



## ► Record of proceedings

5B

International Labour Conference – 109th Session, 2021

Date: 16 July 2021

---

### Reports of the COVID Response Committee

#### Summary of proceedings <sup>1</sup>

##### Contents

	Page
Introduction.....	2
Opening statements.....	2
Discussion of the draft Conference outcome document.....	5
Closing remarks .....	105

---

<sup>1</sup> The text of the resolution submitted by the Committee for adoption by the Conference was published in [Record No. 5A](#).

1. The Committee had before it a draft Conference outcome document entitled “A global call to action for a human-centred recovery from the COVID-19 crisis that is inclusive, sustainable and resilient”, which was appended to the Report of the Director-General.<sup>2</sup>
2. The Committee held ten sittings.<sup>3</sup>

## Introduction

3. The representative of the Secretary-General, Mr Greg Vines, Deputy Director-General for Management and Reform of the International Labour Office, stated how the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic had claimed over 3.5 million lives worldwide, causing unprecedented devastation and disruption to the world of work. The task of the Committee was both historic and daunting: to discuss and adopt a global call to action on the basis of the focused and accelerated implementation of the ILO Centenary Declaration for the Future of Work, 2019, that would place the world of work on a trajectory of inclusive, sustainable and resilient development with decent work for all. The Committee had a unique opportunity to discuss and adopt an outcome document that would ensure that the ILO remained relevant in a time of unprecedented crisis and that would help the world of work build forward better.
4. The Chairperson of the Committee emphasized that, during times of crisis, it was important for governments, employers and workers to come together and demonstrate the power of social dialogue to find solutions.

## Opening statements

5. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that any action by the ILO to promote a human-centred recovery must be rights-based, firmly rooted in the concept that action on social justice was needed to achieve peace and resilience, and also recognizing the key role of social dialogue based on the enabling rights of freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining. The growing and unsustainable levels of inequality in the world of work, which had further increased due to the COVID-19 crisis, needed to be reversed. Workers in the informal economy and in precarious jobs, who were already poor and lacked social protection before the crisis, were the first to lose their jobs. There was a risk that the crisis would lead to a further proliferation of informal, precarious and insecure forms of work. A human-centred recovery must ensure that all workers, irrespective of their employment arrangements, receive adequate labour and social protection. All proposed strategies must be gender-responsive, as during the pandemic, women in essential sectors and jobs had sustained societies and economies while exposing themselves to high risks and juggling work with family and education duties and were disproportionately impacted by the crisis as they were overrepresented in sectors that had gone into lockdown. Racism and

---

<sup>2</sup> Report I(B), *Work in the time of COVID*.

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

discrimination, which had increased dramatically during the pandemic, must also be addressed.

6. The vaccination gap between countries was widening, which would exacerbate existing income and social inequalities and would be a major obstacle to a sustainable and equitable recovery. The pandemic had shown the relevance and urgency of declaring occupational safety and health as a fundamental right, which the outcome document should therefore address more pertinently. It was concerning that the outcome document gave the impression that economic wealth and employment were dependent only on the private sector whereas social protection would concern workers and the public sector. It was important to invest in both private and public sectors, as they were key to recovery and the creation of decent work opportunities. Ensuring universal social protection and especially social protection floors was now more important than ever, and it was therefore urgent to provide for global solidarity and global resource mobilization to support poor countries in developing those systems. Digitalization, telework and platform work required proper regulations to reduce the risks involved and harness the benefits, which could be reaped with appropriate social dialogue and collective bargaining. Digitalization should also be considered in the context of a sustainable and green recovery. Telework had significant potential, but it also came with challenges, such as privacy and contractual issues. The ILO held a central role in promoting policy coherence in the multilateral system to promote a human-centred and inclusive recovery from the COVID-19 crisis based on the four pillars of the Decent Work Agenda.
7. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the pandemic had exposed many existing structural problems, such as increased mass informality, adverse business environments, ineffective skills systems and weak social protection systems, which had turned a health crisis into a humanitarian disaster. The crisis had also shown the important contribution of the private sector role in creating and retaining jobs. There could be no sustainable and resilient economic recovery without the private sector. The world needed to learn from the disastrous effects of the crisis and develop better policies. To that end, her group expected a practical, balanced and action-oriented document, addressing informality, promoting productivity, referencing a proper skills strategy, discussing the importance of an enabling business environment, and harnessing opportunities for digital and other technologies for both workers and employers. Any references to a “human-centred” recovery had to be clearly characterized as “sustainable and resilient”, as resilient labour markets could only be built through resilient enterprises, macroeconomic stability and a conducive business environment, including by reducing informality. Productivity was highlighted in the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), with SDG target 8.2 referring to higher levels of productivity through diversification, technological upgrading and innovation, and a focus on high-value-added and labour-intensive sectors. As the ILO is the custodian of SDG 8 on decent work and economic growth, it would be wrong to downplay the importance of productivity for inclusive growth in social and economic recovery. The issue was not just labour or company productivity, but macro-level productivity or total factor productivity. The ILO Centenary Declaration also contained critical language on productivity and productive employment, and remained a guiding beacon for recovery.
8. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, recalled the effects of COVID-19 on different sectors, in particular on micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs) and informal work. In view of that, governments had taken various policy measures with fiscal space available to them to secure and retain jobs through subsidies and other forms of support to the needy and vulnerable groups. The Africa group

looked forward to working with the social partners and the other Government groups to develop an outcome document that would speak to the world and help mobilize the required resources for recovery, both domestically and globally.

9. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of the Asia and Pacific group (ASPAG), noted with satisfaction that his group's suggestions during the informal tripartite consultations held in April and May of that year had been well reflected in the outcome document. He wished to remind the Committee that inequality was widening within and among countries and that there were enormous differences in the resources that could be devoted by countries to building forward better in response to the crisis.
10. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of the group of Latin American and Caribbean countries (GRULAC), stated that her group's overall priorities for the outcome document were on vaccine access, a strong gender perspective and tourism. GRULAC also favoured including references to supporting MSMEs and addressing informality and discrimination. The group was aware that it would be a non-binding document, but as a document issued by the International Labour Conference, its form and status remained to be clarified.
11. The Government member of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, speaking on behalf of the group of industrialized market economy countries (IMEC), recalled the importance of the outcome document and stressed the need to share its key messages with the international community to promote a coherent and coordinated recovery. IMEC hoped to engage constructively to achieve an impactful outcome document that could make a real contribution to response and recovery efforts in all countries.
12. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its Member States, said that Turkey, North Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, Albania, Norway, Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Armenia and Georgia aligned themselves with his statement. He noted that the COVID-19 pandemic had affected every aspect of the world of work today and would do so for many years to come, and that saving lives and jobs was still an immediate priority in many countries. The ILO had a crucial role to play in the recovery from the crisis and the strengthening of social cohesion through more inclusive and resilient societies and economic models. The ILO's contribution to the shared objectives of the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, its historic vocation of social justice and decent work for all, and its normative mandate, especially at the country level in the context of the United Nations country teams, were indispensable for fostering a human-centred, inclusive and sustainable recovery. The EU and its Member States strongly supported the call to action and noted the need to deal urgently with economic and social inequalities, accelerate the implementation of the Centenary Declaration and strengthen international cooperation. The outcome document would be a call addressed not only to governments, workers, employers and the ILO itself, but also to the wider multilateral community and the entire world.
13. The Government member of Argentina submitted a written statement in which she noted that States had taken many measures focused on safeguarding human life and health, which had mitigated the effects of the pandemic on employment. Her country had implemented income subsidies, benefits for furloughed workers and a prohibition of dismissals, among other measures. In the post-pandemic period, support of the international financial institutions would be key, and real economic growth should take precedence over fulfilling loan commitments.

14. The World Federation of Trade Unions submitted a written statement in which it proposed that the ILO's activities should include: a global call for the establishment of a stimulus fund for developing countries in which marginal workers had lost their jobs and income; the provision of vaccines to all workers free of charge; the application of international labour standards to migrant workers in receiving countries; and an appeal to host countries to ensure that migrants could safely return to their countries of origin.
15. The International Young Christian Workers submitted a written statement highlighting that the pandemic had underscored the importance of: robust social protection for all; valuing care work; multilateralism; occupational safety and health and dignity in work; adapting rights at work to digital work; opportunities and dignified working conditions for young people; and action to achieve real gender equality. The root causes of inequality, which had been exacerbated by the pandemic, must be addressed, and those who had profited economically must contribute to the common good.

## Discussion of the draft Conference outcome document

16. The Chairperson informed the Committee that 215 amendments had been received to the draft Conference outcome document <sup>4</sup> and proposed that, in the interest of expediency, Government groups should present a consolidated position rather than speaking on behalf of individual governments. He drew attention to the fact that the countries listed on amendments submitted by IMEC should also include Bulgaria and Croatia.
17. The Chairperson also announced that the Secretariat had identified a number of amendments that were purely editorial and had circulated to all groups written proposals on how those editorial matters could be addressed. As the proposals had been accepted, it was not necessary to discuss those amendments further in the Committee.

## Title of the document

18. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, proposed an amendment to change the title of the document from "a global call to action" to "an urgent call to global action".
19. The Employer Vice-Chairperson could accept the amendment, or the original wording. The Worker Vice-Chairperson preferred the original text, as in her view it was a call to action at every level, including local and regional levels, and therefore it was not appropriate to restrict the wording to refer only to global action.
20. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that, since the document under discussion was a global call to action, the original title was more appropriate and preferable. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, also stated his group's preference for the original text. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, had understood that the original title had already gained consensus in the informal consultations, which she preferred, but she could agree

---

<sup>4</sup> See [COVID Response Committee: Proposed amendments to the draft outcome document](#).

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

21. The Chairperson expressed the view that the call for action could take place at the global, regional, national or local levels. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, noted that the majority was in favour of retaining the original title, and withdrew the amendment.
22. The amendment was withdrawn.
23. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete the word “inclusive” from the title, so that it was coherent with the language used in the document submitted to the Governing Body of the ILO on the elements of a potential Conference outcome document.<sup>5</sup>
24. The Worker Vice-Chairperson was strongly opposed to deleting the word “inclusive” anywhere in the document, as she did not want to imagine what a recovery that was not inclusive would look like. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, noted that there had been a unanimous understanding in the informal consultations not to delete the word “inclusive”, as any recovery would not be sustainable without inclusiveness. He therefore did not support the amendment. The Government members of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG; Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC; the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC; and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, also did not support the amendment.
25. The Employer Vice-Chairperson clarified that her group supported an inclusive recovery, but had proposed the amendment in order to be coherent with other texts the Office had prepared for the Governing Body concerning the COVID-19 crisis. Given the possible misunderstanding it had generated, however, the Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment.
26. The amendment was withdrawn.
27. The title of the document was adopted without amendment.

### Preambular chapeau

28. No amendments were received to the preambular chapeau, which was therefore adopted without amendment.

### Preambular paragraph 1

29. No amendments were received to preambular paragraph 1, which was therefore adopted without amendment.

---

<sup>5</sup> GB.341/INS/4.

## Preambular paragraph 2

30. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert, after “tragic loss of life”, the wording “and damage to health and communities”, which was also an important devastating aspect of the pandemic.
31. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment but asked whether “people’s” should be added before “health”. The Employer Vice-Chairperson believed that the meaning was clear but was open to improvements to the wording. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, noted that there was a risk of opening up a list of the effects of the pandemic and stressed that the focus in the text should be on the impact on the world of work. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, also preferred the original text. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the amendment proposed by the Employer Vice-Chairperson.
32. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, proposed a subamendment to add “human” before “health” to clarify the text. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, supported the subamendment.
33. The amendment was adopted as subamended.
34. The Government member of United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, proposed an amendment to break the sentence in two, after “world of work”, to make it more readable.
35. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment and noted that it was similar to another amendment proposed by her group concerning preambular paragraph 3. The amendment was also supported by the Worker Vice-Chairperson and the members speaking on behalf of all other Government groups.
36. The amendment was adopted.
37. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, proposed an amendment to insert, after “losses in labour and business income”, the words “especially in the most impacted sectors”. The amendment was supported by the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons and the members speaking on behalf of all other Government groups.
38. The amendment was adopted.
39. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, introduced an amendment to move “and bankruptcies” to follow “enterprise closures”, rather than “supply chain disruptions”, as it was a more appropriate place. The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons and the members speaking on behalf of all other Government groups supported the amendment.
40. The amendment was adopted.
41. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert, after “enterprise closures”, the words “particularly for micro, small and medium-sized enterprises;”, as a reference to those enterprises was included in the Centenary Declaration and the Sustainable Development Goals, and they should receive due attention in the draft outcome document.
42. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the members speaking on behalf of all Government groups supported the amendment.



43. The amendment was adopted.
44. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed an amendment to insert the word “precarity” between “informality and insecurity”. She noted that there had been an increase globally in precarious work, and that such work did not provide stability and workers in precarious jobs were not covered by social protection. Precarity meant workers not knowing whether they would have a job or income from one day to the next, and probably not being covered by sickness insurance. She added that precarity also affected formal workers. The amendment was intended to highlight the issue, as it was not sufficiently captured by the terms “informality and insecurity”.
45. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that her group did not support the amendment, that there was no international instrument that defined “precarity”, and that its inclusion could be used ideologically, loosely and as a political weapon. It was therefore not appropriate for an international text. She recalled that there had been intense discussion of the term during the negotiations on the Centenary Declaration, and that the proposal to include “precarity” had not received support.
46. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, requested the Secretariat to provide clarification and guidance on the terms “informality”, “insecurity” and “precarity”. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, considered the term “insecurity” to be sufficient and did not support the amendment. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf GRULAC, supported the amendment. Given the various concerns about the definition, IMEC wished to engage in further discussion. Similarly, the Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, expressed his group’s willingness to support the addition, but also wished to see consensus.
47. The Worker Vice-Chairperson conceded that the word “precarity” was not agreed language in the ILO context; however, the term “precarious employment” was mentioned in the Employment and Decent Work for Peace and Resilience Recommendation, 2017 (No. 205), the HIV and AIDS Recommendation, 2010 (No. 200) and SDG target 8.8. Other terms had been attempted, including “non-standard forms of employment” in the 2015 recurrent discussion on labour protection, but none of them had secured the agreement of the Employers’ group. The purpose of the amendment was to make it clear that precarious work in the formal economy could not be considered to be decent work. The Centenary Declaration referred to ensuring that “diverse forms of work arrangements” provided for decent work, but that concept did not have the same meaning as precarity and would not work in the current paragraph, which was intended to relate to problematic developments.
48. The Employer Vice-Chairperson contended that the reference to informality and insecurity covered exactly what the Worker Vice-Chairperson was describing.
49. After consultations, the Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to insert, after “insecurity”, the words “of work and income” instead of inserting the word “precarity”. The Employer Vice-Chairperson accepted the wording in the spirit of compromise.
50. The members speaking on behalf of the Government groups supported the subamendment.
51. The amendment was adopted as subamended.
52. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, introduced an amendment to insert, at the end of the paragraph, “and exacerbated poverty and economic and social inequalities,” to acknowledge additional impacts of the pandemic.



- 53. The Worker and Employer Vice-Chairpersons and the members speaking on behalf of all other Government groups supported the amendment.
- 54. The amendment was adopted.
- 55. Preambular paragraph 2 was adopted as amended.

### Preambular paragraph 3

- 56. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, introduced an amendment to insert “older people as well as” before “the most disadvantaged and vulnerable”. Older people had been particularly affected by the pandemic, as their suffering had worsened, and the increasing use of technology and new ways of working risked leaving them behind.
- 57. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the inclusion of older people as a particularly affected group. However, her group had proposed a similar amendment to include a reference to older workers later in the sentence, in the list of individuals particularly affected by the crisis. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the Employers' group's amendment to include a reference to older people later in the sentence. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and the Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC supported including a reference to older people, and were flexible as to its placement.
- 58. The Government members of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, were generally not in favour of adding more groups to the list; however, they could agree to the inclusion of a reference to older people, which would be better placed in the latter part of the sentence. The Worker Vice-Chairperson clarified that her group's preference was to refer to “older persons” or “older people”, not “older workers” as in the Employers' group's proposed amendment. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed.
- 59. The Chairperson suggested using the word “persons” instead of “people”, so that the text would read as “persons with disabilities, older persons, persons living with HIV or AIDS”. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the proposal but noted that the word “persons” would then appear three times in the list. The amendment was also supported by the Employer Vice-Chairperson and the members speaking on behalf of all Government groups.
- 60. The amendment was adopted.
- 61. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment proposing to delete “and insecure work arrangements”, as the wording was vague and not part of the previously agreed terminology.
- 62. The Worker Vice-Chairperson highlighted that there had been a long discussion during the informal tripartite consultations in April and May on how to refer to workers who were not in the informal economy, but were nonetheless suffering from precarious working conditions that had been aggravated with the crisis. She argued that it was unacceptable to delete the reference to a group of potentially hundreds of millions of workers that should receive due attention in the draft outcome document. As the wording of SDG target 8.8 was “Protect labour rights and promote safe and secure working environments for all workers, including migrant workers, in particular women migrants, and those in precarious employment”, she suggested that the Committee could consider using the official UN term instead.

63. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, indicated the group's preference for the original language.
64. The Worker Vice-Chairperson wished to clarify that the amendment submitted by the Employers' group was proposing to delete "insecure work arrangements," which her group did not support. She had instead offered the wording from SDG target 8.8, which referred to "precarious employment" as an alternative for the Employers' group to consider. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that SDG target 8.8 referred to "secure working environments" and not "work arrangements" and thus was a reference to occupational safety and health issues. Therefore, the alternative suggested by the Worker Vice-Chairperson was not an acceptable substitute.
65. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, noted that while the language evidently did not have clear or universally agreed connotations, his group was flexible on whether to retain or delete it.
66. The Government members of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC; the United States of America, speaking on behalf of IMEC; and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, opposed the amendment.
67. The Employer Vice-Chairperson drew the Committee's attention to the fact that the inclusion of "insecure work arrangements" might challenge existing national labour legislation, for example concerning at-will employment or zero-hours contracts. This was a substantive issue as the term "insecure work arrangements" was ideological. The Worker Vice-Chairperson contended that it was not an ideological issue, as the text was merely describing conditions for millions of workers in the world of work today.
68. After consultations, the Employer Vice-Chairperson announced that she had agreed with the Worker Vice-Chairperson that "insecure forms of work" would be an acceptable term. The members speaking on behalf of the Government groups supported the proposal.
69. The amendment was adopted as subamended.
70. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace "those working in low-skilled jobs" with "low-skilled workers", as the emphasis should be placed on people rather than jobs.
71. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that her group preferred the original text, as it allowed for situations such as those in which highly skilled people, for example migrants, were working in low-skilled jobs. The members speaking on behalf of all Government groups also opposed the amendment.
72. The amendment was withdrawn.
73. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, introduced an amendment to insert "members of" before "ethnic and racial minorities".
74. The Worker Vice-Chairperson pointed out that membership involved a choice, whereas belonging to a racial or ethnic minority was not a choice. Her group preferred the original language. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that her group would follow the consensus. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the amendment. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf GRULAC, agreed with the Worker Vice-Chairperson that it was not appropriate to refer to "members" and preferred the original text.
75. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, explained that the amendment intended to keep the focus on individuals, and proposed a subamendment

to change “members of” to “persons belonging to”. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the subamendment. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the Spanish and French translations already referred to “persons belonging to”, therefore it was appropriate to align all three versions.

- 76. The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 77. The Chairperson noted the frequency of the word “persons” and requested the Secretariat to propose a revised text.
- 78. The representative of the Secretary-General subsequently presented the following revised text for the Committee’s consideration:

The crisis has affected the most disadvantaged and vulnerable disproportionately, particularly individuals in the informal economy and in insecure forms of work; those working in low-skilled jobs; migrants and those belonging to ethnic and racial minorities; older persons and those with disabilities or living with HIV/AIDS. The impact of the crisis has exacerbated pre-existing decent work deficits, increased poverty, widened inequalities and exposed digital gaps within and among countries.

- 79. The Committee supported the Secretariat’s proposal. Preambular paragraph 3 was adopted as amended.

#### Preambular paragraph 4

- 80. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert, after “job and income losses”, the words “in many countries”, as the disproportionate loss of jobs and income had not affected women in all countries, so a global statement would be inappropriate.
- 81. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as it would be difficult to find countries where women had not been disproportionately affected by the crisis.
- 82. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment, as it would make the text ambiguous. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, did not support the amendment either, as his group did not see any differences between countries on that particular issue. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, also wished to retain the original text, in particular since it was in the Preamble and thus reflected the global dimension of the pandemic. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, and the Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment.
- 83. The amendment was withdrawn.
- 84. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, introduced an amendment to delete “including” and to replace “because of their over-representation” with “because they are over-represented”. The intention was to make a more direct reference to women’s over-representation in the hardest-hit sectors.
- 85. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not oppose the amendment, as it provided clarification.
- 86. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as the deletion of “including” reduced the reasons for the disproportionate impact on women. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, also preferred to retain the original wording, as the proposed amendment narrowed the causes for why women had been

disproportionately affected by the crisis. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, also supported the original language, arguing that the proposal was too limiting and focused on a single cause, while there were other causes for women being disproportionately impacted. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, also preferred to keep the original text, as the scope was broader.

- 87. The amendment was withdrawn.
- 88. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew an amendment to delete “unpaid” before “care work”.
- 89. Preambular paragraph 4 was adopted as amended.

### Preambular paragraph 5

- 90. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert “successfully transition from education to work, continue education” in preambular paragraph 5. The younger generation had been particularly affected by the pandemic, and therefore it was appropriate to explicitly mention the impact on their education.
- 91. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, the Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group; the Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG; and the Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, all supported the amendment. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, welcomed the amendment, but questioned the term “continue education” and requested clarification about what was included in order to ascertain whether they supported that aspect. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported IMEC’s position.
- 92. The Employer Vice-Chairperson explained that the purpose of the addition was to complete the existing paragraph, as the crisis had profoundly disrupted opportunities for young people, making it harder for them to continue their education.
- 93. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, and the Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States supported the amendment.
- 94. The amendment was adopted.
- 95. Preambular paragraph 5 was adopted as amended.

### Preambular paragraph 6

- 96. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment in preambular paragraph 6 to insert “a new social contract and” before “concerted action”. She argued that the notion of the new or reinvigorated social contract deserved serious attention, as it was increasingly invoked in the international system as well as by the business world, the World Bank and many others as a term to describe what needed to be done to address existing social inequalities. Clear references to the social contract had been made by the UN Secretary-General in his 2020 Nelson Mandela lecture, in the ILO’s Report of the Global Commission on the Future of Work and in the Report of the Director-General to the current session of the Conference.
- 97. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that, in the informal consultations, the topic had been discussed extensively and rejected. Two years previously, it had also been discussed

at length in the Committee of the Whole on the Centenary Declaration and the decision had been taken not to include it. The Global Commission on the Future of Work had used the term in its report but it had been highly contentious. She therefore firmly rejected the proposed amendment. Moreover, she noted that it was a term taken directly from an international trade union manifesto.

98. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment, as there had been a general agreement to keep only clear and agreed language in the outcome document. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, did not support the amendment. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, and the Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, stated that, as there was no agreed definition of the term “new social contract” and its meaning and implications in the national context were unclear, they did not support the amendment. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment, but was open to considering alternative language.
99. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, responding to the Employer Vice-Chairperson’s comment, noted that over the last hundred years, many programmes that had started out as trade union programmes had become ILO Conventions and tripartite agreements. However, she could agree to revert to the original text.
100. The amendment was withdrawn.
101. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, introduced an amendment to insert “and the international community” after “governments and employers’ and workers’ organizations”, as the call for action was being made not only to ILO constituents, but also to the broader multilateral and international community.
102. The Employer’ and Worker’ Vice-Chairpersons and the Government members of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group; Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG; and Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, all supported the amendment.
103. The amendment was adopted.
104. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert “full, productive and freely chosen employment” before “decent work for all”, as had been agreed in the discussions on the Centenary Declaration.
105. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not see the need for the insertion, as the concept was already captured in the Decent Work Agenda. Singling out one strategic objective of the Decent Work Agenda and not the other three would set an unwanted precedent for future documents.
106. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the inclusion of “full, productive and freely chosen employment”, as it would provide the basis for decent work. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, could support the proposed amendment as it would add context, but could also support the original text. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the amendment. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, supported the amendment but proposed a subamendment to insert the word “and” before “decent work for all” to link the two concepts. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the subamendment.

107. The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed her concern that adding “full, productive and freely chosen employment” before “decent work” would give the impression that decent work did not include the concept of “full, productive and freely chosen employment”, and sought clarification from the Secretariat.
108. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment proposed by IMEC to insert “and” before “decent work for all”. She did not believe that a precedent would be set by adding “full, productive and freely chosen employment” to the sentence. She noted that all Government groups had supported the amendment and the subamendment proposed by IMEC.
109. The representative of the Secretary-General explained that from the Secretariat’s perspective, decent work referred to all four strategic objectives of the Decent Work Agenda, one of which was employment. From a policy point of view, it was preferred to refer to only decent work without breaking it down, but on a number of occasions, Committees had decided to make reference to employment or other specific strategic objectives. Therefore, there was precedent for either option.
110. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to add “including” before “full, productive and freely chosen employment for all” and place it after “decent work”. That would clarify that the latter concept was part of decent work.
111. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the proposed subamendment.
112. The amendment was adopted as subamended.
113. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, introduced an amendment to add “will further reverse gains and progress towards achieving” before “the goals of”.
114. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
115. The Government members of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group; Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG; Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC; and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, suggested a subamendment to add a comma after “employment” to improve the flow of the sentence.
116. The amendment was adopted as subamended.
117. Preambular paragraph 6 was adopted as amended.

### Preambular paragraph 7

118. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace “COVID-19 vaccines” with “treatments and preventive measures” and to insert “in all Member States”. She noted that vaccines were not the only measure to combat COVID-19. Hence, there was no need to be specific in the Preamble, which should be kept generic so that it could be relevant in the future.
119. The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed surprise at the proposed deletion of the reference to vaccines, as there had been broad support for vaccine access in the six informal tripartite consultations in April and May. She highlighted that 48 per cent of the European population had been vaccinated, compared with only 2 per cent in Africa. In that regard, closing the vaccination gap was relevant to prevent other gaps and growing inequality. Numerous



reports had shown that jobs and vaccination were top priorities in people's minds, which made jobs and vaccines priorities for the Workers' group.

120. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, rejected the amendment. According to the United Nations, the COVID-19 vaccine was considered to be a global public good, and the amendment undermined the purpose of the outcome document.
121. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, rejected the amendment. If there was an interest in mentioning other, broader health measures, they could be accommodated without deleting the reference to vaccines.
122. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, recalled that during the informal consultations, her group had been very supportive of strong language on vaccine equity. Preambular paragraph 7 was critical for the outcome document, so the group did not support the amendment.
123. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, did not support the amendment, as the reference to vaccines was crucial. The reference to treatments and preventive measures recurred in amendments to other parts of the document, therefore further discussion was required.
124. The Government member of Mali had submitted an amendment to insert, at the end of the sentence, the words ", taking account of the particular situation of Africa".
125. The amendment was not seconded and therefore fell.
126. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, introduced an amendment to insert, after "Urgent and coordinated action is also needed", the words "including in the multilateral context".
127. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, as did the members of all other Government groups.
128. The amendment was adopted.
129. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, introduced an amendment to replace "ensure that all people have" with "provide all people with", as "provide" was a more active verb and it reflected the reality.
130. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the amendment.
131. The Worker Vice-Chairperson preferred to retain the word "ensure", as it was stronger. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, also preferred the original text, as "ensure" reflected a sense of urgency. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, did not support the amendment either, as the group strongly believed that the language should be more ambitious and that "ensure" was stronger. After considering the remainder of the document, the Committee supported the Secretariat's proposal, which included the wording "ensure that all people have".
132. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace "that all people have speedy, equitable and affordable access" with "universal, free and immediate access"; to insert, after "vaccines", the words "as well as to tests, treatments and other public health tools, with fair distribution across all levels of society"; and to replace "which are" with "which is".



133. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that “universal, free and immediate” access to vaccines was very ambitious language which was not appropriate for a Preamble.
134. The Worker Vice-Chairperson responded that, although the text was non-binding, the ILO needed to be ambitious in its global call to action. The Workers’ group was calling for free vaccines, which would be universally accessible, administered with a sense of urgency and distributed fairly among rich and poor countries and within countries to all people.
135. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment but recommended that the wording should be checked against decisions of the World Health Assembly of the World Health Organization (WHO) for consistency.
136. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, suggested that while in some countries vaccines were free, “affordable” would be preferable in the context of national realities. Similarly, “timely” would be preferable to “immediate”, which might not be realistic.
137. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, recognized that many elements of the proposed amendments were aligned with GRULAC’s views. Nevertheless, affordable vaccines would be a more realistic approach than free vaccines. Furthermore, not every country would be in a position to provide immediate access to vaccines.
138. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, preferred to retain the wording “equitable and affordable” rather than “universal, free and immediate”. Her group had some concerns about the word “universal”, and proposed “global” as an alternative. The group also had concerns about referring to “free” vaccines. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, stated that “universal, free and immediate access to vaccines” also posed some concerns for his group.
139. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, introduced an amendment to insert “universal, timely” before “speedy, equitable and”, and to insert “free or” before “affordable”, as they were crucial considerations in relation to access to vaccines.
140. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the amendment would require further discussion, as it needed to be clear who would pay for the vaccines.
141. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, which was aligned with her group’s position, although her group preferred “free”.
142. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, introduced an amendment to replace “speedy” with “timely”.
143. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson had no preference for either “speedy” or “timely”.
144. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment and preferred to retain “speedy”.
145. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the amendment, but suggested that the language needed to be aligned with that of the WHO. The Government members of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment, as “timely” was a more appropriate term.
146. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, introduced an amendment to insert, after “vaccines”, the words “diagnostics and therapeutic and other

health products". The intention was to convey that treatments should be available in an equitable manner. The group stood ready to work on alternative wording to reflect that.

147. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, as the proposal to insert other measures to counter COVID-19 was similar to her own group's approach.
148. The Worker Vice-Chairperson also supported the amendment, but noted that more appropriate wording could be found.
149. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, was open to including such a concept if suitable language that enhanced the document could be agreed upon.
150. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment and stood ready to discuss alternative wording.
151. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, introduced an amendment to insert, after "critical to", the words "safety and health and to", in order to reflect that vaccines are critical to safety and health.
152. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that the amendment seemed unnecessary, but was open to further discussion.
153. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, as there had been debates on, for example, the benefits of reopening schools weighed against the risk to teachers' health. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and the Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, also supported the amendment.
154. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, did not support the amendment, as the text was becoming overly lengthy and the same notion already appeared elsewhere in the document.
155. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete "to curbing the growing inequality within and between countries and", as it was more important to focus on restarting economies.
156. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the members speaking on behalf of the Government groups did not support the amendment. The issue of growing inequalities was highly relevant and it was important to send a strong message on vaccine equity.
157. The representative of the Secretary-General noted that the Committee had been unable to decide on a number of aspects concerning preambular paragraph 7, and suggested that the Secretariat could present a proposal with a view to achieving consensus.
158. At a subsequent sitting, the representative of the Secretary-General proposed the following wording for the Committee's consideration:

Urgent and coordinated action, including in the multilateral context, is also needed to ensure that all people have timely, equitable, affordable and global access to quality, safe and effective COVID-19 vaccines, treatments and preventive measures, such as health technologies, diagnostics, therapeutics, and other COVID-19 health products, with fair distribution across all levels of society, which is critical to safety and health, to curbing the growing inequality within and between countries, and to restarting economies and building forward better;

159. The Committee members supported the wording proposed by the Secretariat.
160. Preambular paragraph 7 was adopted as amended.

### Preambular paragraph 7 *bis*

161. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new paragraph after preambular paragraph 7, to read: “Now is the occasion to address long-standing flaws in labour markets and education systems that have hampered decent work, productivity growth and sustainable development.” The purpose of the paragraph was to include a call to action in the text itself, not just in the title.
162. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, and considered that the paragraph was accusatory in pointing to long-standing flaws in labour markets and education systems. There were substantive clauses later in the document that addressed particular issues, which would be a more appropriate place to mention any flaws.
163. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the amendment.
164. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, did not support the amendment and considered that there were provisions in the rest of the document that addressed the relevant issues. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment, as it was not directly related to the impact of, or the response to, COVID-19. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and the Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, also opposed the amendment.
165. The Employer Vice-Chairperson explained that the intention was to give more direction and meaning to the Preamble, but conceded that the amendment had not received the Committee’s support.
166. The amendment was withdrawn.

### Preambular paragraph 8

167. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert, after the reference to the human-centred approach, the text “based on the ILO’s unique tripartite and normative mandate”, as those unique features of the ILO were not mentioned elsewhere in the Preamble. Inserting the reference provided a clear context to the whole document and sent a strong message to the outside world.
168. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, but proposed subamending it to add “structure” after “tripartite”.
169. The members speaking on behalf of the Government groups supported the amendment with the proposed subamendment.
170. The amendment was adopted as subamended.
171. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, introduced an amendment to insert, after the reference to the human-centred approach, the text “and support to a just transition”. She stated that the reference to a just transition was important, as it was included in the Centenary Declaration.
172. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as there were many other issues covered in the Declaration and no reason to single out a just transition. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, but proposed a subamendment to instead insert “and supports a just transition” at the end of the sentence.

173. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group; Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG; and Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the amendment with the subamendment.
174. The amendment was adopted as subamended.
175. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew an amendment to delete the word “inclusive” in reference to the recovery from the crisis, as the Committee had agreed to retain the term.
176. The amendment was withdrawn.
177. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, introduced an amendment proposing editorial changes to replace “the” with “a” before “foundation”, to delete “practical” before “road map” and to insert “a” before “road map”.
178. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the first part of the amendment was not just an editorial change, but a substantive one, and supported it, as her group believed that no single ILO text could be the sole foundation for the recovery. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed.
179. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC agreed that the first change was not merely editorial and stressed that her group considered the Centenary Declaration to be “the” foundation for recovery, as opposed to just “a” foundation for recovery. She stated that she could not support that portion of the amendment, and while her group could be flexible on the issue at other points in the text, it felt strongly about having that reference in the Preamble.
180. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, asked the Secretariat to explain the difference in meaning; the Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, concurred with the suggestion.
181. The representative of the Secretary-General noted that the use of “the” as opposed to “a” did not indicate that the Centenary Declaration provided the exclusive foundation for a recovery. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, did not support that viewpoint, as the substantive difference between “the” and “a” was the rationale behind that particular aspect of the amendment.
182. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported retaining “the” foundation, on the understanding that it was not excluding other responses to the crisis, but rather it indicated that the Declaration was at the centre of their discussion as the way forward.
183. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, proposed “a key foundation” as an alternative.
184. In the interest of reaching consensus, IMEC subsequently withdrew the amendment.
185. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new sentence in preambular paragraph 8 to read: “It recognizes the important role of the private sector as a principal source of economic growth and job creation”. She emphasized the importance of recognizing the role of the private sector as a principal source of economic growth and job creation, as it employed 90 per cent of the workforce and thus it would play a critical role in the recovery of employment. Moreover, the Centenary Declaration had recognized the role of the private sector in economic growth and job creation.
186. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as her group did not wish to include specific references in the Preamble, which should be kept generic. She added that

there was already important language in several clauses of the outcome document relating to the role of the private sector. Therefore, she insisted that a reference to the private sector could not be included in the Preamble without also including a reference to social dialogue.

187. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment, as although the Centenary Declaration had recognized the importance of the private sector in job creation, it was inappropriate to include such wording in the Preamble, which should be general. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the amendment, as the private sector indeed played an important role in job creation, but he said that he would support the consensus. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, agreed with the principle of recognizing the private sector but preferred to keep the text focused on the Centenary Declaration and did not support the amendment.
188. The Government members of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU, did not support the amendment. They agreed that the Preamble should remain general and noted that the reference to the importance of the private sector was already covered later in the text.
189. The amendment was withdrawn.
190. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, introduced an amendment to insert “effective” before “investment” to make it clear that any investment needed to be effective.
191. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as inserting “effective” would not improve the sentence.
192. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, acknowledged that all investments needed to be effective and thus it was unclear what value the qualifier added other than lengthening the text. He would, nonetheless, support the consensus. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, did not support the amendment, as it was not necessary to add a qualifier. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, stated that her group was flexible on whether to insert “effective”. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment.
193. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that she would follow the majority, which did not see the need to add “effective”.
194. The amendment was withdrawn.
195. Preambular paragraph 8 was adopted as amended.

### Preambular paragraph 9

196. The representative of the Secretary-General noted that some questions had been raised as to the formal status of the outcome document. The Legal Adviser had recommended that the most appropriate mechanism was to submit it as a resolution of the Conference. Therefore, the Secretariat proposed to delete the preambular paragraph 9 and to insert instead the following new text as new Preamble of the resolution:

The General Conference of the International Labour Organization,

Having received the proposal made by the Conference Committee on the Response to COVID-19,

Considering the urgent need for action to ensure a human-centred recovery from the COVID-19 crisis,

Adopts, this [...] day of June of the year two thousand and twenty-one, the following resolution.

A global call to action for a human-centred recovery from the COVID-19 crisis that is inclusive, sustainable and resilient.

The words “Considering that” would then be deleted and the text would continue with “The coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic...”.

- 197.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson had no objection to the new structure but wished to subamend the text to add “sustainable and resilient” to the first reference to “a human-centred recovery”, in line with the Centenary Declaration.
- 198.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment, and noted that that issue had already been discussed in relation to the title, when the groups had stated their preference to retain “inclusive” as well as “sustainable and resilient”. It was not necessary to include the adjectives in the wording of the introduction to the resolution as well as the title. However, if the Committee did decide to insert the adjectives, it would have to be all three of them.
- 199.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the insertion of “inclusive, sustainable and resilient” in the first reference within resolution to the “human-centred recovery”.
- 200.** The representative of the Secretary-General explained that the wording that followed immediately from the resolution was the title of the document, which included “inclusive, sustainable and resilient”. It was therefore not necessary to insert it within the introductory text in addition.
- 201.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, reiterated the necessity to insert “inclusive”, as it was critically important for the three terms to be listed together.
- 202.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, noted that her group would need to consult before it could endorse the introductory text for the proposed resolution, but she agreed that it was important to include all three adjectives when referring to the human-centred recovery.
- 203.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, agreed with the Secretariat that it was not necessary to insert “inclusive, sustainable and resilient” in the introductory text, as it followed in the title; however, if “sustainable” and “resilient” were inserted, “inclusive” was also necessary. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, concurred.
- 204.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace “ensure” with “deliver”, as it was a more appropriate verb in relation to the human-centred recovery.
- 205.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as she noted that the global call to action was being made to ensure that there was a human-centred recovery.
- 206.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, supported the amendment, as “ensure” was less realistic, given that the human-centred recovery could not be guaranteed. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed and had no objection to the amendment.



- 207.** After the Committee had discussed the remainder of the document, the Employer Vice-Chairperson accepted the verb “ensure” in the spirit of compromise, and also agreed to retain “inclusive, sustainable and resilient” for consistency throughout the document. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, noted that her group also preferred the verb “deliver”, but in a spirit of consensus could accept “ensure”.
- 208.** The Committee adopted the text and agreed that it should become the Preamble to the proposed resolution. As a consequence, the words “Considering that” were deleted and the former preambular paragraphs were integrated into the proposed resolution.

## Title of Part I

- 209.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to the title of Part I to insert “sustainable and resilient” before “human-centred recovery”.
- 210.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that a decision needed to be made on whether to refer only to “recovery”, to “human-centred recovery” or to “inclusive, sustainable and resilient human-centred recovery”. “Sustainable and resilient” should not be inserted without “inclusive”.
- 211.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that an agreement had been reached in the informal consultations to mention “inclusive, sustainable and resilient human-centred recovery” once in the document and thereafter only mention “recovery”, or alternatively to repeat all three qualifiers together.
- 212.** After the Committee had discussed the remainder of the document, the Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed that the title of Part I should read “Urgent action to advance human-centred recovery that is inclusive, sustainable and resilient”. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the proposal. The Government members of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, expressed some concerns about repeating wording already contained in other parts of the document, but in the spirit of compromise they could agree to the revised text. The Government members of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC; the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC; and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the revised title.

## Paragraph 1

- 213.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace “on a trajectory of” with “towards a”, noting that it was a linguistic change. She clarified that she was withdrawing the element of the amendment proposing to delete the word “inclusive”.
- 214.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, and welcomed the clarification that the word “inclusive” would remain in the text.
- 215.** The members speaking on behalf of all Government groups supported the amendment, on the understanding that the word “inclusive” would be retained.
- 216.** The amendment was adopted.
- 217.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, introduced an amendment proposing to replace “development” with “recovery”, as the outcome document concerned recovery rather than development.
- 218.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that her group would like to keep the word “development” and proposed a subamendment to include both “development and recovery” in that sentence. The



Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, supported the subamendment to include “development and recovery”.

- 219. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment and noted that “recovery” was limited to the short term, whereas the outcome document reflected the aspirations of the ILO Centenary Declaration and the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, both of which were concerned with development. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, concurred, but stated that his group could support the subamendment to read “development and recovery”.
- 220. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, did not support the amendment, as it narrowed the focus of the paragraph. She also noted that the Centenary Declaration and the 2030 Agenda concerned development.
- 221. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, remarked that the outcome document concerned the recovery from the impacts of the COVID-19 crisis. While his group could be flexible, it supported the amendment without the subamendment.
- 222. The Employer Vice-Chairperson could support retaining “development” in the text, and indicated that her group could be flexible on the issue. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the majority was in favour of retaining the word “development”, since even though the outcome document concerned the recovery, it was also expected to produce long-term effects.
- 223. The representative of the Secretary-General explained that the draft outcome document aimed to capture both short-term recovery and longer-term development.
- 224. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, noted that the human-centred recovery was expected to lead to sustainable development and that it was important to highlight that notion in the outcome document. She noted that the majority was in favour of retaining “development”.
- 225. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, said that her group had reconsidered and would withdraw the amendment.

## Paragraph 2

- 226. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment proposing to add “and national” between “regional” and “cooperation”. She noted that it was important to address cooperation at all levels, including the national level.
- 227. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the outcome document addressed the global dimension of the crisis and that paragraph 2 in particular concerned international cooperation. She requested clarification on the concept of “national cooperation”.
- 228. The Employer Vice-Chairperson explained that the document referred to the actions of Member States and that “national cooperation” signified cooperation between States.
- 229. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment, as the global call for action aimed at promoting cooperation in the multilateral system and it was unclear how national cooperation, which was in the domain of sovereign nations, could contribute. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, indicated that his group was flexible about the proposed amendment, but questioned the value of inserting a reference to “national cooperation”.

The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, did not support the amendment, as the paragraph concerned global cooperation and it was not necessary to insert “national cooperation”. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, also opposed the amendment, as cooperation between States was already covered by “international cooperation”. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, concurred.

- 230.** The amendment was withdrawn.
- 231.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, introduced an amendment to add “humanitarian” between “social” and “environmental”. She explained that international cooperation on humanitarian matters would be important for ensuring policy coherence in the recovery.
- 232.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the inclusion of the word “humanitarian”, but proposed a subamendment to place it after “environmental”, as “economic, social and environmental” were usually listed together.
- 233.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that the ILO’s mandate should not be further extended and requested to hear the views of the Government groups.
- 234.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, sought clarification on whether the concept of “social” already encompassed “humanitarian”. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, concurred with the Employer Vice-Chairperson that “humanitarian” exceeded the ILO’s mandate. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the amendment and the subamendment. The Government member of the Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States supported the amendment and explained that “humanitarian” was not already included under “social”. He observed that health and the environment were also not technically within the mandate of the ILO, but references to them were nevertheless included in the text. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the amendment. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that her group would support the amendment.
- 235.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.

### Chapeau of paragraph 3

- 236.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to include “gender-responsive” before “strategies”. As paragraph 3 was the chapeau for the actions that followed, it was important to include the concept of gender-responsiveness in relation to all actions, rather than only having a separate clause with actions specifically focusing on gender equality.
- 237.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed with the importance of gender-responsiveness, but proposed that the concept should be included after the word “crisis”.
- 238.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment, but proposed a subamendment to read “strategies that are gender-responsive”. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, also welcomed the amendment and indicated that he was flexible on where it was placed. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the amendment. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, supported the amendment, with or without the subamendment.

- 239.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment proposed by the Africa group. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the strategies referred to how to build forward better, and that that must be done in a gender-responsive way. The Worker Vice-Chairperson clarified that the amendment related to making the strategies themselves gender-responsive and proposed as a subamendment “strategies that are gender-responsive”.
- 240.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 241.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, introduced an amendment to insert, after “strategies to build forward better from the crisis”, the words “tailored to specific situations and priorities”; to delete, after “national circumstances” the words “and priorities”; and to insert, after “including”, “for example”. She emphasized that IMEC was seeking an actionable document that offered constituents guidance on recovery. The document would need to relate to different national circumstances and phases of the COVID-19 pandemic. Further, the addition of “for example” was meant to indicate that while all of the subsequent actions were recommended, different countries would take different actions based on their situation and needs.
- 242.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson wished to clarify that the purpose of the document was not to suggest a menu of possible actions, whereby different parties could merely pick and choose what to do. She argued that adding “for example” was significant in that it would undermine the text that followed as well as the other amendments proposed by IMEC and the EU and its Member States. She indicated, however, that her group might be open to mentioning specific situations, but could not support the amendment in its current form.
- 243.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson considered that the amendment was appropriate and supported it.
- 244.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment, and considered that the original text was clear about taking into account national circumstances and priorities. Tailoring to a specific situation seemed rather static, as national circumstances changed, and his group also did not wish to single out specific examples. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, contended that the inclusion of national circumstances made the text open-ended and also opposed the amendment.
- 245.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, did not support the insertion of “for example”, as it would weaken the text by implying that the actions were merely examples. The group did support the notion of “tailored to specific situations and priorities”, as the action-oriented elements would require sufficient flexibility for countries to adapt them and national circumstances must be fully considered. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment, as it was very important to keep the text “tailored to specific situations”.
- 246.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson suggested inserting the wording “tailored to specific situations” elsewhere in the document instead. Her group preferred to have a clear list of actions and then a paragraph on how to characterize them.
- 247.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that she had originally supported the amendment, but if the consensus was to change its placement in the document then she could agree.
- 248.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, could not agree to omitting “for example”, as its inclusion was intended to make it clear that what followed was not an exhaustive list of possible policy actions that could be taken. She noted

that her group's proposal during the informal consultations to include a more detailed annex or toolkit of the types of possible actions had not received sufficient support.

- 249.** The representative of the Secretary-General responded that the Secretariat had tried to take into account all the various views when it prepared the drafting document. He noted that there were three references in the chapeau that provided for flexibility in line with the non-binding nature of the document: (1) "taking into full account national circumstances", which meant that whatever actions were taken were based on national circumstances and priorities; (2) "including", which by definition showed that it was not an exhaustive list, and (3) "by working to", rather than "ensuring" or "implementing", which conveyed that there might be other issues that would arise. As the word "tailored" provided additional flexibility, another suggestion would be to state "to build forward better from the crisis, taking into full account national circumstances and priorities".
- 250.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson maintained that she preferred the original text, which already offered sufficient flexibility, but could accept the proposal. The Employer Vice-Chairperson preferred to wait for a consensus to emerge.
- 251.** At the following sitting, the Chairperson informed the Committee that IMEC had circulated to the groups a subamendment to its own amendment, to read "tailored to specific situations and taking into full account national circumstances and priorities, including by working to". The subamendment received support from all other groups.
- 252.** The amendment was adopted as subamended.
- 253.** Paragraph 2 was adopted as amended.

### Title of paragraph 3(A)

- 254.** No amendments had been received to the title of section A, which was therefore adopted without amendment.

### Paragraph 3(A)(a)

- 255.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, introduced an amendment to replace "ensure" with "promote" before "broad-based, job-rich recovery", as "ensure" would represent too strong a commitment.
- 256.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 257.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that, for her group, "promote" was insufficient, as the document was an urgent call to action. She proposed "achieve", "work towards" or "pursue" as possible alternatives.
- 258.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, noted that the paragraph was intended as a reminder that these were not normal circumstances. He would therefore prefer a word even stronger than "ensure". Furthermore, the call to action was being made not only to governments but also to multilateral commitment.
- 259.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the amendment.
- 260.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the amendment, as "promote" would make it an action-oriented policy that was realistic and relevant enough for everybody to implement according to national circumstances and priorities.

- 261.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, noted that Member States were not in a position to “ensure”, but instead could “promote” or “try to achieve”. He noted that the majority supported the amendment.
- 262.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, stated that the word “ensure” was problematic for her group, as it was a synonym of “guarantee”, which was not realistic. Her group could accept “pursue” as an alternative to “promote”. She also noted that the majority supported the amendment.
- 263.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed that the Committee should decide on the wording of the chapeau before making decisions on the rest of the paragraph. As the clauses were preceded by “working to”, the text with the proposed amendment would read “by working to promote,” which for her group was too weak. She recalled the comment of the Africa group that the intention of the document was to deliver noticeable change. She added that “ensure” was not a guarantee, but implied deliberate action towards the goal. Therefore, her group did not support that amendment.
- 264.** The Government member of Ethiopia speaking on behalf of the Africa group, requested IMEC to reconsider the amendment, reminding the Committee that the world was in an emergency situation, in which it was critical to save lives and recover from the global economic and social crisis. For that reason, his group questioned the appropriateness of replacing “ensure” with “promote”.
- 265.** The Government members of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, and Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the amendment. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, acknowledged the support from some Government groups for the amendment, but was open to the Worker Vice-Chairperson’s proposal of a different word, for example “pursue”.
- 266.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed “provide for” as an alternative, as she considered “working to pursue” inadequate.
- 267.** After discussing the remainder of the document, the Committee adopted a proposed text from the Secretariat, which began with the words “provide for”.
- 268.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert, after “integrated national employment policy responses”, the words “recognizing the important role of the public and the private sector and the social and solidarity economy”. She explained that during the COVID-19 crisis, the public sector was providing not only care, health services and social protection, but also substantial financial support to the private sector. Moreover, for many countries, the social and solidarity economy had become even more important during the COVID-19 crisis.
- 269.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that, according to the World Bank, the public sector provided 10 per cent of employment, whereas 90 per cent was in the private sector. Furthermore, the social and solidarity economy was part of the private sector and only 6.5 per cent of it was paid employment. She proposed a subamendment to read “recognizing the important role of the private sector, including MSMEs and the social and solidarity economy, and the public sector as well as”.
- 270.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that by adding “as well as” in the sentence, “recognizing” would also refer to “supportive and stable macroeconomic and industrial policies”. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed replacing “as well as” with “including”. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the proposed subamendment.

- 271.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, noted that the amendment would place the social and solidarity economy on the same level as the public and private sectors, which his group found problematic. He did not support the subamendment proposed by the Employers' group, as the public sector played an important role in Africa and should not be moved to the end of the sentence. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the inclusion of the main elements but suggested re-ordering them. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the amendment and also the subamendment proposed by the Employers' group; it was important that the notions of the social and solidarity economy and MSMEs remained in the text. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, could support both the original amendment and the subamendment.
- 272.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the public sector created jobs and also provided important support to the private sector. Therefore, it would be appropriate to keep the public and private sector at the same level. She did not agree with placing the public sector at the end of the clause. She preferred to keep "recognizing the important role of the public sector and the private sector" in its original place. With reference to the "social and solidarity economy", she sought advice from the Secretariat whether it was appropriate to insert "including the social and solidarity economy" after "private sector".
- 273.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson emphasized that, as the private sector employed 90 per cent of workers and also included the social and solidarity economy, it was not appropriate to place the reference to it after the reference to the public sector. Furthermore, the vast majority of jobs were created by MSMEs.
- 274.** The representative of the Secretary-General explained that the clause was about ensuring a "job-rich recovery". It aimed to do that through two mechanisms: (1) through integrated national employment policy responses; and (2) through strengthened public and private investment in sectors. The wording recognized the important role of both the private and public sectors as part of the job-rich recovery.
- 275.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, proposed to retain the reference to "the public and private sector" without any reference to "the social and solidarity economy", as it risked a further debate on a list of particular elements of the economy.
- 276.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that in sections A, B, C and D, there was only one reference to the public sector, and only in relation to its role with regard to social protection, which she believed was insufficient, given the critical role of the public sector in the response to the crisis with the provision of indispensable public services, the support to the private sector and in generating employment. She was open to proposing a separate paragraph on the public sector. Alternatively, clause (a) could be split in two, with one clause on employment policy responses and the other on supportive and stable macroeconomic and industrial policies. However, her group would not withdraw any parts of the amendment.
- 277.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, noted that the social and solidarity economy was an important element and would not support removing the reference to it. However, her group was flexible as to where in the clause the term would be placed.
- 278.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that her group would like to retain the subamendment.



279. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, stated that it would be difficult for his group to support the subamendment. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the amendment, but not the subamendment, as his group considered that the public sector was usually listed first. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the amendment, but could also consider the Worker Vice-Chairperson's suggestion to add a new clause. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, supported the amendment, but was open to alternative wording.
280. The Employer Vice-Chairperson insisted that the text should read "the important role of the private and public sector", as the private sector was the largest employer. The Chairperson noted that the majority was in favour of placing "public" first.
281. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew an amendment to delete "and industrial" between "macroeconomic" and "policies".
282. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert, after "industrial policies", the words "and progressive taxation".
283. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment as she considered taxation to be beyond the mandate of the ILO.
284. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that fiscal policy was mentioned in the Centenary Declaration and therefore a mention of taxation seemed appropriate. She proposed a subamendment to read "fair taxation" instead of "progressive taxation".
285. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, argued that the concept of macroeconomic policy included monetary and fiscal policy, which covered taxation. As such, he considered that taxation was already addressed in the text and did not support the amendment. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, did not support the amendment either.
286. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, proposed a further subamendment to replace "progressive taxation" with "tax policies that support the needs of the most vulnerable". The term "progressive" was a concern for her group.
287. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, did not support the insertion of "and progressive taxation" in the text but indicated that her group was prepared to consider alternatives.
288. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, proposed a subamendment to replace "progressive taxation" with "equitable fiscal policies" in order to find a more balanced language.
289. The Employer Vice-Chairperson reiterated that taxation policy was beyond the mandate of the ILO. Her group could, however, accept the proposed subamendment of "equitable fiscal policies".
290. The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to include "education" between the "care economy" and "sustainable infrastructure".
291. The Employer Vice-Chairperson could support the amendment, but noted that the proportion of employment in the education sector was low.
292. The members of all Government groups supported the amendment.
293. The amendment was adopted.



294. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, introduced an amendment to replace “as well as strengthened” with “and promote appropriate” before “public and private investment in sectors hit hardest by the crisis”.
295. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment. The Worker Vice-Chairperson indicated that she preferred the original text.
296. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and the Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the amendment.
297. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, did not support the amendment.
298. The Worker Vice-Chairperson conceded that her group could support the amendment, pending the decisions on the wording used at the beginning and end of the clause.
299. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, introduced an amendment to insert “some” before “retail”, and to move “transport” to come after “tourism”.
300. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
301. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to insert “segments of” between “some” and “retail” and noted that that would be in line with the French and Spanish versions.
302. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the amendment.
303. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, could support the original text or the subamendment made by the Worker Vice-Chairperson.
304. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, explained that it was important to recognize that the crisis had not had an equal effect across the retail sector, with some segments badly hurt while other segments had prospered. Her group was open to alternative language to reflect that notion, whether it was “some segments” or “some retail”.
305. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, could support either “some retail” or “some segments of retail”, because not all retailers had suffered the same impact from the COVID-19 crisis.
306. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to add “arts and recreation” to the list of hardest-hit sectors.
307. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, could support the subamendment.
308. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, introduced an amendment to replace “sustainable infrastructure” with “infrastructure development”.
309. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment, as did the Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG.
310. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, welcomed the inclusion of “development”, but preferred also to retain “sustainable”. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed that it was necessary to retain “sustainable” before “infrastructure development”.

- 311.** The amendment was adopted.
- 312.** The representative of the Secretary-General explained that the purpose of the clause was to look at integrated national employment policy responses and the actions to be taken. He therefore suggested to split the second half of the clause into two subclauses, one on policies and the other on investment.
- 313.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the proposal.
- 314.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that she could not accept the proposal, as the private sector was not mentioned before the public sector.
- 315.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that he could accept the proposal but noted that his group would have preferred to retain “ensure” instead of “provide for” in relation to “a broad-based, job-rich recovery” at the beginning of the clause to show a stronger commitment.
- 316.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, said that his group was flexible on the text proposed by the Secretariat and could support it.
- 317.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that her group accepted the Secretariat’s proposal. With reference to the order in which “public” and “private sector” were placed, she said that her group was flexible, but emphasized the importance of retaining the reference to “the social and solidarity economy”.
- 318.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, accepted the Secretariat’s proposal and noted that her group was flexible on the order of “public” and “private” sectors.
- 319.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, accepted the Secretariat’s proposal.
- 320.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the Government groups had expressed their flexibility on placing “private” before “public sector”.
- 321.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson contended that the majority preferred the current order, “the public and private sector”. Moreover, the clause concerned integrated national employment policy responses, not the private sector; sustainable businesses and other matters related to the private sector were covered in paragraph 3(A)(c). In addition, the social and solidarity economy did not see itself as part of the private sector, but instead as connected to the public sector and the public good.
- 322.** The representative of the Secretary-General clarified that the common order was to refer to “public and private sector”. He nevertheless suggested that the text could read “the private and public sector and the social and solidarity economy”.
- 323.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the purpose of the clause was to recognize the important role of the private sector for a job-rich recovery. Her group had proposed to include MSMEs, which represented a much greater share of employment than the social and solidarity economy, but had compromised on that point. She supported the suggestion to use “private and public sectors”.
- 324.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the proposal to use “private and public sectors”. Moreover, she noted that the social and solidarity economy accounted for 12 per cent of the world economy, and an even greater percentage in some countries.
- 325.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson explained that paragraph 3 (A)(c) of the draft outcome document concerned business continuity and thus had a different purpose than the

paragraph being discussed, which was about recognizing the important role of the different sectors in the employment recovery. Private employers were committed to generating a job-rich recovery. It was crucial for private employers and their important role in generating employment and a job-rich recovery to be recognized in the text and that given that the majority of employment was in the private sector, it should come first. They had heard governments expressing some flexibility on this point and wished to know if they would support rewording. She indicated that should the private sector not receive its due recognition, then her group may not be able to vote in favour of the whole text.

326. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that in developing countries, the “private sector” covered not just the formal economy, but also the informal economy, and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) sought the support of governments to transition to the formal economy. This text needed to reflect the realities of all countries, including those where the public sector could not be replaced by any other sector. For these reasons, his group wished the Employers’ group could reconsider their position.
327. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, echoed the Africa group’s comments. The public sector played a crucial role in developing countries in particular, and its importance had to be acknowledged.
328. The Chairperson expressed regret at the lack of progress on the clause and requested each group to state whether they supported suggested text of the Secretariat.
329. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the members speaking on behalf of all Government groups supported the suggested text.
330. The Chairperson concluded that the majority was in favour of “public and private” and asked the Employer Vice-Chairperson to reconsider; otherwise, the matter would be put to a vote in the final sitting. The Employer Vice-Chairperson underscored the critical importance of the matter to her group’s acceptance of the outcome document as a whole and maintained that the Committee should return to discuss the matter subsequently or vote on it, and any other matters that remained unresolved.
331. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, raising a point of order, stated that she had been negotiating and would continue to negotiate on the basis of seeking consensus. There should be no need to put such matters to a vote, and one group’s acceptance of the final document should not be made conditional on the outcome of an issue such as the current one.
332. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, requested clarification, as it was not her group’s understanding that any undecided matters would be put to a vote during the final sitting; all decisions were supposed to be made by consensus. The Chairperson agreed that the intention was to reach all decisions by consensus, but said that he saw no remaining options other than a vote to resolve the current impasse. He clarified that the prospect of a vote did not necessarily apply to the other matters that had been unresolved.
333. After the Committee had discussed the remainder of the document, the representative of the Secretary-General proposed the following revised text for the Committee’s consideration:
  - (a) provide for a broad-based, job-rich recovery with decent work opportunities for all through integrated national employment policy responses, recognizing the important role of the public and the private sector and the social and solidarity economy, including:

(i) supportive macroeconomic, fiscal and industrial policies that also foster equity and stability; and

(ii) appropriate public and private investment in sectors hit hardest by the crisis, such as hospitality, tourism, transport, art and recreation and some parts of retail, and those with strong potential to expand decent work opportunities, such as the care economy, education and infrastructure development;

**334.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that she had reached an agreement with the Employer Vice-Chairperson, in the interest of making progress, to refer to “the private and the public sector and the social and solidarity economy”. The members speaking on behalf of the Government groups supported the consensus.

**335.** Paragraph 3(A)(a) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 3(A)(a) *bis*

**336.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, presented an amendment to introduce the following new clause:

(b) facilitate a speedy recovery within the travel and tourism sector, which has been one of the sectors hit hardest by the pandemic, bearing in mind its labour-intensive nature with positive spin-off effects on labour markets; its historically significant contribution to job creation; its favourable impact on employment opportunities for women; and its immediate, short- and long-term impact on the development goals in countries highly dependent on tourism, including Small Island Developing States;

She explained that, although the tourism sector had already been mentioned in the text, her group considered it necessary to include a more detailed reference, as the sector had been devastated by the crisis. Moreover, tourism was an important source of job creation, particularly for women, and was of strategic importance for the region of Latin America and the Caribbean.

**337.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that her group had included a reference to travel and tourism, among others, within a proposed new clause after paragraph 3(A)(c), but did not consider it appropriate to single out the sector in its own clause and therefore did not support the amendment.

**338.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson could support the amendment, but proposed a subamendment to replace “recovery within the” with “recovery towards a sustainable” travel and tourism sector.

**339.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, stated that his group’s main concern was that the sector had already been identified in the text and that it was not necessary to devote a separate clause to a specific sector. His group preferred to retain a concise text and thus did not support the amendment.

**340.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, appreciated the proposal and considered the elements were important as the travel and tourism sector had been hardest hit, but called for a more concise text.

**341.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, expressed some reservations about the placement and length of the clause but could accept it. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC proposed a subamendment to make the text more concise: “facilitate a speedy recovery within the travel and tourism sector, bearing in mind its labour-intensive nature and its key

role on labour markets". She proposed deleting the remainder of the proposed new clause or considering alternative text.

- 342.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed the following subamended clause retaining the reference to the countries:

facilitate a speedy recovery towards a sustainable travel and tourism sector, bearing in mind its labour-intensive nature and its key role in countries highly dependent on tourism, including Small Island Developing States.

- 343.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the Worker Vice-Chairperson's subamendment.
- 344.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that her group could accept the subamendment proposed by the Worker Vice-Chairperson to their amendment introducing a paragraph on the travel and tourism sector. The members speaking on behalf of all other groups also supported the subamendment.
- 345.** The amendment was adopted as subamended and paragraph 3 (A)(a) *bis* was adopted.

### Paragraph 3(A)(b)

- 346.** The Chairperson proposed that to expedite the proceedings, the Committee should look at all amendments to each clause or paragraph together.
- 347.** Paragraph 3 (A)(b) had received two amendments:
- IMEC had submitted an amendment to replace "through support for developing countries" with "and exchange of good practice for both developed and developing countries".
  - The Employers' group had submitted an amendment to replace "experiencing crisis-related reductions in fiscal and monetary policy space or unsustainable external debt obligations" with "in confronting the pandemic and pursuing recovery", and to replace "through" with "and" before "support" so as to broaden the scope of global solidarity.
- 348.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson announced that her group did not support either amendment.
- 349.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support IMEC's amendment.
- 350.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, rejected both amendments, as they changed the meaning of the original text, which was about support for developing countries, by providing more fiscal space to respond to the crisis.
- 351.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, agreed that both amendments changed the main message and his group did not support either amendment.
- 352.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC also did not support either amendment. Her group recognized the value of acknowledging the struggles of developing countries.
- 353.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, did not support the Employers' group's amendment, and in the light of the lack of support for her own group's amendment, withdrew it. The Employer Vice-Chairperson also withdrew her own group's amendment.
- 354.** Both amendments were withdrawn.

### Paragraph 3(A)(c)

**355.** Two amendments had been received to paragraph 3(A)(c):

- IMEC had submitted an amendment to replace, after “enabling environment”, the word “for” with “to promote innovation”.
- The Workers’ group had submitted an amendment to replace “crucial” with “important” and to replace “the private sector in generating strong, sustainable and inclusive economic growth” with “sustainable enterprises as generators of employment and promoters of innovation and decent work”.

**356.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, noted that the Workers’ group’s amendment also included a reference to “innovation” and as such, her group was prepared to support it and withdraw its own amendment.

**357.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment proposed by IMEC but did not support the one proposed by the Workers’ group.

**358.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, had no objection to either amendment, and asserted that this was a matter of drafting for the Secretariat to consider.

**359.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, could support either amendment and was likewise flexible on the placement of the reference to “innovation”.

**360.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, also supported both amendments.

**361.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson could be flexible on the placement of “innovation” in the text and noted that the wording chosen for her group’s amendment was explicitly taken from the Centenary Declaration so that it could be agreeable to all. That was a point of substance, as not every part of the private sector generated sustainable employment.

**362.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson recalled that the Committee was operating under different circumstances than the Committee that had discussed the Centenary Declaration and she therefore supported the original wording as it was more appropriate.

**363.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, said that, after consulting with his group, he could support the Workers’ amendment.

**364.** The amendment was adopted, and the clause was adopted as amended.

**365.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment proposing to insert a new clause after clause (c), to read:

as rapidly as safely possible, reopen businesses, borders, transport and communities and restore freedom of movement and commerce to pre-pandemic levels to minimize the loss of jobs and enterprises and the negative impacts on community and economic life, and to kick-start recovery;

**366.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment.

**367.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, was not in favour of a “one size fits all” solution, as the circumstances of each country were different and the opening of businesses, transport, border management and so on would depend on national circumstances. For those reasons, he could not support the amendment.

- 368.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, agreed that different actions were necessary depending on national context and did not support the amendment.
- 369.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, could not support the amendment, as different countries were at different stages of the pandemic and could not safely lift all restrictions at the same time.
- 370.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, and the Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, considered the amendment to be beyond the ILO's mandate and could not support it.
- 371.** The amendment was withdrawn.

### Paragraph 3 (A)(c) *bis*

- 372.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment proposing to insert a new clause after clause (c), which would read:
- adopt and implement policy guidelines conducive to more transparent and sustainable migration governance, ensuring that employers have access to the needed skills of migrants and that migrants, including returning migrants, have access to employment opportunities through legal pathways;
- 373.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson recognized the importance of referring to migrant workers in the document, and indicated that her group had considered submitting a subamendment to this paragraph that would recognize the plight of migrant workers in the pandemic, including international migrant workers, beyond the reference in the amendment to employers' having access to migrants' skills. She stated that if the Committee were amenable to including a reference to migrant workers in the outcome document that she could suggest additional wording that reflected the situation of migrant workers in more detail.
- 374.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, considered that the amendment did not capture well the reality of migrant workers and did not support it.
- 375.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, concurred with the Africa group and argued that the issue should be considered in a holistic manner, covering both countries of origin and of destination. He could not support the amendment in its current form.
- 376.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that it was difficult to reach agreement on the proposal on migration governance within one group, let alone by the whole Committee, since the language presented would need extensive consultations in order to find consensus. They could not support the amendment. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, and the Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, considered that the amendment exceeded the mandates of the ILO and of ministries of labour and did not support it.
- 377.** The amendment was withdrawn.

### Paragraph 3(A)(d)

- 378.** The Committee had before it six proposed amendments to paragraph 3(A)(d):



- The Employers' group had submitted two amendments: (1) addressing the measures needed to retain workers, to insert, after "wage subsidies", the wording "scope to temporarily alter roles, duties and work locations; capacities for job retention through redeployment or transfer, including to related entities and operations, without triggering severance allowances or other separation benefits" and (2) to delete, after "business support measures", the words "conditioned on retention of workers".
  - The Workers' group had submitted an amendment to insert, at the end of the clause, the words "while ensuring income continuity for the workers concerned".
  - IMEC had submitted two amendments: (1) to insert "targeted" before "wage subsidies" and (2) to replace "suspensions of" with "measures relating to" before "tax and social security contribution".
  - GRULAC had submitted an amendment to insert "and time-bound" before "suspensions" and then to insert, after "suspensions" the words "or reductions", and lastly to replace "tax and social security contribution" with "taxes".
- 379.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendments submitted by IMEC and GRULAC. She could agree to the amendment introduced by the Workers' group to add "while ensuring income continuity for the workers concerned" provided that her group's amendment to delete "conditioned on retention of workers" was adopted, as such conditionality was unfair to employers and did not reflect the reality in some countries.
- 380.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson was against the Employers' amendment to delete the reference to "conditioned on retention of workers". Many trade unions had fought hard in their countries in support of substantial subsidies to businesses during the crisis, but this needed to be done on the condition of employment retention. She added that the conditionality of employment retention was often part of collective bargaining agreements. For all those reason, she could not support the amendment. With reference to the amendment that her group submitted, she explained that it addressed a missing element in the text on the need to safeguard workers' incomes when working hours are reduced.
- 381.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported IMEC's amendment on targeted wage subsidies.
- 382.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson acknowledged the merit behind the EU, IMEC's and GRULAC's amendment as it was logical to talk about "measures relating to" tax and social security contributions but disagreed with and could not support GRULAC's further amendment to delete "and social security contribution".
- 383.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the IMEC amendment to include "targeted" wage subsidies. The Africa group did not support the amendment from the Employers' group. His group was of the view that the issue required social dialogue between the Employers' and Workers' groups and hence could not support the amendment. The Africa group was flexible regarding GRULAC's amendment to include "and time-bound" although they could not see much value added. The group agreed to the amendment on ensuring income continuity for workers.
- 384.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, did not support the Employers' group's amendment to delete the reference to retaining workers. They did not support the IMEC amendment to include the qualifier "targeted", but they supported the amendment to include "measures relating to" tax and social security contribution. ASPAG did not support GRULAC's amendment which introduced "and time-bound" and deleted "and social security contribution". Regarding the amendment from the Workers' group,

ASPAG did not think it was necessary to add anything after “retention of workers” and therefore did not support it.

- 385.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported IMEC’s amendment to include “targeted”. They did not support the amendment submitted by the Employers’ group. GRULAC were flexible about keeping the EU/IMEC amendment instead of their own amendment, but having heard the desire to retain the reference to “social security contribution”, suggested they keep both and were flexible to work on suitable language. GRULAC supported the Workers’ group amendment on income continuity for workers as presented.
- 386.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, noted that it was important that wage subsidies were targeted. IMEC did not support the Employers’ group’s amendment on removing the reference to retaining workers. They welcomed GRULAC’s flexibility to support the IMEC’s amendment as “measures relating to tax and social security contributions” offered a wider choice of options. IMEC did not support the deletion of “conditioned on retention of workers” but did support the amendment from the Workers’ group as they thought the point of retention of workers was in order to promote income continuity. The proposed a subamendment: “conditioned on retention of workers in order to promote income continuity for the workers concerned”.
- 387.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, preferred the IMEC amendment to that of GRULAC on taxes. They wished to retain the language from the original text as the role of the public sector was to support businesses and also lives and jobs and thus did not support the Employers’ group’s amendment. Regarding the amendment proposed by the Workers’ group, they believed the issues had already been covered on the social protection part but agreed with IMEC’s proposal for a subamendment.
- 388.** The Chairperson noted that the majority did not support the amendments submitted by the Employers’ group.
- 389.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew its first amendment on job retention options. However, she insisted on bracketing their second amendment since the retention of workers had been discussed by many countries and had not been retained as a policy measure during the crisis. Regarding the subamendment proposed by IMEC for amendment on income continuity, the Employers’ group did not agree as the substance did not make sense. Her group felt that the right to income continuity, as a result of redundancy or when on zero-hours or other short-time contracts, should not fall only on employers; it needed to also fall on social transfer schemes or labour market administrations. She did not understand the emphasis on income continuity as what was important was the continuity of the employment contract. The Employers’ group suggested a subamendment that removed “conditioned” and replaced it with, for example, “allowing for a maximum of retention of workers”. The word “conditioned” did not enable any companies the flexibility they needed regarding their own workforce in such crises. She suggested the Secretariat could propose wording that was less restrictive than “conditioned”.
- 390.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson wished to clarify what the paragraph was about, which was providing incentives to employers. In reality, many actions mentioned in the paragraph had been done since the beginning of the pandemic to ensure that economies and societies continued to function, and also in the interest of workers. The text mentioned “such as through work-sharing and shorter working weeks” which were often part of bargaining systems, but when they were part of incentives they often went together with guarantees.

It was not correct to ask workers to, for example, have a half working week and give up half of their salary. Keeping a worker on an employment list as a worker did not necessarily mean the worker kept one hundred per cent of his salary; therefore, retention as such was not sufficient to ensure income continuity. There were two different issues – retention and income continuity – and the Workers’ group thought both needed to be retained in the text.

**391.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG agreed with the compromise proposal put forth by IMEC.

**392.** At a subsequent sitting, the representative of the Secretary-General presented a proposal for a revised paragraph 3(A)(d) for the Committee’s consideration:

provide incentives to employers to retain workers despite crisis-related reduction of business activity, such as through work-sharing and shorter working weeks, targeted wage subsidies, temporary measures relating to tax and social security contributions, and access to business support measures in order to maintain employment and income continuity;

**393.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, the Employer Vice-Chairperson and the members speaking on behalf of the Government groups supported the proposal.

**394.** Paragraph 3(A)(d) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 3(A)(e)

**395.** The Committee had before it three proposed amendments to paragraph 3(A)(e):

- IMEC had submitted an amendment to delete “prioritize action to” before “support young workers”.
- The Workers’ group had submitted an amendment to insert wording in the first part of the clause, so that it would read: “prioritize action to support education, training and quality employment for young workers and self-employed and opportunities for young entrepreneurs to maximize their potential as a source of dynamism...”.
- The Employers’ group had submitted an amendment to replace “brighter” with “better” before “future of work”.

**396.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, explained that her group’s amendment aimed to avoid any potential discrimination implied by “prioritize action to support young workers”. As to the Workers’ group’s amendment, she proposed a subamendment to replace “quality employment” with “decent work”, and added that her group did not believe it was necessary to include “self-employed” as proposed in the same amendment.

**397.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment proposed by the Employers’ group to replace “brighter” with “better”. She supported the IMEC amendment to delete “prioritize action to”. Her group had expected more substance in this clause for young persons, as their needs were not mentioned elsewhere in the outcome document. Therefore, her group had proposed more language on the issues to be addressed, as well as the addition of “self-employed and opportunities for young [entrepreneurs]” to make the text more balanced. Her group would need to consult on the subamendment proposed by IMEC to replace “quality employment” with “decent work”.

**398.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the Workers’ group’s amendment with IMEC’s subamendment to replace “quality employment” with “decent work”.

399. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, also supported that aspect of the amendment, as well as the subamendment introduced by IMEC to replace “quality employment” with “decent work”. Concerning the reference to “self-employed and opportunities for young [entrepreneurs]”, he believed that young persons were already captured sufficiently in the text. His group supported replacing “who are an indispensable” with “to maximize their potential as a [source of dynamism]”.
400. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported all amendments for the clause, but introduced a subamendment to add “quality” before “education”. He also supported the subamendment introduced by IMEC to replace “quality employment” with “decent work”.
401. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, also supported all amendments for the clause, but proposed a subamendment to add “among others” between “support” and “quality education”, so that it would read “support, among others, quality education, training and decent work”. Her group believed that there were other ways to support young people and entrepreneurs to maximize their potential. Concerning the subamendment introduced by IMEC to replace “quality employment” with “decent work”, her group was flexible.
402. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, noted that the clause on the impact of young people was particularly important for his group. He supported the subamendment introduced by IMEC to replace “quality employment” with “decent work”. He questioned the inclusion of “self-employed” as part of the Workers’ group’s amendment. He explained that public training programmes usually targeted employees rather than self-employed workers. His group supported the Employers’ group’s amendment to replace “brighter” with “better future of work”.
403. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment introduced by GRULAC to add “among others”, the subamendment introduced by IMEC to replace “quality employment” with “decent work”, and the subamendment introduced by ASPAG to add “quality” before “education”. Her group did not agree to deleting “self-employed”, as those workers also needed quality education and decent work.
404. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that her group would like to retain the reference to “self-employed”. She questioned the proposal of GRULAC to add “among others”, as it would be understood that more could be done for young people besides the most important things, such as education and training. She requested the Secretariat to look at the sentence for possible improvement.
405. The representative of the Secretary-General requested clarification on what the “among others” referred to. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, explained that the “among others” referred to measures. The most important ones had been listed, but they were not the only measures to support young workers. The representative of the Secretary-General suggested that it could read “quality education, training and decent work, among other measures, for”. The Worker Vice-Chairperson contended that the current text did not exclude other measures and that quality education and decent work were not measures.
406. The representative of the Secretary-General presented a proposal for a revised paragraph 3(A)(e) for the Committee’s consideration:
- support education, training and decent work for young people, including workers, entrepreneurs and the self-employed, to maximize their potential as a source of dynamism,

talent, creativity and innovation in the world of work and a driving force for shaping a better future of work.

- 407.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to shorten paragraph 3(A)(e) by deleting “including workers, entrepreneurs and the self-employed”, as she did not think it was necessary to mention the different groups.
- 408.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the text as proposed by the Secretariat, but had no objection to the subamendment of the Workers’ group.
- 409.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the Secretariat’s proposal, as it was more inclusive, but could accept a focus only on young people if that was supported by the majority. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, also supported the proposal but proposed to include “quality” before “education”. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, had understood there had already been agreement to include a reference to workers, entrepreneurs and the self-employed, but if the Workers’ group preferred to leave it out, her group could agree. The group could support the Secretariat’s proposal with the amendment. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, had been prepared to accept the text proposed by the Secretariat, but was open to referring only to young people and to inserting “quality” before “education”. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, could agree to the Secretariat’s proposal, but preferred the version with the amendment from the Workers’ group and the inclusion of “quality” proposed by ASPAG.
- 410.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the inclusion of “quality education”.
- 411.** Paragraph 3(A)(e) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 3(A)(f)

- 412.** The Committee had before it seven proposed amendments for paragraph 3(A)(f):
- The Employers’ group had submitted three amendments: (1) to insert, at the beginning of the clause, “facilitating successful labour market transitions, particularly for young people, by strengthening” before “public and private investment”; (2) to insert, after “apprenticeships”, the words “career guidance”; and (3) to insert “public-private” before “partnerships”.
  - The Workers’ group had submitted two amendments: (1) to replace “more equitable and effective access” with “universal access” before “high-quality education” and instead insert “more equitable and effective access” before “training” and (2) to insert, at the end of the clause, the words “with special emphasis on the low-skilled and the long-term unemployed”.
  - IMEC had submitted an amendment to replace “strengthen” with “promote” at the beginning of the clause.
  - The Africa group had submitted an amendment to insert “skills development and” before “lifelong learning”.
- 413.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that her group supported IMEC’s amendment to replace “strengthen” with “promote”, the Africa group’s amendment to add “skills development” and the Workers’ group’s first amendment to refer to “universal” access to education. She did not, however, support the amendment to add “with special emphasis on

the low-skilled and the long-term unemployed”, as that would narrow the focus of the clause.

- 414.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, supported all the proposed amendments, with the exception of the Employers’ group’s amendment to add “public-private” before “partnerships” as that narrowed the scope of partnerships. However, she proposed subamending the Workers’ group’s amendment on “universal access to high-quality education” to refer instead to “universal access to quality education”, in line with the reference in the ILO Centenary Declaration.
- 415.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that her group did not have an objection to the Employers’ group’s reference to “facilitating labour market transitions”, but would prefer it to be placed elsewhere in the clause. The goal was to strengthen public and private investment for young people. Her group did not agree to replacing “strengthen” with “promote” as it would weaken the language. Furthermore, the chapeau text called on all constituents to take action. Her group supported the Africa group’s amendment to insert a reference to skills development. She accepted the subamendment by IMEC to change “universal access to high-quality education” with “universal access to education”, but questioned why the former was unacceptable. Her group did not support the Employers’ amendment to insert “public-private” before “partnerships”, as other types of partnerships existed. She agreed with the insertion of “career guidance”. Lastly, she proposed a subamendment to her own group’s amendment to read “while paying special attention to the low-skilled and the long-term unemployed” and insisted that these groups had to be mentioned explicitly.
- 416.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the subamendment on “universal access to quality education”. He also proposed to replace “facilitating” by “facilitates” and indicated that for the group “facilitating” is an end and “promoting” is a means. He supported the insertion of “career guidance”, but not of “public-private” before “partnerships”. He proposed a subamendment to add “among others” after “low-skilled and the long-term unemployed” at the end of the clause.
- 417.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the Employers’ group’s amendment to include “facilitating successful labour market transitions, particularly for young people”. He also supported the inclusion of “career guidance” and the amendment to add “with special emphasis on the low-skilled and the long-term unemployed”. However, he did not support either the replacement of “strengthening” by “promoting” or the insertion of “public-private” before “partnerships”.
- 418.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported Employers’ amendment. She agreed with IMEC’s proposal to insert “promote” and Africa group’s proposal on skills development. Concerning education, she supported the insertion of “universal”, and kept flexible on “equitable and effective access to training and apprenticeships”. She did not support the amendment on career guidance, as it was too specific, but could reconsider in the interest of consensus. She supported the Employers’ amendment on public-private partnerships and the Africa group’s proposed subamendment to add “among others” after “low-skilled and the long-term unemployed”.
- 419.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, noted that there was no need to include a reference to young people in labour market transitions. He did not support the insertion of “public-private” before “partnerships”, and fully agreed with IMEC on adding “universal access to quality education”. He could accept



the insertion of “career guidance” and fully supported the Africa group’s amendment to insert “skills development”.

420. The Worker Vice-Chairperson suggested that the amendment on facilitating labour market transitions could be placed near “upskilling”. She added that her group did not want the clause to be limited to young people. Concerning the Africa group’s proposed subamendment to adding “among others”, she indicated that she preferred “paying special attention to”, which already implied that others existed.
421. The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment on public-private partnerships, and agreed that the reference to young people after “facilitating labour market transitions” could be deleted if it was considered too narrow.
422. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, indicated that his group was flexible as to the placement of the wording on labour market transitions. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed that the reference to labour market transitions would be better placed at the end and that it would be preferable not to include a reference to young people.
423. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed moving “facilitating labour market transitions” to come after “partnerships”. She introduced a further subamendment so that the wording at the end of the clause would read “including low-skilled, long-term unemployed and young people”; that subamendment was not supported.
424. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, withdrew her group’s amendment proposing to replace “strengthen” with “promote”.
425. The clause was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 3(A)(g)

426. The Committee had before it three amendments proposed for paragraph 3(A)(g):
  - The Employers’ group had submitted two amendments: (1) to insert, at the beginning of the clause, “promote open trade and investment and” and (2) and to insert, after “contribute to”, the words “productive enterprises (including MSMEs)”.
  - The Workers’ group had submitted an amendment to insert “including through human rights due diligence” at the end of the clause.
427. The Employer Vice-Chairperson explained that it was important to add a reference to open trade and investment, as it was also recognized in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda on financing for sustainable development, had been endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly and was key in the economic recovery. The group also sought to add a reference to productive enterprises, as they were highlighted in the Centenary Declaration. The Employers’ group strongly opposed the reference to human rights due diligence, which was an extremely narrow issue, as it was only one part of one pillar of the UN Guiding Principles on business and human rights and would ignore the first pillar of the UN Guiding Principles, which refer to the duty of States to protect human rights.
428. The Worker Vice-Chairperson considered that promoting open trade and investment went beyond the ILO’s mandate. The Workers’ group had difficulty supporting the inclusion of “productive enterprises” and indicated that any reference made to enterprises should be about sustainable enterprises and that decent work should also be mentioned. She proposed a subamendment to insert, after decent work, “the sustainability of enterprises, including MSMEs, along the supply chain”. She considered that there was nothing

inappropriate about including a reference to human rights due diligence, as there was overall agreement to the OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Business Conduct and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.

429. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, preferred the original text and did not support the proposal of the Employers' group to add "promote open trade and investment", since that challenged the realities of different countries. It would be preferable to delete "open". The Africa group also preferred the original text to the Employers' group's amendment that added "productive enterprises", as for their group there was no benefit unless enterprises were sustainable. It was acceptable to the group, however, to add "including MSMEs". Regarding the amendment from the Workers' group, the Africa group could consider it if it was linked to the ILO Tripartite Declaration of Principles Concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy (MNE Declaration).
430. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, did not accept the amendments to insert "promote open trade and investment and" and "including through human rights due diligence", but supported the amendment to include "productive enterprises (including MSMEs)".
431. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, did not accept the amendment to include "promote open trade and investment and", as the language was too broad and extended into the mandate of other organizations. Her group was ready to support the amendment to include "productive enterprises (including MSMEs)" before "decent work" and was open to hear the suggestions from other groups on alternative drafting of that amendment. The group supported in principle the insertion of "including through human rights due diligence" and was flexible on the use of alternative language.
432. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, said that her group could not accept the amendment to include a reference to promoting open trade and investment, but could support the inclusion of "productive enterprises (including MSMEs)" if it were placed at the end of the clause, after "environmental sustainability". Her group supported the amendment to insert "including through human rights due diligence".
433. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, also supported the amendment to add "including through human rights due diligence" and agreed that the focus of the paragraph should be supply chains. His group was in favour of inserting "productive enterprises (including MSMEs)", but rejected the inclusion of a reference to promoting open trade and investment.
434. The Employer Vice-Chairperson, responding to comments made by the various groups, noted that supply chains concerned trade. She believed that "human rights due diligence" was narrow and limited and its inclusion would require mentioning adequate national legal frameworks, effective enforcement and implementation of national laws, an enabling business environment and corporate social responsibility initiatives. Her group could not accept singling out "human rights due diligence", without reference to an inclusive list of other elements of the UN Guiding Principles. She recalled that the UN Guiding Principles were based on three pillars, the first of which concerned the duty of States to protect against human rights abuses by all actors in society. It was unacceptable to refer only to the second pillar concerning the corporate responsibility to respect human rights.
435. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the focus in the clause under discussion was on the responsibility of employers with respect to human rights due diligence and that the responsibility of governments to provide appropriate national laws and other measures and elements were mentioned in elsewhere in the document. She could not agree to omit a

reference to “human rights due diligence” and requested the Secretariat to provide guidance.

- 436. The representative of the Secretary-General indicated that the Secretariat could propose a reformulation of the clause based on the discussion.
- 437. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed replacing “due diligence” with a reference to the UN Guiding Principles, which contained pillars on the State duty to protect, and companies to respect, human rights. She also indicated that her group would not object to also including a reference the ILO MNE Declaration.
- 438. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that she could accept a reference to the UN Guiding Principles and the ILO MNE Declaration.
- 439. The Employer Vice-Chairperson indicated that her group could consider the proposal by the Africa group to delete “open”, so that the sentence would read “promote trade and investment and foster more resilient supply chains”. She noted that the pertinent references to “trade and investment”, “supply chains” and “UN Guiding Principles” made the text more complete.
- 440. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that his group preferred to keep the reference to “sustainable” and supported the Employers’ group’s proposal to include a reference to the UN Guiding Principles.
- 441. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that in Part II of the text there was a reference to “promote fiscal and monetary policies”, where her group would propose an amendment to include “trade and investment policies”. The general language used in the first part of the sentence was problematic for her, and she preferred for trade and investment to be referred to as sustainable or to be qualified in some other way. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that her group could accept to add “sustainable” before “trade and investment”.
- 442. After informal consultations, the Employer Vice-Chairperson presented the following proposal, upon which the Employers’ and Workers’ groups had agreed bilaterally and which included a reference to the three pillars of the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and the ILO MNE Declaration:

(g) foster more resilient supply chains that contribute to:

- (i) decent work;
- (ii) sustainability of enterprises along the supply chain, including micro, small and medium-sized enterprises;
- (iii) environmental sustainability; and
- (iv) protection of and respect for human rights in line with the three pillars of the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and the ILO Tripartite Declaration of Principles Concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy;

supported by sustainable international trade and investment.

- 443. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the common proposal was the result of lengthy negotiations and a spirit of compromise, and reaffirmed the Workers’ group’s support for it. The Government member of Namibia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, accepted the proposal in the spirit of consensus, but noted that the language was cumbersome. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, noting the difficulty in arriving at the proposal, said that her group could support the consensus. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, supported the proposal, noting

that “protection of and respect for human rights” was reflected in the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, also supported the proposal.

- 444. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, did not support the proposal. He voiced reservations about the prominence of the reference to human rights in a document that was primarily focused on labour rights. He proposed deleting “protection of and respect for” before “human rights”.
- 445. The Chairperson emphasized that the chapeau referred to “contribute to” in connection with “the protection of and respect for human rights” and did not use rigid language such as “comply”. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, group, conceded that he could accept the proposed text in the interest of consensus, but wished to place on record his group’s reservations.

### Paragraph 3(A)(h)

- 446. The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced two amendments: (1) to delete “just” before “digital and ecological transitions” and (2) to replace “collective bargaining” with “workplace cooperation”. In relation to the first, she said that by leveraging opportunities of digital and ecological transitions, the transitions would become just. In relation to the second, her group was proposing to retain “including through social dialogue”. Another alternative would be to refer to the agreed ILO definition of social dialogue.
- 447. The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support Employers’ amendment to delete “just” before “digital and ecological transitions”, but could agree to have it placed elsewhere in the text. She found it unacceptable for one of the social partners of the ILO to delete the reference to “collective bargaining”, as it was a fundamental principle and right at work.
- 448. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendment to delete “just” in reference to digital and ecological transitions, noting that in his region, there was a digital divide and that the ecological transition was at different stages. His group did not support the amendment to delete “collective bargaining” after “social dialogue”. As social dialogue concerned the policy level and collective bargaining concerned the enterprise level, he did not see any contradiction. The Government members of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG; Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC; the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC; and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, also did not support the amendments to delete “just” before “digital and ecological transitions” and to delete “collective bargaining”. For the EU and its Member States, the notion of a just transition was extremely important, as opportunities needed to be leveraged in an inclusive manner, so that no one was left behind.
- 449. The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed to withdraw the amendment to delete “just” before “digital and ecological transitions”. Regarding collective bargaining, the Employers’ group could not agree to emphasize just one element of social dialogue, which should properly be referenced in full as “collective bargaining, workplace cooperation, information sharing and consultations”. In response to the Africa’s group comment, she clarified that social dialogue took place at all levels, not only at the policy level.
- 450. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the Centenary Declaration stated that “social dialogue, including collective bargaining and tripartite cooperation, provides an essential foundation of all ILO action” and that “effective workplace cooperation is a tool to help ensure safe and productive workplaces, in such a way that it respects collective bargaining

and its outcomes, and does not undermine the role of trade unions". If any amendments were needed, they should be based on the Centenary Declaration.

451. The Employer Vice-Chairperson countered that the Centenary Declaration's reference to collective bargaining was referring to ILO action, while the clause under discussion was about digital and ecological transitions contributing to decent work. She did not object to adding other types of social dialogue, as that would be the only way her group would accept the inclusion of collective bargaining in the clause.
452. The representative of the Secretary-General noted that there had been extensive debate on that terminology during the discussion of the ILO Centenary Declaration and suggested that using the terminology from the Declaration on social dialogue, collective bargaining and tripartite cooperation could be the best option. The text could thus be revised to read "social dialogue, which includes collective bargaining and tripartite cooperation". Such wording seemed to have a reasonable level of support from governments.
453. The Employer Vice-Chairperson suggested the Secretariat should propose text for consideration among the groups. The Worker Vice-Chairperson sought confirmation that social dialogue would be described as including collective bargaining and tripartite cooperation. For her group, it was acceptable to clarify that social dialogue could comprise more than just collective bargaining and also could include tripartite cooperation. .
454. At the request of the Committee, the Secretariat proposed the following revised text for the Committee's consideration: "leverage the opportunities of just digital and environmental transitions to advance decent work, including through social dialogue, including collective bargaining and tripartite cooperation.
455. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the revised text, and proposed that the first instance of "including" could be replaced with "inter alia" to avoid repetition. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the members speaking on behalf of the Government groups supported the revised text and the Worker Vice-Chairperson's suggestion.
456. Paragraph 3(A)(h) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 3(A)(i)

457. The Committee had before it three amendments to paragraph 3(A)(i):
  - GRULAC had submitted an amendment to insert "innovative" between "comprehensive" and "integrated approaches".
  - IMEC had submitted an amendment to delete "in the rural economy".
  - The Employers' group had submitted an amendment to replace "the rural economy" with "all parts of the economy".
458. The Worker Vice-Chairperson indicated that her group could support the amendment from GRULAC to insert "innovative" to describe approaches to informality. However, the group could not support the deletion of the reference to the rural economy, as although other sectors had informal employment, a high proportion of it was in the rural economy and therefore it had to be mentioned. The original text made it clear that the clause did not refer exclusively to the rural economy through the wording "with due attention to". She proposed as an alternative to insert "especially" before the rural economy to further qualify the text.

459. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that she could support IMEC's proposal to delete "in the rural economy" as an alternative to her group's amendment to include a reference to "all parts of the economy".
460. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, rejected the deletion of "the rural economy" and noted that the rural economy was critical as it had substantial relevance to efforts in the transition to formality. His group could support the Workers' group's proposal to use instead "especially in the rural economy", while "paying due attention to the rural economy" might also be an acceptable alternative. His group was in favour of introducing "innovative" in the first sentence.
461. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the inclusion of "innovative" and rejected both amendments to delete the reference to the rural economy. If the text were to support the principle of leaving no one behind, there had to be an emphasis on the rural economy, as that was of particular importance to the members of his and other groups. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, did not support removing the reference to the rural economy but was open to accepting the proposed subamendments.
462. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, supported the inclusion of "innovative". On the rural economy, her group was open to proposed rewording. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States supported the "innovative" inclusion and confirmed his group's support for the subamendments proposed by the Workers' group and the Africa group concerning the rural economy.
463. The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that "paying due attention to the rural economy" was acceptable if the text was clear that informality was not exclusive to the rural economy. The reference to "paying due attention" earlier in the clause could be replaced with "particularly for".
464. Paragraph 3(A)(i) was adopted as amended.

### Title of paragraph 3(B)

465. The Employers' group introduced an amendment to revise the section title from "Protection of all workers" to "Protection of workers and employers".
466. The Worker Vice-Chairperson commented that no other ILO text referred to protection of both workers and employers. This subsection was about the protection of all workers, with an emphasis on "all". Her group was emphatically against the amendment. The members speaking on behalf of the Government groups also rejected the amendment. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, explained that, as governments, they were looking for balanced language and that this section of the text concerned protection for workers. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, said that, although employers played a critical role in the economy, it was not appropriate to refer to protection of employers in the context of the ILO. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, reminded the Committee that her group had been focused on the protection of workers as the main objective since the informal consultations, on which there had appeared to be consensus. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, noted that workers had an unequal bargaining power in industrial relations.



- 467.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson asserted that freedom of association was also applicable to employers. Their right to freedom of association was frequently at issue in the Committee on the Application of Standards and in the Committee on Freedom of Association. In 2019, the ILO had agreed on the Violence and Harassment Convention, 2019 (No. 190), which explicitly included protections for employers.
- 468.** The representative of the Secretary-General noted that the title related to the section on the protection afforded to or sought for workers, and in no way detracted from the protections that applied to employers under ILO instruments and action.
- 469.** After consultations, the Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment in the spirit of compromise.

### Paragraph 3(B)(a)

- 470.** The Committee had before it seven amendments to paragraph 3(B)(a):
- The Employers' group had submitted an amendment to delete "ratified" before "international labour standards" and to delete the words "and promotion of their ratification, implementation and supervision, with particular attention to areas where serious gaps have been revealed by the crisis".
  - The Workers' group had submitted two amendments: (1) to delete "the elimination of child and forced labour" from clause (a) and (2) to insert a new clause to read: "redouble efforts to address the increasing fundamental rights violations resulting from the pandemic, with a special emphasis on the elimination of child and forced labour".
  - The Africa group had submitted an amendment to replace "implementation" with "application".
  - IMEC had submitted two amendments: (1) to insert "take measures to" at the beginning of the clause and (2) to insert "including" before "the elimination of child and forced labour" and "in supply chains" after it, and to move the reference to follow "fundamental principles and rights at work".
  - The Government members of Canada and the United States had submitted an amendment to insert, after "international labour standards," the words "considering ratification of ILO Conventions and Protocols".
- 471.** The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of the Government of Canada, explained that the intention of their own amendment was to emphasize the importance of reinforcing respect for international labour standards, while providing legal accuracy. As the international community might not be aware that those standards included both ratifiable and non-ratifiable instruments, she proposed a subamendment to clarify: "promotion of their implementation, supervision and, for Conventions and Protocols, their ratification". This would keep the important concept of respect for all international labour standards contained in the original, while clarifying that some standards (but not all) are ratifiable. They could not support the Employers' amendment to delete the latter half of the clause, after "international labour standards".
- 472.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, thanked the United States and Canada for their effort to make the wording more precise, but sought clarification on what "promotion" stood for. He explained that his own group had proposed to replace "implementation" with "application", as it considered that "application" also took into account national circumstances and allowed scope for progressive compliance. The

Africa group did not support the Employers' group's amendment to insert "ratified" and delete the latter part of the clause. Nor did it support the amendment to insert "in supply chains" after "child and forced labour", as the evidence showed that the majority of such labour took place outside of supply chains. The group was in favour of moving "the elimination of child and forced labour" to come after "fundamental principles and rights at work" for the sake of coherence.

- 473.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, did not support deleting "promotion of their ratification" as many international labour standards had not been ratified by countries, nor did he support the Employers' group's amendment to limit the reference to international labour standards to those that are ratified. Regarding the Africa group's proposal to use "application", the group was open to finding an alternative appropriate word. The group did not support IMEC's amendment to insert a reference to supply chains in connection with the elimination of child and forced labour, nor did it support including a separate clause on the topic.
- 474.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, did not support the Employers' group's amendment to limit the reference to "ratified" international labour standards, nor did they support the amendment of Canada and the United States. Regarding the Africa group's amendment, she suggested that both "implementation" and "application" could be used. Her group did not support IMEC's to add a reference to supply chains in connection with the elimination of child and forced labour.
- 475.** The Government member of the United States, speaking also on behalf of the Government of Canada, clarified that their amendment was still proposing to retain the reference to promoting the implementation, supervision and ratification of international labour standards and to make clear that "implementation" would apply to both Conventions and Recommendations. Speaking on behalf of IMEC, she noted that her group could not support the Employers' group's proposed insertion of "ratified" before "international labour standards" and the deletion of "promotion of their ratification, implementation and supervision". The group considered its own amendment to include a reference to "the elimination of child and forced labour in supply chains" to be important, as there was a risk that child labour and forced labour would increase in the response to the COVID-19 crisis. The group was open to including a separate subsequent clause on this important topic, as proposed by the Workers' group.
- 476.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, noted that for his group it was essential to promote the ratification, implementation and application of labour standards, and he therefore could not accept the Employers' group's amendment to deleting the reference. The group was open to placing the reference to "the elimination of child and forced labour" in a separate clause. The reference to "supply chains" should be retained, as it was consistent with the Alliance 8.7 report. His group did not support the Africa group's amendment to replace "implementation" with "application". With regard to the amendment proposed by the United States and Canada, his group preferred the original language.
- 477.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the word "respect" referred to fundamental principles and rights at work, and clarified that labour standards were only applied and implemented in national law when they were ratified. Nevertheless, she indicated her willingness to withdraw her group's amendment. She insisted that IMEC's amendment concerning child and forced labour in supply chains could not be adopted as it was unjustified and had not received support.

- 478.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment proposed by the United States and Canada, as its current drafting could lead to misunderstandings. Concerning the Africa group's amendment, her group could consider a reference to "implementation and application". She explained that her group's amendment on "child and forced labour" was linked to a subsequent amendment to insert a new clause on the subject. If, however, the new clause did not receive majority support, then the reference to "child and forced labour" would need to be retained in the current clause. She did not support placing it after the reference to "fundamental principles and rights at work" as it would diminish the importance of the other fundamental principles and rights at work. As to the proposed subamendment to insert a reference to migrant workers, she proposed that it should instead be placed at the end of the clause so as not to break up the four elements drawn from the Centenary Declaration, which belonged together.
- 479.** The representative of the Secretary-General confirmed that international labour standards included Recommendations, which could not be ratified. With regard to implementation and application, the usual word used was "application" in relation to Conventions and other ratified instruments. However, since the sentence referred to "respect" and not "compliance", the word "implementing" was appropriate.
- 480.** As a result of the subsequent discussion of paragraph 3(B)(a) *bis*, the Committee decided to remove the reference to "the elimination of child and forced labour" before "international labour standards" in paragraph 3(B)(a), which was then adopted as:

provide all workers with adequate protection, reinforcing respect for international labour standards, and promoting their ratification, implementation and supervision, with particular attention to areas where serious gaps have been revealed by the crisis. This includes respect for fundamental principles and rights at work; an adequate minimum wage, either statutory or negotiated; maximum limits on working time; and safety and health at work with particular attention to the ongoing challenges presented by the COVID-19 pandemic;

### Paragraph 3(B)(a) *bis*

- 481.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new clause after paragraph 3(B)(a), to read: "redouble efforts to address the increasing fundamental rights violations resulting from the pandemic, with a special emphasis on the elimination of child and forced labour". The intention was to highlight the potentially substantial effects of the pandemic on child labour and forced labour along with violations of other fundamental rights. The group was open to proposing a subamendment to include a reference to supply chains, but wished to hear other the other groups' positions first.
- 482.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that she understood that the amendment was intended to replace the reference to child and forced labour in the previous clause, and could accept it, but without the addition of a reference to supply chains.
- 483.** The Government members of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, agreed with the Employer Vice-Chairperson. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, could support the inclusion of a reference to the elimination of forced labour and child labour either in the previous clause or in the new clause. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, could support the amendment, and formally proposed a subamendment to insert "including in supply chains". The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the Workers' amendment and the IMEC subamendment.

484. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the members speaking on behalf of the Africa group and ASPAG both opposed the inclusion of a reference to supply chains. The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that as she wanted the clause to be broadly accepted, she preferred to retain the amendment without the subamendment. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, withdrew the subamendment.
485. The new clause was adopted without subamendment.

### Paragraph 3(B)(a) *ter*

486. The Employers' group introduced an amendment to insert a new clause after paragraph 3(B)(a), to read: "provide employers with assistance, advice and support in complying with health measures and other COVID-based rules and regulations, including through Governments cooperating with, and where appropriate seeking the assistance of, organizations of employers, to distribute information and advice to employers". The amendment sought to ensure that governments would provide much-needed support to employers' organizations and seek their assistance to introduce information and advice to employers and enterprises.
487. The Worker Vice-Chairperson considered that the proposed new clause made the text too one-sided, as there was no equivalent reference to workers' organizations. Moreover, the amendment covered similar themes to those addressed in paragraph 3(B)(c). It would be helpful to understand the differences in order to justify a new clause.
488. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, stated that he agreed in principle with the Employers' group's amendment. However, as the amendment seeking to include employers in the title of the section had not succeeded, the proposed new clause was out of the scope of the section. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, concurred.
489. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that her group had had extensive discussions on this amendment, including potential revisions to make it more general. The group remained flexible, but was not convinced of the value of the new clause. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, said that her group had also discussed the amendment extensively, given the considerable implications of the crisis for employers. There were concerns about possible duplication of other language in the text and the group could offer proposals to eliminate any duplication and make it more focused. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, echoed those comments.
490. The Employer Vice-Chairperson emphasized that it was important to focus on the substantive matters of relevance to employers, and was open to merging the content with paragraph 3(B)(c) to avoid duplication. She proposed that the Secretariat develop options for a new merged text in 3(B)(c). The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed with the idea of integrating the content into paragraph 3(B)(c), as it would help to achieve a more balanced approach.
491. The representative of the Secretary-General proposed the following revised text for the Committee's consideration, which merged the content of the proposed new clause into paragraph 3(B)(c):

strengthen occupational safety and health measures by cooperating with public institutions, private enterprises, employers, workers and their representatives on:

- (i) the provision of tailored practical guidance;

- (ii) support for risk management;
- (iii) the introduction of appropriate control and emergency preparedness measures;
- (iv) measures to prevent new outbreaks or other occupational risks; and
- (v) compliance with health measures and other COVID-19-based rules and regulation;

recognizing that safe and healthy working conditions are fundamental to decent work.

- 492.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson commented that her group had initially had reservations concerning the wording “recognizing that safe and healthy working conditions are fundamental to decent work” but had verified that it was identical to that of the Centenary Declaration and could therefore accept it.
- 493.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the members speaking on behalf of the Government groups supported the revised text. The revised text was merged under paragraph 3(B)(c).

### Paragraph 3(B)(b)

- 494.** The Committee had before it six proposed amendments to paragraph 3(B)(b):
- The Employers’ group had submitted two amendments: (1) to delete “psychosocial” before “support” and (2) to delete “including against excessive workloads”.
  - The Workers’ group had submitted two amendments: (1) to insert, after “workers”, the words “including those working transnationally” and (2) to insert, at the end of the clause, the words “and consider recognizing COVID-19 as an occupational disease”.
  - IMEC had submitted two amendments: (1) to replace “ensure” with “provide” and to insert “workers at higher risk of exposure to COVID-19 and those at greater risk of negative health impacts, including” before “health workers” and (2) to move “adequately” from before “remunerated” to precede “protected”.
- 495.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson explained that her group wanted to identify specifically frontline workers working transnationally, as they were facing particular challenges during the pandemic. Her group had proposed inserting “consider recognizing COVID-19 as an occupational disease” because frontline workers had risked their own health and safety while working for the public good, and those who had suffered from the disease themselves should receive appropriate support. She did not support the first aspect of the IMEC amendment proposing to replace “ensure that” with “provide that”, which offered no guarantees. However, her group supported the intention behind the rest of the amendment. The Workers’ group could not support the Employers’ group’s amendments to delete the references to “psychosocial support” and “excessive workloads”. Firstly, there had been a huge impact on mental health among health workers and frontline workers as a result of the pandemic, and secondly, health workers and other frontline workers, including in the logistics, health and food retail sectors, had sacrificed greatly due to working excessive workloads to keep people safe and fed.
- 496.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated her group’s support for IMEC’s first amendment. The group rejected the proposal to consider classifying COVID-19 as an occupational disease, as such classification was a highly technical process, decided at the national level by sector and not appropriate for a global text. Her group also did not support the reference to “those working transnationally” as it was not specific enough.

- 497.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, expressed his support for replacing “ensure” with “provide”, noting that his group remained flexible, and supported the remainder of the amendment. The group supported the inclusion of frontline workers working transnationally. Regarding the inclusion of a reference to COVID-19 as an occupational disease, the group could support it.
- 498.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, suggested in that connection that IMEC’s amendment should be subamended, as “ensure” was more appropriate in conjunction with access to vaccines, but his group supported the rest of the amendment. The group did not support the Workers’ group’s proposed amendments.
- 499.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that her group supported IMEC’s amendment but not the Workers’ group’s proposed insertion of a reference to transnational workers. Her group had given serious consideration to the reference to classification of COVID-19 as an occupational disease but ultimately could not support it, as classifications were different in each country and had to be done on a case-by-case basis in the context of COVID-19.
- 500.** The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, requested clarification on what ASPAG had intended to subamend. She noted that the intention of IMEC’s amendment had been largely editorial, and to keep the focus on healthcare and frontline workers. IMEC could support the amendment proposing to include transnational workers, but proposed subamending it to include “who are” before “working transnationally” for clarity. IMEC could not accept the Workers’ amendment to consider recognizing COVID-19 as an occupational disease.
- 501.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported IMEC’s original amendment, but not as subamended by ASPAG. The group could accept the inclusion of those working transnationally, but not the proposal on the classification of COVID-19 as an occupational disease.
- 502.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson re-emphasized that her group could not accept the Workers’ group’s proposals on transnational workers or the occupational disease classification. However, it could accept IMEC’s proposal, including with “ensure” instead of “provide”, but not the subamendment from ASPAG. On the basis of the Committee’s discussion, the Employers’ group withdrew both of their own amendments.
- 503.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson clarified that her group’s proposal on considering recognizing COVID-19 as an occupational disease referred to healthcare and other frontline workers, not the entire population, and that “consider” did not represent an obligation. On the inclusion of workers working transnationally, some groups had noted that they were already included in the concept of “workers”. However, transnational workers included workers in transport and other sectors, and it was important to mention them specifically.
- 504.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that COVID-19 had already been recognized as an occupational disease by the competent professional bodies and it was not appropriate to make general statements about it in the ILO framework. Nor did her group agree to single out transnational workers as other workers were just as important.
- 505.** The representative of the Secretary-General presented the following proposed wording for the Committee’s consideration:

provide that workers at higher risk of exposure to COVID-19 and those at greater risk of negative health impacts, such as healthcare workers and all other frontline workers, including those working transnationally, have access to vaccines, personal protective



equipment, training, testing and psychosocial support, and that they are adequately remunerated and protected at work, including against excessive workloads;

**506.** The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons and the Government members speaking on behalf of the Africa group, ASPAG, GRULAC, IMEC and the EU and its Member States agreed to the proposal.

**507.** Paragraph 3(B)(b) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 3(B)(c)

**508.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert, at the end of paragraph 3(B)(c), the words “recognizing that safe and healthy working conditions are fundamental to decent work”. This was supported by all groups.

**509.** The Chairperson announced that, as a result of a decision to merge the content of paragraph 3(B)(a) with paragraph 3(B)(c), the clause would now read:

strengthen occupational safety and health measures by cooperating with public institutions, private enterprises, employers, workers and their representatives on:

- (i) the provision of tailored practical guidance;
- (ii) support for risk management;
- (iii) the introduction of appropriate control and emergency preparedness measures;
- (iv) measures to prevent new outbreaks or other occupational risks; and
- (v) compliance with health measures and other COVID-19-based rules and regulation;

recognizing that safe and healthy working conditions are fundamental to decent work;

**510.** It was so adopted.

### Paragraph 3(B)(d)

**511.** The Committee had before it seven proposed amendments to paragraph 3(B)(d):

- The Employers’ group had submitted three amendments: (1) to replace “adapt” with “utilize” before “teleworking” and to insert “retain jobs and” before “expand decent work opportunities”; (2) to delete the reference to “collective bargaining”; and (3) to insert “ratified” before “international labour standards”.
- The Workers’ group had submitted an amendment to replace “adapt” and “expand”, to read “ensure teleworking and other new work arrangements provide decent work opportunities”.
- IMEC had submitted three amendments: (1) to insert “introduce or” before “adapt teleworking”; (2) to insert, after “including”, the words “for example”; and (3) to insert after “international labour standards” the wording “and privacy and promoting data protection”.

**512.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson underlined the importance of the clause on teleworking, as it had not been a universally positive experience. Her group did not support the wording “introduce or adapt” or “utilize”. The group could not support the deletion of “collective bargaining” nor the insertion of “ratified” before “international labour standards”. The Committee had already discussed and rejected the latter proposal in relation to earlier

wording. Her group could agree to the inclusion of a reference to privacy and data protection.

- 513.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed with the proposals to add “introduce” and replace “adapt” with “utilize”. Her group had proposed an amendment to add “retain jobs and”, as teleworking had been an important way of enabling workers to retain their jobs during the pandemic. She did not agree with the Workers’ group amendment to replace “adapt” with “ensure” and noted that she preferred IMEC’s proposal. She had no objection to IMEC’s proposal to add “for example”. Her group had proposed an amendment to add “ratified” before international labour standards as this paragraph was addressed to States and countries, who could not be asked to respect Conventions that they had not ratified. Concerning their proposal to delete “collective bargaining,” she indicated that a compromise could be found using wording such as “including, among other means, collective bargaining”. She agreed with IMEC’s proposal to include a reference to privacy and data protection.
- 514.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, indicated that in general his group preferred the original wording, but supported the insertion of a reference to retaining jobs. He did not support the greater commitment implied by the word “ensure”, nor did his group support the inclusion of “for example”, though the group did agree with the addition of “among other means, collective bargaining”.
- 515.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, said that his group supported the amendment to add a reference to retaining jobs. While supporting replacing “adapt” with “ensure”, his group preferred the original wording. His group was flexible about including “ratified” before “international labour standards” and supported the reference to privacy and data protection. He proposed a subamendment to add “where appropriate” after “arrangements”.
- 516.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC did not support IMEC’s amendment as teleworking already existed and did not need to be introduced. She did not support replacing “adapt” with “utilize”, nor did her group support the Employers’ amendment to add “ratified” before “international labour standards”. She proposed to replace “for example” by “among others” and indicated her support for “ensure”.
- 517.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, suggested that the proposals by IMEC and the Employers’ group could be combined to read “introduce, adapt and utilize teleworking”. Her group did not support the proposal by the Workers’ group of using “ensure”. The group supported the Employers’ group’s proposal to insert a reference to retaining jobs in principle, but proposed a subamendment to insert “decent” before “jobs”. IMEC supported the Workers’ group’s proposal to replace the word “expand” with a reference to ensuring that they provide decent work opportunities. Following the previous discussions on inserting “for example” after “including”, the group was prepared to be flexible regarding the corresponding amendment. The group believed that it was important to retain the reference to “collective bargaining” but would support the majority decision on the matter. IMEC did not support the addition of “ratified”.
- 518.** The Government of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, was also flexible with regard to the Employers’ group’s proposal of “utilize” and agreed with the insertion of a reference to “retain jobs”. The group did not agree with the deletion of “collective bargaining” and the insertion of “ratified” before “international labour standards”. The EU also supported the Workers’ group’s proposal to use “ensure” and “provide” instead of “expand”. He highlighted that IMEC’s amendment on privacy and data

protection was very important, as teleworking had created not only opportunities, but also challenges, among them work-life-balance and privacy and data protection, and there was a need for proactive policies and regulation.

- 519.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson stressed that because current forms of teleworking and new work arrangements were not necessarily decent, it would not be sufficient to refer to the expansion of decent work opportunities. The Workers' group supported ASPAG's subamendment to introduce "where appropriate", as these arrangements were indeed not appropriate in every kind of job. Moreover, if there was a general understanding that the sentence should start by "introduce, adapt or utilize", then it should continue to say "to ensure and expand decent work opportunities", which was similar to IMEC's proposal to add "decent" before "jobs". The Workers' group would support the wording "retain decent jobs and provide for and expand decent work opportunities" or "ensure and expand decent work opportunities". She proposed that the Committee return to the concept of collective bargaining once the Secretariat had provided a proposal for how this issue could be addressed in one of the previous paragraphs. For the Workers' group, the word "introduce" was not necessary in relation to teleworking, and "adapt and utilize" were sufficient. She noted that the majority was not in favour of the Employers' group amendment to insert "ratified". Her group supported the IMEC proposal regarding privacy and data protection.
- 520.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the proposals to say "introduce, adapt and utilize teleworking and other new work arrangements, where appropriate". It was also important to refer to "retain and expand decent jobs and work opportunities", as such arrangements had been crucial to retaining jobs. Regarding collective bargaining, the Employers' group could demonstrate flexibility on the proposal "among other means, regulation, social dialogue, including collective bargaining and workplace cooperation". Her group was, however, insistent on the inclusion of "ratified" before "international labour standards", as it was a matter of international law and the text had to be legally correct. Alternatively, if "ratified" was not inserted, "international labour standards" could be replaced by "fundamental principles and rights at work". It was not possible to refer to respect for international labour standards that were not ratified, as this would contradict international law.
- 521.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the Committee had already discussed the question of "ratified" in relation to a previous amendment and sought clarification from the Secretariat so that the Committee could reach a final agreement. The Workers' group could not support replacing "international labour standards" with "fundamental principles and rights at work" because the clause referred to issues concerning safety and health at work, working time and other labour standards that should apply to teleworking and other new forms of work.
- 522.** The representative of the Secretary-General suggested that "introduce" could be redundant, and proposed beginning the clause with "utilize and adapt". On the question of "ratified", he understood the Employers' group's argument in relation to ILO Conventions and Protocols. However, from the Secretariat's perspective, the word "respect" was not used as a formal, legally enforceable term, but in the sense of "having respect for" rather than "comply with" or "apply". That was the case with privacy, for example, as different countries had different privacy laws that should be respected. Many of the groups were against the inclusion of the word "ratified", and given that it was preceded by the more flexible word "respecting", the end of the clause could be rephrased to "respecting international labour standards and privacy, and promoting data protection and work-life balance". Regarding

the use of “among other means” in relation to collective bargaining, it would indicate that there were various means that could be used alongside it.

- 523.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson replied that international labour standards referred to an existing body of law, rather than a general and vague principle such as privacy, and therefore could not be treated in the same way. If the term “ratified” was not accepted, then it was necessary to find another term for international labour standards. Furthermore, she did not accept the linguistic interpretation of “respect” in a legal text where, in her view, it was synonymous with “compliance”. It was not possible to require States to respect all international labour standards irrespective of whether they had ratified them, as this could be held against governments or companies.
- 524.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that since the Employers’ group’s proposal to insert “ratified” had not received any support in the informal consultations or by any other group during this sitting, she suggested returning to the Employers’ group’s proposals to add “ratified” before “international labour standards” at the end of the discussion on the rest of the document. She furthermore stressed that the Workers’ group had very strong feelings about the inclusion of “ensuring decent work opportunities”, as an enormous number of workers had been increasingly dealing with teleworking and other new work arrangements, often finding themselves in very insecure situations. It was crucial to include a message that these work arrangements had to be decent, in view of the many references to the advantages of teleworking. She suggested that the Committee return to the clause at a later stage.
- 525.** The Chairperson summarized that there were three issues to be resolved, relating to “ensure”, “collective bargaining” and “ratified”.
- 526.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, said that her group wished to maintain the amendment to “introduce” teleworking and new work arrangements, as that remained a possibility.
- 527.** After consultations, the Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew her group’s amendments to add “ratified” before “international labour standards” and to delete “collective bargaining”.
- 528.** The representative of the Secretary-General proposed the following revised text for the Committee’s consideration:
- introduce, utilize and adapt teleworking and other new work arrangements so as to retain jobs and expand decent work opportunities through among other means regulation, social dialogue, collective bargaining, workplace cooperation and efforts to reduce disparities in digital access, respecting international labour standards and privacy and promoting data protection and work-life balance;
- 529.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson, the Worker Vice-Chairperson and the members speaking on behalf of the Government groups supported the revised text.
- 530.** Paragraph 3(B)(d) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 3(B)(e)

- 531.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, introduced an amendment to add “and decent work” after “transition to formality”.
- 532.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the amendment.
- 533.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the inclusion of “decent work” in the clause in principle, but suggested a subamendment to place it after “certainty and legal protection”.

In her view, the essential point of this clause was the transition to formality, which would not only achieve decent work, but also provide certainty and legal protection.

- 534.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment and could also agree to the subamendment.
- 535.** The Government members of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG; Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC; and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment.
- 536.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that her group preferred the original amendment by IMEC. First, the language used after “uphold” reflected the wording of the Centenary Declaration and it was therefore important to keep it as it was. Second, the transition to formality and decent work was the ultimate objective, and therefore the reference should remain at the end of the clause. The subamendment would be a narrower approach that only qualified the employment relationship.
- 537.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the majority did not support her group’s subamendment and therefore withdrew it.
- 538.** Paragraph 3(B)(e) was adopted as amended.

### Chapeau of paragraph 3(B)(f)

- 539.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to replace “by” with “which may include” in the paragraph that introduced the elements of a transformative agenda for gender equality. She explained that the list that followed was non-exhaustive and that scope should be left for additional elements that were not mentioned.
- 540.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as it rendered the list overly vague, and the various elements optional. In her group’s view, it was important to set out the key elements of a transformative agenda for gender equality. Using “by” did not mean that the list was exhaustive, and it was important to have a commitment to the whole agenda and not a menu of options.
- 541.** The Government members of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group; the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC; and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the original text. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, did not support the amendment either, as a broader formulation might invite further debate.
- 542.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, did not support the amendment. The text referred to the transformative agenda for gender equality and many actions under this paragraph were not optional; constituents should strive to implement all of them.
- 543.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson suggested returning to chapeau after discussing the subclauses. After the discussion that followed, the Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment.

### Paragraph 3(B)(f)(i)

- 544.** The Committee had before it four amendments to paragraph 3(B)(f)(i):
  - The Employers’ group had submitted an amendment to delete “supported by pay transparency”.

- ASPAG had submitted an amendment to add “equal” before “work” and “as well as for work” before “of equal value”.
  - IMEC had submitted two amendments: (1) to add “equal work” before “work of equal value” and (2) to add “inter alia” before pay transparency.
- 545.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson could support either amendment proposing to insert a reference to “equal work”. Her group would support the insertion of “inter alia”. If that amendment was adopted, the Employers’ group would withdraw the amendment proposing to delete the reference to pay transparency. Pay transparency should not be referred to as an obligation, as it was extremely burdensome for companies, especially for SMEs.
- 546.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendments to refer to “equal work”. The standard ILO term was “equal pay for work of equal value” or, under the Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100), “equal remuneration for work of equal value”. Her group could accept the amendment to insert “inter alia” if the common understanding was that pay transparency was supported as well as other measures.
- 547.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed that the language of the Convention No. 100 should be used. However, she noted that “pay transparency” was not mentioned in that Convention and that there had never been an ILO discussion on the topic. She therefore proposed to delete “pay transparency”.
- 548.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the amendments to insert a reference to “equal work” and preferred to use the language set out in ILO standards. His group was flexible on including “inter alia”.
- 549.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, did not support the Employers’ group’s amendment to delete “supported by pay transparency”. His group was flexible on the amendment to include “inter alia”. He explained that his group had proposed the amendment to include “equal work as well as for”, as that was a persistent problem.
- 550.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, did not support the amendments to include a reference to “equal work” or the amendment to delete “supported by pay transparency”. She highlighted that pay transparency was an important measure that had been implemented to tackle the gender pay gap and it was important for the ILO to highlight the importance of the measure. Her group supported the insertion of “inter alia”.
- 551.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, proposed a possible alternative to the reference to equal pay, which was to refer to “ensuring gender pay equity”. She explained that her group had proposed the insertion of “inter alia” because pay transparency was not the only means to achieve gender pay equity. Her group did not support the proposed deletion of “supported by pay transparency”.
- 552.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported both amendments submitted by IMEC, but did not support the amendment to include “equal work”. His group also supported retaining the reference to “pay transparency”.
- 553.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson repeated her proposal to refer either to “equal pay” or to “equal remuneration” “for work of equal value”, saying she thought “equal pay” worked better in the current document. She noted that Convention No. 100 was adopted in 1951 when the discussion, legislation and expertise on pay transparency did not yet exist.



Nevertheless, the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations had referred to pay transparency as an important means to achieve equal pay. Her group could support the amendment to include “inter-alia”.

- 554.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that although ILO Convention No. 100 did not refer to “pay transparency”, her group could accept the insertion of “inter alia” and supported the subamendment proposed by IMEC to include “ensuring gender pay equity”.
- 555.** The representative of the Secretary-General, considering the views expressed, suggested that the subclause could read “ensuring equal pay for work of equal value supported inter alia by pay transparency”.
- 556.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, withdrew their amendment and supported the proposed new wording.
- 557.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, also accepted the rewording.
- 558.** Paragraph 3 (B)(f)(i) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 3(B)(f)(ii)

- 559.** The Committee had before it three amendments to paragraph 3(B)(f)(ii):
  - The Employers had submitted an amendment to delete “expanding paid care leave policies for a more” and replacing it with “fostering”.
  - IMEC had submitted an amendment to split the subclause in two, the second of which would read “promoting a more balanced sharing of work and family responsibilities”.
  - The Government of Algeria had submitted an amendment to read “developing, through collective bargaining, provisions governing paid or unpaid care leave policies for a more even division of labour at home”.
- 560.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the deletion of “expanding paid care leave policies”. Her group seconded the amendment by the Government of Algeria, as it supported the message that it was useful for paid care leave policies to be developed through collective bargaining; however, she could not support the amendment at that point, as the matter of collective bargaining would be addressed at a later stage in the discussion. Her group supported the proposal to split the subclause in two.
- 561.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson emphasized that the amendment to delete “expanding paid care leave policies” was crucial for her group, as it would be employers who would incur the costs of such policies. It was completely unacceptable to impose such costs on employers during a period when companies, especially SMEs, were struggling to survive. Her group did not support Algeria’s proposal to include “developing, through collective bargaining, provisions governing”. Concerning the IMEC amendment, her group was flexible on using either the original or the proposed language.
- 562.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the Employers’ group’s amendment to delete “expanding paid care leave policies”. His group supported the amendment proposed by Algeria, and was flexible on IMEC’s amendment on “promoting a more balanced sharing of work and family responsibilities”.
- 563.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, did not support the amendment to delete the reference to expanding paid care leave policies. His group

supported IMEC's amendment. Concerning the amendment to include the reference to collective bargaining, he would need to consult with his group.

564. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, did not support the Employers' group's amendment and emphasized that paid care leave policies were crucial to ensure the inclusion of women in the labour market. Her group did not support IMEC's amendment, as they believed it was important to link "paid care leave policies" with "division of labour at home" as that would ensure a more balanced sharing of work and family responsibilities.
565. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, did not support the amendment to delete of "expanding paid care leave policies". She suggested that instead of "expanding", the words "strengthening" or "introducing" could be used. Concerning amendment on collective bargaining, her group believed it was important to add "including" before "through collective bargaining". However, the group could not support adding "or unpaid care leave" as part of the same amendment.
566. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the amendment to delete "expanding paid care leave policies", but supported IMEC's amendment to introduce a separate subclause on "promoting a more balanced sharing of work and family responsibilities". Concerning Algeria's amendment, he supported the suggestion made by IMEC to use the words "strengthening" or "introducing" instead of "expanding".
567. The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that, in some countries, expanding paid care leave would be too expensive whereas it might be desirable in others. Her group might support expanding "adequate care leave" or "appropriate care leave".
568. The Worker Vice-Chairperson wished to clarify the intended meaning of "expanding care leave policies", as it referred to expanding both policies on care leave as well as – where it was not yet sufficiently developed – the care leave itself. The issue was not necessarily to place an undue burden on employers in terms of costs in cases where extensive leave options already existed. In order to have a transformative agenda for gender equality, it was necessary to expand care leave policies.
569. The representative of the Secretary-General explained that in drafting the document, the Secretariat had looked to the Centenary Declaration, which referred to the need for a transformative agenda for gender equality. The Secretariat had identified "expand" as an appropriate verb to support the concepts of "accelerating" and "transformative". He wished to allay concerns that the language created obligations around expanding paid care leave, as the chapeau to paragraph 3 placed all these actions in the context of national circumstances, being tailored to specific situations, and a commitment to work towards achieving them. The current document was not binding and was aspirational on the various aspects of the transformative agenda.
570. The Employer Vice-Chairperson pointed out that there was no reference to paid care leave in the Centenary Declaration and that the outcome document had to be in line with the wording of the Declaration, as its intent was to accelerate its implementation. Further, many companies were facing bankruptcy as a result of the crisis and the present text did not reflect the reality of the struggles of employers, which could undermine the reputation of the ILO. She also disagreed with the suggestion that an expansion of paid care leave policies did not indicate an expansion of paid care leave itself. She proposed a subamendment, "expanding policies for adequate paid care leave", to allow for countries without adequate

policies to work on them without obliging countries that already had appropriate policies in place to expand them.

571. The Worker Vice-Chairperson argued that the reputation of the ILO was also in jeopardy if it did not push for a transformative agenda for gender equality. She noted that during the crisis, many countries had expanded paid care leave policies and that care leave was particularly relevant in the context of COVID-19. It was not necessarily the case that employers would have to bear the costs as substantial public money had been spent to provide support for workers through expanded care leave policies during the crisis. She did not support IMEC's proposal to split the subclause, as it seemed logical to keep the concepts linked. It was also important to underline the point that expanded care leave policies should be aimed at both women and men.
572. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, stated a preference for retaining the original text, as the document was aspirational rather than binding. Nevertheless, his group could also support the Employers' group's subamendment to read "expanding policies for adequate paid care leave". The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, agreed.
573. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, proposed that it would be most straightforward for the subclause to read "expanding paid care leave policies for a more balanced sharing of family responsibilities". The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, expressed flexibility regarding the proposal.
574. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, maintained that building back better, and ongoing demographic shifts, necessitated a transformative gender equality agenda. For his group, that meant expanding care leave policies, but he could be flexible to achieve consensus. He would support the addition of "adequate".
575. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed to subamend the text to read: "expanding policies providing adequate paid care leave and promoting a more balanced sharing of work and family responsibilities".
576. The Employer Vice-Chairperson accepted the text proposed by the Workers' group.
577. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that her group was flexible, but considered the wording "care leave policies" to be more direct.
578. The Government members of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group; Bangladesh, speaking on behalf ASPAG; the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC; and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, all supported the Workers' group's proposed subamendment.
579. Paragraph 3(B)(f)(ii) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 3(B)(f)(iii)

580. The Committee had before it three amendments to paragraph 3(B)(f)(iii):
  - The Workers' group and the Africa group had each submitted an amendment to replace "women's" with "gender" before "skills gaps".
  - IMEC had submitted an amendment to delete "women's" before "skills gaps".

**581.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson explained that her group proposed to refer to “gender” rather than women, and noted that the Africa group had proposed the same amendment. The Workers’ group did not support the amendment from IMEC, as the text had to be related specifically to gender skills gaps. The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported replacing “women’s” with “gender”. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, thanked the social partners for their support and wished to hear others’ views. The Government members of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf ASPAG; Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC; the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC; and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States all supported the term “gender skills gaps”.

**582.** Paragraph 3(B)(f)(iii) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 3(B)(f)(iv)

**583.** IMEC had submitted two amendments to paragraph 3(B)(f)(iv): (1) to insert “the care economy” after “social work” and (2) to insert, after “and other sectors”, the words “where women are over-represented”.

**584.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson agreed to the inclusion of the care economy but did not agree to IMEC’s second proposal, as women should be supported regardless of whether they were under- or over-represented.

**585.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the inclusion of the care economy and agreed with the Employers’ group that investment in women should not only be in sectors where they were over-represented. Furthermore, it had not been established that women were indeed over-represented in the sectors mentioned in the subclause.

**586.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and the Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, also supported the first amendment but not the second. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that her group had been ready to support both amendments.

**587.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, withdrew the amendment to insert “where women are over-represented”.

**588.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the insertion of “the care economy”.

**589.** Paragraph 3(B)(f)(iv) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 3(B)(f)(v)

**590.** The Committee had before it two amendments to paragraph 3(B)(f)(v):

- The Workers’ group had submitted an amendment to replace “entry and advancement” with “entry to and advancement in education, training employment and career”.
- IMEC had submitted an amendment to insert “including by combatting gender stereotypes” at the end of the subclause.

**591.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson explained that her group’s amendment sought to make the text more precise by specifying to what “entry and advancement” referred, namely

education, employment and career. Her group supported IMEC's proposal to include a reference to combatting gender stereotypes".

- 592.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the Workers' group's amendment and had no objection to IMEC's amendment. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, agreed that the two amendments clarified the wording and so supported them. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the Workers' group's amendment and proposed a subamendment to IMEC's amendment to remove "by combatting". The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, also supported both amendments and could accept the subamendment to the latter one. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, proposed a subamendment to the Workers' amendment to delete "career", as it was covered already by "employment". Regarding the proposed subamendment to delete "by combatting", she did not support it, as the text would not read correctly. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported both amendments and preferred to retain the words "by combatting".
- 593.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed surprise at the suggestion to delete "career", as many people, especially women, had jobs but not necessarily a career. She agreed that it was better to retain "by combatting". The Employer Vice-Chairperson understood the point IMEC made that advancement in employment was a synonym to career, but her group could accept both terms. The wording "by combatting" needed to remain for clarity.
- 594.** The representative of the Secretary-General suggested that the addition of "career" was helpful as the intention was to refer to career progression. He also agreed that the text read better if "by combatting" was retained. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, proposed an editorial subamendment to make "careers" plural, which was accepted.
- 595.** Paragraph 3(B)(f)(v) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 3(B)(f)(vi)

- 596.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson explained that they wished to be consistent with the Violence and Harassment Convention, 2019 (No. 190) concerning violence and harassment against women and men in the world of work. They thought their proposed language of "preventing and protecting against" was more appropriate.
- 597.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government members speaking on behalf of all Government groups supported the amendment.
- 598.** Paragraph 3(B)(f)(vi) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 3(B)(g)

- 599.** The Committee had before it eight amendments to paragraph 3(B)(g):
- The Workers' group had submitted an amendment to move "discrimination" to after "violence and harassment".
  - The Africa group had submitted an amendment to add "disability".

- ASPAG had submitted an amendment to delete the subclause “including race, colour, sex, religion, political opinion, national extraction and social origin, and with respect to migrants, indigenous and tribal peoples, and people living with HIV”.
  - GRULAC had submitted an amendment to add “people of African descent, ethnic minorities, persons with disabilities”.
  - IMEC had submitted an amendment to delete “discrimination” and add “in the world of work and discrimination” after “violence and harassment”; to add “disability, age”; to add “members of” before indigenous and tribal peoples”.
- 600.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson explained that her group’s amendment was to move the word “discrimination” to come before the grounds of discrimination that were listed in the paragraph. She supported IMEC’s proposal to insert “in the world of work” after “violence and harassment”. She considered the reference to “race, colour, sex, religion, political opinion, national extraction and social origin” to be appropriate, as those were the grounds specified in the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111) and the clause would otherwise be very general. The word “including” showed that other grounds were possible. The Committee had discussed indigenous and tribal peoples and had agreed on “persons belonging to” rather than “members of”. She asked the Government groups whether it was appropriate in their regions to refer to “people of African descent”. The Workers’ group was flexible as to what aspects were included in the list, and proposed that the reference to persons with disabilities should be included.
- 601.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the addition of “in the world of work” and agreed with the Workers’ group that violence and harassment should be placed before discrimination. The Employers’ group supported ASPAG’s amendment to delete the list after “and discrimination on all grounds”.
- 602.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, noted that complications arose with listing vulnerable or disadvantaged groups and his group preferred to align with those listed in Convention No. 111. The group also supported including “in the world of work”, moving the word “discrimination”, and streamlining the detailed list but wished to retain race, colour and sex, and to add persons with disabilities. The group did not support GRULAC’s proposal to include “people of African descent” and “ethnic minorities” as they were already covered by the list.
- 603.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, explained that his group had proposed the amendment to delete the reference to “including race, colour, sex, religion, political opinion, national extraction and social origin, and with respect to migrants, indigenous and tribal peoples, and people living with HIV” as “on all grounds” was clear, and it was not appropriate to only include in the list only certain individuals covered by Convention No. 111.
- 604.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported moving the word “discrimination”. Her group did not support ASPAG’s proposal as it was necessary to explain the reference to “all grounds”. She noted that various amendments sought to include “persons with disabilities” and requested guidance from the Secretariat on how best to formulate it. Her group did not support the amendment to insert “members of” before “indigenous and tribal peoples” as that was not standard UN language. She explained that her own group’s amendment to include a reference to “people of African descent, ethnic minorities, persons with disabilities” aimed to reflect a significant factor in her region’s diversity and identity. As Convention No. 111 dated back to 1958, it was appropriate to bring



the list up to date. Responding to the Worker Vice-Chairperson's question, she noted that the reference to "people of African descent" was standard language included in resolutions of the Human Rights Council and the UN General Assembly.

605. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, strongly supported keeping the list. In reference to her own group's amendment to include "disability" and "age", she suggested to move the terms to the end of the clause so that the list stayed in line with Convention No. 111. Her group did not support the GRULAC amendment as "people of African descent, ethnic minorities" were already reflected in the list. With regard to her group's amendment on "members of", she could accept the alternative of "persons belonging to", as the intention of the amendment was to reflect people as individuals.
606. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported IMEC's statement and noted that it was important to stay in line with relevant Conventions. His group believed that the reference to "disability" was important, but was flexible on its placement.
607. The Worker Vice-Chairperson suggested keeping the original text proposed by the Secretariat, which included the list from Convention No. 111 and a limited number of other groups. With regard to IMEC's amendment on "members of", she explained that discrimination related not only to individuals but also to groups, and noted that the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169), referred only to "indigenous and tribal people". She suggested the following rewording "on all grounds, including race, colour, sex, religion, political opinion, national extraction and social origin, and with respect to migrants, indigenous and tribal peoples, people of African descent, ethnic minorities and persons with disabilities and living with HIV/AIDS".
608. The Employer Vice-Chairperson did not support the rewording proposed by the Workers' group. Her group preferred to include the original list of Convention No. 111, which ended with "social origin", or to end after "all grounds" as proposed by ASPAG.
609. The Worker Vice-Chairperson contended that "people of African descent" was not an arbitrary group. She referred to the United Nations International Decade for People of African Descent and noted that it was an important group in the Americas. She believed it was important to include, after the important clause on gender, a clause in which other discriminated groups and individuals could see themselves reflected.
610. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, explained that it was important for her group to include the reference to "people of African descent" as they were a significant part of the population of Latin America and the Caribbean, who had been hit hard by the crisis. They also suffered structural discrimination.
611. The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that, if the Committee favoured retaining the list, it would also be important to refer to the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer and intersex (LGBTQI) community, as that group was discriminated against, including by law in many countries.
612. The Worker Vice-Chairperson stated that the ILO had instruments on migrants, indigenous peoples and persons with HIV/AIDS. It would be important to also refer to the groups that were especially impacted by the COVID-19 crisis, as mentioned in the Preamble. It was important for her group to retain the reference to "all grounds, including".
613. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, indicated that according to international law, there was a difference between the rights of individuals

and groups. She needed to consult with her group on the reference to “indigenous and tribal peoples”.

614. The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled that the text concerned a transformative agenda and was not a legal text. She clarified that people belonging to the groups listed were not only discriminated against as a person, but also as a person belonging to those groups.
615. The Employer Vice-Chairperson remarked that the suggestions from the groups were not coherent. If the aim of the text was to be inspirational, then a reference to LGBTQI needed to be included, whereas if the text needed to be consistent with international law or ILO instruments, then the list in Convention No. 111 should be included.
616. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, noted it was important to have a list that was balanced and supported the inclusion of a list that remained solely within the purview of ILO instruments.
617. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, said that if a list were to be included, it needed to be in line with Convention No. 111.
618. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed to include the list of Convention No. 111 and a reference to migrants, indigenous and tribal peoples, persons with disabilities and persons living with HIV/AIDS. She expressed regret that a number of groups did not accept the reference to “people of African descent, ethnic minorities”.
619. The representative of the Secretary-General confirmed that migrants, indigenous and tribal peoples, persons with disabilities and persons living with HIV/AIDS were covered by international labour standards.
620. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, stated that it would also be important to look at the decisions and discussions of the Governing Body on the ILO’s engagement in the United Nations International Decade for People of African Descent (2015-2024).
621. After consultations, the Worker Vice-Chairperson presented the following compromise proposal, which was based on a proposal from the Secretariat, with the addition of “taking into account the specific circumstances and vulnerabilities of” and “the elderly”:
 

execute across the public and private sectors a transformative agenda for equality, diversity and inclusion aimed at eliminating violence and harassment in the world of work and discrimination on all grounds, including race, colour, sex, religion, political opinion, national extraction and social origin, and taking into account the specific circumstances and vulnerabilities of migrants, indigenous and tribal peoples, people of African descent, ethnic minorities, the elderly, persons with disabilities and persons living with HIV/AIDS.
622. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, expressed a preference for target groups not to be included in the clause, but could agree in the interest of consensus. He proposed replacing “the elderly” with “older persons”, which was more respectful.
623. The Worker Vice-Chairperson, the Employer Vice-Chairperson and the members speaking on behalf of the Government groups supported the revised text with that change.
624. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, agreed that substituting “the elderly” with “older persons” was appropriate, and proposed a further subamendment to include “and their members” after “indigenous and tribal peoples” in order to include the individuals as well the groups and to be consistent with the wording in the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169). The representative of the

Secretary-General recognized that the terminology suggested by IMEC had been in used in Convention No. 169 but understood that the social partners and other Government groups had supported the revised text as it currently stood in the Workers' group's proposal. He suggested that the current wording included the individuals of the groups as well as the groups as a whole. The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, expressed regret that there was no support for her group's proposal, but could support the current wording in the spirit of compromise.

**625.** Paragraph 3(B)(g) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 3(B)(g) *bis*

- 626.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new clause to read: "ensure workers and employers have access to quality employment services to mitigate increased economic and labour market disruption". The intention was to make it clear that access to quality employment services was a public responsibility that governments needed to address. She noted that public employment services were often unsatisfactory and in many cases had proved unhelpful during the crisis.
- 627.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that, for her group, the new clause was not acceptable if it did not specify quality "public" employment services and indicate what they should be doing. The amendment would need to be subamended extensively if it was to be included in the text. She asked to hear the Government groups' views.
- 628.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson contended that, if "public" were to be included, "private" would need to be as well.
- 629.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, was open to the content of the amendment, but raised concerns about its placement within the current section, which related to protection of workers. The amendment seemed more in line with the section A on inclusive economic growth and employment.
- 630.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, agreed with the views of the Africa group regarding the placement of the proposed new clause, and expressed doubt on the need for a separate clause.
- 631.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that her group could be flexible on the amendment.
- 632.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, also indicated openness to the content, and proposed a subamendment so that the clause would read "enhance quality employment services for workers and employers to mitigate pandemic-induced economic and labour market disruption". The group agreed that employment services were an important aspect of the crisis response, and was flexible on the placement of the clause.
- 633.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, aligned itself with the IMEC position, while noting that his group had concerns about specifically including a reference to private employment agencies.
- 634.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson reminded the Committee that the amendment had originally referred solely to "quality employment services", with no other qualification.
- 635.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson reiterated that the text must include a specific reference to public employment services. She agreed that the clause would be better placed in section A.

- 636.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson confirmed her group could be flexible on placing the clause under section A. A reference to public employment services would require the insertion of “private” as well. She supported IMEC’s proposed subamendment aside from the term “pandemic-induced”; her group was also open to other suggestions. She requested the Secretariat to propose a modified text.
- 637.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson insisted that her group was not prepared to put public and private employment services on the same footing. The group would not support the amendment unless a reference to “public employment services” was included.
- 638.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson pointed out that the programme and budget of the ILO included activities on private employment services, and that they complemented public employment services.
- 639.** The representative of the Secretary-General proposed “crisis-induced” as a substitute for “pandemic-induced”, as the term “crisis” was already used throughout the document. He expressed doubt on the inclusion of private employment services, as the chapeau of paragraph 3 called on ILO constituents to make commitments, but governments were not responsible for private employment services.
- 640.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson contented that the role of government was in enhancing access to private employment services, and that private employment services were no less important than public employment services. It was for each country to decide which policies to adopt, and governments would regulate to ensure access to employment services.
- 641.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled that there had been many discussions within the ILO about private employment agencies and she did not wish to reopen the debate. Although private employment agencies were included to a degree within the ILO system, they did not have the same status as public employment services.
- 642.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, considered that specifically naming private employment services would create confusion, as they offered different types of services and varied significantly in their relationships to workers. In some cases, they acted as employers, others provided services to enterprises. It was preferable to refer to quality employment services in general, or to specify public employment services.
- 643.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, echoed the Africa group’s comments on the variety of private employment services, and stated that his group was also flexible on whether to insert “public” or just refer to “quality employment services”.
- 644.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, suggested that not specifying the type of employment services was preferable. The term “crisis-induced” proposed by the Secretariat to replace “pandemic-induced” in her subamendment was acceptable.
- 645.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the other Government groups’ comments, and also questioned the appropriateness of mentioning private employment services. He asked that the Secretariat check the agreed language and provide guidance.
- 646.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson referred to paragraph 3(B)(g), which the Committee had agreed was about a transformative agenda for the public and private sectors. Furthermore, the original amendment had not proposed any further qualifier between “quality” and “employment services”.

- 647.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson maintained her position that a reference to “public” had to be included for her group to support the clause. The ILO had responsibilities on promoting public employment services. The group would not accept a generic reference that could later be interpreted as placing private employment services on the same level. She requested the Secretariat to provide an overview of how the subject was normally treated and the differences between public and private employment services.
- 648.** After consultations, the Worker Vice-Chairperson presented a compromise proposal for paragraph 3(B)(g) *bis*, which read, “strengthen national systems of employment services and national policies to provide quality employment services for workers and employers to mitigate crisis-induced economic and labour market disruption, recognizing, where appropriate, the complementary role of properly regulated private employment services ensuring free access for workers;”.
- 649.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson announced that the social partners had agreed on a subamendment to replace “properly regulated employment services ensuring free access for workers” with “private employment services, when appropriately regulated in line with international labour standards, including the prohibitions therein on charging fees and costs to workers”.
- 650.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a further subamendment to replace “appropriately regulated” with “properly regulated” to avoid repeating “appropriate”.
- 651.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group; Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC; the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC; and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the proposal with the subamendments. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, said that, in the spirit of consensus, his group accepted the compromise proposal.
- 652.** Paragraph 3(B)(g) *bis* was adopted as amended. The Committee agreed to the Secretariat’s proposal to place it after paragraph 3(A)(d) on business continuity and an enabling environment.

### Paragraph 3(B)(g) *ter*

- 653.** The Chairperson announced that the Government member of Algeria had withdrawn an amendment to insert a new clause in paragraph 3(B) on strengthening labour administrations.

### Title of paragraph 3(C)

- 654.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert “and sustainable” between “universal” and “social protection”, as people needed social protection to be sustainable.
- 655.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as the ILO’s message on social protection was that it should be universal, and any further qualifiers should be covered in the subsequent text, not in the title. The Government members speaking on behalf of the Africa group, GRULAC, IMEC, and the EU and its Member States also rejected the amendment. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, indicated that his group could be flexible on the amendment. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported including a reference to sustainable social protection later in the section.

**656.** After discussing the remainder of the document, the Committee decided not to add “and sustainable” in the title of paragraph 3(C), which was adopted without amendment.

### Paragraph 3(C)(a)

**657.** The Committee had before it four amendments for paragraph 3(C)(a):

- The Employers’ group had submitted an amendment to insert “and sustainable” before “social protection”.
- The Workers’ group had submitted an amendment to insert, after “healthcare”, the words “food, shelter and sanitation”.
- IMEC had submitted two amendments: (1) to insert “nationally defined social protection” before “floors” and (2) to insert “the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental” before “health”.

**658.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson explained that her group’s first amendment was to insert the word “sustainable” before “social protection”, which was a priority for the Employers. Her group would support the IMEC amendments to insert “nationally defined social protection” before “floors” and to insert “the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental” before “health”. Her group did not support the Workers’ amendment to insert a reference to “food security, shelter, and sanitation”, as they were included in the concept of “basic income security”.

**659.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson would support the amendment to include “sustainable” if the amendment proposing to include it in the section title was withdrawn. Noting that sustainability normally referred to the sustainability of social protection systems, she asked the Secretariat to clarify whether referring to the sustainability of social protection was appropriate. As to the amendment to insert a reference to nationally defined social protection floors, she noted that the Social Protection Floors Recommendation, 2012 (No. 202), defined such floors as nationally defined sets of basic social security guarantees. The amendment seemed therefore to be redundant, and not an entirely correct summary of the concept of Recommendation No. 202. Her group did not accept the amendment to insert a lengthy qualifier before “health”. As to her group’s own amendment, she noted that food, shelter and sanitation were of great importance to the poor.

**660.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, accepted the inclusion of “sustainable” and of “nationally defined social protection”. However, he did not support the Workers’ group’s amendment, as the clause was not intended to be an exhaustive list. The group also did not support the insertion of “the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental” before “health”, as it was too lofty for this outcome document.

**661.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the insertion of “sustainable”, “nationally defined social protection” and “the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health”. He noted that the latter wording was from the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and was therefore agreed text. The group would not support the insertion of “food, shelter and sanitation”.

**662.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the inclusion of “sustainable” and of “the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental”. The group was flexible with regard to the insertion of “nationally



defined social protection” and of “food, shelter and sanitation” but was not convinced of the relevance of the latter amendment.

- 663.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, supported the inclusion of “sustainable” but not of “food, shelter and sanitation”.
- 664.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the inclusion of “nationally defined social protection” as long as it was consistent with the language used in the Committee on the recurrent discussion on social security. His group did not support the insertion of “food, shelter and sanitation”, which seemed to be more within the mandate of other UN agencies.
- 665.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson had no preference with regard to “the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health” and would support the consensus.
- 666.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed disappointment at the lack of support for “food, shelter and sanitation” and preferred the original text rather than the addition of “nationally defined social protection”. Her group could accept the other amendments, provided that the insertion of “sustainable” was not included in the section title. The Employer Vice-Chairperson confirmed that she had withdrawn the amendment to the section title.
- 667.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, agreed to support the inclusion of “nationally defined social protection” and requested clarification on whether there was majority support for inserting the proposed wording before “health”. The Chairperson noted that there appeared to be majority support for that amendment.
- 668.** Paragraph 3(C)(a) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 3(C)(b)

- 669.** No amendments had been received for paragraph 3(C)(b), which was therefore adopted without amendment.

### Paragraph 3(C)(c)

- 670.** The Committee had before it two amendments to paragraph 3(C)(c):
  - The Employers’ group had submitted an amendment to replace “expand” with “provide adequate” before “access to paid sick leave”.
  - The Workers’ group had submitted an amendment to add “and sickness benefits, and health and” between “paid sick leave” and “care services”.
- 671.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson explained that her group’s amendment to replace “expand access” with “provide adequate access” was more appropriate as some countries already had generous paid sick leave and should not have to expand it. Furthermore, expanding paid sick leave would further increase the burden for employers and impede the transition to the formal economy. Her group agreed to the Workers’ group’s amendment to insert “sickness benefits and health and” before “care services” to broaden the scope.
- 672.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew the part of her group’s amendment proposing to delete “family leave and other family-friendly policies”. She said that she preferred the word “expand”, as it captured not only those who already had access, but also those who did not yet have it. Regarding the placement of the word “adequate”, she asked whether this

referred to adequate access or adequate sick leave. The Employer Vice-Chairperson responded that “adequate” referred to “sick leave”, therefore the text could read “provide access to adequate paid sick leave”.

- 673.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, preferred “expand” to “provide”, agreed to the addition of “adequate” and supported the addition of a reference to sickness benefits and healthcare services.
- 674.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, was flexible on whether “expand” and “provide” should be used. As sickness benefits varied between countries, he proposed a subamendment to add “as appropriate” after “sickness benefits” for more flexibility.
- 675.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, preferred the word “expand” to “provide”. Her group agreed to “adequate” and to the inclusion of a reference to sickness benefits and healthcare services.
- 676.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson asked for additional clarification whether ASPAG’s subamendment to add “as appropriate” referred only to “sickness benefits” or to “paid sick leave and sickness benefits, and health and care services”, to which the Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, responded that “as appropriate” should only qualify “sickness benefits”.
- 677.** The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, preferred the original formulation of “expand” as opposed to “provide”. She asked for clarification on what the term “sickness benefits” would encompass that was not reflected in “paid sick leave” and “health care services”.
- 678.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that his group preferred “expand”, supported the addition of “health care services” and also requested clarification on what the term “sickness benefits” would include.
- 679.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson explained that paid sick leave was limited to the leave itself, and did not include additional payments or services for sick workers. That was why they had proposed to include a reference to “sickness benefits”. They did not support the subamendment to insert “as appropriate”, as it would refer to the whole previous part of the sentence. The subamendment would therefore be difficult to accommodate. The notion of “expand” did not mean expanding paid sick leave where it was already adequate, but referred to expanding access to cover workers who currently had no access to paid sick leave. That notion was not captured by the word “provide” along with “adequate”.
- 680.** The representative of the Secretary-General suggested that, as the chapeau of paragraph 3 referred to “tailored to specific situations and priorities, taking into full account national circumstances”, the qualifier “as appropriate” was not necessary. Furthermore, he noted that the clause included the wording “for all workers”, which signified that providing access for all workers meant expanding as far as possible.
- 681.** Paragraph 3(C)(c) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 3(C)(d)

- 682.** The Committee had before it five amendments to paragraph 3(C)(d):

- IMEC had submitted an amendment to replace “ensure” with “provide”.
  - ASPAG and IMEC had each submitted an amendment to replace “greater” by “reinforce”.
  - The Employers’ group had submitted an amendment to delete “through effective domestic resource mobilization as well as greater global solidarity and coordination”.
  - The Workers’ group had submitted an amendment to add “and global” between “domestic” and “resource mobilization”.
- 683.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the use of the word “provide”, as it made more sense in conjunction with the chapeau. Regarding “reinforce”, she sought clarity on the rationale for the amendment and how it would fit with the surrounding text. She explained that her group was proposing to delete “through effective domestic resource mobilization as well as greater global solidarity and coordination”, as it was too narrow and not suited to different country contexts. She did not support the addition of “and global” before “resource mobilization”, as social protection systems were by definition national and the financing basis must remain national.
- 684.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed support for the use of “provide” rather than “ensure”. Regarding the amendment to replace “greater” with “reinforce”, she preferred the original word but could be flexible. She opposed the deletion of “through effective domestic resource mobilization as well as greater global solidarity and coordination”. Her group was proposing to add “and global” after “domestic”, because although effective domestic resource mobilization was central for financing social protection, for poorer countries it was insufficient. Poorer countries required additional support from the international community, international solidarity and international resource mobilization.
- 685.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, agreed to replacing “ensure” with “provide”. He could support the use of “reinforce” in principle, but expressed the need to clarify the mechanisms to enforce global solidarity. He opposed the deletion of “through effective domestic resource mobilization as well as greater global solidarity and coordination”, as the clause would no longer specify any mechanism to achieve the proposed objectives. He was not in a position to support the addition of “global” before “resource mobilization”.
- 686.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported replacing “ensure” with “provide”. He did not support the deletion of “through effective domestic resource mobilization as well as greater global solidarity and coordination” as it would leave the clause overly general. Regarding resource mobilization, he proposed to delete “domestic” so that it would read “effective resource mobilization”. Another option would be to insert “more” before “effective”. He supported the use of the word “reinforce” as it made the message more robust.
- 687.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, did not support replacing “ensure” with “provide” or the Employers’ group’s proposed deletion. She supported the subamendment proposed by ASPAG to read “effective resource mobilization”. She sought clarity on the rationale for replacing “greater” with “reinforce”.
- 688.** The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, explained that replacing “greater” with the active verb “reinforce” would underline the actions to be taken

and send a stronger message. Her group supported replacing “ensure” with “provide” but opposed the Employers’ group’s proposed deletion. The group preferred not to add “global” but would support a general reference to “effective resource mobilization”.

- 689.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, opposed the Employers’ group’s proposed deletion but supported the use of “reinforce”. He also supported the subamendment to read “effective resource mobilization”.
- 690.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that her group could accept the wording if “ensure” was replaced with “provide” and the original wording of “domestic resource mobilization” was retained, in which case she could withdraw her group’s amendment.
- 691.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson underlined her group’s preference to refer only to “effective resource mobilization” as it should not be limited to domestic resource mobilization. She did not support the insertion of “more” before “effective”. She did not support the proposal to replace “greater” with “reinforce” as the difference was unclear.
- 692.** The representative of the Secretary-General suggested that the clause should be read in connection with the chapeau of paragraph 3, which stated “we commit”. The proposal to replace “greater” with “reinforce” could clarify constituents’ commitments. Resource mobilization could be domestic or global, and it would be up to the constituents to decide on the most appropriate channel, depending on their circumstances.
- 693.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson disagreed and reiterated that social protection systems are national and that it was governments who committed to their sustainable financing through effective domestic resource mobilization. Sustainable financing could not rely on foreign payments. Moreover, it was important to qualify “resource mobilization” with “domestic” as the clause went on to refer to “global solidarity and coordination”.
- 694.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed concern that global solidarity would be ineffective if not supported by financing. She highlighted that domestic resource mobilization would not be sufficient in poorer countries and that support from international financing institutions such as the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund would be needed. These organizations should look at how they could provide support, for example through debt relief, to facilitate financing of social protection systems. She would accept “effective resource mobilization”, otherwise the text should refer to “domestic and global resource mobilization”.
- 695.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and the Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, confirmed that social protection financing relied on domestic resource mobilization as well as global support if needed. They suggested keeping the wording general without specifying “domestic and global”.
- 696.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, observed that the majority supported deleting “domestic” before “resource mobilization”, as that wording was more general. She noted that the spirit behind the reference to “global solidarity and coordination” was the UN Sustainable Development Goals. Many types of resource mobilization existed to finance social protection and social protection floors. For that reason, her group supported the wording “effective resource mobilization” and “global solidarity and coordination”.

- 697.** The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, supported the deletion of “domestic” before “resource mobilization”. That general formulation would allow for domestic or any other kind of resource mobilization. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, aligned himself with IMEC’s statement.
- 698.** After consultations, the Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew her group’s subamendment to include the word “domestic” and proposed that “reinforce” should instead read “reinforced”
- 699.** The representative of the Secretary-General proposed a revised text for the Committee’s consideration: “provide for equitable and sustainable financing for social protection systems through effective resource mobilization as well as reinforced global solidarity and coordination to ensure that no one is left behind”. The Committee members supported the proposal.
- 700.** Paragraph 3(C)(d) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 3(C)(e)

- 701.** The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, introduced an amendment to insert “shocks and” before “pandemics”. Her group believed that it was a useful addition considering that the ILO had the relevant expertise and that constituents would have to deal with other shocks in the future.
- 702.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, the Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group; Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC; Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendment. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, did not support the amendment, as he believed the word “shocks” was open-ended and required further explanation. However, after hearing the views of the other groups, he supported the consensus.
- 703.** There was a discussion on the translation into French and Spanish of the word “shocks”. The representative of the Secretary-General proposed that the translators could suggest an appropriate translation for the French and Spanish.
- 704.** Paragraph 3(C)(e) was adopted as amended.

### Title of paragraph 3(D)

- 705.** No amendments had been proposed for the title of paragraph 3(D), which was therefore adopted without amendment.

### Paragraph 3(D)(a)

- 706.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, introduced an amendment to delete “many” before “countries” and to add, after “and sectors”, the words “with good practices”. His group considered the reference to “many countries” to be subjective and misleading. Furthermore, the group considered that referring to “countries and sectors with good practices” would introduce the concept of learning lessons and sharing good practices.

- 707.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, asked the Secretariat if social dialogue was widely practised in the formulation and design of recovery strategies. If it was, then his group could support the amendment to delete “many” before “countries”. His group supported the addition of “with good practices” after “countries and sectors”.
- 708.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, questioned the placement of “with good practices”, as it gave the impression that “build upon the role that social dialogue has played” referred only to countries and sectors that had good practices. She suggested placing “good practices” elsewhere in the text. Her group was flexible on the suggestion to delete “many” before “countries and sectors”.
- 709.** The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, did not support deleting “many” before “countries and sectors”. She noted that the phrase “with good practices” was unclear. It could mean that social dialogue had been used observing good practices, or it could be calling for an exchange of good practices. She agreed that the reference to “good practices” might need to be placed elsewhere.
- 710.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, noted that his group was flexible on the amendment to delete “many” before “countries” and to add “with good practices” after “sectors”, but preferred the original text proposed by the Secretariat.
- 711.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that not all countries had good social dialogue practices and many had poor practices. Her group preferred to keep the original text as proposed by the Secretariat. If the reference to “good practices” was to be retained, she agreed that it could be added elsewhere in the text. One possible reformulation would be: “build upon the role that social dialogue has played, with good practices applied in the immediate response to the COVID-19 pandemic in many countries”. However, she did not believe it was necessary to add a reference to “good practices”.
- 712.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson preferred the original text as proposed by the Secretariat.
- 713.** The representative of the Secretary-General suggested that if there was a need to include a reference to “good practices”, one option could be to delete “countries and sectors”, so the sentence would read “build upon the role that social dialogue, both bipartite and tripartite, has played in the immediate response to the COVID-19 pandemic, based on good practices of respect for the promotion and realization of the enabling rights...”.
- 714.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that his group had proposed to delete “many” as it appeared to be subjective, but in the interest of expediency, he withdrew the amendment.
- 715.** Paragraph 3(D)(a) was adopted without amendment.

### Paragraph 3(D)(b)

- 716.** The Committee had before it three amendments to paragraph 3(D)(b):
- The Employers’ group had submitted an amendment to replace “design and implement” with “inform” before “national recovery plans”.
  - GRULAC had submitted an amendment to read: “consulting the tripartite partners to contribute to designing and implementing national recovery plans”.



- IMEC had submitted an amendment to read: “including through governments consulting with social partners in designing and implementing national recovery plans”.
- 717.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson could support the amendment to delete “convening” and replacing it with “consulting”, but proposed a subamendment to read “on a tripartite basis with the social partners”. Her group had proposed an amendment to replace “design and implement” with “inform”, because it was not the social partners that designed and implemented national recovery plans, but governments, who did so in consultation with the social partners. She indicated that her group was flexible on the amendment, if the IMEC amendment to read “including through governments consulting with social partners in designing and implementing national recovery plans” was adopted.
- 718.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the IMEC and GRULAC amendments were similar in content. Her group’s preference was for the IMEC amendment, as governments could convene or consult the social partners, but it would be unusual to state that they should consult themselves. Furthermore, she did not support adding “on a tripartite basis”, because countries had different consultation practices that did not always involve all parties simultaneously.
- 719.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendments to replace “convening” with “consulting with”. He considered the Employers’ subamendment to add “on a tripartite basis” to be redundant.
- 720.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported IMEC’s amendment to replace “convening” with “consulting” and the Employers’ group’s amendment to replace “design and implement” with “inform”, while noting that the latter amendment would be dropped if IMEC’s amendment was adopted. His group also supported the proposal to replace “the tripartite partners” with “social partners”.
- 721.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, noted that IMEC’s amendment concerning consulting the social partners was similar to that of her own group, and the group could support IMEC’s proposal. However, her group would like to keep the notion of “contribute to” from its own proposal. The group did not support the amendment to replace “design and implement” with “inform”.
- 722.** The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, noted that GRULAC seemed to be thinking along similar lines as IMEC with its amendment, which also substituted “consulting” for “convening”, and there seemed to be consensus on that. Furthermore, because the amendment described governments consulting with social partners, a subamendment to add “on a tripartite basis” was unnecessary. Her group also preferred the original text of “design and implement” to the Employers’ group’s amendment of “inform”.
- 723.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that his group also preferred “design and implement” but could accept “inform”, and also preferred “consult” to “convene”. The subamendment to add “on a tripartite basis”, however, was redundant.
- 724.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed that “consulting on” was more appropriate than “consulting in” the design and implementation of recovery plans. She did not support GRULAC’s amendment to insert “contribute to” in relation to national recovery plans, as in the consultative process being described, it was understood that governments would incorporate the input of the social partners into recovery plans.

**725.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson confirmed that she would withdraw the amendment to replace “design and implement” with “inform” if only the IMEC amendment was adopted. She agreed with the Worker Vice-Chairperson that “contribute to” was not necessary.

**726.** Paragraph 3(D)(b) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 3(D)(c)

**727.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete “human-centred” before “recovery strategies”. She noted that there had been agreement that once the agreed descriptors had appeared in the document title, there was no need to repeat them throughout the text.

**728.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson agreed with the proposal, though for different reasons. For her group, the clause was about the need for the involvement of all the named stakeholders, so the description of the recovery strategy was less important.

**729.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that his group was flexible on the amendment. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the amendment. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, commented that her group preferred to retain the original language, but was willing to be flexible.

**730.** The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, conceded that while her group had also preferred the original text, having listened to the other groups’ comments, and so long as the “human-centred” language was adequately reflected elsewhere, she could agree to the amendment. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed.

**731.** Paragraph 3(D)(c) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 3(D)(c) *bis*

**732.** The Committee had before it an amendment submitted by the Government member of Mali to insert a new clause after paragraph 3(D)(c) to read “promote social dialogue as a tool for global solidarity to prevent any discrimination linked to the COVID-19 vaccination passport”.

**733.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, seconded the amendment and proposed a subamendment, which read: “promote global cooperation and solidarity mechanisms to ensure vaccine equity and non-discriminatory vaccine certification”. He explained that, although vaccine access was mentioned in preambular paragraph 7, it was important to include it in the actionable part of the document and to highlight the need for efforts to combat any related discrimination.

**734.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that she was sympathetic to the concerns raised, as a situation had developed in which people from the West could travel, and the rest of the world could not. However, the clause would be more appropriately placed elsewhere.

**735.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that her group also supported the important principle, and noted that people who were unable to receive the vaccine for health or other reasons should not be discriminated against. However, as access to vaccines was a government responsibility, it should not be placed in the section on social dialogue. Furthermore, the link to the world of work must be maintained.

- 736.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the content of the subamendment and agreed that it was better to place it elsewhere in the document.
- 737.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that her group supported the important notions of vaccine equity and non-discrimination and agreed that, with the deletion of the reference to social dialogue, it no longer belonged in that section. She noted, however, that there was already a reference to vaccine equity in the Preamble. As for vaccine certification, the issue was at various stages of advancement in different countries and regions. As a result, her group had doubts as to the scope of the present clause, and whether it should be included in the outcome document.
- 738.** The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, echoed the doubts expressed by GRULAC as to whether the paragraph should be included in the present document. To some degree, the issues it addressed were outside the remit of the ILO and were more suited to that of the World Health Organization. Vaccine certification was at different stages of development in different parts of the world and it was difficult to comment on a phenomenon that did not yet exist in many places. In addition, the document already contained language on vaccine-related issues and vaccine equity. As a result, her group did not support the inclusion of the additional clause.
- 739.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, was not in a position to support the subamendment in its current form, and agreed that it was out of place in the section on social dialogue.
- 740.** The representative of the Secretary-General suggested that the clause could be placed under section B on protection of workers. The relationship to the world of work was in non-discrimination and vaccine certification. The Employer Vice-Chairperson considered it was better placed under section A, as the issues of vaccine equity and discrimination against unvaccinated workers were related to inclusive growth and employment. The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed that a sentence with a strong message on vaccine equity could be added to preambular paragraph 7.
- 741.** When the discussion resumed after consultations, the Chairperson noted that doubts had been expressed as to whether the concept of vaccine equity belonged in the document.
- 742.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, proposed three subamendments with a view to reaching consensus: (1) to replace “global cooperation” with “international cooperation”; (2) to replace “vaccine certification” with “COVID-19 certification”, as that included tests as well as vaccines; and (3) to replace “ensure” with “work towards”.
- 743.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the proposed subamendments. However, her group suggested that “COVID-19 certification” might benefit from clarification. In addition, she agreed to including action on vaccine-related issues in the operative part of the document.
- 744.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson also supported the subamendments suggested by the Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States. She considered that “COVID-19 certification” was clear as a stand-alone term.

- 745.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, stressed the need for actionable language on the critical issues of vaccine equity and COVID-19 certification, which undoubtedly concerned the ILO. Delineation between the ILO and other multilateral organizations should be avoided, and cooperation and solidarity between multilateral organizations was required. He supported the proposed subamendments, but suggested replacing “COVID-19 certification” with “COVID-19 testing and vaccination certification”.
- 746.** The representative of the Secretary-General suggested that the wording on certification might be ambiguous as to whether the ILO itself would be working towards certification or working towards ensuring that any certification was non-discriminatory. The Worker Vice-Chairperson considered that it was clear from the text that the ILO would work towards ensuring that certification was non-discriminatory. She proposed to add “related” between “COVID-19” and “certification” and remove “testing and vaccination” to provide further clarity.
- 747.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, proposed alternative wording to explain the meaning of COVID-19 certification, which did not receive the support of the Committee.
- 748.** The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, said that if the text was to be included, it belonged under Part II concerning the ILO working with the multilateral community. Her group would prefer to end the clause after “vaccine equity” and to specify “COVID-19” before “vaccine equity”. She also proposed a subamendment to insert “where relevant” before “non-discriminatory COVID-19-related certification”, as certification was still theoretical, and countries were at different stages in the COVID-19 response.
- 749.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, reiterated that the document was a non-binding call to action, and adding “where relevant” would limit the spirit of solidarity. The Worker Vice-Chairperson added that the words “promote” and “work towards” were two general qualifiers, which meant that “where relevant” was unnecessary. The representative of the Secretary-General suggested that “where relevant” was not necessary, as the idea was to ensure that any certification was not discriminatory.
- 750.** The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, agreed in the spirit of compromise to accept the text without her group’s proposed subamendments.
- 751.** Paragraph 3(D)(c) *bis* was adopted as amended. The Committee agreed to the Secretariat’s proposal to place it as the final clause of paragraph 6.

## Title of Part II

- 752.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert “sustainable and resilient” before “human-centred recovery” and subamended it to also add “inclusive”, in line with earlier decisions. The Committee members agreed that all of the titles should be checked for consistency at the end of the discussion.
- 753.** After the Committee had discussed the rest of the document, the Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment so that the title of Part II would read: “ILO leadership and support of a human-centred recovery that is inclusive, sustainable and resilient”.

**754.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the members speaking on behalf of the Government groups supported the subamendment.

**755.** The title of Part II was adopted as amended.

#### Paragraph 4

**756.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew an amendment to delete “inclusive” from paragraph 4. The Committee therefore had before it two amendments to paragraph 4:

- The Employers’ group had submitted an amendment to delete, after “leadership role”, the words “in the international system”.
- IMEC had submitted an amendment to replace “To this end” with “Through focused and accelerated implementation of the ILO Centenary Declaration”.

**757.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson explained that her group wished to delete “in the international system” as it was too limited. She noted that the second sentence of the paragraph read “it will strengthen its support of Member States’ recovery efforts”, which showed that the role extended beyond the multilateral level. An alternative would be “must play a leadership role both with its constituents and in the international system”. Her group supported IMEC’s amendment.

**758.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson considered “both with its constituents and in the international system” somewhat wordy but could accept it. She asked what the rationale for IMEC’s amendment was.

**759.** The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, considered that it was more appropriate to include “through focused and accelerated implementation of the ILO Centenary Declaration” in the first paragraph of Part II, just as the same reference was included in the first paragraph of Part I. It also helped to improve the readability of paragraph 5 and strengthened the document. The group believed that it was important to keep the reference to “the international system” in paragraph 4, as the subsequent paragraphs included references to the ILO working with constituents and the international system.

**760.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, agreed to referencing the ILO taking a leadership role not only in the multilateral system but also with its constituents, while noting that there were different mechanisms within Member States.

**761.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, preferred to retain “in the international system” but could be flexible on the amendment to delete it. His group agreed that it was logical to move the reference to the accelerated implementation of the Centenary Declaration.

**762.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, stated that paragraph 4 concerned the role of the ILO in the international system and did not support deleting the reference. For her group, the accelerated implementation of the ILO Centenary Declaration was one of the most important aspects of the document and she supported moving the reference up to paragraph 4.

**763.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that it was important to keep the reference to the international system, and could support the proposal to add “with its constituents”.

**764.** Paragraph 4 was adopted as amended.

### Chapeau of paragraph 5

**765.** The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, introduced an amendment to delete the reference to “focused and accelerated implementation of the ILO Centenary Declaration” in paragraph 5. She explained that the rationale was to move it to paragraph 4. As the Committee had adopted the related amendment, the chapeau of paragraph 5 was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 5(a)

**766.** The Committee therefore had before it five amendments to paragraph 5(a):

- The Employers’ group had submitted two amendments: (1) to delete “risks and” before “challenges”, which had been withdrawn, and (2) to add, after “including”, the words “through an enabling environment for entrepreneurship and business growth”.
- The Workers’ group had submitted an amendment to add, after “employment”, the words “and social development”.
- IMEC had submitted two amendments: (1) to add, after “create inclusive”, the words “and sustainable” and (2) to split the clause into subclauses.

**767.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported IMEC’s amendments to insert “and sustainable” and to restructure the clause, and sought clarity from the Worker Vice-Chairperson on the proposal to add “social development”. Her group considered its own amendment to add the words “through an enabling environment for entrepreneurship and business growth” to be an important addition, as it highlighted that businesses create employment.

**768.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported IMEC’s amendment to add the words “and sustainable”. In response to the Employer Vice-Chairperson’s question on the amendment to add “and social development”, she explained that social development was widely referenced in ILO instruments, including in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, the Rural Workers’ Organisations Convention, 1975 (No. 141), and the Employment and Decent Work for Peace and Resilience Recommendation, 2017 (No. 205). The outcome document contained significant language on economic and employment issues, but not on social development, and it would be appropriate to add a reference to it, given the emphasis of the ILO’s work on economic and social development in recent decades. Her group did not support the Employers’ group’s amendment to add “through an enabling environment for entrepreneurship and business growth” as it duplicated existing wording. She could accept the amendment to restructure the text, but proposed combining the last two subclauses, as there was a relationship between technological progress and the sharing of benefits.

**769.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the addition of “and sustainable”. With regard to the amendment to add “and social development”, his group could consider it, but was doubtful whether social development was within the purview of the outcome document on the COVID-19 crisis. His group was flexible on the addition of “through an enabling environment for entrepreneurship and business growth”. Regarding the amendment to restructure the clause, his group preferred to retain the original text.



- 770.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the addition of “and social development” and was flexible on the amendment to divide the text into subclauses and on combining subclauses (iv) and (v). His group supported the amendment to add “through an enabling environment for entrepreneurship and business growth”.
- 771.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the amendments to add “and sustainable” and “and social development”. Her group welcomed the reference to entrepreneurship and supported the Employers’ group’s amendment. She supported the amendment to divide the text into subclauses, and the proposal to merge the last two subclauses.
- 772.** The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, supported to add “and sustainable” after “create inclusive”, the amendment to add “and social development” after “employment” and the amendment to add “through an enabling environment for entrepreneurship and business growth”. She explained the reason behind the amendment to divide the text into subparagraphs was to make the text clearer. She supported the proposal by the workers to join subclause (iv), “harness the fullest potential of technological progress to create decent jobs and sustainable enterprises, including by addressing its risks and challenges”, and subclause (v), “enable a broad participation in the benefits of economic growth”. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, aligned himself with IMEC’s statement.
- 773.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson considered that it was illogical to include “through an enabling environment for entrepreneurship and business growth” after “create inclusive and sustainable economic growth, employment and social development” and suggested moving the reference to an enabling environment to one of the subclauses. Furthermore, the standard wording was “an enabling environment for sustainable enterprises”.
- 774.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson observed that there was broad support for the inclusion of a reference to an enabling environment for entrepreneurship and business growth in paragraph 5(a). It was clear that inclusive economic growth and employment required an enabling environment for business, and the wording was consistent with that used in the Centenary Declaration.
- 775.** The representative of the Secretary-General suggested that a reference to an enabling environment for sustainable enterprises could be included between subclauses (ii) and (iii), under the specific policy areas. Concerning the last two subclauses, he confirmed that the original intent was indeed to link the issue of technological progress with broad participation in its benefits. To align with the Centenary Declaration, the clause could begin with “promote” rather than “create”.
- 776.** After consultations, the representative of the Secretary-General proposed the following revised text for the Committee’s consideration:
- (a) create inclusive and sustainable economic growth, employment and social development, increasing support for the development of policies and approaches that:
    - (i) generate employment-intensive investment;
    - (ii) strengthen active labour market policies;
    - (iii) promote an enabling environment for entrepreneurship and sustainable enterprises;
    - (iv) boost productivity through diversification and innovation; and

- (v) harness the fullest potential of technological progress to create decent jobs and sustainable enterprises by addressing its risks and challenges, enabling broad social participation in its benefits and reducing the digital divide and its impact on the world of work.

- 777.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, **following discussions and consultations on an amendment of her group regarding paragraph 5(d) *bis* later in the document**, suggested incorporating some of the elements of that amendment into the current subclause and proposed the following rewording for subclause (v): “harness the fullest potential of technological progress and digitalization, including platform work, to create decent jobs and sustainable enterprises, enabling broader social participation in their benefits and address their risks and challenges, including by reducing the digital divide between people and countries”. She clarified that the rationale was that the ILO’s support to Member States was not limited to addressing challenges and risks, but also included reducing the digital divide.
- 778.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group; Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG; Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC; and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the revised text.
- 779.** The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, expressed her group’s concern that the digital divide was not something that the ILO itself could reduce, but said that as the clause concerned the ILO supporting the Members States in their own efforts, the wording was acceptable to the group.
- 780.** Paragraph 5(a) was adopted as amended.

### Chapeau of paragraph 5(b)

- 781.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert, at the beginning of paragraph 5(b), the words “preserve jobs, increase the resilience of jobs to crises and pandemics, and”, to reflect how preserving jobs and increasing their resilience had been critical during the current crisis.
- 782.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the amendment, as the clause should open with a focus on protecting workers to mirror the heading of the second section in Part I. She also expressed doubts about whether a job could be characterized as “resilient”. The Employer Vice-Chairperson explained that in the world of work, “resilience” meant the ability to cope with shocks such that an employer would not have to downsize and workers could be kept on the payroll. One example would be implementing shorter working weeks.
- 783.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, suggested that the issue was already sufficiently covered in section A of Part I. His group preferred the original text, but could be flexible. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, echoed the Africa group’s comments. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the amendment as it brought in an element of innovation, especially in terms of learning from the crisis.
- 784.** The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, also welcomed the notion behind the amendment, and proposed a subamendment, which could be placed in a new subclause, to refer to protecting workers, preserving jobs and promoting resilient labour markets. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed.

- 785.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled that paragraph 3(A)(d) already provided for incentives to employers to retain workers. Part II was about the role of the ILO, and the clause should start with the protection of workers. She did not see the need for the addition, but if the majority was in favour, it should be placed in a new subclause.
- 786.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that her group could accept IMEC's subamendment in a new subclause (iii).
- 787.** The representative of the Secretary-General recalled the overall structure of the document and the need for a clear link between the headings in Parts I and II, as had been agreed during the informal consultations. He suggested that the original language could be maintained and, if there were broad support for adopting the amendment, it could be included later in the sentence or as a subclause.
- 788.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported that approach as well as including IMEC's subamendment regarding labour markets. The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the members speaking on behalf of the Government groups supported the proposal.
- 789.** The Committee adopted new paragraph 5(b)(iii), which read "preserving jobs and increasing the resilience of labour markets to crises and pandemics".

#### Paragraph 5(b)(i)

- 790.** The Employers' group had submitted an amendment to delete "ratification and application" and to insert "ratified" before "international labour standards". The Committee decided to consider the amendment together with a number of similar amendments.
- 791.** After the Committee had considered the document in its entirety, the Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment.
- 792.** Paragraph 5(b)(i) was adopted without amendment.
- 793.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to delete "with" and add "a" before "emphasis". The Committee decided to retain "with" and add "a". The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, noted that the change had a substantial impact on the Spanish version, which the Secretariat agreed to resolve.

#### Paragraph 5(b)(ii)

- 794.** The Employers' group had submitted three amendments to paragraph 5(b)(ii): (1) to replace "informality" with "the informal economy"; (2) to delete "and insecure forms of work, which have been particularly affected by the crisis"; and (3) to insert "research" before "development cooperation" and to insert "and policy interventions and guidance" after it
- 795.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that her group sought to replace "informality" with "informal economy", as it was a more correct and inclusive term. The group proposed to delete the reference to insecure forms of work, as they were not limited to informal work. The amendment to insert "research" and "policy interventions and guidance" aimed to give more substance to the subclause on what the ILO needed to do to help Member States.
- 796.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the members speaking on behalf of the Government groups supported the addition of "research" and "policy interventions and guidance".
- 797.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the use of the term "informal economy" as it changed the approach of the clause. The Committee agreed to return to the amendment after a decision had been made on the reference to informality in the Preamble.

**798.** After consultations, the Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment to delete “insecure forms of work, which have been particularly affected by the crisis”.

**799.** Paragraph 5 (b) (ii) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 5(c)

**800.** The Committee had before it three amendments to paragraph 5(c):

- The Workers’ group had submitted an amendment to add “adequate” after “comprehensive”.
- The Employers’ group had submitted two amendments: (1) to add “progressively” before “comprehensive” and add “systems” after “protection” and (2) to delete “major life and” before “work transitions”.

**801.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the insertion of “adequate”. She subamended her group’s amendment to move “progressively” to the beginning of the clause, before “achieve”. The group proposed to add “systems” after “social protection”, and to delete the reference to major life transitions because that was beyond the mandate of the ILO, which should remain focused on the world of work. She offered as alternatives: “major transitions in the world of work”, “major transitions related to the world of work”, or “major transitions related to work”.

**802.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the addition of “progressively” before “achieve”, as it weakened the wording on a section concerning the support the ILO would provide Member States in their efforts to achieve the stated objectives. She did not support the deletion of the reference to major life transitions, as there were many such transitions in an individual’s private life that would have an effect on work, such as pregnancy, illness or ageing or illness. Furthermore, work–life balance was within the purview of the ILO. She proposed “major life transitions that have implications for work” as a compromise.

**803.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the inclusion of “adequate” but not of “progressively”. He preferred to retain the reference to major life transitions.

**804.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the addition of “adequate” but not of “systems”, as the text referred to access to services. He supported the Employers’ amendment to delete “major life”.

**805.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the addition of “adequate” and “systems” and the subamendment to insert “progressively”. However, the group preferred to retain “major life and work transitions”.

**806.** The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, supported the insertion of “adequate” but not of “progressively” and “systems”. Her group had concluded that there were a number of life transitions that were appropriately work-related, so they preferred the original language.

**807.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, confirmed that the EU did not support the addition of “progressively” nor did they agree with “systems”, as it narrowed the scope. He supported retaining the reference to life transitions to for the reasons given by the Workers’ group. The EU supported the addition of “adequate” on the understanding that it was coherent with terminology used by the Committee on the recurrent discussion on social security.

- 808.** The representative of the Secretary-General suggested that retaining the wording “achieve universal access” would be consistent with Part I. He suggested that “progressively” might be unnecessary in conjunction with “efforts to achieve”, which already left scope for Member States to make those efforts progressively. The Employer Vice-Chairperson then withdrew the amendment to insert “progressively” and “systems”.
- 809.** The representative of the Secretary-General went on to explain that the intention of the paragraph was to refer to both life and work transitions of individuals. As others had remarked, there were a number of non-work-related transitions that did not arise from work but nevertheless had an impact on it, such as a disabling accident. The Social Protection Floors Recommendation, 2012 (No. 202), included a reference to “over the life cycle”. He said that the Secretariat could propose a text to seek consensus.
- 810.** At the beginning of a subsequent sitting, before resuming the discussion of paragraph 5(c), and in reaction to proposed compromise texts that the Secretariat had circulated, the Employer Vice-Chairperson raised a point of order on the governance of the proceedings, stating that it was not appropriate for the Secretariat to state its opinion on amendments, that proposals from the Employers’ group had generally not been taken into account in the Secretariat’s proposed compromise texts, that the agreed compromises had not been correctly reflected by the Secretariat, and that it was inappropriate for the Secretariat to make subsequent changes to its own compromise proposal. Her group remained committed to achieving a consensus-based document.
- 811.** The representative of the Secretary-General explained that the role of the Secretariat in supporting the Committee’s work included providing summaries of discussions and also legal and technical advice on drafting. Under the adopted procedure of the Committee, explained by Chairperson, the Secretariat was called upon to summarize the discussions and, in some cases, propose alternative texts. He reassured the Committee members that the Secretariat had proposed compromise proposals with the sole purpose of supporting the Committee’s work. He wished to place on record his appreciation for the professionalism and commitment of his colleagues, particularly in view of the challenges of a virtual meeting.
- 812.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled that the Officers of the Committee had agreed that the Secretariat could provide advice. Furthermore, the compromise texts had reflected important changes that had arisen subsequently. She reaffirmed her own group’s commitment to achieving consensus.
- 813.** The representative of the Secretary-General proposed the following revised text for the Committee’s consideration:
- achieve universal access to comprehensive, adequate and sustainable social protection, including floors, which ensure income security and health protection and enable people, including the self-employed and workers in the informal economy, to navigate transitions over the life cycle such as those precipitated by the COVID-19 crisis.
- 814.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson recalled that during previous discussions it had been agreed that universal social protection floors were not limited to work-related matters. Major life transitions were also not a work-related matter and she therefore proposed an amendment to replace “navigate transitions over the life cycle” with “cope with the challenges in life and work”.
- 815.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the members speaking on behalf of the Government groups supported the proposal.

- 816.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, proposed to insert “nationally defined” before “floors” to clarify the scope and noted that it had been included in another part of the draft outcome document. The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that while the words “nationally defined” were included in one part of the draft outcome document, the Committee had agreed that one reference was sufficient. She asked the Secretariat to check and provide guidance.
- 817.** The representative of the Secretary-General noted that the Africa group was referring to the similar reference in paragraph 3(C)(a) in Part I, but the current paragraph referred to the ILO’s support to constituents. As “nationally defined” had already been used to qualify “floors”, he suggested that it was not necessary to repeat it. The Government member of Ethiopia speaking on behalf of the Africa group, withdrew the proposal.
- 818.** Paragraph 5(c) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 5(c) *bis*

- 819.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to include a new clause after paragraph 5(c) to read: “strengthen the capacity of labour administrations and labour inspectorates to ensure implementation of rules and regulations, especially regarding social protection and occupational safety and health”, in order to reflect an important aspect that was missing from the draft document.
- 820.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson had no objections. The Government member of Bangladesh speaking on behalf of ASPAG, said that in some countries, other agencies were responsible and proposed a subamendment to include, after “inspectorates”, “and other relevant authorities”.
- 821.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, supported the subamendment proposed by ASPAG. She proposed a further subamendment to delete “especially”.
- 822.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that she could accept the addition of “and other relevant authorities” but not the deletion of “especially” as it would not be clear that labour inspectorates had a variety of other tasks.
- 823.** The Committee supported the addition of “and other relevant authorities” and the retention of “especially”.
- 824.** Paragraph 5(c) *bis* was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 5(d)

- 825.** The Committee had before it three amendments to paragraph 5(d):
- The Employers’ group had submitted two amendments: (1) to delete “use social dialogue to design and implement recovery strategies”, to add, after “strengthening”, the words “the capacity of” and to replace “through targeted and integrated measures” with “to engage in social dialogue, inform national recovery strategies and to support their members in the recovery”; and (2) to replace “regional and national” with “its” before “training partners”.
  - The Workers’ group had submitted an amendment to delete “and regional and national training partners”.



- 826.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson explained that her group's first amendment intended to reflect the fact that social dialogue went beyond the role of helping to design a recovery strategy, and an important element was to support the members of employers' and workers' organizations in the recovery. The second amendment was to reflect that the International Training Centre of the ILO had many training partners, including at the international level.
- 827.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew her group's amendment in favour of the Employers' group's amendment to retain "and its training partners" and supported the wording "to engage in social dialogue" and "to support their members in the recovery". The members speaking on behalf of the Government groups also supported "and its training partners". The Worker Vice-Chairperson could not support the deletion of "use social dialogue", and proposed to align the wording with that used in paragraph 3(D)(b).
- 828.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the deletion of "use social dialogue", as it changed the message of the original text. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, agreed and preferred to retain "through targeted and integrated measures". The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, also opposed the amendment, as it duplicated similar wording on designing and implementing recovery plans. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, preferred the original text as it better reflected the need to underline the role of the ILO in assisting constituents in using social dialogue.
- 829.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed combining the first part of the original text and the additional wording proposed by the Employer Vice-Chairperson, so that the clause would read:
- use social dialogue to design and implement recovery strategies, strengthening the capacity of employers' and workers' organizations to engage in national recovery strategies and to support their members in the recovery, including through the International Training Centre of the ILO and its training partners.

- 830.** The Committee supported the proposal. Paragraph 5(d) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 5(d) *bis*

- 831.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert the following new clause after paragraph 5(d), which addressed an issue that had been discussed extensively during the informal consultations:
- harness the potential of the digital transformation of the world of work, including platform work, to generate decent work and full, productive and freely chosen employment and inclusiveness by reducing the digital divide between people and countries and ensuring protection for workers' privacy and other rights, including through social dialogue, collective bargaining and appropriate regulation.
- 832.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson was open to considering an additional clause but proposed a subamendment to make it more general and concise: "harness the potential of digital transformation to generate decent work and full, productive and freely chosen employment to reduce the digital divide between people and countries". Her group did not support singling out platform work as it was only a minor portion of digital work.
- 833.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the subamendment, as it changed the message of the text considerably. She noted that the Centenary Declaration referred to "policies and measures that ensure appropriate privacy and personal data protection, and

respond to challenges and opportunities in the world of work relating to the digital transformation of work, including platform work". It was also important to mention workers' privacy and other rights in connection with digital work.

- 834.** The representative of the Secretary-General observed that paragraph 5(a)(v), which had not yet been adopted, read: "harness the fullest potential of technological progress to create decent jobs and sustainable enterprises and by addressing its risks and challenges and enabling broad social participation in its benefits". He suggested that a reference to the digital divide could be incorporated in the earlier subclause. In addition, paragraph 3(B)(d), which was also pending adoption, referred to "efforts to reduce disparities in digital access".
- 835.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the members speaking on behalf of the Government groups supported the suggested approach. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, and the Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, also indicated that it was not the role of the ILO to reduce the digital divide between people and countries.
- 836.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson expressed her flexibility in combining the two clauses but noted that proposed paragraph 5(a)(v) in its current form did not include references to platform work, digital work or data protection and privacy, and technological progress was not synonymous with digitalization. Moreover, the chapeau of paragraph 5 read "the ILO will strengthen its support of Member States' efforts to", meaning that the ILO itself would not be undertaking the action. She suggested that a reference to platform work could be made in relation to telework.
- 837.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported moving the reference to the digital divide but expressed reservations about the inclusion of the term "platform work", as it had different implications in sectors such as healthcare and technology. However, the group could align with the majority.
- 838.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, considered that the reference to "platform work" was important and was also included in the Centenary Declaration.
- 839.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that she could support the inclusion of "reducing the digital divide" under paragraph 5(a)(v). The reference to "platform work" in the Centenary Declaration related to the context of the future of work and was not appropriate in the current document. As "privacy" was already addressed elsewhere in the document, the rest of the proposed new clause was redundant.
- 840.** The representative of the Secretary-General suggested that paragraph 5(a)(v) could be expanded to include "reducing the digital divide between people and countries, and enabling broad social participation in its benefits" and that platform work and privacy could be addressed in the clause on teleworking.
- 841.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, proposed that the rewording could include "addressing the risks and challenges, including those posed by the digital divide", which would reflect her group's concern that the ILO's role is to help constituents in their own actions to address the challenges of the digital divide.
- 842.** After discussing the wording in conjunction with paragraph 5(a)(v), the Committee decided to merge paragraph 5(d) *bis* under paragraph 5(a)(v).

### Paragraph 5(d) *ter*

- 843.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert a new clause to paragraph 5 to read “ensure that skills are in line with labour market needs and support effective transitions for the young generation from education to work”. The intention was to emphasize the importance of supporting the transition from education to work for young people, who had been hit hard by the COVID-19 crisis.
- 844.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support the proposal, as young people had already been addressed. Furthermore, skills did not only serve labour market needs.
- 845.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, also supported it, but proposed a subamendment to replace “skills” with “skills development opportunities”. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, stated that her group was flexible. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, said that her group was also flexible, and proposed a subamendment to replace “the young generation” with “youth”. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that his group shared the concern of the Employers’ group and support the subamendment proposed by IMEC.
- 846.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed replacing “ensure” with “promote” or “provide for” as the Committee had agreed on at other points in the document so as not to provide guarantees. She also noted that language from the Centenary Declaration could be incorporated to read “skills are responsive to labour market needs” and to add “and development needs”. She could support the use of “youth” but preferred “young people”.
- 847.** The representative of the Secretary-General drew the Committee’s attention to the reference in paragraph 3(A)(f) of the document to “investment in lifelong learning, including through more equitable and effective access to high-quality education and training as well as apprenticeships, upskilling and reskilling, and through other active labour market policies and partnerships that reduce skills mismatches, gaps and shortages”. He suggested that, if the Committee wished also to include a reference to skills and young people in Part II, it could be incorporated under paragraph 5(a) among the other measures to create inclusive and sustainable economic growth, employment and social development.
- 848.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that she could agree to moving the text to become paragraph 5(a)(vi). She did not support the subamendment to replace “ensure” with “promote” or to include “and development needs”. She could support the subamendments to use “skills development opportunities”, “that are responsive to labour market needs” and “young people”.
- 849.** The members speaking on behalf of the Government groups expressed a preference to use “promote” rather than “ensure”, to include “responsive to”, not to include “and development needs” and to use the term “young people”. They expressed flexibility on the placement of the clause. The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, also proposed to replace “effective” with “smooth” before “transitions”.
- 850.** The representative of the Secretary-General suggested that the Committee could consider adopting the broader term “education and training to work”, which had been used in the Centenary Declaration.
- 851.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the addition of “training”. She preferred the word “effective” to “smooth” before “transitions”, but could be flexible.

- 852.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson could agree to replacing “ensure” with “promote”, supported the addition of “training”, but did not support replacing “effective” with “smooth”; she was flexible on the use of “young people” or “youth”.
- 853.** The text was adopted as amended, to be included as paragraph 5(a)(vi).

#### Paragraph 5(d) *quater*

- 854.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add a new clause under paragraph 5 to read “ensure that guidance, training and placement services provide older workers with the facilities, advice and assistance they may need to stay in the labour market”. It was intended to pay special attention to the increasingly large group of older workers, especially in industrialized countries, who faced growing difficulties in remaining in the labour market, including as a result of technological progress.
- 855.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that the amendment focused exclusively on older people remaining in the labour market, and recalled that the discussions related to older workers in the context of the ILO Centenary Declaration had resulted in a more balanced text that read: “supporting measures that help older workers to expand their choices, optimizing their opportunities to work in good-quality, productive and healthy conditions until their retirement, and to enable active ageing”. Furthermore, there was still a pending proposal by the Employers’ group on employment services. All these points considered, her group could only support the amendment if it was subamended in line with the wording used in the Centenary Declaration.
- 856.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, expressed reservations about singling out one segment of the labour force, as other vulnerable groups also needed due attention for support. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the amendment, given that older people required specific attention. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, said that her group could be flexible in including the clause and proposed a subamendment to replace the word “placement” with “employment” before “services”. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the proposed subamendment.
- 857.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the subamendment by IMEC. Regarding the wording in the Centenary Declaration, she noted that this was a Declaration for the next 100 years, whereas the present discussion focused on exiting the current crisis and ensuring a speedy recovery. In many countries older workers had been among the first to lose their jobs in the crisis, and it was a matter of urgency to ensure that they could be reintegrated into the labour market. Her group was flexible about including the clause under paragraph 5(a). Finally, she highlighted that supporting older workers was also a priority policy area in many regional organizations and in line with international and regional policy approaches.
- 858.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson responded that there were many vulnerable groups in the labour market, as mentioned in earlier paragraphs, and that it was primarily workers in precarious employment who had lost their jobs in the crisis, whereas older workers in stable employment were protected. Moreover, it would be important to replace “ensure” with “promote”. The current situation was more nuanced than presented in the amendment; for

example, there had been cases where social dialogue had resulted in agreements allowing older workers to leave the labour market earlier in order to make way for young people who urgently needed work. If there was a general sentiment that some language on older workers was needed, then the current amendment had to be subamended to recognize the points stated in the Centenary Declaration.

- 859.** The representative of the Secretary-General suggested that, on the basis of members' proposals, one possible option would be: "promote guidance, training and employment services that provide older workers with the facilities, advice and assistance they may need to expand their choices, optimize their opportunities for work in good-quality, productive and healthy conditions until their retirement, and to enable active ageing".
- 860.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the Centenary Declaration did indeed include more general language on the topic of older workers, but the issue that was urgent now for older workers was staying or returning to the labour market after the crisis. Nevertheless, the suggestion made by the representative of the Secretary-General was acceptable to her group.
- 861.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that the proposed wording was acceptable to her group, but recalled that the Committee had yet to resolve wording on employment services under paragraph 3(B).
- 862.** The members speaking on behalf of the Government groups also accepted the proposed new wording.
- 863.** The text was adopted as amended, to be included as paragraph 5(a)(vii).

### Chapeau of paragraph 6

- 864.** The Committee had before it two proposed amendments to the chapeau of paragraph 6:
  - ASPAG had submitted an amendment to insert "Underlining the importance of multilateralism, particularly in addressing the COVID-19 impacts on the world of work" at the start of the paragraph.
  - IMEC had submitted an amendment to replace "and processes" with "as well as civil society"; it had withdrawn an amendment to insert "and sharing of good practice" before it was discussed.
- 865.** The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons and the Government members of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the amendment submitted by ASPAG. The Government members of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that they were flexible. The amendment was adopted.
- 866.** The Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons both opposed the IMEC amendment, which would commit the ILO to strengthening its cooperation with civil society. The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, withdrew the amendment.
- 867.** The chapeau of paragraph 6 was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 6(a)

- 868.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson presented an amendment to replace "align" with "coordinate" and to add, after "impact" on, the words "employment, decent work and the protection of all workers, while paying particular attention to". The intention was to reflect the core

business of the ILO and refer to the protection of all workers, not just those most vulnerable and affected.

- 869.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson opposed the amendment, as it detracted from the urgency of the ILO assisting in the recovery. The paragraph was not about the ILO's general work and mandate, but the specific situation of recovery from the crisis and assistance to Member States. The most urgent aspect, namely maximizing the impact of technical and financial support for the most vulnerable people and most affected sectors, was already contained in the original draft.
- 870.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, understood the appeal of including all workers, but the top priority in this text was indeed the sectors most vulnerable and hardest hit by the crisis. He proposed a subamendment to replace "while paying particular attention to" with "with a focus on".
- 871.** The Government members of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that they were flexible on the amendment and subamendment. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported both the amendment and the subamendment. The Worker Vice-Chairperson supported the Africa group's subamendment.
- 872.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson observed that some sectors had benefited enormously during the crisis, therefore the ILO should focus on those most vulnerable. If the other groups supported the Workers' group's amendment, her group was prepared to accept the Africa group's subamendment to include "with a focus on", but would prefer the stronger wording "with a special focus on" to reinforce the emphasis on the most vulnerable and hardest hit. The Worker Vice-Chairperson accepted the proposed text.
- 873.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that if the subparagraph was to be adopted with the list including "protection of all workers", it would also need to include the important notion of "business continuity". The Worker Vice-Chairperson remarked that the subsequent clause already included a reference to business continuity. The Employer Vice-Chairperson responded that the subsequent clause also referred to protection of all workers. If business continuity was not to be included, then neither should a reference to protection of all workers. The Worker Vice-Chairperson contended that there had been majority support for the text her group had proposed.
- 874.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, supported the amendment as subamended. He noted that business continuity would already be covered under support to the hardest-hit sectors, as this would also include "business continuity". The hardest-hit sectors and businesses were already receiving government support with the available resources. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, agreed. The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, also agreed, and expressed his group's flexibility on the amendment as subamended. He noted that "business continuity" was in accordance with "hardest-hit sectors". The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, could support the subamendment that included neither "protection of all workers" nor "business continuity". The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, said that her group was flexible on the subamendment.
- 875.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that, in the interest of consensus, her group could support the clause as subamended.



**876.** Paragraph 6(a) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 6(b)

**877.** The Committee had before it seven amendments to paragraph 6(b):

- IMEC had submitted three amendments: (1) to delete “national policy and” before “development cooperation”; (2) to insert the words “respect for fundamental principles and rights at work and implementation of international labour standards” and to delete the words “to translate international labour standards into national law and ensure their full implementation”; and (3) to add “occupational safety and health” to the list of areas to be prioritized.
- The Employers’ group had submitted two amendments: (1) to insert, after “labour market institutions”, the words “to manage and sustain recovery” and (2) to insert “ratified” before “international labour standards”; the Committee decided to discuss the latter amendment together with other similar amendments.
- The Africa group had submitted two amendments (1) to replace “law and” with “laws and practices to”; (2) to insert “and lifelong learning” after “skills development”.
- IMEC had submitted an amendment to insert “occupational safety and health” after “gender equality”.

**878.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson supported the amendments to delete “national policy and” and to use the wording “respect for fundamental principles and rights at work and implementation of international labour standards”. If the latter amendment was adopted, her group would withdraw its amendment to insert “ratified”. Her group was proposing to add “to manage and sustain recovery and”, as it added focus, given that the document concerned the recovery. She supported the amendments to add “and practices” after “national laws”, to add “and lifelong learning” after “skills development” and to add “occupational safety and health”.

**879.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson also supported the amendments to add “and practices”, “lifelong learning” and “occupational safety and health”. Her group did not support the amendment to add “to manage and sustain recovery and”, because it would limit the intention of the clause. Nor did the group support the wording “respect for fundamental principles and rights at work and implementation of international labour standards”, as the Committee had already discussed the importance of referring not only to implementation, but also to promotion, ratification and supervision of international labour standards. She requested clarification on IMEC’s amendment to delete “national policy”, as the paragraph concerned the ILO working with multilateral and regional organizations, including in order to prioritize certain actions in their national policy and development cooperation. Lastly, she considered the amendment to add “manage and sustain recovery” to be redundant, as it was clear that the context of paragraph 6 was “a strong and coherent global response in support of national recovery strategies”.

**880.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, preferred to retain the reference to “national policy”, as there was a link between national policy and development cooperation. He agreed with the Worker Vice-Chairperson on the need to include the usual reference to “promotion, ratification, implementation and supervision”; furthermore, he commented that the usual reference was to “international labour standards, including fundamental principles and rights at work”. He requested clarification

on the Employers' group's amendment to add "manage and sustain recovery". His group supported the addition of "occupational safety and health".

- 881.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the amendments to add "practices" after "national laws" and to add "and lifelong learning" after "skills development". His group was flexible on the amendments proposed by IMEC.
- 882.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, could support the amendment to delete "national policy", but with a subamendment to add, after "development cooperation", the words "and assistance at the national level". She noted that many countries in her region had strong cooperation at the national level with the ILO on all the matters included in the clause. With regard to IMEC's amendment to use "respect for fundamental principles and rights at work and implementation of international labour standards", her group preferred the original language but could be flexible. Her group supported the amendments to add "manage and sustain recovery", "practices" "lifelong learning" and "occupational safety and health".
- 883.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, explained that her group was proposing to delete "national policy" because paragraph 6(b) concerned multilateral work and the chapeau text already contained a reference to "national policy". With regard to her group's amendment to use the wording "respect for fundamental principles and rights at work and implementation of international labour standards", the intention was to reflect the importance of fundamental principles and rights at work and to create a link with "implementation of international labour standards". The reason for the proposed deletion of "translate international labour standards into national law" was that that fell within the purview of parliaments and not government ministries. However, the group was prepared to withdraw that amendment. Her group was flexible on the Employers' group's amendment to add "manage and sustain recovery" and noted that there had been a discussion on the need to align the document.
- 884.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that his group supported IMEC's amendments, the Employers' group's amendment to add "manage and sustain recovery" and the Africa group's amendment to add "lifelong learning".
- 885.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed as a solution the wording "respect for fundamental principles and rights at work, ratification and implementation in law and practice of international labour standards", which would include all three elements of respect, ratification and implementation of international labour standards.
- 886.** The representative of the Secretary-General suggested that, as the chapeau referred to national recovery strategies, it might not be necessary to refer to national policy or to managing sustainability and recovery. The Worker Vice-Chairperson commented that although the chapeau talked about national recovery strategies, both national policy and development cooperation needed to be prioritized.
- 887.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that her group was flexible on whether to retain the reference to national policy, but if it remained, then the reference to assistance at the national level would have to be deleted. She withdrew the amendment to add "to manage and sustain recovery". Her group accepted the Workers' group's proposal to include "ratification and implementation in law and practice of international labour standards".

**888.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, withdrew the subamendment to refer to “assistance at the national level”, as the reference to “national policy” had been retained.

**889.** The Committee supported the amendment as subamended.

### Paragraph 6(c)

**890.** The Committee had before it two amendments:

- IMEC had submitted an amendment to delete “financing strategies with global support for”, to insert “access to” between “universal” and “social protection”, to insert “nationally defined” before “floors”, and to replace “in conformity with” with “on the basis of”.
- The Employers’ group had submitted an amendment to insert “ratified” before “international labour standards”.

**891.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson could support the wording “nationally defined floors” if the Committee decided to use it elsewhere in the document. She asked why “on the basis of” was proposed instead of “in conformity with”.

**892.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, explained that one of the most important standards on social protection was Recommendation No. 202, which was non-ratifiable, and therefore “on the basis of” was more accurate than “in conformity with”. Regarding the deletion of “financing strategies with global support for”, her group wished to be consistent with the language used by the Committee on the recurrent discussion on social security.

**893.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson considered that “in conformity with” was often used in relation to non-binding instruments; her group preferred it relation to international labour standards. She did not support the deletion of the reference to “financing strategies”, and did not consider that the wording had to be in line with that used by the Committee on social security, as it was not a specialized term. Her group did not support the addition “ratified”. Nor did the group support the addition of “access to” as the objective of the ILO was universal social protection and it was not appropriate to limit the text to refer only to access to social protection.

**894.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson generally supported the IMEC amendment, but could be flexible. She supported the addition of “access” for the sake of consistency. Moreover, if “in conformity with” was replaced with “on the basis of”, her group would withdraw its amendment to insert “ratified” before “international labour standards”.

**895.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, did not support the proposal to delete the reference to financing strategies, but supported the proposals to include “access to” and “nationally defined”; the group was open to the use of either “in conformity with” or “on the basis of”.

**896.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, said that his group was flexible on IMEC’s amendment but did not support the Employers’ group’s amendment.

**897.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, did not support the proposal to delete the reference to financing strategies but did support the second part of the amendment to insert “access to”, as the language came from the SDGs. Her group supported using “on the basis of”. Regarding “nationally defined”, she recalled that social

protection floors were by definition nationally defined and that the language needed to be consistent. Her group did not support the addition of “ratified”.

- 898.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, did not support the addition of “ratified”, as labour standards also included Recommendations. He agreed with IMEC on the need for the language to be harmonized with that used by the Committee on the recurrent discussion on social security.
- 899.** The representative of the Secretary-General noted that the reference to financing strategies was used in both Recommendation No. 202 and the Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952 (No. 102). He suggested that the terminology was both consistent and sufficiently broad to encompass the content of the clause. The reference to “universal social protection, including floors” was consistent with the wording used elsewhere in the document.
- 900.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson said that it was important to look at the context of the full document. The title of section 3(C) was “Universal social protection” and paragraph 3(C)(a) contained details on what was desirable in social protection systems. There was thus no need to include additional commentary in paragraph 6(c).
- 901.** The Government member of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of IMEC, recalled that the Committee had indeed already adopted language in paragraph 3(C)(a) including both “access to” and “nationally defined social protection floors”. Further, the text under consideration by the Committee on social security proposed language on universal access. Noting the lack of support for the deletion of the reference to financing strategies, she withdrew that part of the amendment.
- 902.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson asked the representative of the Secretary-General to clarify how the ILO usually discussed the objective of universal social protection within the international system. The Committee should adopt the standard approach. Further, there was no need to specify “nationally defined” in relation to social protection floors. She proposed instead “with the objective of universal social protection, including floors”. She was, however, prepared to agree to the replacement of “in conformity with” by “on the basis of” before “international labour standards”.
- 903.** The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, emphasized that the insertion of “access to” was important for the IMEC group, but noting the lack of majority support, proposed the alternative of “recalling” instead of “in line with” before “the objective of universal social protection”. Her group could agree to withdraw the part of the amendment to insert “nationally defined” before “floors”.
- 904.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not support “recalling”, nor did the members speaking on behalf of the Government groups. They could, however, support “with” instead of “in line with”.
- 905.** The representative of the Secretary-General observed that the Declaration of Philadelphia referred to “the extension of social security measures to provide a basic income to all in need of such protection”. The objective of the ILO was thus universal social protection, rather than access to it.
- 906.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed a subamendment to insert “adequate” between “comprehensive” and “sustainable”, as that would be consistent with the earlier text. She was prepared to accept the clause with this subamendment.

**907.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment to insert “ratified” before “international labour standards” and supported the clause as amended. The members speaking on behalf of the Government groups also supported the amended text.

**908.** Paragraph 6(c) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 6(d)

**909.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced two amendments to paragraph 6(d): (1) to add “and sustainability” after “decent work” and (2) to add “global and domestic” before “supply chains”. She explained that the first amendment was to ensure consistency, and the second was to highlight the fact that decent work deficits occurred in domestic as well as global supply chains.

**910.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson could accept the addition of “sustainability” if it was preceded by “environmental”. Concerning the addition of “global and domestic” before “supply chains”, she noted that there had been lengthy discussions on the topic within the ILO, but the Governing Body had decided at its March 2021 session that the reference should be to “supply chains”, without the qualifier “global and domestic”. Her group therefore could not support that amendment.

**911.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, said that the addition of “sustainability” was rather vague, but his group could consider accepting it with the addition of “environmental”. His group remained open to the addition of “global and domestic”, but preferred the original text.

**912.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, supported the amendment to add “sustainability” without the subamendment, and also the amendment to add “global and domestic”.

**913.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, supported the subamendment to insert “environmental”, as it added clarity. However, she did not support the amendment related to supply chains, on the understanding that there was already agreed language on supply chains within the Governing Body.

**914.** The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, accepted the addition of “sustainability” and was flexible on adding “environmental”. Regarding the wording on supply chains, her group could both support the amendment as well as the more general original formulation.

**915.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, supported the amendments by the Employers’ group and the subamendment of the Workers’ group.

**916.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment on supply chains in the spirit of consensus. Her group did not support the subamendment to add “environmental”, as the amendment referred to sustainability in supply chains more broadly, as measures taken in response to the pandemic had led to serious disruptions of supply chains.

**917.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson, noting that the Government groups had considered “sustainability” alone to be vague, and that the clause concerned international trade and investment policies, proposed the wording: “decent work, environmental sustainability and

sustainable enterprises in supply chains”. The Employer Vice-Chairperson proposed that, as there was already a reference to environmental policies at the end of the clause, “environmental sustainability” could be replaced with “resilience”.

- 918.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson did not agree that the reference to “environmental policies” at the end of the clause justified not including “environmental” before “sustainability”. Furthermore, the word “resilience” would lead to the same questions regarding its exact meaning as “sustainability”. Her group was in favour of “environmental sustainability” and was open to adding “and sustainable enterprises”.
- 919.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the members speaking on behalf of the Government groups were in favour of the formulation “decent work, environmental sustainability and sustainable enterprises in supply chains”.
- 920.** Paragraph 6(d) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 6(e)

- 921.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert “and trade and investment” after “monetary” and to insert, after “policies that” the words “provide the policy space to act and that” to reflect the importance of such policy space, especially in developing countries.
- 922.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson could accept the addition of “trade and investment” but not the second part of the amendment, as it was unclear.
- 923.** The Government members of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group; Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG; the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC; and Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, also agreed with the addition of “trade and investment”, but not the reference to policy space. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, said that her group preferred the original text, but was flexible.
- 924.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson withdrew the second part of the amendment.
- 925.** Paragraph 6(e) was adopted as amended.

### Paragraph 6(e) *bis*

- 926.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to insert an additional clause after paragraph 6(e), to read: “promote an enabling environment for enterprise growth for a swift and sustainable recovery and address informality”. It was an important addition for micro, small and medium-sized enterprises.
- 927.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that it was important to look at the consistency of the document, as the issues of an enabling environment for enterprises and addressing informality were already included elsewhere. If the clause were to be placed in paragraph 6, it would mean that the ILO would have to develop a programme and place it on the multilateral agenda. If the clause were to be added, it should be inserted in a different place and should also cover issues such as a just transition.
- 928.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson noted that the reference in paragraph 5 to “promote an enabling environment for entrepreneurship and sustainable enterprises” was a call for the ILO to “strengthen its support of Member States’ efforts”, whereas paragraph 6 concerned



the ILO's multilateral cooperation to strengthen cooperation to achieve a strong and coherent global response and thus there was no duplication. Her group was open to possible rewording, but wanted to retain the clause in paragraph 6.

- 929.** The Government members of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group; Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG; and Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, acknowledged the importance of promoting an enabling environment, but also questioned where the reference should be placed.
- 930.** The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, stated that her group was flexible on the amendment. She noted that "an enabling environment for sustainable enterprises" was referenced under Part I and in paragraph 5(a) of the text, therefore if the amendment was supported, the wording should be aligned with the earlier clause. The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, said that his group could support the amendment.
- 931.** The representative of the Secretary-General noted that the intention behind paragraph 6 was to serve as a tool to develop actions on issues where multilateral cooperation was important, and suggested that an enabling environment for business could be considered to be more of a domestic responsibility.
- 932.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson disagreed that an enabling environment was purely a domestic issue, as it was also very important in the context of the ILO's engagement within the multilateral system.
- 933.** After consultations, the Worker Vice-Chairperson proposed the following alternative wording, which had been developed in agreement with the Employers' group: "reduce inequalities, formalize the informal economy, address insecure forms of work and promote an enabling environment for entrepreneurship and sustainable enterprises".
- 934.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson and the Government members, speaking on behalf of the Government groups supported the proposal.

### Paragraph 6(f)

- 935.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson introduced an amendment to add "and pandemic responses and recovery" after "Sustainable Development Goals". She explained that the potential of the SDGs was broad, therefore her group would like to add a focus on the pandemic response and recovery. However, her group was prepared to withdraw the amendment if the other groups did not support it.
- 936.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the Government members of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, did not support the amendment, as it was clear that the response to the pandemic was the subject of the global call to action.
- 937.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew the amendment.

### Paragraph 7

- 938.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson withdrew an amendment to delete "inclusive". She introduced an amendment to delete "convene a major policy forum aimed at", as her group did not consider it appropriate to have a reference to convening a major policy forum funded by the taxpayers without any information about its scope and purpose. Her group

had not received the information on the policy forum that it had requested from the Secretariat.

- 939.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the members speaking on behalf of the Government groups did not support the amendment. The Government members of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, and Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, noted that the ILO had a practice of convening major policy forums. The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, agreed that more information on the proposed forum was needed and noted that it should not take place too late in the year, given the resumed session of the International Labour Conference.
- 940.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson commented that if the original text was to be retained, the words “subject to the approval of the Governing Body” should be inserted.
- 941.** The representative of the Secretary-General explained that all decisions adopted by the International Labour Conference that required follow-up were discussed by the Governing Body at its June session and the Governing Body oversaw the implementation of decisions of the Conference. He assured the Committee that the proposed policy forum would be organized in close consultation with constituents, and invited the Director of the Research Department to provide more details on what was envisaged.
- 942.** The deputy representative of the Secretary-General, Mr Richard Samans, Director of the ILO Research Department, said that the primary intention of the policy forum was to serve as a vehicle for strengthening the efforts and coherence of the multilateral institutions behind the recovery strategies and the focused and accelerated implementation of the ILO Centenary Declaration. The Secretariat envisaged the policy forum to be a well-prepared process in which the ILO and other multilateral institutions agreed to deepen their existing programmatic cooperation and coherence in support of Member States and constituents. The outcome document outlined several areas that would benefit from increased efforts and enhanced coordination in the multilateral system. It would be premature to enter into all of the details, as the development of the forum needed to be done in close consultation with a variety of parties. Furthermore, such a forum would raise the Centenary Declaration to a new level of visibility and spur action in the international community.
- 943.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that she required official, transparent information in writing. There was also a risk that the forum would not result in any concrete action to support the recovery agenda. Her group was in favour of the ILO mobilizing a strong and coherent global response in support of Member States’ human-centred recovery strategies, and could support wording along the lines of “the ILO will work with other international institutions and take the lead” or “explore concrete avenues for taking the lead” and “mobilizing strong and coherent global response”.
- 944.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson noted that it was the ILO’s practice to convene forums in order to draw attention to its actions and messages from both constituents and the wider international system. The Global Summit on COVID-19 and the World of Work was one such example. The policy forum could instead be named a “global summit” or “high-level summit”. She noted that tripartite constituents were always fully consulted in the development of such initiatives. It was important to send a strong message at the end of the document and to say that not only would the ILO take a strong leadership role but would also organize a major policy forum to advance the issue further.
- 945.** After consultations, the representative of the Secretary-General proposed that, after “major policy forum”, the words “with modalities to be determined by the Governing Body” could be inserted.

**946.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson stated that her group could agree to the new proposal. The Worker Vice-Chairperson and the members speaking on behalf of the Government groups supported the Secretariat's proposal.

**947.** Paragraph 7 was adopted as amended.

### Conclusion of the discussion of amendments

**948.** On resumption of the sitting, the Chairperson announced that there were 21 amendments on which no decision had been reached. He noted that, before the Committee's final sitting, the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairpersons had had informal bilateral consultations, and he hoped this would help reach a compromise on the outstanding paragraphs. He furthermore recalled that the groups had asked the Secretariat to prepare for the Committee's consideration revised drafts for some of the remaining clauses.

**949.** The outcomes of the final discussion are reflected in this Summary of Proceedings under the corresponding paragraphs, clauses and subclauses above.

**950.** The entire text of the proposed Conference resolution was adopted as amended.

### Closing remarks

**951.** The Chairperson announced that the Committee had successfully completed its substantive work and thanked all members for their spirit of collaboration.

**952.** The Employer Vice-Chairperson said that while the negotiations had not always been easy, the impartiality of the Representative of the Secretary-General and the constructive deliberations and spirit of compromise among the tripartite constituents had been critical in enabling the Committee to complete its work. She thanked the Chairperson for his great dedication and commitment, for facilitating the deliberations and for steering the Committee towards the adoption of the document without recourse to voting. The resolution to be proposed to the Conference was a major text that translated the principles contained in the Centenary Declaration into action in relation to overcoming the crisis triggered by the outbreak of COVID-19. She expressed her thanks to the Secretariat for supporting the work of the Committee with such dedication, and stated that her group was very pleased with the outcome.

**953.** The Worker Vice-Chairperson thanked her own group for its hard work and commitment. The virtual format of the Committee had made discussion within the group more complex, and she expressed the hope that future sessions of the Conference would be able to be held face to face to facilitate the sharing of views and allow everyone to feel properly involved. She also thanked the Government groups for their discipline and their solid contribution to a strong and meaningful proposed resolution, and acknowledged the tremendous workload for the spokespersons of the regional groups due to the remote participation. She agreed with the Employer Vice-Chairperson that the negotiations had not always been easy, and thanked her for engaging in social dialogue to allow the social partners to arrive at solutions jointly. She also thanked the Secretariat, particularly the technical staff and the interpreters, for their patience and hard work. Finally, she thanked the Chairperson for his charm, patience and dedication through the long and challenging discussions, and for kindly encouraging Committee members to find solutions, which had produced a very good outcome.

**954.** The Government member of Ethiopia, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, noted that the Committee's task was originally intended to fine-tune what was considered to be a good

draft outcome document that had been prepared by the informal tripartite group. However, the complex nature of the response to the COVID-19 crisis had been evident once the divergent views had emerged. He thanked the Chairperson for his wisdom and support in facilitating the convergence of the differing views to produce the proposed resolution, which was for an important cause. The virtual format of the meeting was a challenge for the Africa group in terms of liaising and coordinating, and he thanked his group members for their commitment and continued support throughout the process. He expressed his gratitude to the Secretariat for its professional and dedicated support, without which it would have been difficult to achieve such a quality report. He also thanked the social partners for their rich and valuable contributions to the discussion and for their flexibility in working towards a common cause. He thanked the other Government groups for their support, understanding and flexibility in arriving at consensus. His group was pleased with the result and looked forward to its success.

- 955.** The Government member of Bangladesh, speaking on behalf of ASPAG, thanked the Chairperson for his patience throughout the negotiations. He also thanked his colleagues in his group for their flexibility during consultations, and for the confidence and trust they had placed in him as the group's spokesperson. He also expressed thanks to the other Government groups for their support and understanding of his group's position. Finally, he thanked the Secretariat for its support and patience.
- 956.** The Government member of Mexico, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, thanked the Chairperson for his leadership of the Committee. She noted that the virtual format had been challenging for her group, but it had engaged constructively in deliberations in order to achieve a good outcome. She thanked her colleagues in her group for their active participation and their trust in her as spokesperson. She thanked the social partners for their commitment and active engagement with her group, particularly in the context of the virtual format, to achieve consensus on differing views. She also thanked the Secretariat for its work, patience and continual responsiveness. Her group was pleased with the proposed resolution, which included many important ideas and reflected her group's priorities. She looked forward to seeing it implemented on the basis of the Centenary Declaration.
- 957.** The Government member of the United States, speaking on behalf of IMEC, said that it had been a hard road, but a productive one, and she thanked all participations for their collaboration and constructive engagement. Her group was pleased that the Committee had managed to produce a sound resolution to propose to the Conference, even in the challenging circumstances of a virtual format, but looked forward to meeting face to face for future sessions of the Conference. She thanked the tripartite constituents and the Secretariat for its outstanding work in the difficult circumstances, and thanked the Chairperson for his leadership. It was important for the ILO to exercise its leadership at a time of great disruption in labour markets and economies, and her group was pleased that a robust proposed resolution had been achieved.
- 958.** The Government member of Portugal, speaking on behalf of the EU and its Member States, expressed his group's satisfaction with the call to action resulting from the discussion. He thanked the Chairperson, the social partners, the regional groups and their spokespersons for their constructive spirit in order to complete the Committee's work and produce a positive outcome. His group strongly supported the call to action contained in the proposed resolution, which was substantial proof of the commitment of all ILO constituents to a human-centred, inclusive, sustainable and resilient recovery that was based on the Centenary Declaration.

- 959.** The Chairperson said that it had been an honour for him and his country to be nominated to chair the Committee. The goal had been to agree on a high-level call to action for the ILO to address an important and meaningful recovery strategy as the world continued to grapple with the COVID-19 pandemic. That goal was ambitious and the task was challenging, but the Committee had succeeded in producing a proposed resolution that it could be proud of. He expressed his particular gratitude to his two Vice-Chairpersons, without whose commitment a meaningful outcome could not have been achieved. He thanked the Committee Reporter, whom he had been unable to meet due to the virtual format of the meeting, and thanked the regional spokespersons for their commitment to consensus-building, which had paved the way to a positive outcome.
- 960.** The representative of the Secretary-General congratulated all participants on achieving a global call to action that was human-centred, inclusive, resilient, sustainable and incredibly important. It provided a much-needed road map for recovery and promoted the critical role that the ILO could play in leading that recovery. The Committee had delivered on constituents' calls to accelerate the implementation of the ILO Centenary Declaration to address the extraordinary challenges lying ahead. Faced with the inability to travel, the Committee had successfully used technology and worked across time zones to ensure that the ILO responded to one of the greatest challenges of the time. He thanked the constituents for their high level of engagement and invaluable contributions. He extended his thanks to the Chairperson, who had been instrumental to the success of the Committee's work, and to the Vice-Chairpersons for their passion, expertise and determination to find common ground. He also thanked the spokespersons of the Government groups, whose thorough knowledge, commitment to finding solutions through social dialogue and engagement with their constituents through virtual channels was extraordinary. Lastly, he thanked his colleagues in the Secretariat for their dedication and support.
- 961.** The Chairperson concluded by thanking the representative of the Secretary-General and all other members of the Secretariat for their dedication and hard work, which had begun long before the start of the meeting and would continue over the days ahead. He declared the final sitting closed.