprenticeships through international and domestic cooperation.
- 1479.** The Government member of Morocco, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, proposed to replace “domestic cooperation” by “partnerships”, which would also encompass the subsequent proposal from the Employers’ group on public-private partnerships.
- 1480.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed to replace the word “through” with “and”, given the remarks from the Workers’ group.
- 1481.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment, as the original text was clearer.
- 1482.** The Government members of Brazil and Canada did not support the amendment.
- 1483.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment.
- 1484.** The title of section V was adopted without amendment.

Point 24, chapeau**A.332**

- 1485.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment to add “, together with the social partners,” after “Members”, as it was important to have an explicit mention of the social partners, who could play an important role in promoting quality apprenticeships.
- 1486.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 1487.** The Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, proposed a subamendment to replace “together”, by “in consultation”, in order to maintain the same terminology throughout the text.
- 1488.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Brazil supported the subamendment.
- 1489.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment.
- 1490.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.

A.325

- 1491.** The Government member of Switzerland, speaking also on behalf of Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States, proposed an amendment to replace “including” with “such as”, so that the list was not exhaustive. The promotional measures in the following clauses should inspire and guide Members on useful and proven practices, but not all such promotional measures would be suitable for all Members.
- 1492.** The Government members of Singapore and Chile supported the amendment.
- 1493.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to delete “by” after “such as” in the amendment to further clarify that the list was indicative, not obligatory.
- 1494.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Zambia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment or the subamendment, as the original text meant that Members should consider all the measures listed.
- 1495.** In view of the comments of the Africa group, the Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the subamendment and did not support the amendment.
- 1496.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson accepted the need for flexibility in some cases, and was willing to accept the amendment.
- 1497.** The Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment and recalled that a Recommendations was not legally binding, and the intention was to promote best practice.
- 1498.** The Government member of Switzerland noted that the intention of the amendment was to provide flexibility to Member States regarding the measures to be taken to promote apprenticeships, but in view of the opposition expressed, withdrew the amendment
- 1499.** Point 24, chapeau, was adopted as amended.

Point 24(a)

- 1500.** As there were no amendments to point 24, clause (a), it was adopted.

Point 24(b)

1501. An amendment proposed by the Employers' group (A.282) was withdrawn.

1502. Point 24, clause (b) was adopted.

New clause after (b)

A.158

1503. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, introduced an amendment to add a new clause after clause (b), to read "establishing sectoral or occupational skills bodies to facilitate the implementation of quality apprenticeships".

1504. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, noting that sectoral and occupational skills bodies were helpful in promoting quality apprenticeships.

1505. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Australia, Switzerland and the Islamic Republic of Iran and France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, all supported the amendment as a very constructive proposal.

1506. The amendment was adopted and the new clause was adopted.

Point 24(c)

A.328

1507. The Government member of Switzerland, speaking also on behalf of the United States, introduced an amendment to replace "a robust" by "robust mechanisms such as a" and to add "and regular consultations with the social partners" after "system". In their experience, labour market data alone was not sufficient and qualitative data obtained from employers' and workers' organizations was necessary in order to have a more complete picture of skills needs.

1508. The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons and the Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment.

1509. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment as a constructive proposal, but noted that it was possibly unnecessary in view of the amended chapeau.

1510. The Government member of Brazil also supported the amendment, while agreeing on its possible redundancy.

1511. The amendment was adopted.

A.310

1512. An amendment submitted by the Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran was not seconded and therefore fell.

1513. Point 24, clause (c) was adopted as amended.

New clause after (c)

A.190

- 1514.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new clause after clause (c), to read “Members should implement effective and sustainable financing models, including incentives schemes for enterprises and learners and performance-based funding for education and training institutions;” in order to have an effective, productive, quality apprenticeship system that delivered results.
- 1515.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as education and training should be within the framework of a strong public TVET model. Performance-based funding posed real difficulty, as short-term performance-based assessments of education needs were not accurate and did not help development. It was important to ensure that the system was robust, but performance-based funding could drive inequality and would not help to build a strong public model.
- 1516.** The Government member of Switzerland agreed with the Workers’ group concerning performance-based funding models and viewed incentive schemes as problematic in some contexts. He proposed a subamendment, which was seconded by the Government member of Canada, to delete “, including incentives schemes for enterprises and learners and performance-based funding for education and training institutions”.
- 1517.** The Government member of the United Kingdom proposed replacing “including” with “which may include”. The United Kingdom had introduced incentive schemes for enterprises as an exceptional measure during the pandemic to maintain demand for apprentices, but had subsequently concluded that the majority of such apprenticeships would have been offered even without the subsidies. The Government therefore reserved the right to introduce incentives in a targeted way, but noted that it was not universally necessary.
- 1518.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed to subamend the clause to read “Members should implement effective and sustainable financing models, including consideration of incentive schemes for enterprises and learners;” to emphasize that Governments should consider incentive schemes, which could be important in motivating both the potential host enterprise and the potential apprentice.
- 1519.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the subamendment proposed by the Government member of Switzerland, but not the further subamendment of the Employers’ group.
- 1520.** The Government member of Switzerland suggested that the matter of incentives might be better placed under clause (d), which addressed incentive packages aimed at enterprises, including financial incentives.
- 1521.** The Government member of the United Kingdom still thought it was useful to include incentive schemes as an example of something governments might choose to use, and supported the Employers’ group’s further subamendment.
- 1522.** The Government member of Cameroon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and the Government members of Canada and the United States supported the subamendment proposed by the Government member of Switzerland and did not support the further subamendment of the Employers’ group. They agreed that incentives were best treated in the subsequent clause.

1523. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the further subamendment; the new clause to be inserted after point 24, clause (c) therefore read “implementing effective and sustainable financing models;”.

1524. The amendment was adopted as subamended and the new clause was adopted.

Point 24(d)

A.265

1525. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, introduced an amendment to delete “, such as cost sharing, tax exemptions, subsidies for social security contributions, or training of trainers, to enterprises, especially micro, small and medium-sized enterprises”, as such lists were not helpful in that they could not be exhaustive.

1526. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed and supported the amendment.

1527. The Government members of Zambia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, Oman, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, and the Government members of Brazil and Türkiye all supported the amendment.

1528. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the removal of the list, as it clarified what the support services were, but he acknowledged the consensus within the Committee.

1529. The amendment was adopted and the other amendments submitted to the clause (A.283, A.284, A.313, A.329, A.348, A.349 and A.350) fell.

1530. Point 24, clause (d) was adopted as amended.

New clause after (d)

A.186

1531. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment to insert a new clause to read: “public-private cooperation supports apprentices in accessing learning and work opportunities”. He stressed the importance of public-private cooperation because it was a proven measure in apprenticeship systems in many countries.

1532. The Worker Vice-Chairperson deemed the addition unnecessary, as the concept was covered by other clauses in point 24.

1533. The Government members of Türkiye and Brazil did not support amendment.

1534. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that the term “public-private cooperation” was vague.

1535. The Government member of Switzerland supported the amendment. He observed that public-private cooperation was a cornerstone of a well-functioning and flexible apprenticeship system and was important to ensure both governance and implementation.

1536. The Government member of Morocco, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, acknowledged the importance of public-private partnerships but did not support the amendment.

1537. The Government member of Burkina Faso supported the amendment but found the term “cooperation” too broad and proposed to replace it with “partnerships”.

1538. Referring to the Global Call to Action of 2021, the Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced a further subamendment to reformulate the amendment to read “effective public-private

partnerships to support quality apprenticeships". He explained that forms of support depend on national contexts and highlighted practical and significant support that private enterprises might be able to bring to public apprenticeship systems. He claimed that apprenticeship training would not be possible if it relied solely on public resources.

- 1539.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment, arguing that public-private partnerships should be firmly based within the infrastructure of the public education and TVET system.
- 1540.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the subamendment. He proposed that the French version should use the term "partenariats entre le secteur public et le secteur privé", as the term "partenariats public-privé" had a connotation of public infrastructure management by private enterprises.
- 1541.** The Government member of Switzerland, considering the points raised by the Workers' group, proposed a further subamendment to add after "quality apprenticeships", "within a national regulatory framework".
- 1542.** The Government member of Morocco agreed with the point made by the Government member of France and seconded the subamendment by the Government member of Switzerland.
- 1543.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the proposed subamendment.
- 1544.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a further subamendment to replace "within a national regulatory framework" with "within a strong TVET infrastructure".
- 1545.** The Government member of Brazil did not support the proposal by the Workers' group, as the focus of the discussion was on international cooperation.
- 1546.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the further subamendment proposed by the Workers' group, preferring the proposal made by the Government member of Switzerland. In his opinion, "national regulatory framework" included the regulatory framework for TVET and therefore, the wording proposed by the Workers' group was unnecessary. He clarified that section V was not only about international cooperation but also about the promotion of quality apprenticeships and that public-private partnerships were therefore relevant.
- 1547.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson shared the views expressed by the Government member of Brazil. She preferred not to insert a separate clause, noting that much of the substance proposed under the amendment was already covered in other parts of the document.
- 1548.** The Government members of Saudi Arabia, Türkiye and the United States supported the further subamendment proposed by the Government member of Switzerland.
- 1549.** In the spirit of consensus, the Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the further subamendment proposed by the Government member of Switzerland.
- 1550.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, also supported the further subamendment proposed by Government member of Switzerland. He pointed out that a verb was missing before "effective" and suggested that the Drafting Committee would add one.
- 1551.** The amendment was adopted as subamended and the new clause was adopted.

Point 24(e)**A.266**

- 1552.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, proposed an amendment to delete clause 24(e), as the future instrument should not encourage the use of intermediaries, especially not through financial support. He also recalled that many EU Member States had no intermediaries within their national frameworks.
- 1553.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment and noted that intermediaries played an important role. Deleting the clause would narrow pathways for apprentices because not all apprenticeship programmes followed a traditional single-enterprise apprenticeship model, and intermediaries helped to sustain apprenticeship systems.
- 1554.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, as the encouragement of intermediaries could be unhelpful and could lead to apprenticeship programmes being run as a business.
- 1555.** The Government member of Singapore supported the amendment.
- 1556.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment.
- 1557.** The amendment was withdrawn.

A.347 and A.330

- 1558.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add “accredited” before “intermediaries” to ensure that intermediaries would meet obligations under a regulatory framework to enhance protection of apprentices.
- 1559.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as every government had conditionalities for public procurement and they were equivalent in function to accreditation. Therefore, the reference to accreditation added no value but would create an additional layer of bureaucracy without a return on investment to the government.
- 1560.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment. He proposed a subamendment so that the clause would read: “recognizing that accredited intermediaries can participate in the provision, coordination and support of apprenticeships;”, thereby deleting the reference to financial support.
- 1561.** The Government members of Argentina, Brazil and Colombia supported the subamendment.
- 1562.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, also supported the subamendment, but proposed a subamendment to transform the clause to read “recognizing the role of accredited intermediaries in the provision, coordination and support of apprenticeships” to align with the wording of point 4, clause (b).
- 1563.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson insisted that “accredited” be maintained. Referring to point 15 which defined roles of intermediaries and called for Members to prescribe regulatory conditions under which intermediaries operate, she argued that accreditation was a prerequisite for intermediaries.
- 1564.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson recalled that regulatory aspects were covered in point 15, and argued that this clause should focus on promotional aspects, in line with the title of the section. On that basis, he called for the role of intermediaries to be recognized. Regarding

financial support, he clarified that the intent was to enable intermediaries to provide instrumental services, such as attracting more apprentices into the system. The proposed subamendment introduced by the EU Member States seemed to indicate that the intent to incentivize small businesses to take on apprentices was lost.

- 1565.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, proposed a further subamendment to insert the words “, when appropriate” after “apprenticeships” as it would allow more flexibility among different national frameworks for apprenticeships.
- 1566.** The Government member of the United Kingdom supported the Employers’ group, and cited three examples of roles of intermediaries in his country where the Government procured the services of intermediaries through competitive tender processes.
- 1567.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, preferred the original text. He remarked that the reference to financial support was unnecessary because the chapeau called for Members to “create an enabling environment”.
- 1568.** The Government member of Türkiye drew attention to another amendment (A.330), which was proposed by his country and Switzerland, to delete the words “, including through financial support,”.
- 1569.** The Government member of Switzerland stressed the importance of removing the reference to financial support from the clause. Intermediaries in his country played a crucial function without receiving subsidies.
- 1570.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Singapore and the United States supported the proposal made by Türkiye and Switzerland.
- 1571.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the encouragement of intermediaries, but could agree with the text if “, when appropriate” was added at the end of the clause.
- 1572.** The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons and the Government members of Australia, Brazil, and Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the further subamendment.
- 1573.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 1574.** Amendment A.347 was not adopted. Three amendments (A.345, A.346 and A.285) were withdrawn.
- 1575.** Point 24, clause (e) was adopted.

New clause after (e)

A.344

- 1576.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert “evaluating the contribution of accredited intermediaries to quality education and good working conditions” after point 24, as there should be an evaluation process of the contribution of their participation.
- 1577.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, observing that it was misplaced and should relate to point 15, clause (c) or (d). The need for evaluation of the entire apprenticeship system was already mentioned and evaluation of good working conditions was beyond the scope of the future instrument.

- 1578.** The Government member of Brazil did not support the amendment, stating that it was too prescriptive.
- 1579.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the intention of the amendment was that the evaluation of intermediaries would contribute to promoting quality apprenticeships.
- 1580.** The amendment was withdrawn and the new clause was not adopted.
- 1581.** Two other amendments (A.342 and A.343) were withdrawn.

Point 24(f)

A.341

- 1582.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment to add “quality” before “apprenticeships”, emphasizing that awareness-raising activities and promotional campaigns would target quality apprenticeships, not apprenticeships generally.
- 1583.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Canada, Kenya, Switzerland and the United States supported the amendment.
- 1584.** The amendment was adopted.

A.286

- 1585.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment to add “by promoting the benefits of apprenticeships to students, families, teachers, career counsellors, workers’ and employers’ organizations, and employers, particularly micro, small and medium-sized enterprises”. He stressed the need to overcome the stigma attached to apprenticeships, which were perceived as inferior pathways for young people compared to university education.
- 1586.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Australia, Canada, Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Switzerland supported the amendment.
- 1587.** The Government member of Brazil also supported the amendment, but pointed out that some groups were missing from the list of target groups.
- 1588.** The Government member of Argentina shared the view of the Government member of Brazil and proposed to add “workers” to the list, which was seconded by the Government member of Switzerland.
- 1589.** The Government member of Brazil proposed a further subamendment to replace “students” with “young people”, which was seconded by the Government member of Switzerland.
- 1590.** The Government member of Australia and Canada supported the subamendments.
- 1591.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 1592.** Point 24, clause (f) was adopted as amended.

New clause after (f)

A.238

- 1593.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment to insert a new clause to read “increasing awareness of apprentices’ rights, entitlements and protections in promotional campaigns”. She stated that there was a set of protections which should be part of the

promotional process and campaigns. Social partners could have a significant role in promoting the entitlements of apprentices.

- 1594.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to read “promoting both the benefits of apprenticeships and the rights of apprentices;”.
- 1595.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, while acknowledging positive aspects of apprenticeships, remarked that a concern over a lack of decent conditions for apprenticeships must be addressed. This amendment intended to give assurance to young people that they could access and benefit from a quality structure of apprenticeships.
- 1596.** The Government member of Australia shared the view of the Workers’ group and supported the original amendment.
- 1597.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the initial proposal from the Worker Vice-Chairperson.
- 1598.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, opposed the amendment, as it was part of the awareness-raising and promotional campaigns mentioned in clause (f).
- 1599.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson suggested to delete “in promotional campaigns” because there could be various circumstances to promote awareness of apprentices’ rights.
- 1600.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the retention of the words “in promotional campaigns” because it conveyed the notion of active promotion.
- 1601.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not agree, as promotional campaigns were intended to promote the positives of apprenticeships and the benefits they provide to employment and employability, which were distinct in nature from raising awareness of apprentices’ rights, entitlements and protections.
- 1602.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed with the Employer Vice-Chairperson that rights, entitlements and protections should always be promoted, not just within promotional campaigns.
- 1603.** The Government member of the United States preferred to retain the reference to “promotional campaigns”, as rights, entitlements and protections were a positive aspect of apprenticeships that should be promoted.
- 1604.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson contended that the clause concerned promoting quality apprenticeships to people who might not otherwise choose to start apprenticeship training. Thus, it was important that promotional campaigns provided information both on the benefits for apprentices as mentioned in clause (f), and on decent conditions as set out in points 12 and 14.
- 1605.** The Chairperson noted that the Employer Vice-Chairperson’s proposal to delete “in promotional campaigns” did not enjoy sufficient support.
- 1606.** The amendment was adopted and the new clause was adopted.

Point 24(g)

A.267

- 1607.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, introduced an amendment to insert “needs-based” before “pre-apprenticeship programmes;”, to clarify that

those who could not directly access apprenticeship programmes should have access to pre-apprenticeship programmes to prepare them for apprenticeship training.

- 1608.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, noting the functions of pre-apprenticeship programmes to fill capacity gaps of individuals.
- 1609.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, as it was helpful in ensuring that pre-apprenticeship programmes were aimed at those who needed them the most.
- 1610.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment.
- 1611.** The amendment was adopted.
- 1612.** Two amendments (A.268 and A.287) were withdrawn.

A.339

- 1613.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert, after “pre-apprenticeship programmes”, the words “by TVET or other public educational institutions with a focus on increasing participation of disadvantaged groups”. Pre-apprenticeship programmes should be established not only outside existing systems but also within the TVET institutions that were already in place in order to help, in particular, young people who had an unsuccessful school experience, for example. There should also be a focus on disadvantaged young people as they were more likely to experience such unsuccessful situations.
- 1614.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment as it was overly detailed and prescriptive and did not reflect current practices. In fact, in addition to TVET institutions, employers and other organizations offered pre-apprenticeship programmes.
- 1615.** The Government member of Argentina agreed with the aim of increasing the participation of disadvantaged groups; however, she pointed out that the first part of the amendment was too prescriptive and did not fit the country context. In Argentina, many training institutions belonged to social partners.
- 1616.** The Government members of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Switzerland agreed with the Government member of Argentina.
- 1617.** The Government member of Canada supported the deletion of “by TVET or other public educational institutions” and proposed a subamendment, seconded by the Government member of the United States, to replace “disadvantaged groups” with “under-represented groups”, which gave a sense of opportunity and positivity.
- 1618.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson observed that the language should be consistent with that used in point 22; the Government member of Canada withdrew the subamendment to add “under-represented”.
- 1619.** The Worker and Employer Vice-Chairpersons agreed to the proposed text, which read: “establishing needs-based pre-apprenticeship programmes with a focus on increasing participation of disadvantaged groups”.
- 1620.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.

A.340

- 1621.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add a new clause after point 24(g): “establishing pre- and post-apprenticeship training for the establishment and development of lifelong learning capabilities”. Acknowledging the previous adoption of the new clause on pre-apprenticeship programmes, “pre-apprenticeship” training was no longer required in the amendment, which should instead focus on post-apprenticeship training. Post-apprenticeship training had been successful where it had been established, as it allowed apprentices to develop advanced skills and further knowledge development, which led to work opportunities, future job changes and lifelong learning.
- 1622.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson recalled that clause (h), already covered the aspect of what must come after the apprenticeships such as facilitating access to further vocational and higher education opportunities. He also raised concern over ambiguity around funding of post-apprenticeship training.
- 1623.** The Government member of Canada did not support the amendment, as the concept was covered under clause (h). In addition, the term “post-apprenticeship” could also be problematic as it fell outside the apprenticeship scheme in some jurisdictions.
- 1624.** The Government member of Brazil supported the comment made by the Government member of Canada.
- 1625.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, suggested that the text of the amendment could be consolidated with clause (h) to discuss together the vertical and horizontal mobility of an apprenticeship qualification.
- 1626.** The amendment was withdrawn.
- 1627.** Point 24, clause (g) was adopted as amended.

Point 24(h)

A.269

- 1628.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, introduced an amendment to insert “ensuring that apprenticeships provide access to other learning pathways, including training and other career pathways,” before “facilitating access” and to replace “vocational and higher education” with “vocational education and/or higher education”. The primary role of apprenticeships was to acquire competencies to gain access to jobs, but it was also important to provide apprentices with further opportunities for professional development and to respond to the changing needs of the labour market.
- 1629.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment and proposed a subamendment to insert “lifelong learning and” before “other learning pathways”.
- 1630.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as the original text offered greater clarity. Furthermore, it was impossible to ensure that apprenticeship training would lead to the outcomes referred to in the amendment. He noted that his group had submitted an amendment (A.288) to insert a new clause reading “providing flexible learning pathways, and supporting mobility and portability of skills and qualifications” after clause (h), and proposed that the element of lifelong learning could be added to that proposal.
- 1631.** The Government member of Türkiye supported the amendment proposed by the EU Member States but did not support the inclusion of lifelong learning in the clause.

- 1632. The Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the subamendment, as lifelong learning was outside the scope of vocational and/or higher education.
- 1633. The Government members of Brazil, Argentina and Switzerland did not support the amendment or subamendment.
- 1634. The amendment was withdrawn.
- 1635. Point 24, clause (h) was adopted without amendment.

New clause after (h)

A.288

- 1636. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new clause after point 24, clause (h), "providing flexible learning pathways, and supporting mobility and portability of skills and qualifications." He also proposed a subamendment to add "lifelong learning" after "mobility".
- 1637. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment and subamendment and proposed a further subamendment to replace ", and supporting" with "and career guidance to support" in order to emphasize the importance of career guidance.
- 1638. The Government members of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, Oman, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and the United States supported the amendment and subamendments.
- 1639. The amendment was adopted as subamended and the new clause was adopted.

Point 24(i)

A.338

- 1640. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment, which she subamended to replace "effectiveness and efficiency in delivering and managing quality" by "the quality of". She observed that new technologies and innovative methods could do more than improve effectiveness and efficiency in delivering and managing quality apprenticeships, and that the focus should be on the role of new technologies and methods in improving the quality of apprenticeships more generally.
- 1641. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Australia and France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment.
- 1642. The Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment. The issues of the effectiveness and quality of apprenticeships were already handled elsewhere in the text, but this clause was about using more technologies and innovative methods to train apprentices.
- 1643. The Government members of Oman, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, Argentina, Brazil and the Islamic Republic of Iran supported the amendment.
- 1644. The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 1645. Point 24, clause (i) was adopted as amended.

New clause after (i)

A.337

- 1646.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert “setting requirements for quality apprenticeships in state-owned enterprises and public procurement policies, including infrastructure investments;”, after point 24, clause (i). The purpose was to promote quality apprenticeships in their own establishments and in public procurement policies.
- 1647.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment because such a requirement did not easily fit in the setting. This risked imposing suboptimal conditions in public procurement and infrastructure development. In particular, the word “requirement” was too strong.
- 1648.** The Government members of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States; Brazil and Singapore did not support the amendment, as it was overly specific and prescriptive.
- 1649.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment and the new clause was not adopted.
- 1650.** An amendment to insert another new clause (A.289) was withdrawn.
- 1651.** Point 24 was adopted as amended.

New point before 25

A.290

- 1652.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment, which he subamended, to insert “Members should promote a culture of lifelong learning, skilling and upskilling.” before point 25.
- 1653.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson could support the amendment in principle but requested clarification on how it would add to point 24.
- 1654.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the intention was to have a single summary statement of the importance of promoting a culture of lifelong learning, as opposed to the practical steps referred to under point 24, clause (h).
- 1655.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment. In order to be in line with the wording used in the Report of the ILO Global Commission on the Future of Work, 2019, she proposed a further subamendment to insert the words “and reskilling” after “upskilling”.
- 1656.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU Member States, Oman, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, Argentina and Brazil did not support the amendment as they considered it to be redundant.
- 1657.** The Government member of Bangladesh supported the amendment as subamended.
- 1658.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed to add the term “reskilling”. While the amendment might result in some redundancy, it would provide drafting guidance for the instrument to be drafted the following year. Thus, it would be useful to add a point with an emphasis on culture.
- 1659.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said the amendment added an additional aspect in relation to the culture of lifelong learning. Although she agreed that the amendment was similar to text already incorporated, it would be useful to include it as the various references to lifelong

learning could be rationalized in the proposed text for the Recommendation in the second discussion.

1660. The amendment was adopted as subamended and the new point was adopted.

1661. An amendment (A.291) was withdrawn.

Point 25, chapeau

A.335, A.314 and A.292

1662. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment (A.335) to replace “promoting quality apprenticeships in the informal economy” by “facilitating the transition from the informal to the formal economy, take the following measures:”, as the text should focus on facilitating the transition from the informal to the formal economy rather than seeking to build quality apprenticeships in the informal economy.

1663. The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of Canada and Türkiye, proposed an amendment (A.314) to add “as appropriate” after “Members should”, to add “access to” before “quality”, to replace “informal” by “formal” and to add “for persons in the informal economy and with a view to facilitating a transition from the informal to the formal economy” after “economy”. He noted that the purpose was similar to the Workers’ group’s amendment.

1664. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew a similar amendment (A.292) and supported the Workers’ group’s amendment.

1665. The Government member of Singapore supported the amendment proposed by the Government member of the United States.

1666. The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of Canada, and Türkiye, recognizing the similarity to the Workers’ group’s amendment, withdrew their amendment and supported the Workers’ group’s amendment.

1667. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment proposed by the Workers’ group.

1668. The amendment was adopted.

A.336

1669. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment, which she subamended to add “in consultation with the social partners,” after “Members should” to recognize the important role that social partners could play.

1670. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.

1671. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

1672. Point 25, chapeau was adopted as amended.

Point 25(a)

1673. An amendment proposed by the Employers’ group was withdrawn.

A.327

- 1674.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, introduced an amendment to replace “improving” by “improve” and to replace “enhancing” by “enhance”, in order to improve the language.
- 1675.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson requested clarification from the secretariat.
- 1676.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, as it would expand the scope of the clause.
- 1677.** The Government member of Canada supported the amendment and proposed a subamendment to delete the word “pedagogical” after “technical” in the spirit of using plain language, which was seconded by the Government member of the United States.
- 1678.** The Government member of Malawi did not support the subamendment.
- 1679.** The Government member of Bangladesh supported the subamendment.
- 1680.** The representative of the Secretary-General clarified that the wording “to strengthen the capacity of micro and small economic units by” referred to the three means listed; therefore, the verbs should remain as “improving” and “enhancing”.
- 1681.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the amendment proposed by the Africa group would separate the actions required to promote quality apprenticeships in the informal economy, while the original text combined the means; the difference between the two was not significant. He supported the subamendment proposed by the Government member of Canada.
- 1682.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to the proposal made by the Government member of Canada to replace “pedagogical” with “teaching and training” in the spirit of using plain language.
- 1683.** The Government member of Cameroon, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, emphasized that the “pedagogical” dimension was vital, but the group was flexible on the Workers’ group’s proposed rewording. Investing in developing the competencies of master craftspersons could encourage them to move from the informal to the formal economy.
- 1684.** The Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, proposed a further subamendment to add “methods” after “teaching and training”, in order to retain the full meaning of “pedagogical”.
- 1685.** The Chairperson asked whether the Committee could support the text “strengthening the capacity of micro and small economic units by facilitating access to business development and financial services, improve occupational safety and health conditions, and enhance the technical, teaching and training methods, and entrepreneurial competencies of master craftspersons;”.
- 1686.** The Government member of Argentina considered that the main goal was to strengthen the capacity of micro and small economic units and therefore the verbs should be “facilitating”, “improving” and “enhancing”.
- 1687.** The Government member of the United States expressed a preference for “improving” and “enhancing” and supported the inclusion of “teaching and training methods”.
- 1688.** The Government member of Bangladesh supported “improving” and “enhancing”.

1689. The Government member of Cameroon supported “improving” and “enhancing” if “teaching and training methods” were included.

1690. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

A.294

1691. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete “conditions” after “occupational safety and health”.

1692. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Australia and Canada supported the amendment.

1693. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, requested clarification on the language used in the General Affairs Committee in relation to occupational safety and health. The representative of the Secretary-General clarified that the General Affairs Committee had used “a safe and healthy working environment”. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, proposed a subamendment to use “environment” instead of “conditions”.

1694. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment.

1695. The amendment was adopted as subamended.

1696. Point 25, clause (a) was adopted as amended.

Point 25(b)

A.334

1697. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment, which she subamended, to replace the text of point 25, clause (b) with “ensure that apprentices have access to off-the-job learning and that micro, small and medium-sized enterprises have access to advice from TVET and other public institutions to build capacity for the provision of training; and”. She affirmed that MSMEs should have access to TVET and other public institutions’ advice to build their capacity for training which could play a significant role in the transition from the informal to the formal economy.

1698. The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran supported the amendment.

1699. The Government members of Chile, Argentina and Colombia did not support the amendment, as the original text was more flexible and allowed for the presence of private training institutions in the system.

1700. The Government member of Morocco and the Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, emphasized the role of non-public institutions in training, which reflected the reality in their countries, especially in rural areas. An apprentice being trained by a master craftsperson would typically undertake part of their preparation under non-public intermediaries, such as other craftspersons or craft associations. The use of “public” in this context was overly limiting. They suggested retaining the original text and adding a separate point dealing with access to advice from TVET and other public institutions.

1701. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that it was essential for non-public providers to be able to provide off-the-job learning. In informal settings, private institutions needed to provide support to apprentices, and he highlighted the strong message from the Africa group that

they needed non-TVET providers. The Employers' group preferred the original text, as it was more practical and centred on the apprentices working in the informal economy.

1702. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the objectives of the amendment were, first, to ensure that apprentices did have access to off-the-job learning and, second, to ensure that public institutions could provide advice and support to MSMEs and build capacity. She noted that in some countries it was not always in the public sector. She clarified that clause (a) was directed at facilitating access to business development and financial services, whereas the current clause was intended to facilitate access to public advice and services from TVET institutions. She withdrew the amendment and would seek to add that element in one of the following clauses.

1703. Another amendment (A.295) was withdrawn.

A.270

1704. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, introduced an amendment to delete "through intermediaries or".

1705. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, given the importance of intermediaries in providing access to off-the-job learning, above all in developing countries.

1706. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Argentina and Türkiye supported the amendment.

1707. The Government member of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, indicated flexibility, but deleting references to intermediaries removed a central element in the delivery of apprenticeships in the informal economy.

1708. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, noted that they were sensitive to the argument put forward by the Government member of Uganda and were willing to go with the consensus.

1709. The Employer Vice-Chairperson invited the Government members to reconsider, as the document should consider the circumstances of all countries.

1710. The Government member of the United States introduced a subamendment, seconded by the Government members of Switzerland and Morocco, to add ", where applicable" after "through intermediaries".

1711. The Government member of Morocco stressed the importance of including intermediaries such as civil society and associations, as they played an important and active role as training operators in certain industries.

1712. The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, was persuaded by the argument of the Government member of Morocco and supported the subamendment.

1713. The Government member of Switzerland reported that in his country, intermediaries played an important role in the provision of complementary on-the-job training.

1714. The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and the Government member of Saudi Arabia, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, supported the subamendment.

- 1715.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced a further subamendment to add “accredited” before “intermediaries” on the basis that it was important to only include intermediaries that met quality assurance standards.
- 1716.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson questioned the practicality of the addition of “accredited”. Related wording in point 12 had ensured that intermediaries fulfilled the necessary requirements.
- 1717.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and the Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the further subamendment on the basis that it was overly restrictive.
- 1718.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.

A.315

- 1719.** The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of the Government member of Türkiye, introduced an amendment to add “aim to” at the beginning of the clause on the basis that the addition would provide some flexibility.
- 1720.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 1721.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as it weakened the clause significantly.
- 1722.** The amendment was withdrawn.
- 1723.** Point 25, clause (b) was adopted as amended.

Point 25(c)

A.271

- 1724.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of EU Member States, proposed to delete point 25, clause (c), as it was unclear what was meant by “quality assurance bodies” and the role they played in quality apprenticeships in countries with a high degree of informality.
- 1725.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson asked the secretariat to clarify the purpose of the clause.
- 1726.** The representative of the Secretary-General explained that the intention of clause (c) was to recognize that in many cases micro and small economic units that engage apprentices did not have the capacity to undertake quality control and assessment, and therefore joined associations to undertake these functions. It was consequently important to support the development of sufficient capacity within these associations.
- 1727.** The amendment was withdrawn, alongside three other amendments (A.296, A.312 and A.333).

A.331

- 1728.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace “perform the role of quality assurance bodies” with “improve the quality of apprenticeships”, noting that was the purpose of capacity-building. Moreover, the notion of “quality assurance bodies” was unclear in the context of the informal economy. She requested the secretariat to provide further clarification.

- 1729.** The representative of the Secretary-General explained that associations of micro and small businesses were usually organized by occupation and played an important role in several African countries. They supported the conclusion of the apprenticeship agreement, provided dispute resolution mechanisms, supported upskilling of master craftspersons, coordinated group insurance schemes, offered the use of new technology or equipment, organized end-of-apprenticeship assessments and awarded certificates. Those practices could be found in countries such as Benin, Senegal, Ghana, Cameroon, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Rwanda, among others.
- 1730.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson thanked the secretariat for the explanation and reiterated the intention of the amendment.
- 1731.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment based on the practices mentioned by the secretariat.
- 1732.** The Government representative of Argentina also supported the amendment.
- 1733.** The amendment was adopted.
- 1734.** Point 25, clause (c) was adopted as amended.
- 1735.** Point 25 was adopted as amended.

Point 26, chapeau

- 1736.** As there were no amendments to the chapeau, it was adopted.

Point 26(a)

- 1737.** An amendment (A.297) was withdrawn.

A.311

- 1738.** The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran introduced an amendment to add “and regional” after the word “international”. She explained that the exchange of information and cooperation with neighbouring countries was crucial.
- 1739.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson seconded the amendment and requested a subamendment to replace “and regional” with “, regional and domestic”. There could be considerable problems with skills recognition if subdivisions of a federal State were not coordinated.
- 1740.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, but not the subamendment introduced by the Employer Vice-Chairperson. While she acknowledged the importance of skills recognition within a country, it was not the role of international labour standards to give guidance to Member States on domestic matters such as skills portability in their countries.
- 1741.** The Government members of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Saudi Arabia supported the amendment and the subamendment.
- 1742.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 1743.** Point 26, clause (a) was adopted as amended.

Point 26(b)

- 1744.** An amendment (A.298) was withdrawn. Point 26, clause (b) was adopted.

New clause after (b)

A.300

- 1745.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add, after clause (b), a new clause to read “ensure that completed apprenticeship qualifications are recognized nationally”. He explained that qualifications should not be specific to one subnational jurisdiction.
- 1746.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as it should be the Member States’ prerogative to ensure skills recognition within the country. She added that the concept was already covered in earlier provisions.
- 1747.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, introduced a subamendment to add, after “nationally”, the words “regionally and internationally”. He highlighted that portability of qualifications was especially important in terms of labour migration.
- 1748.** The Government member of Morocco supported the subamendment and noted that regional frameworks for certification had not yet been addressed in the instrument. He stressed the importance of regional skills recognition for better mobility of apprentices.
- 1749.** The Government member of Argentina supported the subamendment, but said that the word “ensure” was too strong. She introduced a further subamendment to replace “ensure that” with “promote the recognition of”.
- 1750.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the further subamendment.
- 1751.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced a further subamendment to add, after “nationally”, the phrase “through cooperation in equivalence recognition systems” to encourage cooperation between states to ensure a level of equivalence between the apprenticeship systems and the qualifications.
- 1752.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed with the proposal made by the Government representative of Argentina. He did not support the further subamendment proposed by the Workers’ group because the details of the process of recognition were not necessary.
- 1753.** The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran supported a reference to regional and international skills recognition, as it reinforced the last amendment adopted.
- 1754.** The Government member of Canada said that the recognition of qualifications was critical. He supported the text without the words “through cooperation in an equivalence recognition system”.
- 1755.** The Government members of Brazil, Chile, France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, New Zealand and Switzerland agreed with the Government member of Canada.
- 1756.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, proposed a further subamendment to read “promote the recognition of completed apprenticeship qualifications nationally, regionally and internationally to offer expanded job and training opportunities”.
- 1757.** The Government member of New Zealand said that the latest proposed subamendment was unnecessary, and proposed to end the clause after the word “internationally”.

- 1758.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, the Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Brazil, Oman, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, and Türkiye supported the further subamendment by New Zealand.
- 1759.** The amendment was adopted as subamended and the new clause was adopted.
- 1760.** An amendment (A.299) was withdrawn.
- 1761.** Point 26 was adopted as amended.

Section VI. Traineeships

- 1762.** In accordance with the decision taken by the Committee when discussing point 5 to remove traineeships from the scope of the instrument, all the amendments proposing to delete section VI were adopted.⁶
- 1763.** The Committee recognized that beyond the issue of apprenticeships to be addressed in the instrument, which must remain a strong pillar of vocational education and training, other areas of work-based learning, including traineeships, were also critical to enhance and underpin vital skills, productivity, employment opportunities and decent work, necessary for the future of work.
- 1764.** The Committee therefore recommended that the Office should develop proposals for the Governing Body, including in the context of the programme and budget, regarding the modalities, provision and conditions of traineeships and other forms of work-based learning, including through the organization of a tripartite meeting of experts.
- 1765.** The Committee adopted the entire proposed Conclusions as amended, subject to any final adjustments by the Drafting Committee.

Discussion of the draft resolution

- 1766.** The representative of Secretary-General recalled that requests had been made to include in the resolution a paragraph on traineeships in order to invite the Governing Body to consider and take further actions. He suggested that the Committee could discuss, first, whether a paragraph on traineeships should be included in the resolution. If so agreed, it could then discuss the wording used. If the paragraph were not included in the resolution, the issue of traineeships would still appear in the Summary of Proceedings of the Committee, and any of the parties would be able to raise it before the tripartite Screening Group that determines the agenda of Governing Body sessions.
- 1767.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the inclusion in the resolution of a paragraph concerning traineeships. She noted that many governments had indicated that traineeships were an issue of serious concern and that a separate discussion, such as a tripartite meeting of experts, devoted to traineeships would be appropriate.
- 1768.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the inclusion of an additional paragraph in the resolution, which should refer only to the inclusion of an agenda item on apprenticeships for the next session of the Conference. The Committee should not take on the duty of the Screening Group to determine the priorities of the Governing Body. A decision on

⁶ A.157, A.247, A.237, A.236, A.272, A.301, A.316, A.326, A.273, A.302, A.317, A.274, A.303, A.318, A.275, A.304, A.319, A.276, A.305, A.320, A.277, A.306, A.321, A.278, A.307, A.322, A.279, A.308, A.323, A.280, A.309 and A.324.

traineeships could only be made through an explicit tripartite agreement, which was currently lacking.

- 1769.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, stated that it would be important to have in writing, in the resolution, a proposal for the Governing Body to consider holding a meeting of experts on traineeships, which would not override any ILO mechanisms.
- 1770.** The Government members of Argentina, Australia and Chile also supported the inclusion of a paragraph on traineeships.
- 1771.** The Government members of Uganda, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Saudi Arabia, speaking on behalf of the GCC countries, opposed the inclusion of a paragraph on traineeships.
- 1772.** The Government member of Brazil asked whether it was within the competence of the Committee to make such a proposal to the Governing Body.
- 1773.** The representative of the Secretary-General explained that the agenda of the Governing Body was set by the tripartite Screening Group. Where the Screening Group could not reach consensus, the decision was delegated to the Officers of the Governing Body.
- 1774.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson recalled that the Committee's mandate was based on the decision of the Governing Body at its 334th Session, which referred to a discussion on apprenticeships.
- 1775.** The Chairperson noted that the proposal to add a paragraph on traineeships to the resolution did not enjoy consensus. Therefore, the Committee adopted only the standard paragraphs placing an item entitled "Apprenticeships" on the agenda of the next ordinary session of the Conference for a second discussion with a view to the adoption of a Recommendation.

Closing statements

- 1776.** In their closing statements, all speakers expressed particular gratitude to the Chairperson for his leadership and to the representative of the Secretary-General for his guidance and in responding to the Committee's questions. They also thanked the secretariat, the Government members, the Worker Vice-Chairperson, the Employer Vice-Chairperson, and the interpreters for their excellent work. They expressed appreciation for the consensus-building efforts, through social dialogue, which had characterized the Committee's discussion on apprenticeships.
- 1777.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the Committee had reached the half-way point having agreed on a road map, which included definitions, regulations, protections for apprentices and other elements. She noted that remaining areas for discussion included learning pathways for apprentices, the role of public TVET institutions and qualified teachers, and the rights of apprentices. Her group hoped that the discussions would create the basis for a discussion that would also cover trainees. She acknowledged that the Committee's work had been very valuable and had laid a sound foundation for the work the following year. With the instrument, Members would have a responsibility to establish quality legal frameworks and take all necessary measures so that apprenticeships met apprentices' expectations of high-quality training and adequate protections ensuring a degree of dignity.
- 1778.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson thanked the Government members of the Committee for their various positive contributions. He gave special thanks to the Worker Vice-Chairperson for being positive, practical and pragmatic throughout the discussion and to the Chairperson

for skilfully chairing the meetings. He also expressed his gratitude to his own group for their support. He expressed his appreciation to the secretariat for laying a great foundation for the discussion, the representative of the Secretary-General for his rapid clarifications, and the interpreters who had facilitated the discussion.

- 1779.** The Government member of France, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that Albania, North Macedonia, Serbia and Türkiye aligned themselves with his statement. He recalled that the Committee had agreed that apprenticeships had a pivotal role in addressing unemployment, in particular youth unemployment. The adopted Conclusions were an important step towards achieving this goal by reducing skills mismatches and ensuring better employment prospects through apprentices acquiring the skills and competencies needed in working life. He acknowledged and supported the pivotal role the ILO played in the world of work, in particular in ensuring quality apprenticeships. He looked forward to adopting a new standard on quality apprenticeships at the 111th Session of the International Labour Conference.
- 1780.** The Government member of Kenya, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, expressed hope that the standard on apprenticeships would ensure not only the quality of apprenticeships but also promote gender equality and balance, social inclusion and lifelong learning. He looked forward to a standard that would influence the development of national, regional and international qualification frameworks. He suggested that the instrument should place emphasis on the recognition of prior learning, considering recognition of traditional apprenticeships as currently practised in most African countries. He invited the secretariat to consider operationalizing the term “traditional apprenticeships”. Lastly, the future Recommendation would facilitate the transition from the informal to formal economy.
- 1781.** The Government member of Oman, speaking also on behalf of the GCC countries, emphasized that skills development was key for sustainable economic and social development and good governance in all countries. He welcomed the adoption of the Conclusions which would be the basis for the Recommendation on apprenticeships to guide and empower the Member States to ensure quality apprenticeships.
- 1782.** The Government member of Chile, speaking on behalf of the group of Latin America and Caribbean countries, welcomed the guiding document for a quality apprenticeship framework. He considered that apprenticeships were a way of ensuring employability, decent work and productivity.
- 1783.** The Government member of the United States stated that his country was committed to strengthening the knowledge, skills, competencies and lifelong learning of individuals through apprenticeship systems. Apprenticeships, including pre-apprenticeship programmes, could help expand access to and opportunities in in-demand quality jobs, particularly for under-represented and underserved population groups. Such programmes could also increase the pipeline of skilled workers for employers and played a vital role in responding to labour market changes. He emphasized the importance of equality, balance, diversity and inclusion in apprenticeships so that all members of society would have access to those important and enriching programmes.
- 1784.** The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran expressed her Government’s commitment to improve apprenticeships through close international and regional cooperation.
- 1785.** The Chairperson thanked the Committee members for the trust they had placed in him and for their cooperation. He highlighted the vital role of tripartism and the importance of

freedom of speech. He believed that the Committee had negotiated well and had shaped an important instrument on apprenticeships.

- 1786.** The representative for the Secretary-General congratulated the Committee on setting a valuable foundation for adopting an international standard on apprenticeships the following year, which would have an impact on the some of the most vulnerable persons in the world. Within the Committee, he had observed social dialogue and tripartism at their best.