

IOE Report



112th Session of the ILO International Labour Conference
3-14 June 2024
and 351st ILO Governing Body Session
15 June 2024

Prepared by the IOE Secretariat



A powerful
and balanced
voice for business

Introduction

The 112th session of the International Labour Conference (ILC) was held from 3 - 14 June in Geneva, Switzerland. Some 3,000 participants, including over 600 employers, attended the Conference. The 112th session of the ILC took place in a time of significant global dynamics and policy shifts, which are accompanied by social and economic conflicts, geopolitical tensions and uncertainties. These dynamics added an extra layer of urgency to the discussions as employers worldwide grapple with political and economic instability and recognise the need for stronger international cooperation.

This year, the ILC was also marked by the launch of the Global Coalition for Social Justice. This initiative aims to provide a platform for strengthening the cooperation of the ILO and its constituents with the UN and its specialised agencies, the international financial institutions, regional development banks and the World Trade Organization (WTO). The initiative presents social justice as “one of the cornerstones of the renewed multilateralism that is required to overcome current challenges”. Employers are fully engaged in this initiative supporting global efforts to foster dialogue, share best practices, and develop practical solutions to enhance social justice.

The [Director-General's Report](#) drew attention to the current state of global inequality, exacerbated by the restrictive measures taken during the Covid-19 pandemic and rapid technological changes, and calls for a “new social contract”. Employers responded by calling for a constructive and forward-looking approach to formulating and addressing necessary social and macroeconomic policies that benefit society as a whole. They argued against expending excessive resources on deep theoretical reflections about a “new social contract,” a concept with multiple definitions that may not be globally applicable due to varying levels of development and diverse cultural, social, and economic realities.

The ILC also coincided with Governments preparing for the upcoming second World Summit for Social Development, which is foreseen for autumn 2025. This summit will gather world leaders with the objective of recommitting to the principles outlined in the 1995 Copenhagen Declaration on Social Development, to address existing gaps within and among countries, and to review the employment and social effects of policies on the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development with a view to make them conducive to employment and

social cohesion. The co-facilitators of the Summit, the Ambassadors of Morocco and Belgium, attended an Employers' Group meeting and met with all ILC delegates. The Employers' Group led by Ms Renate Hornung-Draus highlighted the Employers' priorities to the Ambassadors and asked for a proper engagement of Employers' and Workers' organisations in the Summit.

Also, the **Director-General** issued a [report on the situation of workers in the occupied Arab territories](#). The Report presented the findings of the severe conditions faced by Palestinian workers due to the ongoing conflict and occupation. Palestinian workers in the West Bank, Gaza, and the occupied Syrian Golan face unprecedented hardships, such as poverty, displacement, destruction of workplaces, and fiscal instability.

Elections of members of the Governing Body (GB) for the period 2024-2027 took place during this session of the ILC. The new composition of the GB can be found [here](#).

Other highlights, following the ILC agenda's order, are the following:

1. Employers were very actively and constructively engaged in the discussion and outcomes of the [Committee on the Application of Standards](#) (CAS), which is the core tripartite supervisory body of the ILO's standards system. The CAS examined 24 individual country cases related to the observance of ILO Conventions and held one special sitting on compliance with Conventions 87 and 98 by Belarus. It further considered the yearly general report by the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations (CEACR) as well as the CEACR's General Survey on "Labour Administration in a Changing World of Work". (See below, page 4)
2. The First Standards-setting Discussion on [Biological Hazards in the Working Environment](#) took place after the inclusion of Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) as a new fundamental principle and right at work. This first standard-setting discussion on Biological Hazards in the Working Environment resulted in the adoption of draft Conclusions with a view to a Convention supplemented by a Recommendation, a process that will be finalised at the 2025 113th ILC. Despite the lack of consensus nearly leading to a vote on multiple occasions during the difficult discussions, the outcome of this first discussion still established a strong foundation with the potential to produce a satisfactory instrument for the Employers' Group in 2025.

3. The Third [Recurrent Discussion](#) on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (FPRW) resulted in the adoption of a balanced set of Conclusions and Recommendations, providing a robust framework for action for the upcoming years. These conclusions acknowledge the progress made, and, most importantly, they reaffirm the key role of sustainable enterprises in creating decent work and upholding FPRW. The conclusions draw special attention to the needs and support for MSMEs.
4. A [General Discussion on Decent Work and the Care Economy](#) led to the adoption of a Resolution with Conclusions and Recommendations to guide the ILO plan of work on this topic. These conclusions provide a positive, pragmatic and practical approach for constituent action. Attention was drawn to the need to create an enabling environment for sustainable enterprises that promotes productivity, investment, education and skills development, enhanced access to business opportunities, formalisation and finance. (See below, page 12)
5. The [General Affairs Committee](#) examined proposals for the abrogation of four International Labour Conventions placed on the agenda of the Conference by the Governing Body upon the recommendation of the Standards Review Mechanism Tripartite Working Group (SRM TWG). (See below, page 15)

Opening Speech by Renate Hornung-Draus, ILC Employer Spokesperson, is available [here](#).

The closing Speech by Rajeev Dubey, ILC Employers Vice-Chairperson, India, is available [here](#).

Finance Committee

Spokesperson: Blaise Matthey (Switzerland)

IOE: Luis Rodrigo Morales

The Finance Committee adopted the audited consolidated financial statements for 2023 following their review by the March Governing Body (GB). The Committee also adopted the draft scale of assessment for 2025. This is in accordance with the established practice of harmonising the rates of assessment of ILO Member States with their rates of assessment in the United Nations (UN).

Committee on the Application of Standards (CAS)

Spokesperson: Kaizer Moyane (South Africa) /Paul Noll (Germany)

IOE: Rita Yip, Altea Rossi

The CAS once again demonstrated its ability to conduct a results-oriented tripartite dialogue and adopted clear, balanced, and straightforward conclusions.

The Employers can be proud that CAS in 2024 aimed at achieving the right balance in the supervision of standards, taking into account not only the needs of workers to be protected but also the needs of sustainable enterprises to develop and create employment opportunities for men and women. This important balance cannot be underestimated.

During the [General Discussion on the General Part of the CEACR Report](#), the Employers first observed widespread non-compliance with ratified Conventions by member states. They highlighted the **importance of states carrying out thorough assessments of their ability to comply with Conventions' obligations before their ratification** in consultation with social partners. This would also reduce significantly the number of comments by the Committee of Experts and, thus, the burden on the supervisory system.

Second, Employers stressed again the importance of **distinguishing between direct requests and observations**. Notably, compliance assessments in direct requests exclude a major part of the CEACR standards supervisory work from tripartite scrutiny, given that direct

requests are not discussed in the CAS. **Employers reiterated their proposal to discontinue direct requests and only issue observations** to simplify matters and render the overall supervisory system more transparent.

Third, Employers recalled the decision of the GB at its 349th bis session, in November 2023, to refer the dispute on whether Convention 87 protects the right to strike to the International Court of Justice. Employers, therefore, **expressed concern that the CEACR**, despite the GB decision, **maintained its comments on the right to strike in relation to Convention No. 87 unchanged and unabated**. They highlighted that the best way forward would have been to suspend such comments until the Court rendered its advisory opinion on the matter and exclude any cases featuring such comments from the CAS discussion. This would have avoided any appearance of interference or intention to influence the cause and outcome of the advisory proceedings.

Fourth, Employers highlighted their **concerns** on the statement by the CEACR that it would **consider the ILO strategy for achieving decent work in supply chains in its supervisory work**. Employers highlighted the difference between the CEACR mandate to assess governments' compliance with ratified Conventions at the national level and a more general assessment of compliance with ratified Conventions within supply chains. They noted that consideration of supply chains by the CEACR should not expand states' responsibilities under ratified Conventions beyond their national borders.

Fifth, Employers once again called on the CEACR to consider the **needs of sustainable enterprises** in its supervisory work. While respect for international labour standards is one prerequisite for a favourable environment for sustainable businesses, only sustainable businesses can guarantee the proper application of international labour standards, providing for decent jobs and decent job creation. Moreover, Employers stressed that giving due attention to the needs of sustainable enterprises would improve the overall balance and, thus, the relevance and acceptance of the CEACR recommendations.

Finally, in light of the thematic discussion held to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Convention No. 87, Employers underlined the **different nature of ILO instruments** compared to other UN Human Rights treaties. In particular, they pointed out the importance of not blurring the line between Convention 87, on the one hand, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural

Rights. While such instruments may cover the same rights, they afford different protection to them and were adopted in different contexts and with different intentions.

In the discussion and outcome of the [General Survey on Labour Administration in a changing world of work](#), Employers stressed that a well-organised labour administration that takes equal account of the needs of workers and employers is the be-all and end-all of good labour market governance and, thus, the key to achieving decent work, sustainable companies and economic stability. In this light, they highlighted that labour administrations need to engage with independent and representative employers' and workers' organisations closely in their activities through consultation, cooperation and negotiation.

The **discussion of the list of individual cases** was conducted successfully. A list of 24 cases including four double-footnoted cases was submitted on time and adopted by the Committee. In determining the list, a procedure based on objective criteria has been applied taking due consideration of regional balance, the countries' level of development, as well as the types of instruments.

The conclusions of the 24 cases discussed reflected only those recommendations that reached a consensus. This is highlighted in the [Work of the Committee on the Application of Standards](#) (page 7, paragraph 32). In other words, matters related to the right to strike were excluded in the conclusions. Any divergent views on these issues are set out in the CAS Record of Proceedings.

The following cases discussed were particularly important for Employers:

- **[Nicaragua Convention 87 on Freedom of Association](#)**: This case concerns the most serious allegations against the Government for dissolution and confiscation of the assets of the Higher Council for Private Enterprise (COSEP) and its 18 member associations, as well as persecution, intimidation, repression and arbitrary detention of COSEP leaders. The Employers urged the Government to immediately restore the legal status of the dissolved organisations and to fully and unconditionally recognise the right of independent employers' and workers' organisations to organise their activities without any interference that would restrict this right. They also expected the Government to

strengthen effective social dialogue at the national level, with the presence of the ILO, in order to rebuild trust with the social partners.

- **El Salvador [Convention 87 on Freedom of Association](#):** This case concerns acts of violence, threats, persecution, stigmatisation, intimidation and aggression by the Government against individuals or organisations for the exercise of legitimate trade union and employers' organisation activities, in particular against the Asociación Nacional de la Empresa Privada (ANEP), the most representative employers' organisation in the country, and its affiliated entities.
- **Netherlands – St Maarten [Convention 87 on Freedom of Association](#):** This case concerns the Government's attempt to marginalise the existing representative employers' organisation by instructing the law-based chamber to set up another employers' organisation. The Employers' Group urged the authorities of Sint-Maarten to define clear objective criteria of the representativeness of social partner organisations, in order to avoid arbitrary political decisions, start an effective dialogue with the employers' organisations on the composition of the Socio-economic Council (SER) in full respect of Convention 87;

Employers' Spokesperson speech in General Discussion is available [here](#)

Employers' Spokesperson speech in General Survey is available [here](#)

Employers' Spokesperson speech at the adoption of the CAS report is available [here](#)

Standards Setting: Biological Hazards (first discussion)

Spokesperson: Isabel Maya Rubio (Spain)

IOE : Pierre Vincensini, Robert Marinkovic

Biological hazards, whether contagious or non-contagious, pose a significant health risk across various sectors and workplaces worldwide, potentially leading to occupational and work-related diseases. The COVID-19 pandemic has underscored the profound global consequences of uncontrolled biological hazards. Exposure to contagious viruses is just one example among many potential risks faced by workers and businesses. The pandemic has also demonstrated the importance for governments to fulfill their public health responsibility in order to manage and

mitigate global health crises, and the critical role that social partners can and should play when devising the related measures impacting the world of work.

This Committee undertook the first discussion on protection against biological hazards with a view to setting new international labour standards. During this first discussion, **the committee agreed on Conclusions regarding a Convention supplemented by a Recommendation**. It will continue its work during the second year to agree on the final text. One of the most important elements of the Conclusions reached during this first discussion was on the definition and scope of what are considered “biological hazards”. Additionally, an agreement was reached that the scope of the instruments would apply to all workers in all branches of economic activity, with the possibility of some limited exclusions.

Employers were of the view that a Recommendation would have been more useful as it would provide more flexibility and practical implementation, considering the diversity of OSH systems and regulations at the national level and the need to coordinate/integrate with national public health policies. However, a broad majority of Governments favoured a Convention accompanied by a Recommendation.

Also, Employers consistently argued for a pragmatic and practical approach that is in line with existing OSH instruments, coherent with Fundamental Conventions Nos. 155 and 187, and develop a text that is ratifiable and implementable, thus ensuring its success.

The discussion was challenging due to a lack of clear communication from the ILO Office on working methods and practices, as well as a very large number of amendments which had to be discussed, even though they were often unnecessary and impractical. Also, many of these amendments opened the door to policy debates which did not relate to the content of the instrument, especially those coming from the Worker Group. Also, Workers and most Governments pushed for a very broad and hard-to-interpret definition of biological hazards, which set the tone for the rest of the discussions and made the negotiations challenging.

The Committee succeed in addressing the full text of a draft Convention, with the text of the Recommendation to be reviewed next year. Out of a total of 382 amendments, the Committee

resolved 317 of them.

Although the lack of consensus and attempts at compromise nearly led to a vote on more than one occasion, **the outcome of this year's discussion still has the potential to produce a satisfying pair of instruments in the coming year.**

Key aspects and achievements:

- The **scope of the proposed Conclusions is currently broad** as it addresses biological hazards in the working environment and in relation to public health and emergencies. It also features an overly **broad definition** that does not provide clarity.
- However, the proposed Conclusions include strong references to a **risk-assessment approach** in several key points of the text. This is based on OSH's existing practice and **qualifies and balances the broad definition and scope.**
- Although employers' and governments' responsibilities are strongly present in the text, **some elements of employers' responsibilities have been moved to the Recommendation.** It has also been properly clarified that employers are responsible for OSH conditions in the working environment that are **under their control.** Most importantly, the draft text of the Convention includes a **clear reference to workers' duties**, which their group strongly opposed and sought to delete in several of its amendments.
- Two paragraphs on possible **sector exceptions were accepted**, even though Workers had tried to avoid any exclusions.
- **Several other proposed controversial additions from the Workers were not accepted** due to strong arguments from Employers and support from some Governments. These included income protection during periods of isolation or quarantine, protection regardless of employment status, due diligence for multinational enterprises and supply chain, right to an effective remedy for workers, or an uncertain concept of precautionary approach and principle.
- The draft Convention contains a reference to mental health and well-being when referring to national policy, a notion strongly advocated by Workers. However,

Employers succeeded in avoiding the reference to “psychosocial and other adverse effects”, which would have broadened the scope of the instruments in an undesired manner.

Employers will continue their efforts to improve the Convention text ahead of the Second Discussion, bearing in mind the points that might be raised again by the Workers. Employers will also work on the possible content of the Recommendation, in order to achieve an outcome of applicable instruments that the Employers will promote and endorse. It is essential to reach a common understanding with the other Governments and Workers on a practical, flexible and principles-based Convention and a balanced Recommendation.

The Committee’s webpage with other information is available [here](#). The adopted text of the Resolution and proposed Conclusions are available [here](#).

Recurrent Discussion: Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work

Spokesperson: Tom Mackall (USA)

IOE : Jason Pegat-Toquet, Natalia Privee Boudeguer

As a follow-up to the [Social Justice Declaration \(2008\)](#), the third Recurrent Discussion on the Strategic Objective of Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (FPRW) adopted a resolution. The purpose of the discussion was to take stock of the status of FPRW since the last recurrent discussion in 2017, particularly to better understand the diverse realities and needs of member states. The aim is to respond more effectively to them and assess the results of the ILO’s activities to inform future action.

During the two weeks of the Conference, Employers repeatedly stressed the need to remain faithful to the wording and spirit of the 2008 Social Justice Declarations by stating the *inseparable, interrelated, and mutually reinforcing* character of *all five Fundamental principles and rights at work (FPRW)*. Employers repeated the view that no FPRW is more important than others, and no FPRW enables the others. Employers insisted they must be considered as a whole without a hierarchy of value as enablers of the four Pillars of the Decent Work Agenda. Additionally, Employers reiterated the importance of avoiding policy discussions (e.g., on platform work) or

bringing controversial concepts (e.g., insecure forms of work or algorithmic management) that could lead to polarised debates.

With regards to the **working methods**, one particularly difficult issue for the overall efficiency of the Committee work lay in the fact that Governments did not take the floor through their regional spokespersons. This delayed the committee's work particularly due to repetitive statements from countries part of the same region. Additionally, a major challenge was the lack of proper regional balance within the Drafting Group with the absence of representation from a government of Latin America. Through an informal agreement with the Workers, Employers managed to ensure that the agreed text in the Drafting Group was not subject to amendments.

Employers engaged in the discussion constructively, conveying a coherent, responsible, and pragmatic approach towards the current challenges in the process to respect, promote and realize FPRW and the role that member states and the ILO should play. As a result of intense negotiation, proactive engagement, and commitment of all Employer delegates in the Committee, the outcome of this discussion provides a robust framework for action for the upcoming years.

Key aspects and achievements:

- **Acknowledgement of the undeniable progress** made since the last recurrent discussion in 2017, despite important pressure from the Office, the Workers and other Governments to focus only on negative trends.
- The imperative to continue **addressing root causes**, especially persistent implementation gaps, **informality**, **weak governance** and inadequate enabling environments for sustainable enterprises as major barriers to progress on respecting, promoting and realising FPRW.
- The necessity to take steps to reduce informality in line with ILO Recommendation 204.
- The inclusion of a stand-alone area of focus on “formalization and sustainable enterprises” in the Conclusions which reaffirms the **key role of sustainable enterprises in advancing FPRW**. The Conclusions emphasise the critical need for **an enabling environment** that supports sustainable enterprises to foster productivity growth, ensure effective decent work,

and promote respect for FPRW. Special attention is given to micro, small, and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs), recognised as the backbone of our economies.

- The reaffirmation that effective realisation requires proper action to **eliminate the implementation gap of FPRW**, moving beyond ratifications. To close implementation gaps across all five FPRW categories, the conclusions acknowledge that **reliable evidence-based data and quality reporting** *is sine qua non* to inform Constituents and the Office of their situation and better monitor tailored action plans based on evidence.
- The **Office’s research action needs to include: the examination of the root causes of FPRW** deficits and building on the body of policy-based evidence; undertaking research on the economic and social impact of informality; undertaking action-oriented research on best practices to integrate respect for FPRW into the business of MSMEs, including through greater synergies with the SCORE Program.
- Under the Office’s action on strengthening capacity and knowledge-sharing, Employers succeeded in adding the following points: the need to conduct target capacity building for workers and employers’ organisations on FPRW, strengthen the ILO Helpdesk, reinforce the ILO Global Business Network on Forced Labour and other initiatives, and identify ways to ensure their sustainability.
- The reiteration that achieving the full realisation of FPRW calls for strengthened engagement in **tripartite social dialogue**.

Long-lasting debated issues

- Employers prevented the inclusion of problematic policy concepts, such as “**non-standard forms of work**”, linked to biased misconceptions towards certain working arrangements (platform economy). Employers also succeeded in highlighting the opportunities that various emerging forms of work can offer, especially to escape poverty and transition to the formal economy.
- Employers managed to avoid the persistent statement of the Workers and some Governments (US, EU, Canada) of the principle of freedom of association and the - misquoted- “right to collective bargaining” as **enabling rights** to the achievement of the other fundamental principles and rights at work, other rights at work, and their particular importance to enable the attainment of the four strategic objectives.

- Employers managed to ensure that the conclusions stressed the impact of “**supply chain disruptions**” during the recent crisis as a barrier to the fulfilment of FPRW in some countries without singling out or demonising. “**global supply chains**”. References to the binding treaty on business and human rights as well as mandatory human rights due diligence were also successfully withdrawn from the text.
- While FPRW **thematic priorities** were extended from three to **five** - including just transition and digital economy - no mention of platform economy or algorithmic management can be found in the Conclusions. Hence, Employers managed to avoid pre-empting the upcoming Double Standard-setting on Platform Economy in 2025-2026.

Overall, one of the added values of this Recurrent Discussion and its outcome is the guidance it will provide to the Office’s work for the upcoming years. A related and **balanced updated integrated strategy on FPRW, responsive to constituents' needs**, is explicitly called for to ensure balanced action across all five FPRW categories and to address implementation gaps. The Employers’ Group must continue to influence the implementation of these conclusions to be discussed by the GB in November 2024 when the Office proposes an updated integrated strategy on FPRW as a follow-up to the ILC conclusions.

Employer Spokesperson’s speech at the adoption of the report is available [here](#).

Adopted text of the Resolution and Conclusions can be found [here](#)

Decent Work and the Care Economy (General Discussion)

Spokesperson: Sonya Janahi (Bahrain)

IOE: Akustina Morni, Stéphanie Winet, Amadou Sako, Anelise Araujo

The General Discussion on Decent Work and the Care Economy resulted in the adoption of a conclusion and resolution that will promote a robust, well-functioning and sustainable care economy. Employers successfully contributed to a positive, pragmatic, and practical outcome, securing various elements important to the private sector.

The work of the Committee was driven by a very detailed document provided by the Office to be

worked on by the Committees' Drafting Group and subsequently in plenary. It resulted in the incapacity to address all points of the draft given the time constraints. This led to many bracketed provisions dropped at the final hour (which worked in the Employers' favour), including provisions addressing compensation for overtime, promoting regular and predictable working hours and schedules, exploitation and abuse, a human rights-based approach and requesting the ILO to organise a meeting of experts to assess the normative and non-normative gaps in the care economy.

Employers emphasised that a well-supported care economy can lead to a healthier, more productive and agile workforce, foundational for enterprise competitiveness and innovation, resulting in more jobs and economic opportunities for businesses, and allowing more individuals to remain in the workforce.

Employers will need to follow carefully the 5R approach (recognition, reduction and redistribution of unpaid care and reward and representation of care workers) as proposed by the Office. The Employers Committee deemed it paramount that a 6th R needs to be included for Resources, but no agreement was found.

Key aspects and achievements:

- The text **acknowledged that there is a skills shortage**, which affects the care economy's public and private sectors. It calls for investments in skills development to ensure that the care workforce is trained and skilled as needed and to provide **career development opportunities to attract and retain workers. The text has a strong skills component, which is a priority for Employers.**
- The outcomes highlighted that a well-functioning and reliable care economy promotes **women's economic inclusion** and enables a female workforce to enter and remain in the labour market.
- Under 'Guiding Principles', there is a stand-alone paragraph recognising the important role of **public-private partnerships** in providing quality care. This demonstrates an explicit acknowledgement of the role of the private sector. In addition, there is a mention of **private enterprises** and the important role they play in the provision of quality care, investment in sustainable and modern care infrastructure, and provision of training and employment opportunities.

- **Productivity** is mentioned four times in the text, including in the very first paragraph of the text (where ‘**supports businesses**’ appears) and in para 30 (j) where ‘**create an enabling environment for sustainable enterprises**’ appears.
- **The text mentions the ‘demand and supply’ of care work.** Workers did not want to include the wording ‘supply’. Employers cannot create jobs, promote career development, and achieve decent work within the current ecosystem of persistent staff shortages. As such, the inclusion of ‘supply of’ represented an essential step towards demonstrating the state of play and skills shortages in the care economy.
- Employers also managed to **avoid an excessive focus on collective bargaining**, shifting from an oppositional stand to a more collaborative, social dialogue-led approach in recognition of workplace cooperation. Workplace cooperation was supported by many Governments. Collective bargaining was diluted to include social dialogue and the recognition of the role of employers AND employer-led initiatives in the care economy.
- **Employers succeeded in removing inappropriate language which would have created more uncertainty, such as ‘poor working conditions’** and included language from the ILC Global Call to Action (‘decent work deficits’).
- Slogans such as ‘**care is not a commodity**’ were removed and replaced with ‘*labour in the care economy is not a commodity*’ in line with the spirit of the Philadelphia Declaration.

Some concepts which were either vague, inappropriate or not agreed upon in a tripartite manner were removed from the text, such as social reproduction, intersectionality, ‘right to all people to provide and receive care’ (which is not a universally accepted right), limits to working time and overtime, ‘progressive ensuring living wages’, ‘fair’ remuneration, ‘funded’ care leave policies, ‘emotional’ element, and ‘care as a public good’. Employers were successful in persuading the other constituents in this regard.

The Employers were highly satisfied with the discussion and outcome of the process.

Employers’ Spokesperson speech at the adoption of the Committee’s report is available [here](#). Adopted text of the Recommendation is available [here](#).

General Affairs Committee

Spokesperson: Jacqueline Mugo (Kenya)

IOE: Luis Rodrigo Morales

The General Affairs Committee examined proposals for the abrogation of four international labour Conventions, namely the Underground Work (Women) Convention, 1935 (No. 45), Safety Provisions (Building) Convention, 1937 (No. 62), Convention concerning Statistics of Wages and Hours of Work, 1938 (No. 63) and Labour Inspectorates (Non-Metropolitan Territories) Convention, 1947 (No. 85). The proposals were placed on the agenda of the Conference by the GB upon the recommendation of the Standards Review Mechanism Tripartite Working Group (SRM TWG).

The Report of the General Affairs Committee can be found [here](#).

Credentials Committee

Spokesperson: Fernando Yllanes (Mexico)

IOE: Luis Rodrigo Morales

This Committee is responsible for following the composition of the Conference, and monitoring cases related to the nomination of delegations, and the examination of objections and complaints concerning credentials.

The Committee reviewed the situations of Djibouti, Mauritania, Nicaragua, and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, where the Governments had not nominated their delegations in agreement with the most representative workers' or employers' organisations.

The Committee also examined objections concerning the failure to deposit credentials of an Employers' delegate by the Government of El Salvador.

Finally, the Committee considered complaints from the Workers' delegations of Colombia and Uganda, and the Employers' delegation of Congo, alleging that their Governments had not paid their travel and subsistence expenses as required by Article 13(2) of the ILO Constitution.

The Committee made recommendations to the Conference on the basis of its findings, that can be found [here](#).

IOE Special sessions

Business and Human Rights

Sustainability of Pension Funds

IOE also organised a side event on Business and Human Rights for the Employers' Group to highlight the influential role of local businesses as catalysts for positive transformative change to advance human rights and drive sustainable development. This interactive event provided an important opportunity for the global employer community to engage in a meaningful dialogue with the Chairperson of the United Nations Working Group on Business and Human Rights (UN WGBHR).

In addition, IOE, together with the International Federation of Pension Funds Administrators (FIAP), organised a round table to exchange views on IOE members' experiences on the sustainability of pension systems particularly focusing on individual capitalisation and the drawbacks of reversion. Discussants from different regions provided insights on the diversity of systems and shared challenges. A follow-up session will be organised in the near future.

351st Session of the Governing Body (GB) – 15 June

This session was held under the new composition of the Governing Body for the period 2024-2027, which can be found [here](#).

On 15 June, the GB considered several issues, including the developments in the application of the resolution concerning the Russian aggression against Ukraine and the Complaint against the Government of Guatemala filed by workers at the 111th session of the ILC.

The main items in the agenda were the following:

- The GB elected **Ambassador YUN**, the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations in Geneva as its new Chairperson. He will discharge this responsibility for one year. **Renate Hornung-Draus**, from Germany, was re-elected as Employers' Vice-Chairperson and **Catelene Passchier**, from the Netherlands, was re-elected as Workers' Vice-Chairperson.
- **Questions arising out of the 112th Session of the ILC – a brief discussion on challenges and lessons learnt of the 112th ILC took place.** Employers expressed concern regarding the preparation of the ILC reports, the delivery and appointment of chairpersons, rules of procedure and working hours, among others. The GB decided to add to the agenda of its 352nd Session (October–November 2024) two items for debate and decision: (a) The status of Palestine in the ILO and participation rights of Palestine in ILO meetings following the United Nations General Assembly resolution ES-10/23; and (b) Possible options that could allow employers' and workers' representatives from Myanmar to contribute to the work of future sessions of the Conference, based on the recommendation of the Credentials Committee of the 112th Session of the International Labour Conference.
- **Review of the functioning of the Governing Body, identification of possible areas for improvement:** The GB requested the Office to prepare for its consideration at the 352nd Session (October– November 2024) an issues paper containing an analysis of the matters outlined in the document and decided to continue its discussion on the content, form and modalities of the review of the functioning of the GB at the 352nd Session (October–

November 2024). Procedural proposals for the composition, terms of reference and duration of a working party; and a roadmap and timeframe for tripartite intersessional consultations will be considered at that session.

- **Composition, agenda and programme of standing bodies and meetings.** The GB took note of the Appointment of two new members of the Committee of Experts. It also noted the interest of the Dominican Republic to host the 20th American Regional Meeting in December 2025.
- **Committee on Freedom of Association.** The GB adopted the [407th report of the Committee on Freedom of Association](#). At this session, the CFA examined 19 cases on the merits. Among these, it considered 6 serious and urgent cases: 2508 (Islamic Republic of Iran), 2609 (Guatemala), 2761 and 3074 (Colombia), 2923 (El Salvador), 3269 (Afghanistan) and 3405 (Myanmar).

The 352nd Session of the GB will take place from 30 October to 9 November.



A powerful
and balanced
voice for business

Avenue Louis-Casari 71 – CH-1216 Genève
T +41 22 929 00 00 F +41 22 929 00 01
ioe@ioe-emp.com • ioe-emp.org

© IOE 2024