



► Record of proceedings

7B

International Labour Conference – 109th Session, 2021

Date: 6 July 2021

Fifth item on the agenda: A recurrent discussion on the strategic objective of social protection (social security), under the follow-up to the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, 2008

Reports of the Recurrent Discussion Committee:
Social protection (social security): Summary of proceedings ¹

Contents

	Page
Introduction.....	3
Opening statements and discussion point 1	4
Discussion point 2.....	11
Discussion point 3.....	16
Discussion point 4.....	23
Discussion on the draft conclusions	29
Approval of the draft conclusions concerning the second recurrent discussion on social protection (social security)	86
Approval of the draft resolution concerning the second recurrent discussion on social protection (social security)	87
Closing remarks	87

¹ The resolution and conclusions submitted by the Committee for adoption by the Conference are published in *Record of proceedings* No. 7A.

Introduction

1. The Committee elected its Officers as follows:

Chairperson:	Ms Catalina Devandas Aguilar (Government member, Costa Rica) at its first sitting
Vice-Chairpersons:	Mr Guido Ricci (Employer member, Guatemala) and Mr Magnus Norddhal (Worker member, Iceland) at its first sitting
Reporter:	Mr Mauricio Rubiano Bello (Government member, Colombia), at its fourth sitting

2. At its second sitting the Committee appointed a Drafting Group to prepare and submit a draft outcome document for its review. It was composed as follows:

Government members

Government observers

Employer members

Employer observers

Worker members

Worker observers

3. The Committee held eight sittings.
4. The Committee had before it Report V, entitled *Building the future of social protection for a human-centred world of work*, prepared by the International Labour Office (hereinafter the Office report) for consideration under the fifth item on the agenda of the 109th Session of the International Labour Conference: "A recurrent discussion on the strategic objective of social protection (social security), under the follow-up to the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, 2008".
5. In her opening remarks, the Chairperson emphasized that everyone had the right to social security as well as to an adequate standard of living, as anchored in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and reflected in the ILO's comprehensive legal architecture. Governments had a clear responsibility to deliver those rights by designing, implementing and monitoring national policies and systems. The COVID-19 pandemic had highlighted the lack of social protection coverage of more than half of the world's population and the importance of building and maintaining social protection systems to ensure protection against systemic shocks and life-cycle risks. Globally, governments' unparalleled policy responses demonstrated the reliance on social protection to protect peoples' health, jobs and incomes, thereby ensuring social and economic stability. Yet, rights-based social protection systems could not be built solely through temporary crisis response mechanisms. Pointing to the high cost of policy inaction, she called on governments, working in tandem with social partners, to sustain their policy action to create universal, comprehensive, sustainable and adequate social protection systems, including social protection floors, guided by ILO standards, in particular the Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952 (No. 102), and the Social Protection Floors Recommendation, 2012 (No. 202).

6. Referring to the remaining nine years to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the vision of the ILO Centenary Declaration for the Future of Work (the Centenary Declaration) of a human-centred approach to the future of work, the Chairperson underlined the Committee's role to call on all constituents to turn promises into action. The case for investing more and better in social protection had never been so compelling. Anchored in the ILO's normative mandate and tripartism, the Organization's two-dimensional approach was solid, tested and fit for purpose. In view of the multiplication of actors in the field of social protection, she underlined the need for the ILO to reinforce its efforts to promote internationally agreed principles and standards to guide the implementation of social protection systems and ensure their sustainable and equitable financing.
7. In conclusion, the Chairperson reminded the Committee that it had a unique opportunity to provide strategic direction and guidance to the ILO and its constituents to achieve universal access to social protection and ensure the leadership role of the ILO.
8. The representative of the Secretary-General (Deputy Director-General for Field Operations and Partnerships) situated the discussion in the current context and earlier deliberations of the Conference.
9. The deputy representative of the Secretary-General (Director, Social Protection Department) summarized the Office report.
10. The Committee decided to organize its discussions based on four points for discussion proposed by the Office: (1) realizing universal social protection; (2) strengthening social protection systems; (3) ensuring adequate and sustainable financing for social protection systems; and (4) reinforcing ILO means of action to achieve universal access to comprehensive and sustainable social protection.

Opening statements and discussion point 1

11. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that, in such challenging times, social protection had become more relevant than ever. A rapidly changing world of work demanded new paradigms to overcome both long-standing and new challenges through sustainable and adapted social protection systems. Discussions should focus on the ILO's role in assisting constituents in effectively realizing the right to social protection, as stated in Recommendation No. 202, and, guided by other relevant and up-to-date standards, analysing what has worked and what has not worked, and identifying gaps and necessary improvements.
12. For employers, universal social protection was a fair and aspirational goal and also a joint social commitment. He affirmed his group's ongoing support for Recommendation No. 202, underlining its focus and flexibility, as well as for the Centenary Declaration, which called for the adoption and extension of adequate, sustainable and adapted social protection systems, and recognized the continued relevance of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) target 1.3. His group reaffirmed the need to accelerate progress towards universal social protection coverage, with due respect for sustainability and adapted to national circumstances, in line with relevant ILO instruments. The fiscal and economic sustainability of social protection systems also depended on an environment in which businesses could remain sustainable and capable of creating decent work. With more than 60 per cent of the global workforce in the informal economy, likely increasing due to the COVID-19 crisis, formalization remained essential, in particular to ensure financing. Social protection floors should be leveraged

to incentivize formalization and empower those in vulnerable situations and currently unprotected.

13. The Employer Vice-Chairperson further underlined the need for policy coherence and coordination, in particular with employment policies, as key to designing and implementing sustainable social protection schemes, including in a context of ageing, youth unemployment and informality. Furthermore, innovative policy approaches should be welcomed, in particular those that achieved a sound balance between sustainability, fiscal space and economic growth, on the one hand, and significant coverage, respect for human dignity and social justice, on the other. Member States should consider using a variety of different methods to mobilize the necessary resources to ensure financial, fiscal and economic sustainability of national social protection floors. Equitable financing required taking into account the economic context, the size of businesses and the situation of beneficiaries, to avoid unreasonable pressures, in particular on small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). Many countries, especially developing countries, would only be able to achieve universal and adequate coverage progressively.
14. Priority should be given to the development of modern, transparent, efficient and sustainable social protection systems, and only then could ways to further support individuals in need of better coverage be obtained without incurring unnecessary costs or strain on sustainability. Poverty traps and incentivizing informality must be avoided.
15. The traditional model, assuming full-time employment and lifetime contributions and payroll taxes, was no longer adapted to the current global context, characterized by increased engagement in diverse forms of employment as well as multiple working arrangements. Pragmatic and sustainable approaches that accommodated the changing nature of work were thus needed, depending on national circumstances.
16. He concluded by saying that the changing nature of work across countries at all levels of development required new thinking to ensure the continuity of robust and effective social protection. Effective social dialogue and good governance were needed to achieve coherent policy responses, prepare workers for change and boost employability. Social dialogue should also seek to reach a common understanding of how to achieve sustainability as an underlying condition to realize adequate social protection for all.
17. The Worker Vice-Chairperson emphasized the importance of universal access to social protection to address the pandemic's adverse consequences on peoples' health, jobs and livelihoods, and to promote economic recovery and future resilience. Despite being a human right, more than half of the world's population lacked access to any form of social protection and less than a third was comprehensively protected. Some groups were disproportionately excluded or received significantly lower benefits, including women, migrants, persons in precarious and low-paid work, and workers in the informal economy. The specific needs of children in terms of adequate income support and quality services had also to be taken into account. Coverage and adequacy gaps had been exacerbated by the rise of precarious and non-standard forms of work and persisting informality, contributing to increased levels of poverty and inequality. Social protection was one of the four interrelated pillars of the ILO's Decent Work Agenda and therefore enhancing decent work and strengthening social protection needed to go hand in hand.
18. He stressed the importance of freedom of association and collective bargaining, adequate wages including minimum living wages, and measures to tackle precarious work, formalize the informal economy, address discrimination and promote equal

opportunities. The growth of non-standard forms of work also had to be addressed, as well as restrictions on access to social protection prevalent in specific sectors, as in the case of agricultural and domestic workers. Labour market measures had to work in tandem with the objectives of strengthening social protection systems and developing rights-based social protection floors that guaranteed dignified livelihoods. Furthermore, social security had to be adequate and inclusive of all workers and allow for collective risk pooling under the general responsibility of the State.

19. ILO standards, in particular Convention No. 102 and Recommendation No. 202, provided a solid framework for the horizontal and vertical extension of social protection. They allowed for a basic level of social protection – the social protection floor – available to all, and upon that foundation, higher levels of social protection were to be provided. The recurrent discussion of the Conference also presented an opportunity to reaffirm the relevance of those standards and to commit to promoting their ratification and effective implementation.
20. He noted the need to ensure gender-responsive social protection and tackle the gender biased design of some social security systems, in particular by taking into account unpaid care work by crediting care work in social security contributions, investing in universal childcare and long-term care services, and improving the conditions of care work, offering paid parental leave for women and men, and ensuring access to adequate non-contributory benefits. In the context of changing labour markets, the preservation and portability of social security entitlements, including through bilateral and multilateral social security agreements for migrants in particular, could support job transitions without jeopardizing their access to social protection. Strengthening and extending social protection required discussions on how countries could ensure a solid and sustainable financing base for social protection, without compromising adequacy and coverage. Social protection was affordable for the vast majority of countries, where governments were able to rely on a variety of means, including by reprioritizing and reallocating expenditure, leveraging progressive taxation, tackling tax evasion, and ensuring that employers paid their fair share of contributions. He underscored that social protection should be seen as an investment in inclusive and well-functioning economies rather than a cost, and as such should be integral to governments' employment and broader macroeconomic policies.
21. He underlined the need to discuss the ILO's leadership role and engagement with multilateral institutions, as a means to ensure that the policy advice and lending conditionalities of international financial institutions were consistent with ILO standards and agreed international commitments to extend social protection.
22. He stressed the importance of discussing the potential for strengthened international support for financing social protection. Whereas national governments had the primary responsibility for ensuring the right to social security and most countries disposed of the necessary resources, low-income countries would nevertheless face major financing constraints, limiting their ability to invest in social protection in the short term, thereby underlining the need for international solidarity.
23. He concluded by saying that ensuring universal access to social protection for all workers in all countries was a matter of collective concern, and the international community, led by the ILO, must work collectively to achieve it.
24. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, stressed the importance of the recurrent discussion within the context and impact of the COVID-19 crisis. He affirmed the essential role of social protection to promote social

justice, decent work and sustainable development, as reflected in the African Union's Agenda 2063. Despite achievements in the extension of social protection over the previous decade, he noted the significant protection gaps in Africa, where only 17 per cent of the population were protected, calling for further efforts to guarantee universal access to comprehensive and sustainable social protection, in line with the Centenary Declaration and the Abidjan Declaration (2019) adopted at the 14th African Regional Meeting. Social protection imperatively needed to be integrated into the global response to the crisis, so as to avoid delays in achieving the 2030 Agenda. Financial constraints and weak institutional capacities represented significant obstacles to the implementation of social security programmes and undermined the possibility of having more efficient and better adapted social protection systems. To face those constraints, national strategies aiming at the extension and improvement of social protection needed to take into account the capacities and specificities of each country and be applied in a progressive and flexible manner. In addition, innovative financing was required to ensure the appropriate financing of social protection floors, including through the coordination and harmonization of different financing mechanisms and programmes, and the improved coherence and good governance of the social protection institutions, notably through reliable information systems. In conclusion, he called upon the ILO to consolidate its leadership and facilitator role within the UN system, drawing on its tripartite structure, its standards and its expertise. He also called for South–South cooperation and triangular cooperation in the area of social protection as a very effective way of sharing experience and knowledge, and urged action to progressively reach universal access to social protection for a human-centred future of work and a more just globalization.

25. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its Member States, indicated that Albania, Armenia, Georgia, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Norway, the Republic of Moldova and Serbia aligned themselves with the statement. She noted the pandemic's role in exposing the gaps in protection and deepening inequalities, and the need for adequate, robust and sustainable social protection systems for all as an income cushion and a stabilizer in times of crises. With reference to the recent Porto Social Summit in May 2021, she noted the pledge to work towards a stronger social Europe in line with the principles of the European Pillar of Social Rights and the need for a fair, inclusive and resilient economic recovery. The EU shared the objective of universal access to comprehensive and sustainable social protection, as reflected in the Centenary Declaration, predicated on a rights-based approach, as well as the achievement of SDG target 1.3. Strengthened international cooperation based on strong political will and coordinated multilateral action, especially with international financial institutions, was necessary to generate funding, technical knowledge and ongoing social dialogue. She underlined the continued support to the Global Flagship Programme on Building Social Protection Floors for All.
26. Concerning discussion point 1, she underlined that social protection was both a human right and an investment with high social and economic returns that contributed to reducing poverty, vulnerability and social exclusion and inequalities; tackled gender gaps; enhanced political stability; promoted fairness and solidarity; addressed social exclusion; encouraged economic dynamism and inclusive economic growth; and provided for a fairer and more secure society. Acknowledging that social protection was crucial to protect livelihoods, especially during life transitions, she highlighted that all countries, even those with more developed systems, faced new challenges such as globalization, digital and climate transitions and demographic shifts, and required tailored responses for the self-employed and for workers in non-standard forms of work,

including platform and domestic workers, as well as formalization policies to reduce decent work deficits. That required effective and quality social dialogue, in particular in the design and reform of social protection policies, and adherence to the principle of solidarity to achieve universal coverage, adequacy of benefits and financial sustainability. She confirmed the EU's commitment to the ILO's normative framework for social protection and supported increased collaboration between the ILO and other international institutions to ensure universal social protection. She concluded by underlining the EU's commitment to the ILO in its efforts to achieve universal access to adequate and sustainable social protection based on internationally agreed principles and values, in a manner that recognized social protection as a human right and a social need, and in line with the principle of solidarity.

27. The Government member of the Republic of Korea shared her Government's experience in ensuring universal social protection and addressing informality, including by expanding coverage to groups such as artists, the self-employed and platform workers, streamlining administrative procedures and harnessing digital solutions.
28. The Government member of Argentina cautioned against ignoring the deterioration of the very basis of social security in the light of inequality in the distribution of wealth, a labour market that excluded large groups of people from decent work and social protection, notably migrants, persons with disabilities, young people and older persons, and increasing informality.
29. The Government member of the United States of America underlined his Government's support for the goal of realizing universal access to social protection, which was crucial for preventing and reducing poverty, inequality, social exclusion and social insecurity by prioritizing the establishment of nationally defined social protection floors. He welcomed discussions about making universal access to social protection operational and sustainable, in particular in the context of the challenges presented by the COVID-19 pandemic. The disproportionate impact of the pandemic on women, and continued challenges in relation to unpaid care work, called for more gender-responsive public investments in the care economy, including by facilitating public subsidies and promoting an adequate supply of, and access to, high-quality care services. Changes in the world of work often resulted in the misclassification of employment relationships and, in turn, in the denial of adequate social protection. His Government supported the review and updating of social protection programmes to ensure they were inclusive and provided adequate coverage in light of recent transformations in the world of work.
30. The Government member of Belgium expressed support for the ILO's mandate to promote social justice and its social security standards, including in particular the two dimensional approach reflected in Recommendation No. 202 and the SDGs. The COVID-19 pandemic had exposed inadequate public investment in social protection. The Centenary Declaration made it possible to reinvigorate the discussion in order to attain adequate and sustainable universal social protection. His Government supported: the better coordination of economic, social and employment policies in times of crisis; strategies to extend universal, comprehensive and adequate social protection; solidarity as the most efficient means to achieve universal coverage; and the participation of social partners in the formulation, implementation and monitoring of national social protection policies. He concluded by underlining the importance of financing and said that the Conference would have to explore leads in that area.
31. The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago reaffirmed the belief that every individual had the right to a decent life, noting that social protection was not only a human right but also a necessity. With reference to the ILO's normative framework, she

underlined how social protection could launch people on a path to productive employment and lead to inclusive and sustainable growth and more resilient economies. In the light of the pandemic, she called for greater efforts to realize universal social protection in a way that was clear, simple, responsive, adapted to national circumstances, implementable and sustainable, and realized with urgency; to promote tripartism in building, implementing, monitoring and evaluating adequate social protection systems, with trust of all parties as a cornerstone of good governance; and to implement Recommendation No. 202 and the Transition from the Informal to the Formal Economy Recommendation, 2015 (No. 204), utilizing a whole-of-government approach.

32. The Government member of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland referred to the ability of social protection systems to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic across the world. He highlighted pre-existing gaps in coverage, particularly for those in the informal economy, vulnerable and disadvantaged groups, young people, women and people with disabilities. He underscored the importance of an adequate and inclusive social protection system to improve people's lives, incentivizing employment and promoting the financial resilience of individuals and households, referring to his country's experience in removing the distinction between in-work and out-of-work support for low earners, the self-employed and those with fluctuating earnings. The pandemic was a forewarning of potential disruptions to come. He urged the Office to focus efforts on building systems that were flexible, adaptable and resilient to future shocks, including those caused by climate change, and referred to the Standards Review Mechanism in that regard.
33. The Government member of Turkey observed that the COVID-19 pandemic had demonstrated how the lack of coverage increased people's vulnerability and undermined social cohesion. Social protection played a crucial role in ensuring sustainable growth, resilience and inclusive societies. It was important to strengthen the social contract, protecting and promoting human rights. The pandemic further demonstrated the need to coordinate social protection with employment policies, and that countries needed to invest more in social protection systems to ensure their resilience. A coordinated effort was needed, in particular to cover workers in non-standard forms of employment and their dependants. He called upon the ILO to engage in standard-setting action to extend social protection coverage to the self-employed and to workers in non-standard forms of employment.
34. The Government member of Switzerland shared information on the comprehensive Swiss social protection system, which provided coverage for all residents, whether in employment or not, and on reforms to make it more accessible, for example to platform workers. She emphasized her Government's commitment to social protection floors as an important part of decent work and to supporting countries through technical assistance to extend their social protection coverage.
35. The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran stressed the importance of extending coverage to workers in difficult situations, in particular informal economy workers. Her Government had taken steps in that regard, in a way that also ensured environmental sustainability. A range of measures had been adopted in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and implemented through a tripartite group, including measures for vulnerable groups, in particular migrant workers and rural populations. Her Government's COVID-19 response further included a comprehensive vaccination and testing programme, which also covered foreign workers.
36. The Government member of Colombia emphasized the importance of social protection for promoting decent work, social justice and sustainable development. He pointed to

Colombia's achievement of almost universal access to quality health services, with over 95 per cent of the population covered. The coverage gaps that persisted in other areas of social protection were being addressed through a social protection floor of minimum guarantees and single-window services to facilitate access to social insurance.

37. The Government member of Australia recalled the seminal role that the Centenary Declaration had played in guiding the response to the COVID-19 pandemic. In Australia, tripartite dialogue played a key role in building human-centred support, combining social security payments with taxation concessions, productivity initiatives, employment services and labour market strategies as part of an integrated package to also support workforce participation objectives. Sustainable economic growth and reliable access to employment, complemented by improvements to skills and education, were essential to maintain opportunities for future generations. The ILO was well placed through its multilateral leadership role on decent work and its track record of practical assistance to constituents on social protection to play a defining role in the creation of future-focused, adequate and sustainable frameworks.
38. The Government member of Egypt referred to his country's commitment to extending social protection coverage to all, irrespective of gender or other factors, and enumerated a number of actions taken by the Government, such as protecting vulnerable groups facing discrimination and needing special protection, including through free education, distance learning and improved access to basic services.
39. The Government member of Côte d'Ivoire observed the changes brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic and its implications for the future of social protection. The programme "Une Côte d'Ivoire Solidaire" reflected a commitment to a social protection approach fully in line with international labour standards and the 2030 Agenda, and included the extension of health coverage to all as the first pillar of the national social protection floor, aiming not to leave anyone behind. A special scheme for self-employed workers, covering also accident and old age, had been launched in 2019 to support their formalization. In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Government was putting four solidarity funds in place. The ILO had been providing important support to Côte d'Ivoire in that process of continuous improvement of social protection.
40. The Government member of Liberia expressed his gratitude for the organization of the Conference session and confirmed that the tripartite constituents in Liberia would contribute to the discussions as required.
41. The Employer Vice-Chairperson welcomed the many commonalities across the statements made by the Workers, Governments and Employers regarding social protection and emphasized the shared responsibility to do better to achieve progress towards the objective of universal social protection. He noted support for a sustainable approach adapted to country contexts and bearing in mind economic growth and fiscal space. Social protection was extremely important for economic progress and should be considered as an investment. The discussion had also identified challenges in the world of work, such as demographic changes, emerging entrepreneurial models and unpredictable growth rates. Those challenges had been exacerbated by the pandemic, especially for migrant workers and women. There was a growing need to have regulatory frameworks to extend protection to all workers irrespective of their employment situation. ILO frameworks, in particular Convention No. 102 and Recommendation No. 202, offered a solid base to strengthen social protection systems to be sustainable, fair and equitable, with sufficient fiscal space to progressively reach universal social protection.

42. The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled that only 17 per cent of Africa's population was covered. He emphasized the importance of social dialogue for addressing that challenge. There was agreement across governments on the human right to social protection, which applied equally to all, without any exclusion. He recalled the importance of solidarity and collective risk pooling, as well as the primary responsibility of the State to build social protection systems. Governments should not only provide a basic level of protection, but should also follow the ILO's two-dimensional strategy, consisting of a basic floor for all in the horizontal dimension and in the vertical dimension higher levels of benefits and more contingencies covered, in line with Convention No. 102. That approach had been endorsed by the Conference in 2011, during the previous recurrent discussion on social security. It was also reflected in Recommendation No. 202 and was still valid today. Beyond the prevention and reduction of poverty, other important functions of social protection included risk pooling, the maintenance of incomes and living standards, and stabilizing aggregate demand during crises. Those could not be fulfilled by social protection floors alone, but required higher levels of protection in line with Convention No. 102.

Discussion point 2

43. The Worker Vice-Chairperson emphasized the importance of social protection in governments' responses to the COVID-19 crisis: 209 countries had introduced or extended social protection, albeit mostly short-term measures. Rather than using temporary and patchwork solutions, rights-based systems, designed in line with international labour standards, needed to be put in place. They would promote peace, serve to prevent future crises and guarantee resilience in future crises, as highlighted in the Employment and Decent Work for Peace and Resilience Recommendation, 2017 (No. 205).
44. He cautioned against repeating the mistakes that had been made after the previous crisis, when premature austerity had led to cuts in social spending when it was most needed, thereby leading to devastating social consequences, weakening aggregate demand and deepening the crisis. Social protection systems were critical to support people dealing with structural transformations in the labour market stemming from climate change, new technologies or globalization, as reflected in the *ILO guidelines for a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all* and the COP24 Solidarity and Just Transition Silesia Declaration.
45. Strengthening social protection required integrating and coordinating social protection with employment, education, macroeconomic and fiscal policies. Effective coordination was therefore one key element of an overall and strong transparent governance of social protection systems, including effective coordination, reduced fragmentation and improved delivery of benefits and services. Moreover, social protection needed to be complemented with active labour market policies, quality job search assistance, access to skills training, lifelong learning opportunities, hand in hand with measures to create new quality jobs, strengthened public investment and public employment programmes. He repeated that supporting the preservation and portability of workers' social security contributions was important to support workers transitioning between jobs.
46. Furthermore, there was an urgent need to address non-standard forms of work. Inadequate regulations and incentives for employers to resort to cheaper forms of employment had led to a proliferation of precarious work without social security. Governments needed to address regulatory arbitrage and employers needed to take

responsibility for employment relationships and pay social security contributions, as set out in the Employment Relationship Recommendation, 2006 (No. 198).

47. Finally, he emphasized the importance of social dialogue in formulating national social protection policies and strategies, including with regard to social protection reforms. Trade unions played an extremely active role in social protection reforms: from campaigning for the extension of social protection and defending systems from retrenchment; negotiating reforms in tripartite social protection committees and councils; monitoring the implementation of social protection reforms; to even directly administering benefits and services in some countries as was true in his own country, Iceland. A meaningful involvement of workers' representatives in reforms, implementation and oversight ensured that systems were adapted to the needs of workers and could foster public awareness and acceptance of reforms, promoting trust in public institutions.
48. The Employer Vice-Chairperson emphasized the need for more reliable evidence on what worked and what did not. While there was no one-size-fits-all solution, countries could still learn from each other. Social security systems should be an integral part of national development planning and should trigger economic growth, build an enabling environment for sustainable enterprises and increase employability. They should be adapted in the context of the future of work to support and protect workers and employers in their life and work transitions. Social protection systems also needed to be designed so as to facilitate formalization of the informal economy.
49. Many employers also needed protection and support, in particular entrepreneurs and SMEs. Without support, many enterprises would not have the capacity to survive the uncertainties of the prolonged COVID-19 crisis. Helping those enterprises to overcome the crisis would create formal employment and ultimately fiscal space for adequate and sustainable social protection systems.
50. Climate change also had an impact on labour markets, requiring work to be done simultaneously on social protection policies and also on sectoral and industrial policies, enterprise policies and active labour market policies.
51. Social protection regimes should stimulate the active quest for work. The best way of protecting individuals from the transformation of labour markets was to guarantee their employability by supporting labour market transitions and ensuring access to social security. In order to build effective and sustainable social protection systems, it was important to incorporate the practical concerns of the social partners and the private sector, in addition to engaging in formal social dialogue.
52. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that it was time for robust social protection systems to help overcome inequalities and move towards sustainable development. Efforts to establish social protection floors should be based on the principles of solidarity, complementarity and social justice, and should be appropriate given the socio-economic realities of each country, in line with the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization (Social Justice Declaration). Adequate, comprehensive and universal social protection systems should be established progressively and with flexibility, in accordance with the budgetary capacity of the State and on the basis of international labour standards. Genuine social dialogue and solidarity were necessary to ensure a just transition towards greener and less vulnerable economies. The COVID-19 crisis had revealed the need for social protection systems that could provide better crisis response.

53. The Government member of Argentina underlined that the coverage gaps originated from the persistence of an extensive informal economy. Transitioning to the formal economy would imply the gradual extension of social security to all workers. In order to achieve that, coordination between economic, social and employment policies at national level would be fundamental. Drawing on Recommendation No. 204, he enumerated several key elements important for formalization, including strengthening employment and vocational training services, improving labour market regulations, removing barriers to formalization, and the participation of social partners in transition strategies.
54. The Government member of Switzerland said that Switzerland had ratified the ILO key Conventions on social protection and had introduced new family measures. She described the importance of social protection for overcoming the COVID-19 socio-economic crisis and related measures adopted by the Swiss Government, such as the extension of partial unemployment benefits to new categories of workers, including part-time workers, temporary workers and apprentices, as well as measures for own-account workers. Social dialogue with tripartite partners had been crucial to adopt those measures and would remain crucial after the crisis.
55. The Government member of China pointed to his country's people-centred approach to building the world's largest social security system, with nearly 1 billion people receiving pensions, and universal health insurance coverage for 1.36 billion people. The multi-level and multi-pillar system responded to the diverse needs of the people, supported by increasing social protection expenditure. Addressing challenges such as an ageing population and diverse forms of employment, the Government was planning to increase the benefit levels, to introduce an incremental retirement policy and to strengthen the capacity of the public administration. The COVID-19 crisis showed the deficits in social protection globally, including in some developed countries where the social security rights and even the basic human rights of vulnerable groups were not sufficiently protected. The Government of China was willing to work with tripartite partners globally and with the ILO to improve the accessibility, adequacy and sustainability of social security systems.
56. The Government member of the United States said that the COVID-19 pandemic had tested the resilience and effectiveness of all social protection systems. Social protection measures implemented during the pandemic had thrown a lifeline to many vulnerable workers and families throughout the world. Strategies for the long-term stabilization of emergency measures adopted to face the COVID-19 crisis were needed so as to move towards sustainable universal social protection schemes, including floors, in line with Recommendation No. 202. Coordination with broader employment, economic and social policies, and tripartite consultation were critical. The ILO guidelines for a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all provided useful guidance on transitioning to a low-carbon economy while promoting decent work, including with regard to public investments in workforce development along with clean energy technologies. The Office played an important role in supporting Member States' efforts to strengthen their social protection systems.
57. The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago agreed that the COVID-19 pandemic highlighted the need to strengthen the resilience of social protection systems. Social security was a strong catalyst for change as well as an imperative. She emphasized the importance of having social protection strategies and policies that were integrated with a wider set of policies, including education, macroeconomic, employment, financial, social and environmental policies. Moreover, an adequate knowledge base required

sound information systems at the country level to clearly identify the social protection situation and inform programme design. Strong governments and social partners and properly resourced national tripartite systems were also indispensable.

58. The Government member of Senegal underlined that social protection was a key element of her country's national socio-economic development plan and poverty strategy, as well as of the tripartite social protection strategy, which called for the implementation of a social protection system that was accessible, inclusive, legally anchored, rooted in local culture, and guaranteed by the State. She described the simplified social protection scheme that was part of the Government's strategy to extend coverage to informal economy workers with sufficient contributory capacity. She expressed concern that the right to social protection had not yet been a reality for the majority of the population prior to the pandemic. She pointed to the valuable support provided by the ILO in the extension of social protection to the informal economy and the development of a legal framework. She emphasized the importance of technical assistance in the development of national social protection policies and strategies, in order to improve the governance, resilience and operationalization of the social protection system and coordination with other policies, as a means to achieve universal social protection.
59. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, indicated that Albania, Georgia, Norway and the Republic of Moldova aligned themselves with the statement. The COVID-19 pandemic had demonstrated once more that countries with strong, responsive and extensive social protection systems were more resilient in withstanding the effects of economic or health crises. Such systems could not be achieved through one-off crisis response measures but required sustained action and rights-based commitment, supported by instruments such as Recommendation No. 202. The capacity of social protection systems needed to be strengthened in the short and long term to meet people's needs despite challenges such as structural transformations, economic shocks and disasters. Several factors could contribute to improving social protection systems and their coherence and coordination in national and international domains, including social dialogue, combining contributory and non-contributory benefits, with particular attention given to covering workers in the informal economy, the ratification and application of international instruments, and international cooperation and knowledge sharing. While EU Member States had among the highest ratification rates of the ILO social security standards, some were facing budgetary pressures that prevented them from ensuring universal, adequate and comprehensive social protection. She warned that austerity measures must be proportionate and should not lead to a weakening of solidarity. She stressed the importance of social protection to achieve a just and fair transition for all, mitigating the effects of climate change, especially for those in the agricultural, fossil fuel and extractive industries sectors, as pursued with the European Green Deal.
60. The Government member of the United Arab Emirates, speaking on behalf of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) countries, said that strengthening social security systems required following up with national measures on the Centenary Declaration. In the context of COVID-19, governments had been forced to strengthen social protection measures and prioritize human rights and dignity. The Council members had taken legislative and administrative measures to ensure effective social protection for their citizens. Progress had been made at the national level in achieving international commitments, including in respect of human rights, combating poverty and improving economic recovery. He concluded by mentioning the initiatives launched by Council

members to respond to the pandemic, such as subsidies to maintain workers' activities, extending social protection, creating special funds and supporting the private sector.

61. The Government member of Japan highlighted its early ratification of Convention No. 102 and its achievement of universal coverage in respect of health and pensions for all occupations and incomes. The Government had realized a social protection floor by combining contributory and non-contributory schemes for different risks, and it continued to address the significant challenges of a rapidly ageing population and low birth rate. That also required improving labour productivity and adopting policies to enable a better work-life balance.
62. The Government member of the United Kingdom referred to the Universal Credit scheme, saying that it balanced elements of social insurance protection and income-based assessment as a means to maximize employment and in-work progression for all who could work. The scheme also provided support for those who were unable to work through a nationally defined set of basic social security guarantees in line with Recommendation No. 202. She pointed to the Government's close collaboration with social partners in the design of COVID-19 responses, which included a job retention scheme, support for the self-employed, employment support measures, and skills and training plans. She called on the Office to consider such measures when addressing constituents' needs to support a sustainable recovery.
63. The Government member of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela observed that social security systems were experiencing a multidimensional crisis generated by the COVID-19 pandemic, and deplored that unilateral coercive measures limited national response capacities. International labour standards, the National Constitution, the Venezuela National Plan 2019–2025 and the 2030 Agenda constituted a solid reference and legal architecture to advance towards universal and sufficient social security protection. Social security in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela was implemented through a sound legislative framework, strong social budgetary investment and the involvement of the workers, including in respect of the national public health system.
64. The Government member of the Philippines emphasized the role of social protection as a key element in the country's development strategy, yet informality constituted a challenge for closing adequacy and coverage gaps. The COVID-19 pandemic had led to rapid growth in unemployment and underemployment across the world, illustrating the importance of strengthening social protection. National efforts had been accelerated towards institutionalizing the four guarantees of the social protection floor set forth in Recommendation No. 202 through a coherent mix of contributory and tax-based measures as a means of achieving universal coverage through social dialogue, based on empirical evidence and in line with ILO standards and principles.
65. The Government member of Zimbabwe observed that the COVID-19 pandemic had provided renewed impetus to strengthen social protection systems, particularly in developing countries where the greater part of the workers were in the informal economy and not covered by social security. He shared the national experience in reducing fragmentation of the social protection system through a social protection steering committee under the leadership of the Ministry of Public Service, Labour and Social Welfare.
66. The Worker Vice-Chairperson welcomed the Governments' strong commitment to strengthening social protection systems in line with the ILO's two-dimensional approach as well as other points of agreement arising from the discussion, including the importance of strong and transparent governance of social protection; the reduction of

fragmentation; the meaningful involvement of social partners in the planning and implementation of social protection reforms, and also in the oversight of those systems; and coordination with employment, macroeconomic and fiscal policies.

67. In the context of discussions on the future of work, he expressed concern about the growth of non-standard forms of work, and high and persistent informality across the world. Social protection systems needed to extend protection to workers in such forms of work, ensuring also the preservation and portability of entitlements. At the same time, adequate social protection floors that guaranteed universal access to basic income security and essential services, including health, irrespective of contributions, remained key. Creating a “third category” of employment, as practised in some countries, was not a solution to address employment models that compromised workers’ rights since it created even further ambiguity in the employment relationship, encouraged regulatory arbitrage, and provided workers with a partial set of rights and protections. Referring to the importance of the correct classification of employment relationships, he called on employers to live up to their responsibility for their workers and to pay their fair share of social security contributions and taxes. Referring to the Centenary Declaration, he said that that responsibility also included fundamental rights at work, minimum wages, occupational safety and health, and maximum working hours.
68. He closed by stressing that all speakers agreed on the importance of achieving progress in transitioning from the informal to the formal economy through a combination of incentives and enforcement measures in line with Recommendation No. 204.
69. The Employer Vice-Chairperson highlighted the common ground across all speakers regarding the importance of comprehensive policy responses to social protection; the need to coordinate social protection policies with active labour market policies and training and reskilling; and seeing social protection as an investment rather than a cost, provided that it was consistent with economic growth. It was crucial to protect workers during their life and work transitions and to also protect employers, especially SMEs.
70. He underlined the need for concerted efforts to support the private sector in its role of generating decent work and well-being for all. An expansive monetary policy without adequate control could lead to inflation, weakening real wages and confidence in the possibility of repayment of debt, which would undermine social protection schemes and initiatives. It was therefore necessary to seek a balance between aspirations and the capacity to carry them out, which required financing and support from multilateral financial organizations.
71. He closed by suggesting that the ILO, in collaboration with other United Nations agencies and international financial institutions, could focus on the financing of the productive sector and put it back on track, to foster decent work, while strengthening social protection floors.

Discussion point 3

72. The Employer Vice-Chairperson quoted the Report of the Director-General *Work in the time of COVID* to illustrate the enormous demands on finance in a situation when spending was already beyond prudent levels. That raised concerns about debt sustainability and inflation. Businesses were facing unprecedented challenges to their viability, which could dramatically affect wages. The increased need for long-term care in the context of ageing populations was another serious concern.
73. He highlighted the importance of ensuring the sustainability of social protection schemes over the medium to long term, supporting recovery and ensuring resilience.

Different funding approaches should be explored to ensure sustainability: public and private in line with contributory capacities on a consistent and equitable basis. All of the principles set out in Recommendation No. 202 should be considered carefully to guide the adaptation of social security systems. Among them, financial, fiscal and economic sustainability remained especially relevant for realizing social justice and equity. Sustainable financing of social protection required predictable and sustainable resources, transparency, efficiency and sound financial management, as well as rule-of-law and solid anti-corruption policies. The pursuit of universal coverage through social protection floors should not compromise incentives to participate in contributory systems, and solidarity in financing should observe a fair division of contributions between employers and workers, in line with Convention No. 102. In order to increase the effective coverage of contributory schemes, there was a need to progressively extend basic coverage to all, while also allowing contributory voluntary schemes. In alignment with the ILO normative framework, the use of multi-pillar approaches, balancing non-contributory and contributory benefits, had performed well in many countries. He recommended that the ILO, on the basis of its normative framework, should better coordinate with international financial institutions for a better assessment of country-specific options to extend fiscal space.

74. The Worker Vice-Chairperson appreciated the framing of the discussion around both adequate and sustainable financing, since concerns over sustainability often compromised the adequacy and coverage of social protection. Sustainability efforts had often excessively focused on cutting spending rather than reprioritizing spending or raising revenue. As part of fiscal consolidation efforts, many countries, often with advice from international financial institutions and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), had cut benefit levels, reduced replacement rates, strengthened conditionalities and means testing, tightened the link between contributions and benefits, and even shifted towards individual accounts and privately managed systems. Those reforms had undermined the social solidarity of systems and internationally agreed objectives to extend social protection, disproportionately penalizing women and people in low-paid and precarious forms of work, resulting in increased poverty and inequalities.
75. The privatization of social security, healthcare and social services led to major inequalities in access, and also compromised quality and effectiveness. Workers were not opposed to complementary pensions or private savings schemes, provided that they were not promoted at the expense of publicly organized social protection schemes grounded in law and based on principles of solidarity and collective risk pooling.
76. Austerity measures had been economically and fiscally counterproductive, whereas sustaining investment in social protection had produced positive returns on employment, productivity, tax revenue and overall economic growth. Social protection investments were particularly important for future generations as they reduced the economic desperation of children and their families that drove exploitation, including child labour, and allowed children to achieve their full potential.
77. He underlined a variety of ways in which governments could create fiscal space for social protection instead of cutting spending, such as progressive taxation (corporate taxes, wealth taxes, and financial transaction taxes); reallocating public expenditures; tackling tax evasion and addressing illicit financial flows; supporting the formalization of the informal economy; and ensuring that employers paid their fair share of social security contributions. With respect to the last point, he noted that a number of governments had recently reduced or suspended employers' obligations to pay contributions, which

jeopardized the financing base for social protection, shifted the financing burden on to workers, and contravened the provisions of Convention No. 102.

78. He highlighted the importance of international solidarity in relation to financing, particularly towards the least developed countries that could not fill the enormous social protection financing gap. The ILO had estimated that around US\$78 billion would be needed to close social protection financing gaps within low-income countries. While that amount represented only a fraction of a per cent of global GDP, it represented over 15 per cent of the collective GDP of those countries and around 45 per cent of their collective tax revenue. That highlighted the major financing constraints that those countries faced to extend social protection in the short term, and the importance of strengthened international support. There was a clear case for the establishment of a global social protection fund, a proposal that had been discussed in various international forums and would need to be addressed during the Committee discussion.
79. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, recognized sustainable financing as the main challenge for reaching universal social protection. That challenge was exacerbated by the large number of working age people in the informal economy, low productivity, underemployment, insufficient labour and social protection standards, and austerity measures taken by governments in response to financial or environmental crises. The current financing model that was based largely on contributions needed to be transformed to achieve a diversification of sources as well as improved governance structures. In particular, there was a need to provide government funding – with due regard to available resources – for vital contingencies, such as health, maternity, disability and old age; to ensure the harmonization of different government programmes and the coordination of social protection institutions; to ensure good governance supported by comprehensive and reliable information systems, to launch a tripartite discussion of parametric reforms of contributory schemes; to encourage employment promotion measures; and to integrate informal workers. He listed a number of measures necessary to promote formalization through the extension of coverage, namely: the development of a regulatory framework and incentives for registering workers in the informal economy; the elimination of administrative obstacles; the use of information technology in the administration of schemes; the development of entrepreneurship; and the subsidization of vulnerable population groups.
80. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, indicated that Albania, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova, Montenegro, North Macedonia and Norway aligned themselves with the statement. She recalled the need for social protection schemes to be in line with the two-dimensional strategy of ILO standards and to be financially, economically and fiscally sustainable. Globalization, informality, climate change, digitalization and demographic change had posed challenges to the adequacy and sustainability of social protection. Adequate and predictable financing, based on the right balance of contributory and non-contributory schemes, could help tackle those challenges. Facilitating the formalization of the economy was essential, as was expanding contributory revenues, reallocating public expenditure and establishing diverse financing mechanisms to avoid workers bearing an undue level of financial and economic risk. Preventive action, such as adequate occupational safety and health, was also crucial. She highlighted recent EU efforts to monitor developments in pension adequacy and long-term care; to improve access to social protection for self-employed and non-standard workers; to reform pensions in order to increase the poverty-protection and the income-maintenance capacity of the systems; and to provide adequate healthcare and other services for an ageing society.

Sustainable social protection required better coordination of active labour market and tax policies. With reference to the pressure put on countries' fiscal space as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and the low share of GDP invested by some countries in social protection, she called on ILO Members to explore the full potential of their financial possibilities, considering different sources of financing such as fair tax systems, expanding contributory social security, and eliminating illicit financial flows. She welcomed the ILO's engagement in supporting countries in identifying financing options and pointed to the importance of national strategies complemented by coordinated international cooperation to cover the gaps in tax and contribution collection. She cautioned against the negative impact of austerity measures and highlighted the importance of social dialogue. Accessible, adequate and sustainable nationally defined social protection systems needed to be based on solidarity, public financing, well-balanced intergenerational fairness, and the achievement of gender equality. She pointed to a possible active role for the ILO in relation to a new international financing mechanism.

81. The Government member of the Philippines recalled that achieving sustainable financing of social protection systems was difficult for developing countries but that there were untapped opportunities regarding making benefits more accessible, improving redistribution and implementing comprehensive progressive tax reforms linked to social protection objectives. Regarding increased national public expenditure on social protection, much was still needed to achieve adequate coverage. Social protection should not be financed through increased taxation on basic consumer goods. She called on the ILO to provide continued and increased support.
82. The Government member of the United States recalled that the COVID-19 crisis had demonstrated both the importance of social protection systems and sound financial strategies to achieve sustainable universal coverage and adequate benefits as countries emerged from the pandemic, in order to prepare for future crises and to address ageing populations, with due regard to social justice and equity. Possible measures included socially just and equitable taxation, improving tax compliance, decreasing illicit financial flows, and broadening the tax base through formalization policies. Pointing to the challenges of many developing countries to provide adequate and resilient social protection, he welcomed a discussion within the ILO to explore the viability of a global fund to close specific financing gaps and the ways in which more developed economies might participate.
83. The Government member of Switzerland underlined the challenge of ensuring the financial sustainability of social protection systems, in particular pension schemes, calling for diversified funding sources (for example, contributions, taxes, VAT, gaming taxes). As a human right, social security should be guaranteed to all, including through collective financing as a means to ensure positive redistributive effects. Frameworks encouraging economic growth would also be needed. She pointed to the importance of social dialogue, tripartism and inclusive governance to strengthen legitimacy, provide greater stability and promote the financial viability of social protection systems.
84. The Government member of the United Kingdom referred to the provision of support to developing countries to strengthen their social protection systems in nationally appropriate ways, reduce poverty and inequality, and respond to global risks. Additional financing and effective use of existing financing, at the domestic and external levels, was needed. Greater coordination at an international level was highlighted (for example, the Social Protection Inter-Agency Cooperation Board (SPIAC-B), the Inter-Agency Social Protection Assessment (ISPA), the Global Partnership for Universal Social Protection to

Achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (USP2030)), including with humanitarian and environmental actors. The ILO should also advocate for the greater engagement of local actors, including the private sector and social partners, in building sustainably financed and nationally owned social protection systems.

85. The Government member of Argentina described the social protection measures her country had taken in response to the COVID-19 crisis as a means to address the economic downturn, including expanded tax policies, emergency benefits and measures for business, and underlined their gender-sensitive approach.
86. The Government member of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela expressed his concern regarding the coercive measures that had resulted in the contraction of the economy and impacted macroeconomic stability and access to social protection, with reference to a UN Special Rapporteur report. He listed measures taken to address the COVID-19 pandemic, pointing to difficulties in ensuring sustainable financing for the social protection system due to coercive measures, and called for their end.
87. The Government member of Canada said that the pandemic had underscored the need for robust, resilient, sustainable, nimble and innovative social protection systems. Worldwide temporary COVID-19 response measures needed to be removed or shifted towards permanent and sustainable social protection systems. Economic growth required ensuring adequate infrastructure, a conducive business environment, fair labour markets, and decent jobs and conditions for maintaining a healthy tax base. In order to support social security systems in light of population ageing or slower economic growth, she pointed to the possibility of built-in safety measures that included independent oversight of government investment and spending, as well as a mix of funding models (including pay-as-you-go models, general tax revenues, partially funded contributory systems and fully funded personal savings). That diversified financial risks between government, employers, current workers and retirees. She pointed to the need for transparency, accountability and sound financial governance to ensure the sustainability of social protection systems.
88. The Government member of the Democratic Republic of the Congo explained that, as part of the implementation of a social protection floor, the Government had developed a national social protection plan and strategy and reinforced the legal framework, including by broadening its scope of application to informal workers under insurance mechanisms and implementing a universal health scheme. With reference to the role of social protection to ensure social cohesion and peace, he called for international financial support in the implementation of universal health schemes, in particular for countries faced with large informal economies.
89. The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran explained that the national constitution required the establishment of a social security system for all employees and workers in new forms of employment. In the framework of the sixth development plan, and with the objectives set by law to eradicate poverty and inequalities, enhance standards of living, ensure minimum support and protect certain segments of the population, the Government should design and implement a multi-level social protection system that encompassed a management information system. She emphasized the importance of the guidance provided by Recommendation No. 202.
90. The Government member of Brazil said that social security was a fundamental social right guaranteed by the national constitution and that it was delivered through a comprehensive and far-reaching social protection system. He pointed to reforms

undertaken in 2019 to ensure the system's long-term sustainability in light of population ageing, as well as emergency measures taken in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic.

91. The Employer Vice-Chairperson pointed to the huge efforts that had been made by governments across the world to address the pandemic, to maintain the economy and to increase social protection benefits. In many countries, public investments and state spending had been reduced in order to allocate more resources to social protection benefits, including considerable spending on health, unemployment benefits, and benefits for vulnerable households and populations. The ILO had a role to play in supporting governments and the social partners in designing policies that enabled an exit from the crisis and ensured the construction of solid social protection floors for all, without placing a heavy burden on formal enterprises and workers.
92. To be sufficient and sustainable, social protection initiatives could not be promoted in isolation, rather they needed to be combined with broad and sound macroeconomic policies aimed at economic development and productive employment. Poverty and vulnerability should also be reduced in a sustainable manner through productive employment, including with reference to policies that favoured enterprise sustainability, skills development, and transition to formality and job creation. In addition, long-term solutions must be sought to achieve equitable and sustainable social protection systems in the context of an ageing population, youth unemployment and informality. While agreeing that austerity measures should only be taken in particular circumstances, he underlined that in some countries they had proven indispensable to redress financially critical situations, including to avoid the collapse of the economic system or the bankruptcy of the country. Accumulated debts and costly and unsustainable policies would have catastrophic consequences over time. As such, he insisted on the need to explore different financing options based on sustainability, the primary responsibility of the State as referred to in Recommendation No. 202, and the fair division of contributions between employers and workers, as set out in Convention No. 102, as well as on the need to ensure such options were adapted to each country context. That would also serve as a means to avoid burdening future generations. Private sector contributions needed to be accompanied by contributions by public institutions and workers, with due regard to the need for equity, consideration of national economic circumstances, and ensuring that SMEs did not experience unreasonable pressure. He stressed the need to be pragmatic, to adopt more appropriate macroeconomic frameworks and to consider a mix of financing sources as a means to achieve economic and financial sustainability that took due account of social justice and equity.
93. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that there was agreement on the need to ensure adequate and sustainable financing, including by progressive forms of taxation, tackling tax evasion and illicit financial flows, formalizing the informal economy, and strengthening international solidarity for financing social protection. The multi-pillar narrative promoted by the Employers was misleading. In particular, using the word "pillar" to refer to occupational and private pensions provided the false impression of stability and reliability when, in reality, that was nothing other than private savings. With reference to the second pillar, he pointed to its insufficiency, especially for women and workers in low-paid and precarious jobs, underlining that adequate social protection for everyone could only be ensured through publicly organized, statutory pension systems, based on the principles of collective risk pooling and social solidarity. Mentioning the documented social and economic consequences of individual accounts and pension privatizations, including in Latin America, he noted that the shift towards those systems had created high administrative and transition costs, shifted risks to workers, and led to low replacement rates and lower coverage, rather than greater sustainability. With

reference to the 2020 Tripartite Round Table on Pension Trends and Reforms approved by the Officers of the Governing Body, reverse privatizations, such as in Argentina and Chile, had illustrated that the market could not deliver. There were good reasons why ILO standards had not provided a framework for occupational or private pensions, focusing rather on extending publicly organized social protection schemes. While the Workers were not opposed to occupational or private pension schemes, such schemes could not be promoted at the expense of adequate, publicly organized social protection schemes. ILO standards should guide those discussions.

94. A representative of Women in Informal Employment: Globalizing and Organizing, pointed to the importance of social protection for independent workers, particularly those who were marginalized and poor. While assistance and food rations were helpful, access to more stable benefits was needed. She called on governments to protect their people, especially in the face of externally imposed austerity policies, including guaranteeing a dignified life with access to land, housing and a job for all workers, better working conditions and earnings, as well as social protection measures.
95. A representative of Public Services International, highlighting inequality exposed by the pandemic, pointed to the need for concerted efforts for the full realization of social protection as a human right, ensuring sufficient public funding and good governance of social protection systems, including the reversal of austerity measures, enhanced progressive taxation, and reforms to global taxation and international financial systems. He called on Member States to implement Recommendation No. 204, addressing the increased informalization of employment and labour relations, including in the formal economy, the precariatization of work, and labour market flexibilization and deregularization, and promoting social dialogue, including in the monitoring of the SDGs.
96. A representative of Streetnet International pointed to the situation of street vendors in the informal economy, in particular with respect to a lack of recognition by governments, a lack of legal and social protection, the exclusion of direct representation of informal economy workers at all levels of social dialogue, limited access to public space and infrastructures, and violence and brutal action experienced by street vendors. She called for inclusive social dialogue and direct representation of workers in the informal economy within relevant social protection tripartite structures in line with Recommendation No. 202. Social assistance schemes should be embedded in law and extended to informal economy workers, and health protection should be provided, including through social insurance mechanisms.
97. A representative of the International Domestic Workers Federation, referring to the ten year anniversary of the adoption of the Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189), emphasized the ILO's crucial role in improving labour rights and social protection for domestic workers. She pointed to the responsibility of employers of domestic workers to contribute to social insurance, including for migrant domestic workers, and of governments to ensure access to adequate social services and social assistance. The ILO should hold international financial institutions accountable for their impact on the care economy and austerity measures. She called on Member States and employers to work together to achieve universal social protection for all.
98. A representative of Solidar underlined the responsibility of governments to establish and scale up national social protection floors. Stronger international support was needed for countries to increase fiscal space for social protection, including through fair and more redistributive macroeconomic policies, and increased international solidarity through the creation of a global social protection fund to support the implementation of national

social protection floors. She called on the Conference to give the ILO the mandate to lead the establishment and governance of such a fund, given its strong normative framework, technical knowledge and participatory approach. The speaker indicated that her statement represented the position of the Global Coalition for Social Protection Floors.

99. A representative of International Young Christian Workers emphasized the need for young workers, often comprising one of the most vulnerable segments of society, to live a dignified life. In that context, she called for the full implementation of Recommendation No. 202 to guarantee a just social protection system for everybody, including access to quality healthcare, education and unemployment benefits. She emphasized the need to ensure access to public services and called on all delegates to apply the recommendations of the report and, in particular, to invest in social solidarity financing, including by ensuring the taxation of multinational corporations.
100. A representative of Make Mothers Matter stressed the critical importance, relevance and legitimacy of realizing universal social protection for unpaid caregivers, especially mothers. Governments and employers should invest in supporting women, parents and other caregivers, and should account for that essential yet unpaid and invisible work, reflecting a collective responsibility to recognize unpaid care work as essential work for communities and society as a whole. Unpaid caregivers, and in particular mothers, should have access to social protection just like any other worker, ensuring that social protection was considered to be a long-term investment.

Discussion point 4

101. The Worker Vice-Chairperson pointed to the important leadership role the ILO should take within the multilateral system given its tripartite structure, its standard-setting and normative oversight function, and its pertinent constitutional mandate. The lack of policy coherence within the multilateral system and the insufficient recognition of the ILO's mandate and its social security standards urgently needed to be addressed. The extension of social protection had been curtailed by the lending conditionalities and policy advice of international financial institutions and other international organizations, which included: cutting social spending, decreasing benefit levels, reducing employer social security contributions, promoting individualized accounts and privatizing social protection. He noted in particular the World Bank's promotion of social protection floors at the expense of contributory social security systems, contrary to the two-dimensional strategy reflected in Recommendation No. 202 and Convention No. 102. He called on the ILO to take a stronger leadership role consistent with its unique mandate to drive greater international consensus for a coherent approach to social protection based on ILO standards, in particular within the SPIAC-B and the USP 2030. He stressed the need for engagement with international financial institutions, including on international and country-level policy as well as lending conditionalities, to ensure alignment with ILO standards, in particular regarding the next World Bank social protection and labour strategy and the International Monetary Fund's strategy on social spending.
102. He called on the ILO to increase efforts in the promotion of social security standards, notably the ratification and implementation of Convention No.102, including a ratification campaign and through the avenue of the Global Flagship Programme on Building Social Protection Floors for All and Decent Work Country Programmes. Given the need to support decent work within the care economy, he also specifically urged the ratification and effective implementation of the Nursing Personnel Convention, 1977 (No. 149), and Convention No. 189. The multilateral system could better support the world's poorest countries by establishing a global social protection fund that could kick-

start financing for countries with insufficient fiscal space and fund technical support to establish statutory social protection systems in line with international labour standards. The ILO should be the central player in ongoing discussions and lead its governance if established. He also said the fund could be an important opportunity for strengthening coordination between international institutions on social protection, and could contribute to greater multilateral coherence, and called for increased official development assistance for social protection to complement the fund and greater development assistance coordination.

103. He commended the ILO's global leadership role in research on social protection, referring in particular to the *World Social Protection Report* and the publication *Reversing Pension Privatizations*, as well as to ILO data on coverage and financing gaps, highlighting their importance in guiding evidence-based policymaking and informing global debates. He expressed strong support for periodic data collection, further development of ILO data and assessment tools, including on gender and adequacy, and the establishment of quantitative international targets and benchmarks, including on adequacy and coverage, to support the achievement of the SDGs.
104. The Employer Vice-Chairperson highlighted the importance of assessing possible action at the global, regional and national levels, and undertaking an evaluation of impacts and challenges of earlier initiatives to extract lessons learned. He pointed to the ILO's experience in developing and managing initiatives and development cooperation programmes as reflected on the ILO Development Cooperation Dashboard. He stressed the need for cooperation at all levels, and for the ILO's engagement to achieve universal access to comprehensive and sustainable social protection in that regard. In particular, he called for increased technical cooperation and capacity-building as a means to strengthen domestic resource mobilization and build effective systems, especially in countries with large coverage gaps. The ILO had the mandate, expertise, tripartism and normative framework (with particular reference to Convention No. 102 and Recommendation No. 202) to support countries in the development of adequate and sustainable social protection systems. As such, in addition to technical assistance, he underlined the need for further financial support by way of international financial assistance, solidarity and improved coordination among all actors, including international financial institutions, as a means to achieve greater policy coherence and avoid duplications. Well-designed initiatives could mobilize international financial resources and strengthen domestic resource mobilization.
105. Joint national and international financing initiatives, supported by development partners including international financial institutions, were used to contain the COVID-19 crisis and link technical and financial support. In some cases, however, financing constraints and debt sustainability constraints limited the scope for social protection investments in the immediate aftermath of the crisis. In that context, he urged the ILO to deepen that engagement with relevant UN agencies and international financial institutions, including through a common policy framework, consistent with their respective roles, mandates and value added, and in line with international labour standards, notably Convention No. 102 and Recommendation No. 202. Social partners had an important and unique role, in particular in relation to policymaking and the assessment of needs and priorities. Similarly, challenges derived from new business models, diverse forms of work and emerging trends in the world of work, such as platform work, short-term contracts and multiple labour relationships, required nationally adapted responses and strong social partner engagement. The ILO could facilitate knowledge-sharing, best practices and guidance regarding fundamental principles and rights at work as a means to promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment

and decent work for all. He called for the continued promotion of the Centenary Declaration as it embodied a common approach towards developing and enhancing social protection systems that were adequate, sustainable and adapted to developments in the world of work.

- 106.** The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, called on the ILO to build on its unique strengths (its international standards, tripartite structure and technical expertise) and take a leading role in supporting the realization of universal access to comprehensive and sustainable social protection in line with the Centenary Declaration, including through awareness-raising, capacity-building and partnerships with the United Nations and other international and regional institutions. Technical support and capacity-building for low-income countries, South-South and triangular cooperation and strengthened partnerships with regional organizations, including through a memorandum of understanding with the African Union, were key to support countries in the region to develop coherent and adapted social security policies. He called for ILO support in the establishment of social security databases to help monitor the implementation of the SDGs and related indicators, and for the development of tools to support formalization policies. He further encouraged the ILO to undertake promotional activities for the ratification of international social security standards. He called for a World Social Protection Day to build momentum towards promoting universal access to social protection.
- 107.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, indicated that Albania, Georgia and Montenegro aligned themselves with the statement. She called on the global community to accelerate its efforts towards achieving universal access to social protection. Improving social protection required knowledge, monitoring resources, shared best practices, and sufficient and effective national administrative capacities in addition to funding, such as those provided by the EU. Referring to the remaining nine years to achieve the SDGs, she called for concentrated efforts to strengthen the ILO's normative framework, promote ratification and ensure appropriate follow-up. Underlining the timeliness of the eight key actions proposed in the Office report for the COVID-19 recovery and beyond, she called for policy responses adapted to the changing world of work to prevent a weakening of the solidarity of social protection systems. Referring to the upcoming tenth anniversary of Recommendation No. 202, she called on the Office to organize a meeting of experts in 2022 to develop strategies to accelerate universal protection and to identify concrete measures the ILO could take, including technical cooperation, to explore the role of international solidarity and standard-setting activity. She stressed the EU's strong support for the ILO's leadership role on social protection in the multilateral system and called for closer cooperation with other international institutions and programmes, including the International Monetary Fund. Highlighting the potential for renewed joint action regarding international financing for social protection, she welcomed a discussion about how the ILO could take an active role in the ongoing debate on the need for a new international financing mechanism. She stressed the need to strengthen the coverage, adequacy and sustainability of social protection systems for all as a matter of policy priority.
- 108.** The Government member of Argentina, speaking on behalf of the group of Latin American and Caribbean Countries (GRULAC), identified persistent informality as the main obstacle to extending social protection in low- and middle-income countries. Formalization required improved policy coordination, but also changes in international economic and financial relations. The ILO should therefore work with its Member States and other international agencies to promote Recommendations Nos 202 and 204 in an

integrated and mutually reinforcing way, so as to facilitate formalization, promote sustainable enterprises and decent work, and achieve sustainable universal access to social protection. Labour market policies, vocational training, labour market inclusion, appropriate tax policies and incentives, an efficient tax administration, an enabling environment for businesses and, in particular, quality employment services were all important to increase coverage and reduce informality. Institutionalized social dialogue was essential, including for the formulation, implementation and monitoring of transition strategies. He emphasized that the work of the ILO represented a significant contribution to the recovery process. Governments must guarantee the application of the existing standards, as well as provide additional instruments necessary to ensure that the Organization could provide its effective support to face, in a collaborative and synergistic manner, the multiple challenges of social protection in the medium and long term.

- 109.** The Government member of the United States supported the eight key actions listed in the Office report, in particular action 3 on strengthening the governance and sustainability of national social protection systems, which was also important for action 2 concerning closing financing gaps. He highlighted action 6, calling on the ILO to amplify the impact of international social security standards, in particular Recommendation No. 202, given its relevance in the 2030 Agenda during the current decade of action to deliver the SDGs. He further highlighted action 7 on helping to adapt social protection systems in the aftermath of the crisis and in the context of the future of work, as well as action 8 on reinforcing the ILO's leadership role on social protection in the multilateral system. The ILO should work towards developing a common operational framework with the United Nations and international financial institutions, so as to ensure that fiscal consolidation and structural reform measures were not undermining the promotion of comprehensive social protection systems.
- 110.** The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago commended the ILO for the support provided to countries during the pandemic. She called on the ILO to take a greater leadership role, in particular regarding: an integrated implementation strategy for Recommendations Nos 202 and 204; the promotion of the Decent Work Agenda and sustainable enterprises; increased investment in social protection as a development imperative; the creation of fiscal space based on the principles of solidarity, equity and sustainability; improved coordination of social protection and of economic, social, environmental and employment policies; the capacity-building of social partners in collaboration with the International Training Centre of the ILO, Turin; supporting countries in building inclusive social protection systems for workers in all forms of work; and, finally, improving coherence across international organizations.
- 111.** The Government member of Canada highlighted the ILO's key role in research and analysis, information exchanges and the dissemination of good practices, including on issues of unpaid and paid care work and digital labour platforms. Closer collaboration with international financial institutions and other international organizations (for example, OECD and the International Social Security Association (ISSA)), including through participation in the United Nations country teams, was needed to avoid duplication of efforts and provide more effective support to countries to progress on universal social protection and the SDGs. She highlighted the importance of international labour standards, in particular Recommendation No. 202, in promoting universal access to comprehensive, adequate and sustainable social protection systems.
- 112.** The Government member of the United Kingdom emphasized the importance of improved coordination and called for priority support to countries and population

groups with the lowest coverage, in particular in fragile and conflict-affected States. The ILO needed to strengthen its leadership and convening role vis-à-vis other multilateral agencies, including international financial institutions, and particularly the World Bank, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the World Food Programme (WFP), the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), to ensure effective ways of working, learning and sharing information. A common operational framework could foster agreement on comparative advantages, roles and responsibilities among agencies. In addition, the ILO should increase its engagement on the linkages between social protection and policies to address climate change, as the ILO was well placed to ensure that social protection systems helped to prevent – and to build resilience in case of – shocks, and to mitigate any negative impact of pro-climate policies as part of a just transition.

- 113.** The Government member of Egypt referred to positive experiences with the measures Egypt had introduced in response to the COVID-19 pandemic to support in particular workers in the informal economy. She proposed reviewing the relevance of the existing body of social security standards, including exploring the development of new Conventions, to ensure universal access to social protection in accordance with the 2030 Agenda. She suggested the ILO should provide support to Member States in their efforts to reach universal social protection and improve their labour market statistics, in particular to enable them to face the challenges posed by the current crisis.
- 114.** The Government member of the Philippines highlighted the need for coordinated action to address global issues such as digitalization and migration. She called on the ILO to formulate new international frameworks and standards that responded to those new realities, including on social insurance irrespective of citizenship and employment status, as well as to ensure portability across countries. Emphasizing the importance of formalization and a just transition, she noted the potential of the ILO's unique tripartite structure and collective human-centred measures, in which risks and benefits were equitably shared by all. She thanked the ILO for the technical assistance provided to the Philippines.
- 115.** The Government member of the Islamic Republic of Iran said that the Government was pursuing the following steps to address the challenges of the new world of work: closing legal and regulatory gaps; developing active labour market policies and macroeconomic policies that promoted the creation of employment and supported the development of sustainable and green enterprises; and strengthening labour inspection and revising regulations applicable to employment contracts and mechanisms for addressing labour disputes. South-South cooperation and tripartism had been particularly successful at promoting decent work, sustainable growth and social development. The unilateral sanctions imposed by certain countries against other countries were in contradiction with the Charter of the United Nations and international law, in particular the principles of non-interference and of autonomy and independence of countries, and had a negative impact on human rights.
- 116.** The Government member of the Democratic Republic of the Congo recognized the ILO's important role in the area of social protection. She asked for the Organization's support in the extension of social protection to informal economy workers through a clear process, facilitating the transition from the informal to the formal economy, one of the Government's priorities. Furthermore, she asked for capacity-building, in particular with regard to skills and the effective implementation of social protection policies, as well as exchanges of experiences, in order to ensure social protection floors for all.

- 117.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted agreement on the need for greater visibility and respect for international labour standards, at both the international and national levels, as well as on the need for coherence within the multilateral system. The ILO should be more active in providing support to countries in the design and implementation of national social protection floors. Support provided by other international organizations was not always well coordinated and was sometimes even in contradiction with international labour standards, which was something that needed to be addressed. He called on the ILO to step up its efforts and to dedicate human and financial resources to promoting the ratification of Convention No. 102, including within its flagship programmes and Decent Work Country Programmes.
- 118.** The proposal for a global social protection fund could not only provide strengthened and more coordinated financial support to countries, but could also be an important opportunity for strengthening coordination around technical advice on social protection provided by international organizations. While the international community had made numerous commitments to extend social protection, it now needed to allocate resources and technical assistance in a coordinated manner, with the ILO at the centre of that effort. He called on the Conference to give the ILO the mandate to participate in concrete talks with other international organizations concerning the establishment of such a fund.
- 119.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that ensuring continuing, robust and effective social protection, including a solid social protection floor for all, required new ways of thinking. Ensuring that social protection systems were adequate, sustainable and adapted to national circumstances was a shared responsibility and necessary to achieve an inclusive recovery, social cohesion and economic prosperity. That required strong institutions, good governance, more and better investment in social protection, effective, transparent and non-corrupt management, and a balanced allocation of costs. The ILO should aim to provide guidance to its constituents in a balanced and coherent manner with due regard to sustainability and equity.
- 120.** He highlighted the key areas of action that the ILO should increasingly focus on: new approaches and open mindsets; sustainability of social protection schemes; an enabling business environment and the creation of productive and decent jobs as an underlying condition for fiscal, financial and economic sustainability; the transition to the formal economy; coordination with other policies, in particular employment policies; avoiding counterproductive effects of undue pressures on businesses, especially micro, small and medium-sized enterprises; social protection to facilitate work transitions and employability; social protection as an investment; adequate frameworks to progressively extend basic coverage to all, in particular the unprotected; exploring different funding options; systems to ensure transparency, efficiency and well-managed resources; the rule of law and sound anticorruption policies and practices; the fair division of social security contributions between employers and workers, in line with Convention No. 102; fostering an enabling environment for productivity, competitiveness, decent work, job creation and sustainable enterprises; and better collaboration and coordination with international financial institutions to effectively assess country-specific contexts and expenditure needs and priorities.
- 121.** Regarding the proposal to create a global social protection fund, he acknowledged the importance of mobilizing resources and the needs and demands associated with supporting a wide number of countries where limited capacities and resources compromised the development of comprehensive and sustainable social protection systems. He cautioned that the establishment of new structures might not necessarily be effective, calling for a careful analysis of existing and past initiatives, as well as the

leveraging of existing ILO initiatives and programmes. He pointed to decreasing resources allocated to development cooperation, and the need to demonstrate added value and clarity about funding sources. Better coordination of existing official development assistance and ILO support for domestic resource mobilization and capacity-building could also create sustainable solutions in the medium to long term.

Discussion on the draft conclusions

122. The Chairperson introduced the draft conclusions prepared by the Drafting Group and informed the Committee that 141 amendments had been received. She suggested that amendments to the text in square brackets which had not been agreed to in the Group would be treated the same as the other amendments as it was part of the work on which the Group reported back to the Committee. Once the amendment discussion concluded, that the points would be considered agreed text and the brackets would fall. She also requested the Committee's authorization for the secretariat to make editorial and linguistic corrections to the draft conclusions. There was no objection to these proposals.

Title "Conclusions concerning the second recurrent discussion on social protection (social security)"

123. With no amendments submitted, the title "Conclusions concerning the second recurrent discussion on social protection (social security)" was adopted.

Subtitle "Guiding principles and context"

124. With no amendments submitted, the subtitle "Guiding principles and context" was adopted.

Point 1

125. With no amendments submitted, point 1 was adopted.

Point 2

126. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced an amendment to insert "effectively" before "progress" in the first sentence, to bring the wording into line with Recommendation No. 202 and other ILO standards.
127. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, recalling that this was also the formulation in the Social Justice Declaration.
128. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
129. The Government members of Australia, speaking on behalf of the Asia and Pacific group (ASPAG), and Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment.
130. The amendment was adopted.
131. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Canada and the United States, introduced an amendment to include "inclusive" before "and sustainable".

132. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
133. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that given that the discussion was on universal social protection, the term “inclusive” seemed redundant, but he agreed with the principle.
134. The Government members of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment.
135. The amendment was adopted.
136. The Government member of Japan, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Canada, China, Singapore, the United Kingdom and the United States, introduced a series of amendments to insert the words “access to” between “universal” and “social protection”.
137. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, recalling that this had already been discussed in the Drafting Group.
138. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as “universal social protection” reflected both the need to expand coverage and the need to establish higher levels of protection in terms of benefits levels and contingencies covered, which remained faithful to the ILO’s two-dimensional approach. He referred also to the COVID Response Committee, which had retained the concept of “universal social protection”.
139. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment.
140. The Government member of the Philippines supported the position of the Workers’ group to retain “universal social protection” as a guiding principle that referred both to access and also to the adequacy of benefits and implementation gaps. She would welcome clarification from the secretariat on this matter.
141. The Government member of the United States observed that there were multiple references to “access to” throughout the text and asked the secretariat for a clarification of the meaning of universal social protection in order to achieve a coherent use of the concept throughout the text.
142. The deputy representative of the Secretary-General said that the term was firmly grounded in the International Human Rights Framework and that in line with these instruments, in particular Recommendation No. 202, universal social protection encompassed universal coverage in terms of persons protected, comprehensiveness across a broad range of contingencies, and adequacy of benefits and services. Universal social protection was provided through national social protection systems that needed to be sustainable, equitable and adapted to national circumstances. That understanding was also reflected in the 2030 Agenda, notably SDG target 1.3 on social protection systems and measures for all, including floors, and SDG target 3.8 on universal health coverage.
143. The Chairperson proposed that on an exceptional basis, because of the implications of the amendment throughout the document, the discussion on the amendment would be revisited at a later point. She asked the secretariat to share the explanation they had given in writing. This was agreed.
144. In the subsequent sitting, on the basis of the written explanation received from the secretariat, the Government member of the United States proposed a subamendment

to include a definition of the concept of universal social protection in the introduction or in a footnote as follows:

Pursuant to the approach of the ILO Centenary Declaration for the Future of Work and consistent with the ILO Social Protection Floors Recommendation, 2012 (No. 202), the concept of “universal social protection” refers to actions and measures to realize the human right to social security for all by progressively building and maintaining nationally appropriate social protection systems that are comprehensive, adequate, accessible, and sustainable, and provide protection against the risks faced throughout the life cycle.

145. The Chairperson explained that this could be added either as a footnote or into the text, for example at the end of point 2. She invited members of the Committee to state their views on the subamendment.
146. The Government member of the United States suggested that the best option was to insert the text where “universal social protection” was mentioned the first time, either as a footnote or in the main body of the text. The suggested wording reflected the intent of all parties, capturing the concepts of comprehensiveness, adequacy, accessibility and sustainability. The text drew directly on the two principal documents referred to throughout the work of the Committee – namely the Centenary Declaration and Recommendation No. 202 – as well as on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which stipulated that everyone had the right to social security and that social protection programmes should be administered on a national basis.
147. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed with the proposed text but asked the Government member of the United States to indicate whether the text should appear as a footnote or in the main body of the conclusions.
148. The Government member of the United States expressed flexibility, stressing that it should clearly relate to the entire text. He invited other opinions.
149. The Employer Vice-Chairperson expressed his doubts regarding the process of discussing this subamendment and where it could be included. He questioned whether the definition of key concepts like “universal social protection” fell into the realm of what the Committee was tasked to do in the context of the recurrent item discussion and did not support the subamendment.
150. The Government member of the Philippines indicated her support, explaining that the proposed text aptly captured the concept of universal social protection. She was flexible regarding where the text should be placed.
151. The Government member of the United States asked whether the Employer Vice-Chairperson’s concern could be addressed by removing the reference to “the concept of” so that the text would simply start with “universal social protection refers to”.
152. The Employer Vice-Chairperson replied that the change would not alter his opposition to the subamendment. The Committee should not be defining terms and generating new concepts. The Committee should use the concepts as already laid down in existing standards and agreed texts.
153. The Worker Vice-Chairperson disagreed with the Employer Vice-Chairperson, emphasizing that the Committee was not generating a new concept since this had already been discussed in 2011. The extension of horizontal and vertical social security and the concept itself reflected already agreed language from standards and Office documents. He suggested that the proposed text should be presented as a separate point.

- 154.** The Government member of the United States agreed with the Worker Vice-Chairperson. The concept of universal social protection was well established and the purpose of the discussion was to apply that already well-established concept to the world of work today. COVID-19 had shown the need for social protection to be more accessible, adequate, comprehensive and sustainable. That was the essence of the work of the Committee, in addition to questions around how to finance, expand and move forward internationally with universal social protection.
- 155.** The Government member of Argentina agreed with the Government member of the United States and the Worker Vice-Chairperson that this was an established concept. ILO standards offered enough for an interpretation. However, defining such an essential concept needed a much more extensive discussion and the Committee was not the right place for it.
- 156.** The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, reminded the members of the Committee that the guiding principles generally referred to validated principles that had already reached consensus. The wording proposed was interesting but the discussion should return to agreed principles, standards and concepts. He expressed his flexibility on the matter.
- 157.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the proposed subamendment provided an elegant solution for all the proposed amendments seeking to address the wording for “access to universal social protection”. The proposed text did not contain anything new; all the ideas were agreed in 2011. Dropping the reference to “access to” would save time and align with what had been agreed in the COVID Response Committee.
- 158.** The Government member of Argentina, in an effort to find a compromise solution, proposed a subamendment to delete “Pursuant to ... refers” and to start the proposed text with “This implies”.
- 159.** The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago seconded the subamendment.
- 160.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of the United States sought clarification regarding whether the text would start with “This implies” or with “Universal social protection refers to ...”.
- 161.** The Government member of Argentina clarified that the use of “universal social protection refers to” in the subamendment was flexible.
- 162.** The Chairperson thanked the Government member of Argentina for his flexibility and said that the subamended text to be discussed the following day would be:
- “Universal social protection” refers to actions and measure to realize the human right to social security for all by progressively building and maintaining nationally appropriate social protection systems that are comprehensive, adequate, accessible, and sustainable, and provide protection against the risks faced throughout the life cycle.
- 163.** In the subsequent discussion, the Chairperson explained that the discussion on the subamendments had been paused to enable the Members to have consultations and find a compromise. She invited the Government member of the United States to introduce a subamendment with a view to finding a compromise.
- 164.** The Government member of the United States thanked the Employers’ and Workers’ groups for their cooperation and the secretariat for facilitating a consensus on this point. He clarified that in resolving this question, they could agree to remove all amendments pertaining to “access to” from the text. The subamendment should ideally be placed as a new point after point 2:

[2 *bis*] Universal social protection entails actions and measures to realize the human right to social security by progressively building and maintaining nationally appropriate social protection systems, so that everyone has access to comprehensive, adequate, and sustainable protection over the life cycle, in line with ILO standards.

165. The Employer Vice-Chairperson explained that he did not see any added value, as the concepts added by this amendment were already included in other parts of the text, adding that a recurrent discussion should not aim to define concepts. However, in the spirit of consensus, he supported the subamendment.
166. The Worker Vice-Chairperson thanked the secretariat for supporting the development of a consensual text and highlighted the effectiveness of social dialogue that allowed a consensus to be reached in this regard. He supported the subamendment on the understanding that this would resolve all other related amendments.
167. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported both the agreed text and the subamendment.
168. The Government member of Argentina, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, thanked the secretariat for supporting the development of text that reflected the comprehensiveness required of a concept that was central, strategic and fundamental to the conclusions. He further underlined that the text presented an opportunity to clarify, rather than forge, new concepts. He could support the subamendment insofar as the text implicitly reflected “universal coverage” as an essential element to this concept. He further emphasized the need to remove “access to” in the original point in light of this discussion.
169. The Government member of the Philippines supported the subamendment as it provided both a context to the subsequent points and a clear definition necessary to the section on the Framework for Action.
170. The Government member of Zimbabwe supported the subamendment, as this would support the realization of universal social protection.
171. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, proposed a subamendment to delete “access to”.
172. The Government member of the United States requested a clarification by the secretariat on the meaning of “access to” in the new point.
173. The deputy representative of the Secretary-General confirmed that the language of the subamendment entailed the concept of universal coverage and clarified that the subamendment was meant to address the concerns raised regarding the term “access to”.
174. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, withdrew their proposed subamendment.
175. The amendment was adopted as subamended.
176. Point 2 and the new point after point 2 [2 *bis*] were adopted as amended.

Point 3

177. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced an amendment to replace “The State is” by “Governments are” since this would better reflect the ILO tripartite structure. This amendment was discussed together with an identical amendment introduced by the Government members of Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States.

178. The deputy representative of the Secretary-General clarified that in ILO standards “the State” referred to the executive, legislative and judiciary, whereas “Government” referred only to the executive.
179. The Government member of Canada and the Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, withdrew their amendments.
180. The Government member of Argentina, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, emphasized the importance of retaining the original wording, referring to the 2020 Tripartite Round Table on Pension Trends and Reforms.
181. The Government member of Trinidad and Tobago introduced an amendment to replace “it also being the final guarantor of” by “and”.
182. The amendment was not seconded and consequently fell.
183. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced an amendment to add “and sustainable financing” before “of social security” since, as highlighted by Recommendation No. 202, ensuring sustainable financing reflected national ownership and the responsibility of governments to establish social protection systems.
184. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
185. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to add “and sufficient” after “sustainable” in order to reflect the need for the State to mobilize necessary resources.
186. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, disagreed with the subamendment since “sustainable” was a more comprehensive term, consequently adding “sufficient” was unnecessary.
187. The Employer Vice-Chairperson also argued that adding “sufficient” was redundant and did not support the subamendment.
188. The Government member of Argentina preferred the original wording, as the inclusion of “sufficient” would call for the other core objectives, such as “access” and “coverage”, to also be included as otherwise it would be unbalanced.
189. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the subamendment because some countries faced challenges to find sustainable and sufficient financing.
190. The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew the subamendment, agreeing with the argument presented by the Government member of Argentina. He did not object to the amendment but thought it was redundant.
191. The amendment was adopted as proposed.
192. The Government member of Switzerland, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Canada and the United States, introduced an amendment to substitute “guarantee” by “ensure”, with the intention of improving the language, but not to change the substance.
193. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
194. The Employer Vice-Chairperson observed that the term used in Recommendation No. 202 was “guarantee”.

195. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed with the Employers that consistent wording was important and that “guarantee” was stronger.
196. The amendment was withdrawn.
197. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace “, private sector actors” with “or other entities”, as the term “private sector actors” was unclear given that the sentence already referred to workers and employers; adding that human rights applied to everyone. He immediately subamended the amendment in line with the amendment submitted by the EU and its Member States, to simply delete “private sector actors” without replacing it by other text.
198. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, added that the intention of amendment was to delete the words “private sector actors” due to the vagueness of the term.
199. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment.
200. The Government member of Algeria equally noted that the “private sector” was already covered under the term “employers”.
201. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment of the EU and withdrew his amendment.
202. The amendment was adopted as amended.
203. The Government member of Switzerland, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Canada and the United States, introduced an amendment to delete “anchored in law and”. The intention was not to weaken the phrase, but to avoid a repetition, as “rights-based” already implied “anchored in law”.
204. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the human right to social protection derived from international law might not necessarily be translated into national legislation since human rights were in some cases de facto recognized as part of national law. He asked to hear from workers and governments on this interpretation.
205. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support this amendment as “anchored in law” added clarity to the sentence and made it stronger.
206. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, stated that he was flexible.
207. The Government member of the United States noted that “rights-based” meant that it was anchored in law. The addition was redundant, if not tautological. He deferred to the secretariat for an explanation.
208. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment, as it would weaken the notion of the responsibility of the State. She also noted that there was a need to be consistent with Recommendation No. 202, citing Paragraph 7 that sets out that basic social security guarantees must be anchored in law.
209. The Government member of Australia, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, did not support the amendment.
210. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the original text for the sake of consistency with agreed language reflected in texts previously adopted by the Conference.

- 211. The Government member of the United States clarified that his understanding was that rights-based social protection systems had to be anchored in law by necessity. However, if this addition added clarity, he was flexible and could withdraw the amendment.
- 212. The deputy representative of the Secretary-General explained that the intention of the original text was to explain what a rights-based system entailed, namely having social protection systems anchored in law.
- 213. The Government member of Canada reiterated that this amendment did not question the concept of rights-based social protection systems and stated that she was flexible.
- 214. The Government member of Switzerland confirmed that the intention was to avoid a tautology and withdrew the amendment.
- 215. Point 3 was adopted as amended.

Point 4

- 216. An amendment introduced by the Government member of Egypt was not seconded and consequently fell.
- 217. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced an amendment to add “just transition” between “security” and “business stability” to stress that the income replacement function of social protection systems could serve to prevent poverty and social exclusion among persons who had lost their income and employment as a consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic.
- 218. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 219. The Employer Vice-Chairperson disagreed with the amendment. The concept of a just transition had been acknowledged in other contexts, for example with regard to climate change, and was not appropriate in this point that referred to work transitions. He proposed a subamendment to replace “just transitions” with “facilitating transitions”.
- 220. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, stated that it was important to keep a reference to the term “just transition”, in line with the SDGs. Referring to “transitions” alone would be too vague.
- 221. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment, which he considered too vague. He introduced a further subamendment to replace “facilitating transitions” by “facilitating just transitions”.
- 222. The Government member of the Philippines supported the further subamendment, stating that crises, including those related to climate change, natural disasters or calamities, would have an impact on employment and therefore it was important to include the term “just transition”.
- 223. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that “just transition” referred to the context of climate change and was already reflected under point 12(h). The term would not reflect the idea of labour and work transitions as was intended. He proposed a further subamendment to replace “facilitating just transitions” with “facilitating job transitions”.
- 224. The Worker Vice-Chairperson accepted that the term “just transition” was related to climate change specifically and supported the subamendment proposed by the Employer Vice-Chairperson.
- 225. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, reiterated the importance of “just transitions” in the context of all types of crisis, not just climate change.

- 226. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the subamendment introduced by the Employer Vice-Chairperson.
- 227. The Government member of the United States indicated that he would have supported the subamendment proposed by the Worker Vice-Chairperson given the importance of just transitions, but could accept “facilitating job transitions”.
- 228. The Chairperson concluded that there was sufficient support for the subamendment introduced by the Employer Vice-Chairperson.
- 229. The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 230. Point 4 was adopted as amended.

Point 5

- 231. Two amendments submitted by the Government members of Trinidad and Tobago and Egypt, respectively, were not seconded and consequently fell.
- 232. The Chairperson noted that if the next amendment submitted by the Employers was adopted, the amendment submitted by the Government member of Burkina Faso would fall.
- 233. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete “undue austerity”, explaining that while austerity measures should be taken as a last resort, they were necessary in some circumstances, in particular in developing countries, including as a means to prevent the collapse of the economy or increased debt. The term “undue” was ambiguous and difficult to operationalize.
- 234. The Worker Vice-Chairperson disagreed with the amendment. Austerity measures had very negative social and economic consequences, and “undue”, unlike “unjustified”, was appropriate and well defined. He referred to the case of Iceland, which after the 2008–09 financial crisis was under severe pressure from international financial institutions to introduce heavy austerity measures within its social protection system. Yet, withstanding this pressure, Iceland instead strengthened social protection to support the recovery by preserving and increasing aggregate demand and preserving the economy.
- 235. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment. The term “undue” was used to underline that austerity measures were acceptable so long as they were proportionate.
- 236. The Government member of Burkina Faso, in line with her proposed amendment, rejected the inclusion of the term “undue”, since a government that took such measures would necessarily have tangible reasons for doing so and they could therefore not be considered unjustified. She proposed a subamendment to delete the word “undue” before the word “austerity”.
- 237. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the subamendment, and explained that the term “undue” stressed the idea that austerity measures must be proportionate, otherwise they would weaken aggregate demand and worsen the crisis.
- 238. The Government member of the United States did not support the subamendment.
- 239. The subamendment was not seconded and consequently fell.
- 240. The Employer Vice-Chairperson expressed his surprise that only a few governments had spoken on that issue as it was of particular relevance to them.

241. The Government member of Zimbabwe supported the amendment introduced by the Employers' group, explaining that there were always compelling reasons behind the difficult decision to introduce austerity measures.
242. The Government member of the United States did not support the amendment. The proposed text recognized that austerity measures could be necessary but there was a need to be careful about introducing undue austerity measures that were focused on constraining public social expenditure.
243. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, proposed a subamendment to replace "undue austerity" by "and constraints to", referring to constraints that may be imposed on governments.
244. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported this subamendment.
245. The Worker Vice-Chairperson objected to this subamendment since this also deleted "undue austerity". He aligned himself with the arguments put forward by the EU and a number of governments.
246. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, added that in times of crisis States may be required to introduce measures and, within this context, the use of the term "unjustified austerity" appeared too strong.
247. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, reiterated that they wished to keep the reference to "undue austerity".
248. The Government member of Argentina supported the Africa group's subamendment.
249. The Employer Vice-Chairperson called upon European governments to be flexible and acknowledge the particularities of other regions of the world.
250. The subamendment introduced by the Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, was rejected.
251. The deputy representative of the Secretary-General explained that the translation of "undue" as "injustifiées" in the French version may have created confusion, and suggested that the French terms "disproportionnées" or "excessives" could be more appropriate to reflect the meaning of the English term "undue".
252. The Government member of Argentina, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, proposed a subamendment to substitute "undue" with "disproportionate" in all language versions to ensure consistency and seek consensus.
253. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment unless the term "austerity" was also deleted.
254. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment introduced by GRULAC.
255. The Government member of the United States did not support the subamendment, indicating a preference for the original language since the term "disproportionate" would need to be used in context to provide the necessary clarity.
256. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the subamendment introduced by GRULAC, indicating the importance of maintaining the term "austerity measures".
257. Given the overwhelming support for keeping the term "austerity", the Employer Vice-Chairperson said his group would support the subamendment introduced by GRULAC.

- 258. The Government member of Argentina, speaking on behalf of the vast majority of GRULAC countries, asked for a clarification regarding the term “disproportionate”, which allowed for a level of flexibility between means and ends, unlike the term “undue”, which expressed a value judgement.
- 259. The Government member of the United States indicated that he could support the subamendment introduced by GRULAC, clarifying however that the word “disproportionate”, like “undue”, also involved a subjective determination.
- 260. The Government members of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, also supported the subamendment introduced by GRULAC.
- 261. The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 262. Point 5 was adopted as amended.

Point 6

- 263. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to remove “and thresholds” explaining that this wording was redundant.
- 264. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment since the term “thresholds” was not redundant, but was needed for precision and referred specifically to both components: principles and thresholds.
- 265. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment.
- 266. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment, as the term was in line with Convention No. 102 and was therefore relevant and not redundant.
- 267. The Government member of the United States asked if the secretariat could clarify whether principles could have thresholds in the same way that standards included thresholds.
- 268. The deputy representative of the Secretary-General clarified that the principles and thresholds were both included in the standards and it would be inaccurate to say that the term “principles” encompassed the term “thresholds”.
- 269. The Government member of the United States, following the clarification, supported the original wording and objected to the amendment.
- 270. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment on the basis of the secretariat’s clarification.
- 271. The Government member of China introduced an amendment, seconded by the Government member of Singapore, to replace “ensure that” by “promote the application of” and to delete “is implemented”, as it better reflected the idea that ILO Conventions could be ratified and implemented, whereas Recommendations were limited to providing guidance.
- 272. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the proposed amendment, underlining the need to refer to both the promotion and implementation of international labour standards, as this better reflected the obligations of governments and the purpose of point 6.

- 273. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, also objected to the amendment as it was not aligned with the purpose of the text.
- 274. The amendment was rejected.
- 275. Point 6 was adopted.

Point 7

- 276. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete “global” before “pandemic”, explaining that this was redundant as a pandemic had, by its very nature, an impact on the entire world.
- 277. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, and there were no objections from governments.
- 278. The amendment was adopted.
- 279. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to remove “platform workers”, explaining that, unlike the other categories of workers listed, platform workers were not necessarily precarious or vulnerable since they belonged to a heterogeneous group that included a large diversity of work arrangements and therefore could not be subsumed under the same umbrella. The reference to this group, and such enumerations in general, ran the risk of excluding other vulnerable workers and forms of work arrangements and also nullified the efforts made by numerous countries to address the challenges of the platform economy. Platform work should be considered a useful tool, especially in the context of developing countries, the pandemic and even the current Conference session.
- 280. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, contesting the suggestion that delegates to the Conference could be considered platform workers and clarifying that the goal of the sentence was to focus on social security coverage and to cite groups of people who disproportionately faced challenges. There was solid evidence to support the fact that platform workers belonged to this group, including from the OECD.
- 281. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment, explaining that it was important to mention groups and to maintain the reference to platform workers so as to reflect important changes in the world of work and recognize that certain groups of workers were more vulnerable and disproportionately affected by the lack of social protection coverage.
- 282. The Government member of the Philippines did not support the amendment, since platform workers were often invisible and faced vulnerabilities due to regulatory gaps, especially in respect of social security policies. She underlined that this was a serious concern in the Philippines and that these workers were increasingly voicing their plight.
- 283. The Government member of the United States did not support the amendment as the sentence clearly said that these groups were not “always”, but “often disproportionately” affected. Moreover, the text did not say that platform workers were precarious; rather, “persons in precarious situations” was another subset to the other groups listed.
- 284. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment, emphasizing the need to regulate platform work – a consequence of technological progress – as well as to promote the integration of

platform workers into social protection systems. The Africa group requested the ILO for technical assistance to this end.

- 285.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that his group's arguments had not been well understood, but would accept the majority's view.
- 286.** As such, the amendment was not adopted.
- 287.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete "persons in precarious situations" since all listed groups that were affected disproportionately were, in essence, in precarious situations.
- 288.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment as the previous sentence of the paragraph referred to persons who were "unprotected and in vulnerable situations", followed by a list of groups, of which "persons in precarious situations" was one separate category.
- 289.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment since the wording "in precarious situations" referred to the lack of social protection coverage and therefore needed to be reflected.
- 290.** The Government member of Argentina said that the term was justified, and equally noted the extremely precarious situation of homeworkers, who were not explicitly mentioned, wishing to propose a subamendment to this effect.
- 291.** The Chairperson clarified that this subamendment could not be introduced, as it did not relate to the amendment that was being discussed.
- 292.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson maintained that his group's proposal would have reduced redundancies, but he would be flexible in order to move the discussion forward.
- 293.** As such, the amendment was not adopted.
- 294.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete "who" for editorial reasons. The amendment only referred to the English version of the text.
- 295.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, and there were no objections from governments.
- 296.** The amendment was adopted.
- 297.** Point 7 was adopted as amended.

Point 8

- 298.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced an amendment to add "bolster the resilience of societies and" after "Inclusive and sustainable social protection systems" in order to emphasize the impact that inclusive social protection systems could have on societies' capacities to withstand shocks.
- 299.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, the Employer Vice-Chairperson, and the Government member of Zimbabwe supported the amendment.
- 300.** The amendment was adopted.
- 301.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Canada, Switzerland and the United States, introduced an amendment to delete "the resulting" for better readability of the text.

- 302.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported this amendment, as structural transformations would indeed continue to emerge.
- 303.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson also supported the amendment, and there were no objections from governments.
- 304.** The amendment was adopted.
- 305.** The Chairperson indicated that if the following amendment presented by the Employers was adopted, the amendment presented by the Government members of Australia, China and Singapore would fall.
- 306.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace “the rise of precarious” with “new” and to replace the “and” after “forms of work” with “, as well as” and indicated that this was compatible with the amendment submitted by the Government members of Australia, China and Singapore to replace “precarious” with “diverse”, and expressed his support for both. Challenges were linked not so much to the emergence of new forms of work, as to changes within existing forms of employment.
- 307.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson preferred the original text, as the amendments neglected the lack of certainty and protection that workers in non-standard forms of work experienced, as well as the fact that not all new forms of work were necessarily precarious and required specific responses.
- 308.** The Government members of the United States, Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said they preferred the original text.
- 309.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson reiterated that it was important to recognize that there were new forms of work that were not necessarily precarious or harmful, but was flexible.
- 310.** The amendment was not adopted.
- 311.** The Chairperson indicated that if the amendment submitted by Employer members was adopted, the two remaining amendments proposed respectively by China and the EU and its Member States on this point would fall.
- 312.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment. He suggested to change the proposed order in which the amendments would be discussed and to start with the amendment proposed by the EU and its Member States since this was also agreeable for the Employers.
- 313.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced an amendment that had the intention of simplifying and shortening the text. As the ILO Centenary Declaration and decent work were referenced, there was no need to enumerate the different components of fundamental rights, with the exception of “the elimination of forced and child labour”.
- 314.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed his concern about the change of order in which the amendments were discussed and disagreed with the amendment proposed by the Government member of Portugal on behalf of the EU and its Member States. He acknowledged the crucial importance of eliminating child and forced labour, but this was mentioned in other parts of the document. The other pillars of the Centenary Declaration were equally important and none of them should be privileged. He proposed a subamendment to add “principles and” after “fundamental” and “at work” after “rights” and to keep the last part of the sentence “as well as adequate minimum wages statutory or negotiated, occupational safety and health and maximum limits on hours of work.”

- 315.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a further subamendment that would delete the last part of the sentence starting with “as well ...”. The text would end with “at work.” The task of the Committee was not to talk about fundamental principles and rights at work but to discuss social protection.
- 316.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support this additional subamendment. He emphasized that minimum wages reduced the demand for social protection benefits. Strengthened occupational safety and health as well as limits on hours of work would reduce demands on health systems, sickness benefits and employment injury benefits. It was justified to refer to them given their relevance for and impact on social protection systems.
- 317.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that she would agree with the subamendment proposed by the Employers’ group if the reference to the “elimination of child labour and forced labour” was kept. The reference was important since child labour had increased again in 2020, and 2021 was the year of the elimination of child labour.
- 318.** The Government member of the United States supported the subamendment by the Workers’ group. While he agreed with the importance of combating child and forced labour, non-discrimination, freedom of association and collective bargaining were equally important.
- 319.** The Government member of Switzerland supported the subamendment submitted by the Workers’ group but also wanted to keep the reference to “eliminating child and forced labour”.
- 320.** The Government member of Algeria supported the subamendment submitted by the Employers’ group but indicated flexibility, stating that the Centenary Declaration in any case already contained all the principles that were listed.
- 321.** The Government member of China supported the subamendment submitted by the Workers’ group, underlining that no priority should be given to one specific pillar of the Decent Work Agenda – they were all of equal importance. She added that she was flexible regarding the subamendment introduced by the Employer Vice-Chairperson.
- 322.** The Chairperson suggested that there was sufficient support for the subamendment submitted by the Employers’ group.
- 323.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson considered that there was substantial support for retaining the Workers’ group’s subamendment, especially by the Government members of China and the United States. While he understood the position of the EU about stressing the importance of eliminating forced labour and child labour, the Workers did not want to create a hierarchy among decent work principles.
- 324.** The Chairperson asked the Committee members to clearly restate their positions in favour or against the subamendment proposed by the Employer Vice-Chairperson.
- 325.** The Government members of Algeria, Switzerland and Zimbabwe supported the subamendment.
- 326.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the Employers’ subamendment. She emphasized the strong support heard during the discussion regarding highlighting the importance of the elimination of child labour elsewhere in the text.

- 327. The Government member of the United States said that he could accept the subamendment, but had a strong preference for adding the sentence proposed by the Workers.
- 328. The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew the subamendment in view of the lack of support.
- 329. The subamendment introduced by the Employers' group was adopted.
- 330. The two amendments submitted by the Employers' group and by the Government member of China fell.
- 331. The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Canada, China, Japan, Singapore and the United Kingdom, withdrew an amendment in the light of the adoption of the new point 2 *bis*.
- 332. Point 8 was adopted as amended.

Point 9

- 333. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete "global" before "pandemic" as a pandemic was global by definition.
- 334. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, and there were no objections from governments.
- 335. The amendment was adopted.
- 336. The Government member of Canada, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the United Kingdom and the United States, withdrew their amendment to replace "States" by "governments" in light of the earlier discussion and clarification from the secretariat on the same question. The rationale of the amendment had been to emphasize the responsibility of governments, including subnational levels of government, as well as different jurisdictions, to implement social protection.
- 337. The amendment was withdrawn.
- 338. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add "political" before "commitment for social protection".
- 339. The Worker Vice-Chairperson declared his group's support for the proposed amendment. He considered adding "and financial" after "political", but wanted to hear from the governments first.
- 340. The Government members of the United States, Zimbabwe, Argentina, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment.
- 341. The amendment was adopted.
- 342. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced an amendment to add "labour" between "international" and "standards". As the Committee was drafting an ILO document, it would be clearer to refer to international labour standards.
- 343. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 344. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment and proposed a subamendment to add " and social security" after "labour" and before "standards".

- 345. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, argued that the concept of labour standards included social security standards. The addition was therefore redundant but they were flexible and wanted to keep moving forward.
- 346. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the original amendment and opposed the subamendment, in order to avoid excessive detail.
- 347. The Government member of Zimbabwe was not in favour of the subamendment.
- 348. The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew the subamendment.
- 349. The amendment was adopted.
- 350. Point 9 was adopted as amended.

Subtitle “Framework for action”

- 351. With no amendments submitted, the subtitle “Framework for action” was adopted.

Point 10

- 352. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced a linguistic amendment to include “in” between “agency,” and “the”.
- 353. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the proposed amendment.
- 354. The Worker Vice-Chairperson declared no objection.
- 355. The amendment was adopted.
- 356. Point 10 was adopted as amended.

Point 11

- 357. With no amendments submitted, point 11 was adopted.

Section I, title “Measures to promote universal social protection”

- 358. In light of the adoption of the new point 2 *bis*, the Government member of the United States withdrew an amendment.
- 359. Section I, title “Measures to promote universal social protection” was adopted.

Section I, subtitle “Realizing universal social protection”

- 360. In light of the adoption of the new point 2 *bis*, the Government member of the United States withdrew an amendment.
- 361. Section I, subtitle “Realizing universal social protection” was adopted.

Point 12, chapeau

- 362. With no amendments submitted, point 12, chapeau was adopted.

Point 12, clause (a)

- 363. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced an amendment to introduce “through strong social dialogue” after

“strong political will”, emphasizing that social dialogue had a pivotal role to play in the design and implementation of social protection systems.

- 364.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the Workers welcomed a reference to social dialogue but expressed flexibility regarding its insertion in this particular clause.
- 365.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, agreeing also to the important role of social dialogue.
- 366.** The Government member of Australia, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, expressed his support for the amendment.
- 367.** The amendment was adopted.
- 368.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace “general” with “primary” to make the wording consistent with Recommendation No. 202.
- 369.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed with this amendment and proposed a subamendment to add “and overall” before “responsibility” to fully reflect the language of Recommendation No. 202.
- 370.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed to the proposed subamendment.
- 371.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 372.** The Government member of Canada withdrew an amendment.
- 373.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, withdrew their amendment.
- 374.** Point 12, clause (a) was adopted as amended.

Point 12, clause (b)

- 375.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking also on behalf of the Government member of Japan, introduced an amendment to delete “national” before “social protection systems” and to insert “nationally defined” before “social protection floor” in order to reflect better the wording in Recommendation No. 202.
- 376.** The Chairperson, in response to a request for clarification by the Worker Vice-Chairperson, said that the secretariat’s translation was the official one from Recommendation No. 202.
- 377.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson wanted to hear the Employers’ views.
- 378.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson held that the original wording was closer to the language of Recommendation No. 202 and objected to the amendment.
- 379.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed his flexibility regarding deleting “national” before “their social protection systems” since this was already clear in light of the “their” but he wanted to keep “nationally defined” as this was faithful to Recommendation No. 202.
- 380.** The Government member of Australia, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the amendment.
- 381.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment as it was in line with Recommendation No. 202.
- 382.** The amendment was adopted.

- 383.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, withdrew an amendment.
- 384.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete “as soon as possible”. The clause already conveyed a sense of urgency and therefore “as soon as possible” would be redundant; it was also repetitive.
- 385.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson disagreed with the amendment, highlighting that this was not a repetition. Urgency was expressed at the beginning of the clause but it was important to move fast on the extension of social protection. This wording was in line with Paragraph 13(b) of Recommendation No. 202.
- 386.** The Government members of Argentina, and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed with the Workers’ group and rejected the amendment.
- 387.** The amendment was rejected.
- 388.** Point 12, clause (b) was adopted as amended.

Point 12, clause (c)

- 389.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add “sustainable” before “and inclusive” to underline the importance of the sustainability of social protection systems.
- 390.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, had no objections to the amendment.
- 391.** The amendment was adopted.
- 392.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking also on behalf of the Government member of Switzerland, introduced an amendment to delete “and enterprises”. The objective of social protection systems was to protect people, not enterprises, although enterprises benefited from the stability that social protection systems provided.
- 393.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson believed that it would be important to also address the responsibilities of enterprises but his group would be flexible.
- 394.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson objected to the amendment, observing that enterprises were also beneficiaries at two levels. First, the stability provided by social protection, as a human right, was important for enterprises, workers and the population as a whole, and second, clause (c) emphasized the protection of small enterprises and the self-employed who also needed protection. The word “enterprises” should therefore be maintained, or if that was confusing, it could be replaced with “employers” to clarify that it referred to persons.
- 395.** The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, expressed preference for the original wording but remained flexible.
- 396.** The Government member of the United Kingdom proposed a subamendment to add “, and support enterprises” after “workers”.
- 397.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a further subamendment to replace “, and support enterprises” with “and concern all enterprises” to reflect the fact that enterprises played an important role in the social protection system and had certain responsibilities.

- 398.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment proposed by the Government member of the United Kingdom, but disagreed with the further subamendment by the Workers' group.
- 399.** The Government member of the United Kingdom was flexible regarding the subamendment submitted by the Workers' group.
- 400.** The Government member of Switzerland was flexible and in agreement with both subamendments.
- 401.** The Government member of Zimbabwe was flexible.
- 402.** The subamendment proposed by the Workers' group was rejected.
- 403.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson underlined that wording stating that social protection supported enterprises would not be acceptable. He opposed the subamendment and the amendment.
- 404.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, was flexible. Social protection systems were designed to protect people but also concerned enterprises.
- 405.** The Government member of the United States stated that he understood the initial text intended to refer to the roles and responsibilities of both workers and enterprises as recipients and contributors of social protection systems. This could have been expressed better but the proposed amendment and subamendment did not contribute to making things clearer.
- 406.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted the preference among Committee members for the original text and agreed to retain it.
- 407.** The amendment was rejected.
- 408.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete “, including through complementing paid work by social protection benefits to facilitate the insertion or reintegration into the labour market”, clarifying that the Employers' group recognized the importance of promoting labour market inclusion, but considered the wording unclear and the example too limiting. For instance, it only referred to reintegration and reinsertion, neglecting other examples, and only referred to paid work, thereby not taking into account other types of employment.
- 409.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson thought it was important to retain the sentence because the clause was addressing inclusiveness and this was an important way of facilitating inclusion, for example of people who had to leave the labour market temporarily. The wording was furthermore in line with Recommendation No. 202.
- 410.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to delete only “, including through complementing paid work by social protection benefits”, but to retain “to facilitate the insertion or reintegration into the labour market” and to add “and” between “formalization of employment” and “to facilitate”.
- 411.** The Government member of Argentina argued that the subamendment as suggested was not sufficiently specific, considering that the aim was to facilitate the transition to work and access to employment. He proposed a further subamendment to replace the “and” before “to facilitate” with “including incentives to”.
- 412.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson seconded the subamendment proposed by Argentina.

- 413. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of the Philippines, and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, were in favour of the subamendment.
- 414. The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 415. In light of the adoption of the new point 2 *bis*, the Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew an amendment that proposed the addition of “access to” before “universal social protection”.
- 416. Point 12, clause (c) was adopted as amended.

Point 12, clause (d)

- 417. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete the clause, stressing that while his group was not opposed to its content, it repeated other parts of the text and was therefore redundant. It might be preferable to first discuss the other amendments to the clause.
- 418. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported changing the order of the amendments.
- 419. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment put forward by the Employers’ group and did not agree with the proposed change of order, as it would be a waste of time to discuss changes to a clause that might ultimately be deleted. The amendment proposed by the Employers’ group was the most radical of the amendments put forward for the clause and should be discussed first, in line with established procedures. Alternatively, the Employers’ group should withdraw their amendment in order to discuss the other amendments.
- 420. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, noting the close links between the proposed amendments to this clause, said that his group’s suggestion had been made with a view to accelerating the discussion.
- 421. The Chairperson confirmed that the amendments had been ordered in line with the procedures explained by the Workers’ group.
- 422. The Government member of Algeria said that he was flexible regarding the deletion of the clause, but would have liked to hear the arguments put forward by other spokespersons.
- 423. The Chairperson read out the Conference Committees’ rules on the sequencing of amendments and made it clear that the Committee should keep the order since there had not been consensus to change it.
- 424. The Worker Vice-Chairperson disagreed with deleting the clause. The ideas were important and not clearly stated elsewhere so the clause should be retained.
- 425. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, preferred to keep the original text due to its importance and because the next EU amendment was linked to this clause.
- 426. The Government member of the United States agreed with the Employers’ group that some of the wording in the clause was repetitive. However, it was important to refer to one of the major purposes of social protection systems – namely to enable national formalization strategies – and it was therefore important to retain the clause.

427. The Government member of Argentina agreed with the Government member of the United States. There was a repetition of some concepts but the new idea that social protection systems have a key role to play as catalysts for formalization was important.
428. The amendment was rejected.
429. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to include “formal and informal” after “all types of employment” underscoring that social protection was a human right and, as such, it was the long-standing position of the Workers’ group to ensure that all workers, independently of sector and employment status, whether formal or informal, had access to social protection. The amendment was in line with Recommendation No. 202, which clearly stated the need to extend social protection coverage to informal workers. While it was clear that informal workers had limited access to social protection, he also pointed out that ILO research and empirical evidence showed that extending social protection to this group contributed to the transition to the formal economy and provided powerful incentives for workers to register and declare earnings.
430. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, since the idea was the subject of other parts of the text, including in clauses 12(b), 12(c) and 13(g), and it did not align with the intention of the clause to focus on the application of national formalization strategies.
431. The Government members of the Philippines, Zimbabwe, and Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment, given its relevance to national and regional contexts and the purpose of the clause regarding making social protection systems more inclusive.
432. The Government member of Australia, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the amendment.
433. The amendment was adopted.
434. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced an amendment to include the sentence “For this purpose, the solidarity principle and intergenerational equity are an effective way to work towards universal coverage, adequacy of benefits and the long-term financial sustainability of the social protection system” at the end of the clause. She explained that it was important to highlight the principles of social solidarity and intergenerational equity as they were a prerequisite for universal social protection systems and could lead to more effective and equitable redistribution mechanisms.
435. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, mentioning that he would also address these points in the discussion of point 14, clause (c).
436. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to replace “the principle” with “the principles” and to add “sustainability” between “solidarity” and “intergenerational equity”. He underlined that this additional principle made particular sense in this clause since, where the objective is the protection of workers in both the formal and informal sectors, the concern of sustainability becomes even more important as otherwise the whole system could be endangered. He underlined that this was a particular concern to countries with high informality rates.
437. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the Employer Vice-Chairperson’s subamendment given that this principle was already reflected at the end of the clause.

438. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the subamendment as she did not see the added value of referring to “sustainability” again. She preferred to keep the original text.
439. The Government member of Argentina proposed a subamendment to include “sustainability” after “more inclusive” and before “effective”. Since this subamendment did not concern an amendment on this clause, it fell.
440. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the subamendment since the analogous expression “financial sustainability” was already reflected in the text. He expressed support for the amendment introduced by the Government member of Portugal, on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
441. The Government member of the United States stated that he remained flexible but preferred the original text without the amendment introduced by the Government member of Portugal, on behalf of the EU and its Member States, as it made the clause more effective and true to its purpose.
442. Noting that there was insufficient support for the Employers’ subamendment, the Chairperson declared that it was rejected. She declared that the amendment introduced by the Government member of Portugal, on behalf of the EU and its Member States, was adopted.
443. Point 12, clause (d) was adopted as amended.

Point 12, clause (e)

444. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking also on behalf of the Government member of the United States, introduced an amendment to include “removing barriers that prevent their inclusion and” after “including by”, indicating that this was an essential element for social protection systems to be inclusive of people with disabilities as it also considered additional technical barriers that prevented effective access. She noted that the French translation might require adjustment to align with the English version.
445. The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons supported the amendment.
446. The amendment was adopted.
447. Point 12, clause (e) was adopted as amended.

Point 12, clause (f)

448. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment that would merge clauses (f) and (g) as the two clauses were intimately related. The amendment would insert the text of clause (g) at the end of clause (f). A specific reference was made to paid maternity, paternity and parental leave, which positively affected gender equality, promoted higher labour market participation rates by women, and fostered and facilitated work-life balance and a better division of labour. The purpose of crediting contributory periods for unpaid care work was not to pay social security benefits for unpaid care workers, but to ensure that during periods where female or male workers were out of the labour market due to caregiving responsibilities, they could accumulate credits which would enable them, for example, to access a full pension later in life. Almost all OECD countries provided such mechanisms, such as Sweden, as did many low- and middle-income countries, such as the Plurinational State of Bolivia. The EU Commission Pension Adequacy Report highlighted the importance of such mechanisms for reducing pension

gaps and poverty in old age, especially for women, and having a positive impact on men by removing disincentives to participate in care work.

- 449.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment. While he understood the rationale behind it, he reiterated the danger of listing activities or objectives, no matter how desirable, as these needed to be mindful of different national circumstances and he argued that the thrust of the clause was lost by going into such depth and detail. He wished to discuss the amendments introduced by governments.
- 450.** The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, insisted that the some of the principles and objectives reflected in the amendment, and in particular paid parental leave, did not exist nor were reflected in the national culture of many African countries and would either be impossible to implement or would result in an excessive burden for Member States. He proposed a subamendment to add, “according to what is applicable in the national legislation” and “providing for paid and unpaid parental leave where applicable” after “including”.
- 451.** The Chairperson, pointing to the chapeau of point 12 which included “in accordance with national circumstances”, suggested that both ideas raised in the subamendment might already be adequately covered.
- 452.** The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, consequently subamended the text to include only “as applicable” after “including”.
- 453.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment.
- 454.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment nor the amendment, underlining that the original text was clearer.
- 455.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the Workers’ amendment, so long as their own amendment would still be considered. In addition, she raised concerns about the crediting of unpaid work, underlining that it was not an effective way to ensure social protection nor gender equality, but might rather serve as a trap and a financial incentive for women to stay at home rather than integrate into the labour market.
- 456.** The Government member of the United States supported the subamendment and could support the Workers’ group amendment. He stressed, however, that it would be clearer to separate the two clauses, as they contained two distinctive messages, one on gender-responsiveness to serve social protection and another about the care economy. In combining these clauses, the new clause gave the impression that gender-responsive social protection policies only served the purpose of promoting the participation of workers with caregiving responsibilities. He therefore suggested a further subamendment to replace “and invest” by “and including by investing” as this reflected the idea that this was but one element of gender-responsive social protection policies. In addition, he suggested replacing “facilitate” by “foster”, “support” or “incentivize” since it was unclear whether it was the role of governments to facilitate balances within the family.
- 457.** The Government member of Singapore seconded the subamendment introduced by the Government member of the United States.
- 458.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment introduced by the Government member of the United States and further clarified that he did not wish to block the EU from amending the text.

459. The Employer Vice-Chairperson raised a point of order as to whether the discussion on this amendment, that sought to combine clauses (f) and (g), would have the effect of making the remaining applicable amendments fall.
460. The Chairperson underlined that she had not indicated any amendment falling as a consequence of approving the amendment under discussion. Due to lack of clarity of the process, the Chairperson suggested that different parties work together to find common ground and come back to this matter and all related amendments.
461. The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons agreed and the latter suggested that the secretariat propose a formulation on this point.
462. The Government member of Argentina strongly opposed merging clauses (f) and (g) as reflected in the amendment introduced by the Workers since, while both were closely related, they could not necessarily be subsumed and nor would this add clarity to the document. He therefore supported the procedure suggested by the Chairperson insofar as the text prepared by the secretariat did not merge clauses (f) and (g).
463. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, wanting to show flexibility, withdrew the amendment to merge the two clauses.
464. The Chairperson asked the secretariat to introduce a compromise text that it had prepared in response to the Committee's request, to accommodate the amendments on point 12, clauses (f) and (g).
465. The deputy representative of the Secretary-General explained that the proposed compromise text combined the different amendments and subamendments received into three clauses: 12(f) on gender equality, 12(g) on care, and a new clause after 12(g) on social protection for children.
466. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the secretariat's proposed text.
467. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, introduced a subamendment to add "where applicable" at the end of the clause. He recalled that this had been agreed previously and this addition would better reflect the realities of countries in Africa and allow his group to support the proposed text.
468. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, proposed a further subamendment to replace "gendered risks" with "gender-related risks".
469. The Government member of Argentina thanked the secretariat for the proposed text which he supported. He also agreed to the subamendments from the EU and the Africa group.
470. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and Employer Vice-Chairperson had no objections.
471. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the subamendment by the Africa group.
472. The compromise text was adopted as subamended. As a result, four amendments fell.
473. Point 12, clause (f) was adopted as amended.

Point 12 clause (g)

474. The deputy representative of the Secretary-General explained that the compromise text prepared by the secretariat for clause (g) focused on the care economy, including the

provision of affordable and quality childcare and long-term care services in fostering workforce participation of workers with caregiving responsibilities and equal sharing of care work between women and men.

- 475.** The Chairperson said that if the suggested compromise text for clause (g) was approved, two amendments would fall.
- 476.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the text proposed by the secretariat.
- 477.** There were no objections from the Government members.
- 478.** The compromise text was adopted. As a result, two amendments fell.
- 479.** Point 12, clause (g) was adopted as amended.

New clause after 12 (g)

- 480.** The deputy representative of the Secretary-General suggested that the amendment on social protection for children submitted by the Government member of Portugal, on behalf of the EU and its Member States, to contribute to the elimination of child labour, warranted a separate clause.
- 481.** The Chairperson presented the suggested new clause and clarified that if the text was approved the original amendment would fall.
- 482.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the text proposed by the secretariat.
- 483.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson also supported the text proposed by the secretariat and welcomed a separate clause on this important matter.
- 484.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the suggested text, as it was important to take concrete action to protect children, in particular with a view to eliminating child labour.
- 485.** The Government member of Argentina proposed a subamendment to highlight specific challenges and exclusions that children faced, especially exploitation and lack of access to education, healthcare and social services. Families with children were especially vulnerable. He therefore suggested to add, at the end of the clause “including the implementation of family benefits that contribute to providing income security in childhood, in order to eliminate child labour and prevent other forms of child exclusion related to school dropout or lack of access to health services, among others” and to delete “in particular with a view to eliminating child labour” in the text before.
- 486.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson seconded the subamendment.
- 487.** The Government member of the Philippines supported the suggested text, as it was consistent with Recommendation No. 202, which also referred to income security and access to services for children in order to eliminate child labour.
- 488.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the subamendment as the original wording was stronger and made the message clearer.
- 489.** The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the initial text. Countries may face challenges to implement and finance what was proposed in the subamendment.
- 490.** The Government member of Argentina underlined the importance of social protection for children in many countries given the alarming indicators on child poverty, child

labour and access to social services for children. The experiences of countries in Latin America had shown the important contribution of access to education, facilitated through social protection benefits, to combating child labour. He also clarified that the clause would not create any obligations on countries.

491. The subamendment was rejected.

492. The new clause after point 12, clause (g) was adopted, and an amendment fell.

Point 12, clause (h)

493. The Chairperson explained that given that two amendments, proposed respectively by the Government members of Australia, China and Singapore, and the Government member of Egypt, were identical, they would be discussed jointly and no secondment was needed.

494. The Government member of Australia, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of China and Singapore, introduced an amendment to delete “and migrant workers” after “self-employment”, explaining that the reference was unnecessary and redundant, and the preceding descriptions were sufficient.

495. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not find any compelling argument for the amendment and did not support it.

496. The Worker Vice-Chairperson also rejected the amendment and explained that the specific vulnerability of migrants should be recognized as they often experienced difficulties in accumulating the necessary contributory density, especially to access pensions.

497. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that he did not support the amendment, as the terms relevant to the concept of portability were already reflected in the text.

498. The Government member of the Philippines said that she did not support the amendment as this was an important reiteration of the conclusions concerning the recurrent discussion on social protection (social security) adopted in 2011. She argued that the removal of this reference could imply that migrants did not suffer challenges regarding portability, which was far from the truth.

499. The Government members of Zimbabwe, and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that they could not support the amendment.

500. Both amendments were rejected.

501. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace “or” by “and” as governments should provide both options to preserve accrued entitlements and allow workers to transfer entitlements between jobs and countries. The preservation of entitlements was especially important for women and workers in non-standard forms of work who disproportionately experienced work interruptions. If these workers lost their accrued contributions after each career interruption, they would be less likely to access social security benefits and/or have lower benefits. The portability of benefits could also allow workers to move between jobs and transfer their contributions, which was especially relevant in the current labour market context. Such measures were also helpful for migrants in the case of bilateral social security agreements, to allow them to transfer accumulated contributions to another country, thereby making it more likely that they could accumulate the necessary contributions to access adequate social security when needed.

- 502.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of the Philippines, Zimbabwe, and Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment.
- 503.** The amendment was adopted.
- 504.** The Government member of Japan, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of China and Singapore, withdrew their amendment as the language was redundant.
- 505.** The Government member of Japan, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of China and Singapore, introduced an amendment to add “/or” after “and”, explaining that this granted the flexibility for governments to choose the most appropriate instrument, specifying that bilateral agreement could be more appropriate for agreements between partner countries with diverging systems.
- 506.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Australia, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the amendment.
- 507.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that while he could support the amendment, he felt that the suggested language was not ideal for such documents.
- 508.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that she did not support the amendment as it was unnecessary and added no value.
- 509.** The amendment was adopted.
- 510.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced an amendment to replace “migrants” with “all workers”, as bilateral and multilateral social security agreements did not exclusively apply to migrants, but, more broadly, to all workers, including migrant workers.
- 511.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, noting that the text referred to bilateral and multilateral agreements that were specifically concerned with facilitating access to social protection for migrant workers.
- 512.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 513.** The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that the clause referred specifically to migrant workers who moved between countries. He proposed a subamendment to add “, notably migrant workers” after “all workers”.
- 514.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that she did not consider this subamendment necessary as the group of all workers included migrants, but was flexible.
- 515.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that, except for a few very specific examples, bilateral or multilateral social security agreements referred specifically to migrant workers. He said he could nonetheless support the subamendment.
- 516.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of the Philippines supported the subamendment.
- 517.** The Government member of the United States supported the amendment, but not the subamendment.
- 518.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 519.** Point 12, clause (h) was adopted as amended.

Point 12, clause (i)

520. With no amendments submitted, point 12, clause (i) was adopted.

521. Point 12 was adopted as amended.

Section I, subtitle “Strengthening social protection systems”

522. With no amendments submitted, section I, subtitle “Strengthening social protection systems” was adopted.

Point 13, chapeau

523. With no amendments submitted, point 13, chapeau was adopted.

Point 13, clause (a)

524. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete the word “principles” in order to add clarity, as “principles” were already contained in international social security standards.

525. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.

526. Point 13, clause (a) was adopted as amended.

Point 13, clause (b)

527. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add “, adequate” between “comprehensive” and “and sustainable” since the aspect of adequacy was critical for providing effective protection against risks, and was equally important from an economic perspective since it strengthened aggregate demand and helped to respond to economic shocks.

528. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.

529. Point 13, clause (b) was adopted as amended.

Point 13, clause (c)

530. The Government member of Canada, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of the United Kingdom and the United States, withdrew an amendment to replace “the State” by “governments”.

531. Point 13, clause (c) was adopted.

Point 13, clause (d)

532. With no amendments submitted, point 13, clause (d) was adopted.

Point 13, clause (e)

533. The Government member of Burkina Faso, seconded by the Government member of Algeria, introduced an amendment to replace “, between “coordination” and “implementation” with “and”, and to delete “and delivery”, to avoid repetition.

534. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, stressing the importance of delivery for the timely disbursement of benefits.

535. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.

536. In line with the explanation provided by the Workers' group, the Government member of Argentina did not support the amendment. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, stressed the importance of delivery systems and did not support the amendment.

537. The amendment was not adopted.

538. Point 13, clause (e) was adopted.

Point 13, clause (f)

539. The Government member of Burkina Faso introduced an amendment which was not seconded and consequently fell.

540. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add "work" before "transitions", thereby clarifying the type of transitions, namely work transitions, to which the clause, which also mentioned the role of enterprises, exclusively referred.

541. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that, in this context, he could support the amendment. He asked for a review of the French translation to ensure accuracy.

542. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment in principle, but proposed a subamendment to replace "work" with "job" for more clarity.

543. The Employer Vice-Chairperson pointed out that the subamendment, by referring only to transitions between jobs, might omit persons who had been unemployed and found a job. He thought the formulation proposed by the Employers' group was clearer.

544. The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed with the argument of the Employer Vice-Chairperson, adding that this clause also addressed, for instance, skills development and vocational training, and therefore preferred the broader concept of "work".

545. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, withdrew the subamendment.

546. The Government member of Argentina supported the amendment.

547. The amendment was adopted.

548. Point 13, clause (f) was adopted as amended.

Point 13, clause (g)

549. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to move the last part of the clause, starting with "foster transitions from the informal to the formal economy", to the beginning of the clause, not to change the meaning but rather to put an emphasis on the need for transitions from the informal to the formal economy. While promoting a favourable environment for sustainable enterprises was important, it was not a key objective in relation to social protection.

550. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment as it changed the sense of the clause, which sought to promote the need for a favourable environment as a prerequisite for the transition from informality to formality, the prosperity of enterprises, decent work, and the sustainability of social protection systems. This would ultimately result in doing things opposite to the logical order.

551. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment, but also showed flexibility to move the discussion forward.

- 552.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment as it put an emphasis on the key element of promoting the transition from informal to formal.
- 553.** The Government member of Argentina, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the amendment, underlining that transitions from the informal to the formal economy were indeed crucial, including in the region; however the purpose of the clause was to emphasize actions that could achieve this objective, such as building a favourable environment, especially for micro, small, and medium-sized enterprises, that could support a sustainable and solidarity economy, in line with the Centenary Declaration.
- 554.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to eliminate the word “including” after “social protection”.
- 555.** The Government members of Argentina, and Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the subamendment.
- 556.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the subamendment, as it changed the meaning of the clause, and the Workers’ group amendment better reflected the position of the EU.
- 557.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson strongly rejected the subamendment as it completely changed the meaning of the clause, suggesting that transitions from the informal to the formal economy could be reached solely through promoting a favourable environment for sustainable businesses, however there could be numerous other ways. Referring to “including” was therefore prudent.
- 558.** The Government member of Canada, fully acknowledging the need to promote a favourable environment for sustainable enterprises, did not support the subamendment since the clause meant to focus on the need to promote the transition from the informal to the formal economy, and this could also be achieved by other means. She supported the amendment introduced by the Workers.
- 559.** The Government member of the United States rejected the subamendment.
- 560.** The Government member of Argentina said he could be flexible and agreed with the amendment introduced by the Worker Vice-Chairperson.
- 561.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, noting that the views were divided in the Committee, proposed that the secretariat make a suggestion that could be discussed later.
- 562.** The Chairperson suggested not pausing the discussion given the important number of pending issues and tight deadlines.
- 563.** The deputy representative of the Secretary-General recalled that the Transition from the Informal to the Formal Economy Recommendation, 2015 (No. 204), called for an integrated policy framework that addressed multiple dimensions, and highlighted that an enabling environment for sustainable enterprises was one important channel among others, such as the adaptation of national legal frameworks, reforms to administrative procedures, enabling employment and macroeconomic policies and social protection policies.
- 564.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson argued that his group’s subamendment had enough support, as it counted with the support of the entire Africa region.
- 565.** The Chairperson noted that the Workers’ group, and the Government members of Argentina, Canada, the United States, and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, had not supported the amendment.

566. The amendment was adopted without the subamendment.

567. Point 13, clause (g) was adopted as amended.

Point 13, clause (h)

568. With no amendments submitted, point 13, clause (h) was adopted.

Point 13, clause (i)

569. The Government member of Japan, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of China and Singapore, withdrew their amendment.

570. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete “, including collective bargaining,”, clarifying that he did not question the importance of collective bargaining, but that it was included in the formulation “social dialogue in all its forms”. Furthermore, the current clause discussed governance of national social security systems, which often included elements of co-governance between administrations, employers and workers, credit institutions and universities, and others. As such, the term “collective bargaining” was too narrow in this context.

571. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as that clause was not only related to governance, but equally to issues of ownership, accountability and trust in public institutions. In Iceland, for example, collective bargaining was of critical importance for managing and controlling the pension system for these very reasons. He underlined that collective bargaining was a vital tool used around the world.

572. The Government member of Argentina, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, did not support the amendment.

573. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, preferred the original text, as collective bargaining was a tool widely used by EU Members. Furthermore, she referred to the same formulation set out in the proposed resolution concerning a global call to action for a human-centred recovery from the COVID-19 crisis.

574. The Government member of Switzerland did not support the amendment, referring to the participation of social partners in the governance of the Swiss healthcare system.

575. The Government member of the Philippines did not support the amendment and made reference to the tripartite governance of the Philippines social security system.

576. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that tripartite governance reflected the idea that social dialogue was part of social protection in a broad manner, but not necessarily limited to collective bargaining.

577. The amendment was rejected.

578. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace “efficient” with “effective”, as this term implied maximizing the impact of policies, which was more appropriate than the term “efficient”, which implied doing the most with the least possible resources.

579. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.

580. Point 13, clause (i) was adopted as amended.

Point 13, clause (j)

581. With no amendments submitted, point 13, clause (j) was adopted.

582. Point 13 was adopted as amended.

Section I, subtitle “Sustainable and adequate financing of social protection systems”

583. With no amendments submitted, section I, subtitle “Sustainable and adequate financing of social protection systems” was adopted.

Point 14, clause (a)

584. Following the adoption of point 2 *bis*, the Government member of the United States withdrew his amendment.

585. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced an amendment to add “and, at the same time, progressively ensuring higher levels of protection” after “maintenance”, thereby ensuring close alignment with the two-dimensional strategy outlined in Recommendation No. 202.

586. The Worker and Employer Vice-Chairpersons had no objections to the amendment.

587. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, raised a concern regarding the translation in French and explained that he could also support the amendment insofar as the words “as soon as possible” were retained.

588. The secretariat clarified an inconsistency regarding the French translation, the amendment was adopted.

589. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete “as soon as possible”. Noting that a similar amendment had previously not received support, he proposed a subamendment to move the words “as soon as possible” and insert them after “medium and long term”.

590. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported neither the subamendment nor the amendment, preferring the original text as it better reflected Paragraph 13(1)(b) of Recommendation No. 202.

591. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the subamendment nor the amendment and preferred keeping the original text.

592. The Government member of the Philippines did not support the subamendment because it was not logical to insert it after “medium and long term”.

593. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, preferred to retain the original text as it better reflected Recommendation No. 202.

594. The Employer Vice-Chairperson understood that the majority did not support his amendment and demonstrated flexibility to allow the discussion to continue.

595. The amendment was rejected.

596. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, withdrew her amendment to insert “up-to-date” before “social security standards”.

597. The amendment was withdrawn.

598. Point 14, clause (a) was adopted.

Point 14, clause (b)

- 599.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert “, as well as efficient allocation of resources” before “as indispensable elements to ensure the creation of fiscal space”. He argued that it was only possible to ensure sustainability if the resources collected were used efficiently, transparently and in line with objectives, that is if the quality of spending was ensured. Both revenue collection, on the one hand, and ensuring transparent and accountable spending, on the other, were equally important to ensure sustainable social protection systems.
- 600.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, referring back to the earlier discussions on the use of “effective” versus “efficient”, proposed a subamendment to replace “efficient” with “effective”.
- 601.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Zimbabwe supported the subamendment.
- 602.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported both the subamendment and the amendment.
- 603.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 604.** Point 14, clause (b) was adopted as amended.

Point 14, clause (c)

- 605.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace “ensure” with “advance” since it was unrealistic, given certain national contexts, that countries would be able to “ensure” the adequacy and sustainability of nationally defined social protection systems.
- 606.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not agree with the amendment, as it was important to be more ambitious in the social protection agenda.
- 607.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed with the Workers’ group – “advance” changed the meaning and did not have the same impact, it weakened the meaning.
- 608.** The Government member of Zimbabwe did not support the amendment.
- 609.** The Government member of Australia, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the amendment.
- 610.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson appreciated the support of ASPAG for the amendment.
- 611.** The amendment was rejected.
- 612.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace “, collective” with “in”. He queried the wording used in the translations of the amendment. He argued that the term “collective finance” was not appropriate and it was a new concept that was being introduced.
- 613.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson objected to the amendment, emphasizing that solidarity was a separate principle from collective financing. The inclusion of “collective financing” added clarity and was not a new concept but was referred to in Article 71 of Convention No. 102.
- 614.** The Government member of Argentina agreed with the Workers’ group that ILO documents often referred to the principles of social solidarity and collective financing.

The reference to “collective” was fundamental here and he did not support the amendment.

- 615.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment.
- 616.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson pointed out that not all schemes or pillars of social protection systems were based on solidarity and collective financing and proposed a subamendment to keep “collective” and to add “, when applied” after “financing” to reflect this.
- 617.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson rejected the subamendment, insisting that financing of social protection should always be collective.
- 618.** The Government member of Switzerland did not support the subamendment or the amendment. Convention No. 102 referred to collective financing.
- 619.** The Government member of Zimbabwe did not support the subamendment.
- 620.** The Government member of Argentina clarified that “national circumstances” were already referred to in the chapeau of the clause and rejected the subamendment.
- 621.** The amendment was rejected.
- 622.** Point 14, clause (c) was adopted.

Point 14, clause (d)

- 623.** The Chairperson said that if the amendment to be submitted by the Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, was adopted, then the two subsequent amendments would fall.
- 624.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced an amendment to delete the rest of the text after “benefit from social security schemes”. She observed that the sentence was not clear and was too convoluted, introducing many concepts. She asked for clarifications from the secretariat.
- 625.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment because the clause contained important content that should be kept, such as the idea that those with limited contributory capacity or small and medium-sized enterprises may need support.
- 626.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to retain parts of the text “taking into account the situation of business, in particular micro, small and medium-sized enterprises, as well as the contributory capacities of workers”.
- 627.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson suggested hearing the explanation of the secretariat requested by the Government member of Portugal. In any case, the Workers’ group could not accept the subamendment, as it was removing important ideas such as the protection of individuals from bearing an undue level of risk. It was important to ensure that the financing burden was shared in an equitable way.
- 628.** The deputy representative of the Secretary-General explained that the clause reflected Paragraph 3(h) of Recommendation No. 202, which referred to “the optimal balance between the responsibilities and interests among those who finance and benefit from social security schemes”. The formulation had aimed for a balance between the particular situation of business, specifically micro, small and medium-sized enterprises, and the risk of shifting an undue burden of risk on to individuals. This balance would be lost with the deletion and the subamendment.

629. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, withdrew the amendment.
630. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete “that individuals bear”, as enterprises could also face difficulties regarding their contributory capacity. It was necessary to avoid undue risk for both individuals and enterprises. He further noted that the texts in English, French and Spanish were not aligned.
631. The Chairperson clarified that the Spanish version had to be aligned; the French version was correct.
632. The Worker Vice-Chairperson disagreed with the amendment since it would substantially change the meaning of the whole sentence. This part referred to low-income earners who might not be able to afford social security contributions. It was these workers in particular who needed protection from having to bear undue labour market, financial and economic risks.
633. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment as it related to all people, which was the very aim of the text.
634. In line with the arguments put forward by the Workers’ group, the Government members of the Philippines and the United States did not support the amendment.
635. The Employer Vice-Chairperson pointed out that the Africa group had supported the amendment, so it was therefore not possible to say that a majority rejected the amendment.
636. The Worker Vice-Chairperson asked for a clarification on the intervention of the Africa group, as it had referred to “all people”, whereas the Employer Vice-Chairperson had explained that he was concerned about businesses.
637. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, clarified that, in a constructive fashion, he had noted that the deletion of “that individuals bear” would result in a more general expression that took into account both individuals and enterprises.
638. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that, in this case, the new formulation was not what was intended with this sentence, this would then also refer to governments.
639. The Employer Vice-Chairperson responded that the intervention by the Africa group had reflected his group’s intention exactly.
640. The amendment was adopted.
641. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete “through regressive taxes”, as the inclusion of this concept risked overlooking many other important aspects, and this was going into too much detail for the nature of the document.
642. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not agree with this amendment, emphasizing that certain taxes, such as the value added tax, disproportionately penalized low-income earners, who had a higher propensity to consume. It was therefore important to retain the reference to avoiding regressive taxation.
643. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment.
644. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, preferred the original text.

- 645.** The Government member of the United States proposed a subamendment: “including through regressive taxes”.
- 646.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson seconded the subamendment.
- 647.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment, observing that it brought the discussion back to the same concept. The document should not make recommendations to States regarding their fiscal structures; that was beyond the scope of what the recurrent item discussion should address.
- 648.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson quoted Article 71(1) of Convention No. 102, which explicitly referred to taxation: “ ... such benefits shall be borne collectively by way of insurance contributions or taxation or both in a manner which avoids hardship to persons of small means ... ”. So this was fully in line with ILO standards.
- 649.** The Government members of Zimbabwe, Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the subamendment.
- 650.** The subamendment was adopted.
- 651.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 652.** Point 14, clause (d) was adopted as amended.

Point 14, clause (e)

- 653.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that consultations had been held to find a consensus on clauses (e) and (f). He proposed two amendments jointly to delete “multi-pillar”, and to delete “while also allowing the existence of voluntary contributory schemes”. The issues being deleted in clause (e) would subsequently be addressed in clause (f) with text already agreed with the Employers’ group. The approval of the two amendments in this clause thus implied that the agreed changes to clause (f) also needed to be endorsed.
- 654.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson thanked the Workers for presenting this initiative and the good social dialogue they had had to develop the agreed text. He approved the suggested way to proceed and asked the Governments to also agree to the proposed process.
- 655.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed with the proposal that the Workers introduce their amendments first.
- 656.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson explained the amendments, underlining that there was no agreement among ILO constituents on what constituted a multi-pillar system or model. ILO standards only promoted a framework of two pillars: a zero pillar of social protection floors and a first pillar of contributory social insurance. He was also concerned about the potential confusion of using this term since the World Bank was promoting a multi-pillar model that rejected the importance of contributory social security and suggested replacing these with voluntary individual accounts in contradiction to ILO standards. He suggested to introduce the idea of different and voluntary pillars that were in line with the ILO normative framework in the following clause. He emphasized that the Workers’ group was not opposed to voluntary schemes, but the wording needed to accommodate the diversity of national contexts.
- 657.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson repeated that there was agreement on these amendments if the agreed text in clause 14(f) was also kept. This had an impact on the other amendments. He thanked all members of the Committee for their flexibility to reach a consensus.

- 658.** The Government member of Brazil said that, in principle, he would not have supported the amendment. Voluntary systems enhanced resilience and multi-pillar systems provided innovative, flexible frameworks that enhanced the stability of social protection systems. However, since there was an agreement between the social partners, he was flexible.
- 659.** The Government member of the Philippines supported the amendments. Her Government supported complementary schemes in order to ensure national coverage for pension systems, yet they were cautious about private individual account pension schemes as a replacement for public pension systems, which was not in line with Convention No. 102.
- 660.** The Government members of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, welcomed the agreement and supported both amendments.
- 661.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to add “and sustainable” after “equitable” at the end of clause (e).
- 662.** The Chairperson said that according to the rules this subamendment could not be accepted since it was in a different part of the text. It was only possible to propose a subamendment to an amendment submitted.
- 663.** The amendments were adopted.
- 664.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced an amendment to delete “more” before “equitable” as this was not needed, and weakened the message.
- 665.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced a subamendment to add “and sustainable” after “equitable”.
- 666.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment submitted by the Employers’ group.
- 667.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that she could accept the proposed subamendment.
- 668.** The Government members of the Philippines, and Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the subamendment.
- 669.** The subamendment was adopted.
- 670.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 671.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, withdrew two amendments in light of the agreement that had been reached.
- 672.** Point 14, clause (e) was adopted as amended.

Point 14, clause (f)

- 673.** The Chairperson pointed out that one amendment would fall if the following amendment was adopted.
- 674.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment and immediately subamended it, referring to the text negotiated with the Employers and the discussion on the previous clause for the explanation, so that the clause would read as follows:

~~ensure adequate, publicly organised social protection systems that include~~ complement social protection floors, ensuring adequate and higher levels of contributory social

security based on solidarity in financing and a fair division of contributions between employers and workers, ~~while also~~ and allowing for the existence of additional complementary pillars, including voluntary contributory schemes, in line with ILO standards and according to national circumstances;

- 675. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, which reflected the text that had been agreed.
- 676. The Government member of the Philippines was flexible.
- 677. The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 678. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew an amendment since voluntary contributory schemes had already been addressed under the previous amendment.
- 679. Point 14, clause (f) was adopted as amended.

Point 14, clause (g)

- 680. With no amendments submitted, point 14, clause (g) was adopted.

Point 14, clause (h)

- 681. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking also on behalf of the Government member of the United States, introduced an amendment to add “or marginalized” before “groups” as not only under-represented groups were in need of support, but marginalized groups as well.
- 682. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 683. The amendment was adopted.
- 684. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew an amendment to delete “broaden the financing base for social protection”.
- 685. Point 14, clause (h) was adopted as amended.

Point 14, clause (i)

- 686. With no amendments submitted, point 14 clause (i) was adopted.
- 687. Point 14 was adopted as amended.
- 688. Section I was adopted as amended.

Section II, title “Mobilizing ILO means of action”

- 689. With no amendments submitted, section II, title “Mobilizing ILO means of action” was adopted.

Point 15

- 690. With no amendments submitted, point 15 was adopted.

Section II, subtitle “Support for the formulation and implementation of national social protection policies and strategies”

- 691. With no amendments submitted, section II, subtitle “Support for the formulation and implementation of national social protection policies and strategies” was adopted.

Point 16, chapeau

692. With no amendments submitted, point 16, chapeau was adopted.

Point 16, clause (a)

693. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Canada and the United States, introduced an amendment to add “that are gender-responsive and” after “strategies” as it was important that all policies were gender-responsive.

694. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the proposed amendment.

695. There were no objections from the Government members.

696. The amendment was adopted.

697. Point 16, clause (a) was adopted as amended.

Point 16, clause (b)

698. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Switzerland and the United States, introduced an amendment to add “response and” after “crisis-” as there was a need to have crisis response as well as recovery strategies.

699. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson did not object to the amendment.

700. There were no objections from the Government members.

701. The amendment was adopted.

702. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced an amendment to add “as well as new measures such as investments in inclusive labour markets” after “crisis” to underline that social protection policies alone would not be sufficient to address the impacts of the COVID-19 and other crises. She introduced a second amendment to add “more resilient” before “social protection systems” to underline that social protection systems would need to be both sustainable and resilient to be able to respond to crises.

703. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and Worker Vice-Chairperson supported both amendments.

704. The two amendments were adopted.

705. The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of the Government member of the United Kingdom, introduced an amendment to add “meet national social protection needs and” before “respond” to clarify that social protection systems should also be able to respond to national needs, and not just crises.

706. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, the Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment.

707. The amendment was adopted.

708. Point 16, clause (b) was adopted as amended.

Point 16, clause (c)

709. With no amendments submitted, point 16, clause (c) was adopted.

Point 16, clause (d)

710. With no amendments submitted, point 16, clause (d) was adopted.

Point 16, clause (e)

711. The Chairperson said that if the amendment to be submitted by the Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, was adopted, the subsequent three amendments would fall.

712. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced an amendment to delete the clause as the text was a repetition and the importance of bilateral and multilateral agreements for providing access to social protection for migrant workers was already sufficiently reflected in other parts of the document.

713. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as this clause in section II of the conclusions was necessary to guide the work of the Office, whereas the other references to this matter were in the section on Member State action. Bilateral and multilateral agreements were extremely useful to facilitate migrant workers' access to social protection. Moreover, the proposed text had already been included in the conclusions of the recurrent item discussion in 2011.

714. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed with the Workers' group.

715. The Government member of Argentina did not support the amendment given the importance of international agreements in the field of social protection and regretted that, due to time constraints, such important points for the work of the Office could not be fully discussed.

716. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, agreed with all the previous speakers that it was necessary to keep this clause and did not support the amendment.

717. The Government member of the Philippines also rejected the amendment for the same reasons.

718. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, stated that the EU was in favour of multilateral agreements and the concern had been the repetition. She proposed a subamendment to delete "and their families" to align the wording with previous clauses.

719. There was no support for the subamendment.

720. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, withdrew the amendment.

721. The Government member of Egypt introduced an amendment to replace "support and promote" with "urge" because the role of the ILO was to encourage Member States to conclude bilateral and multilateral agreements.

722. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, seconded the amendment.

- 723.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment because “support and promote” was appropriate.
- 724.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment because “urge” would limit the scope of the Office’s work as compared to “support and promote”.
- 725.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment.
- 726.** The amendment was rejected.
- 727.** The Government member of Japan, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of China and Singapore, proposed an amendment to replace “bilateral and multilateral agreements” with “bilateral and/or multilateral agreements” to ensure consistency, recalling that the same had been agreed in clause 12(h).
- 728.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that “and/or” did not read well, but did not object to the amendment.
- 729.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson preferred to maintain the original wording as the use of “and” was stronger and increased the scope.
- 730.** The Government member of Zimbabwe agreed with the Workers’ group and did not support the amendment.
- 731.** The Government member of Japan stated there were differences between national systems and that the Government of Japan had been working on bilateral agreements rather than multilateral agreements. It was important to maintain flexibility and allow Member States to choose between bilateral and multilateral agreements according to their situation.
- 732.** The Chairperson recalled that a similar amendment had been adopted by the Committee previously.
- 733.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, insisted on the importance of guaranteeing consistency within the entire text and proposed a subamendment to delete “and their families”.
- 734.** The Chairperson clarified that the amendment under discussion related to the words “and/or” and that the requested subamendment was not in line with procedures as it did not directly relate to the amendment under discussion.
- 735.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson clarified that the clause under discussion addressed action by the Office, not by its Member States, and that therefore “and” would be appropriate.
- 736.** The Government member of Algeria did not support the amendment, thanking the Worker Vice-Chairperson for his clarification.
- 737.** The Government member of Canada agreed with the Workers’ group and also rejected the amendment, emphasizing that her Government wanted the ILO to support and promote both bilateral and multilateral agreements.
- 738.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the original text.
- 739.** The amendment was rejected.
- 740.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, in the interest of consistency and prior agreement, withdrew an amendment to replace “provide social security” with “provide access to social security”.

741. The amendment was withdrawn.

742. Point 16, clause (e) was adopted.

Point 16, clause (f)

743. With no amendments submitted, point 16, clause (f) was adopted.

Point 16, clause (g)

744. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced an amendment to replace “preservation and portability” with “preservation or portability”, noting that preservation and portability were two different concepts and mechanisms. With the wording “and”, it seemed that States were obliged to do both. It was more accurate to use “or” since already acquired entitlements might be preserved without portability, depending on the legal framework of each country.

745. The Worker Vice-Chairperson once again clarified that this clause referred to actions the Office should take. Governments should preserve accrued entitlements and make them portable when moving from one job to another or from one country to another. This was especially important for women, who disproportionately experienced interruptions due to care work, as well as workers on temporary contracts and in non-standard forms of employment, short-term contracts and platform work. If they lost their accrued contributions after each carrier interruption, they would be less likely to earn social security entitlements and would have lower benefits. Likewise, social security agreements allowed migrants to transfer accumulated contributions to another country, enabling them to reach the necessary contribution period and gain access to adequate social security. His group wished to keep both preservation and portability as options, not one or the other.

746. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed with the Workers’ group. Preservation and portability were two different things, which was why the text should include “and”, in order to do both, depending on the country context.

747. The Government member of Argentina, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, did not support the amendment for the reasons expressed by the Workers’ and Employers’ groups.

748. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, emphasized that portability was an issue to be decided on by individual States depending on their respective social security systems. She proposed a subamendment to say “and/or”.

749. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, emphasizing that his group wanted both portability and preservation, did not object to the subamendment.

750. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment, as “and/or” introduced ambiguity as to the actions expected of the ILO.

751. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, preferred the original text but indicated flexibility.

752. The deputy representative of the Secretary-General emphasized that the clause under discussion came under the section where the Office supported constituents in supporting the portability and preservation of rights.

753. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, in the light of the clarification from the secretariat, no longer supported the amendment.

754. The amendment was rejected.

755. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Canada, Japan and the United States, introduced an amendment to replace “strengthen” with “promote”, as the Office could not directly strengthen social dialogue at the national level.

756. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment as it weakened the original wording.

757. The amendment was rejected.

758. Point 16, clause (g) was adopted.

Point 16, clause (h)

759. The Government member of Japan, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of China and Singapore, withdrew an amendment to delete “, including collective bargaining mechanisms,”.

760. Point 16, clause (h) was adopted.

Point 16, clause (i)

761. With no amendments submitted, point 16, clause (i) was adopted.

Point 16, clause (j)

762. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of Canada, Japan and the United States, introduced an amendment to add “data collection” to the areas for which the Office provided advice. Data collection was very important to inform policy formulation.

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

764. The Government members of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and Argentina, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the amendment.

765. The amendment was adopted.

766. Point 16, clause (j) was adopted as amended.

Point 16, clause (k)

767. With no amendments submitted, point 16, clause (k) was adopted.

768. Point 16 was adopted as amended.

Section II, subtitle “Research and capacity-building”

769. With no amendments submitted, section II, subtitle “Research and capacity-building” was adopted.

Point 17, chapeau

770. The Government member of Canada, speaking also on behalf of the Government members of China, Japan, Singapore, the United Kingdom and the United States, withdrew an amendment.

771. Point 17, chapeau was adopted.

Point 17, clause (a)

- 772.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add “on the effective implementation of” before “on international standards”, to delete “on” before “international”, and to add “social security” before “standards”, in order to encourage their application in all countries, including those that had already ratified the relevant standards and those that had not yet done so.
- 773.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed with the arguments put forward by the Employer Vice-Chairperson, but proposed a subamendment to add “the ratification and” before “the effective implementation” in order to also promote ratification in addition to effective implementation.
- 774.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson suggested an additional subamendment to add “on” before “the effective implementation” for linguistic reasons.
- 775.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking also on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the subamendments and proposed a further subamendment to add “relevant” before “international social security standards” and to replace “social security” by “labour” as this was more encompassing.
- 776.** The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, asked for clarification as “ratification” only referred to Conventions, whereas “implementation” was relevant for Conventions and other standards.
- 777.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment suggested by the Employers’ group, which added to the clarity of the text. However, he could not support the EU’s subamendment as all social security standards that were up to date were relevant.
- 778.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not agree with the subamendment proposed by the Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States. In this context, a precise mandate related to social security was given to the Office.
- 779.** The Government member of the United States expressed preference for the original text, pointing out that giving overly detailed guidance to the Office was counterproductive in developing the flagship report. For instance, the report might also want to investigate the lack of ratifications or ineffective implementation as part of evidence-based comparative analysis. Rather than debating a long list of what should be included, that question should be left to the Office, using comparative evidence and analysis. Regarding the subamendment proposed by the EU, he remained flexible, yet considered “social security” more appropriate in this context.
- 780.** The Government member of Argentina did not agree with the idea of eliminating the specific reference to social security standards.
- 781.** The Chairperson concluded that there was not sufficient support for the subamendment introduced by the Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and it was rejected. She asked the social partners whether they wanted to reconsider their positions in light of the explanation provided by the Government member of the United States.
- 782.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the text including the additional subamendment proposed by the Employers’ group.
- 783.** The deputy representative of the Secretary-General said that it was important not to lose sight of what this particular clause referred to, asking the Office to undertake evidence-based and rigorous research on social protection and its impact, in order to regularly

produce a flagship report on the strategic objective of social protection. In line with the argument put forward by the Government member of the United States, she also noted that being too specific in this regard might make the task assigned to the Office more difficult, namely to carry out rigorous research on social protection in the light of ILO standards.

- 784.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, on the basis of the explanations provided by the Government member of the United States and the deputy representative of the Secretary-General, noted that his group had had no objections to the original text. It had reacted to the amendment submitted by the Employers' group. A focus on implementation alone, without looking at ratification as well, would have been insufficient. His group remained flexible on this issue.
- 785.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson observed that there seemed to be wide support for the currently proposed text. The aim had been to find a formulation that would refer to both countries that had ratified and countries that had not ratified the standards.
- 786.** The subamendments submitted by the Workers' and Employers' groups were adopted.
- 787.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 788.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add ", including best practices for strengthening the sustainability of social protection schemes" as an additional and very useful component.
- 789.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson in principle supported the idea of adding the consideration of "best practices", yet he did not support the sole focus on sustainability, which limited the scope considerably. He therefore proposed a subamendment to replace "strengthening the sustainability of social protection schemes" by "universal social protection".
- 790.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a further subamendment to add "ensuring sustainability and" between "best practices" and "achieving universal social protection".
- 791.** Noting that sustainability had already been extensively discussed and was covered in other points, the Worker Vice-Chairperson said that he did not support the subamendment introduced by the Employers' group.
- 792.** The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, welcomed the idea of supporting the exchange of best practices. He suggested an additional subamendment to add "at the national and international level" after "best practices".
- 793.** The Chairperson said that she understood the importance of sharing good practices, but also noted that the addition of too many qualifiers might limit the Office's ability and its flexibility in carrying out its work, in line with the explanation provided by the deputy representative of the Secretary-General. Furthermore, she encouraged the use of "good practices" instead of "best practices", as a "best practice" did not exist, and urged the members of the Committee to be flexible on this point.
- 794.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed deleting everything after "best practices".
- 795.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that it was necessary to consider carefully what this clause discussed, and that a specific mandate was necessary.
- 796.** The deputy representative of the Secretary-General thanked the Committee for the careful consideration they were giving to these matters and pointed out that it was not possible to elaborate a detailed research agenda in the present document. This would be done in the plan of action that the Office would prepare for the Governing Body in

November. The plan of action would aim to faithfully reflect the guidance that the conclusions of this recurrent item discussions provided.

- 797.** In light of the lack of consensus among Committee members, the Chairperson invited the secretariat to produce a compromise text for point 17, clause (a), which the deputy representative of the Secretary-General presented as follows: “undertake rigorous evidence-based research and analysis on universal social protection, its adequacy, sustainability and impact, including on the ratification and implementation of international social security standards and good practices, and continue to produce, at regular intervals, a flagship report on the strategic objective of social protection (social security)”.
- 798.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, the Worker Vice-Chairperson, and the Government members of Argentina, and of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, agreed with the text proposed by the secretariat.
- 799.** Point 17, clause (a) was adopted as proposed by the secretariat.

New clause after point 17, clause (a)

- 800.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment to introduce a new clause after clause (a) that read: “continue to collect and publish data on social protection and further develop data on adequacy of social protection and gender gaps in benefit levels and coverage;”.
- 801.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to insert “including best practices on the use of contributory voluntary schemes as a tool to advance efforts to close gender gaps” at the end of the suggested new clause.
- 802.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment as the amendment was about statistics and data collection and not about collecting good practices.
- 803.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the subamendment. The focus of the clause should be kept on data collection regarding adequacy and gender gaps.
- 804.** The Government member of Australia supported the original amendment.
- 805.** The subamendment was rejected.
- 806.** The Government members of the United States, and Australia, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the original amendment.
- 807.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed with the amendment, but proposed a subamendment so the text would read: “continue to collect and publish data on social protection and further develop data on adequacy and gender gaps in social protection”.
- 808.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the aim of the Workers’ group was to address gender gaps in benefit levels and coverage, thus the Workers opposed the subamendment, but remained flexible.
- 809.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment proposed by the EU.
- 810.** The Government members of Zimbabwe, Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Australia, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, disagreed with the subamendment and supported the original proposal by the Workers.
- 811.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment.

812. The subamendment was rejected

813. The amendment was adopted.

814. The new clause after point 17, clause (a) was adopted as amended.

Point 17, clause (b)

815. Two identical amendments had been submitted by the Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, and the Workers' group.

816. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced the amendments to delete the clause. She referred to previous Committee discussions about the fact that multi-pillar systems were not part of international labour standards.

817. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendments, highlighting the importance of carrying out careful analysis to gain a better understanding of the impact, advantages and disadvantages of different pillars. The clause was of utmost relevance for countries, particularly in the Americas and Africa.

818. The Government member of Brazil did not support the amendments and concurred with the Employers on the importance of carrying out research to enhance understanding of multi-pillar systems. Multi-pillar systems allowed innovation and provided flexible frameworks, enhancing resilience and stability.

819. The Government member of Australia, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the amendments.

820. The amendments were adopted.

821. Point 17, clause (b) was deleted.

Point 17, clause (c)

822. With no amendments submitted, point 17, clause (c) was adopted.

Point 17, clause (d)

823. With no amendments submitted, point 17, clause (d) was adopted.

Point 17, clause (e)

824. The Government member of Egypt introduced an amendment, but as it was not seconded, it fell.

825. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to include "peer" before "learning" as a means to provide clarity and emphasize the importance for countries to share good practices.

826. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.

827. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, requested a clarification regarding the French translation as he felt that the concept "apprentissage" was not adequately reflected and this was central, especially for South-South cooperation, including through institutions like the College of Social Security in Algeria.

828. The Chairperson underlined that this concern appeared to be a matter of translation and suggested that the word “formation” be replaced by “apprentissage” in the French version to better reflect the English text.
829. The amendment was adopted.
830. Point 17, clause (e) was adopted as amended.
831. Point 17 was adopted as amended.

Section II, subtitle “Effective planning and resource mobilization and allocation”

832. With no amendments submitted, section II, subtitle “Effective planning and resource mobilization and allocation” was adopted.

Point 18, chapeau

833. With no amendments submitted, point 18, chapeau was adopted.

Point 18, clause (a)

834. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to include “of the ILO Decent Work Agenda” after “objectives” to add precision to the text.
835. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
836. The amendment was adopted.
837. Point 18, clause (a) was adopted as amended.

Point 18, clause (b)

838. With no amendments submitted, point 18, clause (b) was adopted.

Point 18, clause (c)

839. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace “and contribute to the mobilization of domestic resources” by “at the national level” as a means to reduce redundancies since the clause already reflected the fact that resource mobilization was done at the national, regional and global levels. He asked the Workers’ group and the secretariat to confirm his understanding of the clause.
840. The deputy representative of the Secretary-General said that the clause was meant to reflect the need to mobilize resources for international development cooperation, as well as encouraging domestic resource mobilization. The amendment could impact this meaning.
841. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, based on this clarification, proposed a subamendment to add “complement mobilization efforts” after “systems”.
842. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment nor the subamendment since the original text was clearer.
843. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the new proposal, explaining that it emphasized the need to increase resource mobilization efforts at the national level.
844. The Government member of the United States, based on the explanation of the secretariat, did not support the amendment nor the subamendment as it unnecessarily narrowed the focus of the clause.

- 845.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment nor the subamendment as they weakened the text.
- 846.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson requested the secretariat to confirm if the subamendment reflected the clarifications given.
- 847.** The deputy representative of the Secretary-General clarified that “complement mobilization efforts” would not clearly reflect the domestic resource mobilization that was in the original text. The original text also illustrated the role of international resource mobilization for development cooperation supporting the mobilization of domestic resource. This would also be lost.
- 848.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment.
- 849.** Point 18, clause (c) was adopted.

Point 18, clause (d)

- 850.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace “including in order” with “with a view” to add precision and better reflect that if the impact of ILO support and the effectiveness of resource mobilization were demonstrated, that would facilitate resource mobilization.
- 851.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson was flexible but felt that the proposal from the Employers’ group limited the scope of the clause and said it was up to the Governing Body to bring this clarity.
- 852.** The Government members of Zimbabwe, and Australia, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the amendment.
- 853.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment because it limited the scope.
- 854.** The amendment was adopted.
- 855.** Point 18, clause (d) was adopted as amended.
- 856.** Point 18 was adopted as amended.

Section II, subtitle “Effective standards-related action”

- 857.** With no amendments submitted, section II, subtitle “Effective standards-related action” was adopted.

Point 19, chapeau

- 858.** With no amendments submitted, point 19, chapeau was adopted.

Point 19, clause (a)

- 859.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, withdrew an amendment to delete “up-to-date” before “ILO social security standards”.
- 860.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete “as well as their consideration in legal reforms” at the end of the clause. While he reiterated support for the ratification and implementation of ILO standards, he underlined that ratification was

not necessary to ensure the effective application of the standards and that not every country needed to undertake a legal reform to implement international standards.

- 861.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as it was important for ILO standards to inform social security reforms and discussions and provide greater clarity, even where they had not been ratified.
- 862.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment. She stressed that social security standards should inform legal reforms even if the related Conventions had not been ratified.
- 863.** The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment.
- 864.** The Government member of Australia, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the proposed amendment.
- 865.** The amendment was rejected.
- 866.** Point 19, clause (a) was adopted.

Point 19, clause (b)

- 867.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced an amendment, immediately subamended, to add “effective implementation of” before “Recommendation No. 204”. She explained that the purpose was to clarify that only Conventions could be ratified.
- 868.** The Worker and Employer Vice-Chairpersons supported the amendment.
- 869.** The amendment was adopted.
- 870.** Point 19, clause (b) was adopted as amended.

Point 19, clause (c)

- 871.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete “systematically promoting its ratification within” to make the text less redundant and emphasize that the ILO’s Global Flagship Programme on Building Social Protection Floors for All had other very important objectives beyond the ratification of Convention No.102, such as supporting constituents in the recovery from the COVID-19 crisis.
- 872.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, pointing to the words “including through”, which would not limit the action of the flagship programme to the promotion of the ratification of Convention No. 102. However, he emphasized the importance for the latter to be systematically promoted within the programme.
- 873.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, subamended the text, adding “systematically” before “promote”, while keeping the text as amended by the Employers’ group.
- 874.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed with the subamendment and the Worker Vice-Chairperson showed flexibility.
- 875.** The subamendment was adopted.
- 876.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 877.** Point 19, clause (c) was adopted as amended.

Point 19, clause (d)

- 878.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, withdrew an amendment which suggested deleting “up-to-date” before “ILO social security Conventions”.
- 879.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add “relevant” before “ILO Conventions” to clarify that this concerns social security standards specifically.
- 880.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, because it weakened the text and could open up discussions regarding which standards would be considered relevant.
- 881.** The Government member of Australia, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the proposed amendment.
- 882.** The amendment was adopted.
- 883.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace “Conventions and Recommendations” by “standards”.
- 884.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Argentina did not object.
- 885.** The amendment was adopted.
- 886.** Point 19, clause (d) was adopted as amended.

Point 19, clause (e)

- 887.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced an amendment to add “through consultations with experts and social partners” in order to highlight the importance of consultation with other partners, including experts.
- 888.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not object.
- 889.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed that consultation with social partners was important and proposed a subamendment to delete “experts and” and to include “and in close cooperation with experts on the subject” after “social partners” so as to better reflect the priority which should be given to consultations with social partners.
- 890.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, and the Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed with the subamendment.
- 891.** The Government member of Algeria proposed a subamendment to refer to “tripartite constituents” instead of only “social partners” so as to also emphasize the role of governments in this context.
- 892.** The Government member of the United States proposed a subamendment to add “including” before “through consultation” in order to avoid narrowing the scope of the Office’s action. The Government member of Canada seconded the subamendment.
- 893.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson was flexible regarding the subamendments introduced by the Employers’ group and the Government members of Algeria and the United States.
- 894.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendments.
- 895.** The subamendments were adopted.
- 896.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 897.** Point 19, clause (e) was adopted as amended.

New clause after point 19, clause (e)

- 898.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced an amendment to insert a new clause to read: “develop, through ongoing tripartite consultation, strategies to accelerate the implementation of Recommendation No. 202 towards universal social protection, using all of the ILO’s means of action”.
- 899.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson had no objections.
- 900.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to add “the ratification of Convention No. 102 and” before “the implementation”, as together these instruments provided a framework for the horizontal and vertical extension of social protection and were always advocated for in tandem.
- 901.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, and the Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the subamendment.
- 902.** The Government member of Argentina had no objections.
- 903.** The subamendment was adopted.
- 904.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 905.** Point 19 was adopted as amended.
- 906.** Section II was adopted as amended.

Section III, title “Reaffirming the ILO’s mandate and leadership in social protection in the multilateral system and promoting policy coherence”

- 907.** With no amendments submitted, section III, title “Reaffirming the ILO’s mandate and leadership in social protection in the multilateral system and promoting policy coherence” was adopted.

Point 20, chapeau

- 908.** With no amendments submitted, point 20, chapeau was adopted.

Point 20, clause (a)

- 909.** Given that other groups had submitted amendments on the clause, the Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew an amendment.
- 910.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced an amendment to replace “play a” by “reinforce its” to emphasize the ILO’s leadership role.
- 911.** The amendment was supported by the Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson.
- 912.** The amendment was adopted.
- 913.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking also on behalf of the Government member of the United States, introduced an amendment to add “strengthening” before “existing” and to insert “at the national as well as international level” at the end of the clause.

- 914.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, the Worker Vice-Chairperson, and the Government members of Argentina, and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment.
- 915.** The amendment was adopted.
- 916.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, with the aim of defining a clearer mandate for the ILO, introduced an amendment to include at the end of the clause “and in particular, proactively work to steer consensus within SPIAC-B and USP2030 on social protection concepts and promote alignment between multilateral institutions on the need to respect ILO standards”.
- 917.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson could not support the amendment, explaining that it was necessary to be cautious and respect the respective mandates of different institutions in the multilateral system. He proposed a subamendment to delete “concepts and promote alignment between multilateral institutions on the need to respect ILO standards” to reflect the need to coordinate actions without imposing on the other institutions.
- 918.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment as it was in contradiction with the ILO’s main constitutional mandate to promote standards.
- 919.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment introduced by the Workers’ group as it raised a valuable and important issue, presented a concrete way forward and recognized the ILO as the specialized institution for social protection.
- 920.** The Government member of the United States supported the amendment. He did not support the subamendment, indicating that the text did not indicate an intent to impose any action and that there was consensus for the ILO to ensure greater multilateral coherence.
- 921.** The subamendment was rejected.
- 922.** The Chairperson recognized that the Spanish translation of the text reflected a stronger meaning than the English text and suggested that this be corrected to resolve the concerns raised by the Employer Vice-Chairperson. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed.
- 923.** The amendment was adopted.
- 924.** Point 20, clause (a) was adopted as amended.

Point 20, clause (b)

- 925.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the Government members of the EU, withdrew an amendment.
- 926.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, as a means to present a concrete proposal for how the ILO could engage with the international financial institutions, introduced an amendment to include a sentence at the end of the clause as follows: “and engage with the World Bank on its next Social Protection Strategy, as well as with the International Monetary Fund with regard to its implementation of social spending floors and its policy advice and lending conditionalities related to social protection, with a view to ensuring respect for ILO standards”.
- 927.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, explaining that it was absurd to suggest that the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank should respect ILO standards. He asked for a clarification in this regard.

- 928.** The Chairperson confirmed that there were no issues with translation and the Worker Vice-Chairperson felt the text was clear.
- 929.** The Government member of Argentina suggested shortening the text to reach consensus. The suggestion was not seconded.
- 930.** The Government member of Algeria preferred the original text so as not to limit the text to specific institutions.
- 931.** The Government member of the United States strongly supported the amendment as it established a concrete proposal for action and pointed out that the text was not drafted in a way that could be understood as being excessively narrow.
- 932.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported this opinion, underlining that the text also served to emphasize the need for the ILO to play a more active role in the multilateral system.
- 933.** The Government member of Argentina confirmed his flexibility as a means to reach consensus.
- 934.** The amendment was adopted.
- 935.** Point 20, clause (b) was adopted as amended.

Point 20, clause (c)

- 936.** The Government members of Switzerland and the United Kingdom withdrew an amendment.
- 937.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add “in close collaboration with the tripartite constituents” at the beginning of the clause.
- 938.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment as the clause was part of the section which was addressing what the ILO, and evidently its tripartite constituents, should do specifically.
- 939.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment as it was redundant.
- 940.** The amendment was rejected.
- 941.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add “initiate and” before “engage” and to replace “the need for a new international financing mechanisms, such as” with “concrete proposals for” and to add after “Fund” “, which should contribute to greater consolidation and less fragmentation of existing international financing mechanisms and complement domestic resource mobilization efforts” due to the need to strengthen solidarity. There was a need to strengthen international solidarity by supporting such a fund and it could serve to consolidate existing mechanisms and support the financing of social protection in combination with other measures such as technical advice. The UN Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights had pointed out the need for the ILO to play a leading role in the governance and development of a possible fund given its unique mandate and technical expertise. The clause should also reflect the need for the ILO to initiate discussions. He underlined that the proposed text took into consideration the concerns that Government members had voiced. The time had come to take concrete steps towards ensuring coherence and securing the necessary resources to create a world that could better resist crises and promote social justice.

- 942.** The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment as it gave a strong mandate to the ILO to move forward to launch discussions and examine options without an obligation of achieving a specific result. He indicated flexibility as to the formulation, insofar as a mandate was given to the ILO in this sense.
- 943.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, recognizing the importance and relevance of the clause, proposed a subamendment to add after “explore options” “in consultation with tripartite constituents” and to rephrase the second part of the clause as follows: “and engage in discussions which should contribute to greater consolidation and less fragmentation of existing international financing mechanisms and complement domestic resource mobilization efforts, including, among other possibilities, a Global Social Protection Fund, to be submitted for consideration to the next session of the ILO Governing Body.” He was not against a financing mechanism but it was important to leave all options open and to have the decision discussed by the Governing Body as it went beyond the mandate of the current recurrent discussion.
- 944.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson objected to the subamendment because it weakened the mandate given to the ILO to initiate and engage in constructive discussions on an international financial mechanism. The deletion of “initiate” also weakened the text. He further underlined that since the International Labour Conference was the highest body of the ILO, the Governing Body was meant to execute the decisions of the Conference and not discuss or approve the discussions of the Conference.
- 945.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, preferred the original text as it was more balanced and allowed for the possibility of other financing mechanisms. She proposed a subamendment which she hoped reflected the concerns of the social partners as follows: “Initiate and engage in discussions on concrete proposals on the need for a new international financing mechanism, such as a Global Social Protection Fund, which could contribute to complement domestic resource mobilization efforts in order to achieve universal social protection.”
- 946.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment introduced by the Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
- 947.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment introduced by the EU but introduced another subamendment, which sought to add “and support” after “complement” and to include “in consultation with tripartite constituents” in the clause.
- 948.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the first part of the subamendment introduced by the Employer Vice-Chairperson but did not support the part that referred to consultations with tripartite constituents, reiterating that it was redundant as this illustrated something that was in itself the rule of the house. He also underlined that discussions were always taken in consultation with all partners and said that it raised concerns as to the inconsistencies the addition could create, in particular if it meant that a similar reference was needed every time the ILO’s decision-making organ was mentioned.
- 949.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, expressed agreement with the Workers’ group.
- 950.** The Government member of Brazil proposed a further subamendment to delete “the need for” before “a new international financing mechanism” for a matter of linguistic clarity. The Employer Vice-Chairperson seconded the subamendment.

- 951.** The Government members of the United States and Argentina supported the subamendment as it clarified the text.
- 952.** The subamendment introduced by the Government member of Brazil was adopted.
- 953.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the first part of the subamendment as introduced by the Employers' group.
- 954.** As there were no objections, the part of the subamendment to include "and support" was adopted.
- 955.** The Government members of Zimbabwe, Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed with the Worker Vice-Chairperson and did not support the second part of the subamendment that introduced "in consultation with tripartite constituents".
- 956.** The Government members of Argentina and Brazil supported the subamendment even if redundant.
- 957.** The subamendment "in consultation with the tripartite constituents" was rejected.
- 958.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson asked for clarifications as to why the subamendment was considered redundant and reiterated the importance of highlighting the tripartite nature of the ILO. As such, he submitted a further subamendment to include "tripartite" before "discussion on concrete proposals".
- 959.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson raised a point of order regarding the further subamendment proposed by the Employer Vice-Chairperson as it had been introduced after the previous subamendment had been rejected. He also said that the new subamendment was meaningless as it would refer to discussions with financial institutions in which the ILO was engaging on the basis of its tripartite mandate.
- 960.** The two subamendments introduced by the Employer Vice-Chairperson regarding tripartite consultations were rejected.
- 961.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the subamendment introduced by the Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States.
- 962.** The Government member of the United States supported the text of the subamendment but suggested a syntax correction to delete "could contribute".
- 963.** In order to achieve consensus, the Government member of Argentina supported the subamendment but requested that the importance of engaging in tripartite discussions be reflected in the report.
- 964.** The subamendment was adopted and, as a consequence, an amendment submitted by the Government member of Trinidad and Tobago fell.
- 965.** Given the discussions on the previous amendment, the Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew an amendment.
- 966.** Point 20, clause (c) was adopted as amended.

Point 20, clause (d)

- 967.** The Government of Egypt proposed an amendment which was not seconded and fell.
- 968.** Point 20, clause (d) was adopted.

Point 20, clause (e)

969. With no amendments submitted, point 20, clause (e) was adopted.

Point 20, clause (f)

970. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced an amendment to replace “hold” with “propose” and to add “who require assistance”. She wished to add nuance to the clause, and consider different national contexts.

971. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment.

972. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support replacing “hold” with “propose”, but remained flexible with regard to the inclusion of “who require assistance”.

973. The Government member of Argentina, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, did not support the amendment, which weakened the text, and called on the EU for flexibility on this matter which did not affect all countries in the same way. For most countries in GRULAC, this question was of utmost importance as had been made clear in all the statements throughout all the sittings of the Committee. The best possible coordination of Recommendations Nos 202 and 204 had to be achieved, as was also argued in many ILO documents. The Committee had agreed on concrete action in this regard in several clauses of the conclusions.

974. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, believed the ILO already organized consultations and would not want to limit ILO action to “proposing” consultations. The group did not support replacing “hold” with “propose”, but could be in favour of inserting “who require assistance”.

975. The Government member of Australia, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the amendment and declared his flexibility with regard to the wording “hold” or “propose”.

976. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, thanked the Government member of Argentina for the clarification and withdrew the amendment.

977. Point 20, clause (f) was adopted.

978. Point 20 was adopted as amended.

979. Section III was adopted as amended.

Approval of the draft conclusions concerning the second recurrent discussion on social protection (social security)

980. The Chairperson declared the draft conclusions concerning the second recurrent discussion on social protection (social security) adopted as amended. The secretariat would ensure correct numbering as well as make minor editorial edits.

981. She congratulated and thanked the Committee for its work, and acknowledged the tripartite consensus behind the Committee’s outcome. The conclusions provided important guidance for the ILO’s work on social protection. The draft resolution and conclusions would be submitted for adoption at the Conference plenary the following day.

Approval of the draft resolution concerning the second recurrent discussion on social protection (social security)

- 982. The Chairperson explained that the draft resolution was a technical element to give effect to the decision by the Committee. It had been made available previously to the Committee.
- 983. The Employer Vice-Chairperson presented an editorial question regarding the draft resolution, and asked the secretariat to adjust wording in the draft resolution to reflect the consensus reached in the Committee regarding the deletion of “access to” when referring to “universal social protection”.
- 984. The Chairperson confirmed that the draft resolution would be amended accordingly.
- 985. The draft resolution was adopted.

Closing remarks

- 986. The Employer Vice-Chairperson expressed his gratitude and appreciation to the Chairperson and the other Committee members for the enriching social dialogue, thanking his group, the secretariat, the technicians, and the interpreters for their support.
- 987. The Worker Vice-Chairperson concurred with the Employer Vice-Chairperson and also praised the Chairperson and his Employer counterpart for the constructive social dialogue. He thanked the Government members for their contributions during the difficult, intensive and long discussions. The agreed conclusions demonstrated that there was a need and a time for action and he congratulated Committee members for the progress made in this regard.
- 988. The Government member of Algeria, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, declared his thanks and gratitude to the Chairperson, the secretariat and the interpreters, as well as congratulating the members of the Committee, who he believed had shown both commitment and willingness.
- 989. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, thanked the Chairperson, the Vice-Chairpersons, the Drafting Group, the interpreters, the social partners and all other participants for their efficient work, and for their constructive and engaged discussions. The final conclusions would strengthen the principles outlined in Convention No. 102 and Recommendation No. 202 and represented a tangible step forward for achieving comprehensive, adequate and sustainable social protection for all as called for by the Centenary Declaration and SDG targets 1.3 and 3.8. Universal social protection extended beyond basic income support, also including a higher level of protection and access to a broader suite of services, providing support during critical transitions in the life cycle, pointing to the need to strengthen social protection systems to withstand future shocks, and ensuring that social protection policies and strategies were gender-responsive and promoted gender equality. The EU remained committed to the objective of universal social protection as the pandemic had reconfirmed the needs of all workers, including the self-employed, and to closing social protection gaps that predated the crisis in line with the reaffirmed pledge to protect people in the new world of work through a fair and inclusive recovery for all adopted at a recent Social Summit in Porto, reinforcing the European Pillar of Social Rights and its Action Plan. The EU and its Member States welcomed the actions identified in the conclusions, which urged the ILO to reinforce its leadership role regarding the promotion of social protection in the multilateral system, the provision of

technical assistance, including furthering discussions on financing mechanisms, and in the mobilization of resources for development cooperation. Recalling that social protection was not a cost, but an investment with high social and economic returns, the adoption of the conclusions would advance efforts to build comprehensive, universal, adequate and sustainable social protection schemes, with the ultimate goal of guaranteeing that every human being enjoyed a life of health and dignity.

- 990.** The Government member of the United States praised the Chairperson for her leadership and the Office and secretariat for their work. He also thanked his Government colleagues, the social partners and the interpreters. Most important was the need to support the most vulnerable and marginalized, and the Committee's work contributed to progress in this endeavour. He looked forward to further cooperation in the future.
- 991.** The representative of the Secretary-General and the deputy representative of the Secretary-General thanked the Committee members for their excellent work and reaffirmed that the Office would reflect guidance received in the follow-up action plan that would be submitted to the Governing Body in November 2021.
- 992.** The Chairperson acknowledged the unusual way in which the Conference had been held, with the need to work virtually. She thanked the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons, who had both been able to be present in Geneva, for their patience and support in solving the most critical issues. She thanked the Government members, and specifically appreciated the commitment and flexibility of Government members, Workers and Employers based in the Asia and Pacific region for working very late. Overall, the level of engagement, the commitment to technical discussions and the genuine search for solutions had been outstanding.
- 993.** Finally, she thanked the Reporter, who would present the Committee's report during the Conference plenary session, all members of the secretariat under the guidance of the Director of the Social Protection Department, and all support staff, and emphasized the wisdom, diplomatic skills and political guidance of the representative of the Secretary-General. It had been a privilege and a great learning opportunity for her to serve as Chairperson and she hoped to be able to support the ILO's tripartite discussions in the future. She concluded by highlighting that the draft resolution and conclusions would be presented to the Conference plenary for adoption.
- 994.** The Chairperson declared closed the last sitting of the Recurrent Discussion Committee.