
Informal tripartite consultations on the working methods of the Committee on the Application of Standards (23 March 2019)

Brief report of the meeting

1. Informal tripartite consultations on the working methods of the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards (CAS) were held on 23 March 2019 from 2 p.m. to 5 p.m.
2. The meeting was chaired by Mr Siphon Ndebele (Government representative, South Africa). The Employer Vice-Chairperson of the CAS at the 107th Session (2018) of the International Labour Conference (ILC), Ms Sonia Regenbogen, and the Worker Vice-Chairperson of the CAS, Mr Marc Leemans, spoke on behalf of the Employers' and Workers' groups, respectively. The Government representatives were from the following nine countries: Algeria, Brazil, China, Egypt, Greece, Lebanon, Malaysia, Poland and Uruguay. The meeting was also attended by a number of observers.
3. The meeting had before it a background note prepared by the Office. The agenda of the meeting was presented by the Chairperson, who opened the floor for comments in relation to the summary report of the previous meeting held on 3 November 2018.

I. Seating arrangements at the CAS

4. **The Director of the International Labour Standards Department** suggested to continue with the practice introduced the previous year of allocating two seats to Government delegations in the CAS. Extra number of seats were also given for country delegations to attend the full deliberation from Room II.
5. **Speaking on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean Countries (GRULAC), a Government representative of Brazil** considered that flexibility in the allocation of seats should be kept, as during some sittings there was space available in the room. Since the CAS was an important Committee, he expressed concern that high-level authorities of the countries might be prevented from attending the discussions due to seating arrangements.
6. **Speaking on behalf of the Africa group, a Government representative of Algeria** said that he considered that the current number of seats per Government delegation was insufficient. He therefore supported the proposal to increase the number to three.
7. **Speaking on behalf of the Western European Group, a Government representative of Greece** agreed with the practice already followed of having some seats for each country delegation. The speaker concurred with the request made by GRULAC of having some degree of flexibility in the allocation of seats when high-level authorities wished to attend the sessions.
8. **Speaking on behalf of ASPAG, a Government representative of Lebanon** supported the proposal made to increase the number of seats from two to three.
9. **The Director of the International Labour Standards Department** noted the request for some flexibility in the allocation of seats. The margin of manoeuvre to respond to this call

depends on the number of delegations registered for the various sittings. Bearing this in mind, when high-level authorities wished to attend a sitting, the secretariat would accommodate their request depending on the number of seats available. However, a commitment to increase the number of seats to three per Government delegation was not possible due to the limited number of seats in the room.

II. Further proposals for possible improvements to the working methods of the CAS

- 10. The Director of the International Labour Standards Department** recalled the agreement reached during the last informal consultations to fully reproduce delegates' statements on the General Survey and on individual cases in verbatim. The Employers had proposed to reorganize Part I of the report so that it included the introduction; the summary report of the general discussion; the outcome of the discussion of the General Survey; the conclusions of the individual cases; the adoption of the report and the concluding remarks. It was also proposed that the CAS report be adopted in patchwork by the plenary and finalized in the three languages one month later. Finally, the meeting should also discuss the proposal to enhance the use of D documents whereby governments on the longlist could submit additional information prior to the start of the CAS.
- 11. The Worker spokesperson** agreed to reproduce the conclusions of the individual cases both in Parts I and II of the CAS report, considering that it was important to keep the conclusions and the discussion of the case together. The speaker also expressed their support for the reproduction in verbatim of the discussions of the General Survey and the individual cases. The enhanced use of D documents could have some value as long as the information provided concerned new developments that had not been examined by the Committee of Experts. This would prevent the Committee from adopting conclusions on items that had evolved. The speaker also agreed with the Office proposal to reorganize Parts I and II of the CAS report as long as no information was lost.
- 12. The Employer spokesperson** agreed with the three proposals in the background note. The Employers' group stressed that Part I of the CAS report would not be a record of proceedings but would rather provide an overview of the results achieved during the discussions. Part II would contain the verbatim of the discussions, thus improving accuracy by avoiding misinterpretations through the summarizing process. This would also allow for savings and the resources saved could be used more efficiently.
- 13. Speaking on behalf of GRULAC, a Government representative of Brazil** reiterated that his region was still deeply concerned with the working methods of the CAS: the voice of the Governments was not heard; there was a lack of true tripartism; and there was a lack of adequate parliamentary procedure. GRULAC had proposed on a number of occasions that the lists of cases be published in advance. While acknowledging the difficulties raised by the social partners in this regard, modern technology should allow room for making progress. The speaker requested that the concerns expressed by various governments be taken into consideration and that the issue of an advance publication of the list of cases be considered during the next meeting. For this purpose, the Office should provide information on the practice followed in the past as well as on the technological methods available through web-based applications to advance the publication of the list. His group agreed with the publication of the discussion of individual cases and General Surveys in the form of verbatim. The summary of the general discussion would appear in Part I together with the conclusions on individual cases and the outcome of the discussion of the General Survey. However, the speaker expressed concern that the general discussion would not be reproduced in verbatim since, in the past, discrepancies had been identified in the summary of the general discussion and had to be corrected. His group requested that the general

discussion also be reproduced in verbatim records in Part II. Finally, in relation to the enhanced use of D Documents, it should be made clear that governments would provide information on a voluntary basis. This would be an opportunity for governments to clarify certain issues.

14. **The Chairperson** requested the Office to clarify where the summaries would be placed.
15. **The Director of the International Labour Standards Department** indicated that Part I would contain the introduction, the summary of the general discussion, the outcome of the discussion on the General Survey, the summary report on the cases of serious failures and the conclusions on the individual cases. The verbatim of the discussion on the General Survey and the verbatim of the discussion of the cases of serious failure would be included in Part II. The only question left was whether the general discussion would appear in summary or in verbatim.
16. **The Employer and the Worker spokespersons** agreed to reproduce the general discussion in verbatim.
17. **Speaking on behalf of the Western European Group, a Government representative of Greece** also agreed with the proposal to reproduce the general discussion and the discussion of individual cases in verbatim; to reproduce the conclusions of the individual cases both in Part I and Part II of the report; and to adopt the report in patchwork. The speaker asked whether the special paragraphs would continue to appear in Part I. In relation to the proposal to allow governments appearing on the longlist to provide information before the session of the CAS, the process had to be completely voluntary and no pressure should be put on governments. Her group also expressed appreciation at the efforts that the social partners were willing to make to anticipate the publication of the shortlist.
18. **Speaking on behalf of the Eastern European Group, a Government representative of Poland** underlined that it was important for Member States to be informed in advance of the discussion of their case and to have the opportunity to deliver comprehensive information.
19. **A Government representative of Uruguay** supported the statement by GRULAC. She emphasized that the restructuring of Parts I and II would improve transparency and highlighted the importance of speakers being able to amend the verbatim records before they were published.
20. **Speaking on behalf of the Africa group, a Government representative of Algeria** emphasized the need to strengthen tripartism in the CAS by reviewing its working methods. Tangible results must be achieved in that regard. He agreed with proposals to publish verbatim records of discussions in order to ensure greater transparency and to restructure Parts I and II of the report. With regard to the publication of the report in the three languages one month after the end of the Conference, that deadline must be respected. Lastly, governments on the longlist should be able to provide information in the form of a D document of at least five pages in length.
21. **The Employer spokesperson** agreed to place on the agenda of the next meeting the issue of the early publication of the lists of cases. While there was, in principle, agreement to publish the longlist earlier than 30 days before the opening of the session of the Conference, more reflection was needed on the practicability of this proposal. This would extend the time during which governments would appear on the list and at the same time give social partners more time to engage with the governments concerned. Concerning the publication of the shortlist, while technology might help, there was value in people meeting in person and, practically, the first opportunity to discuss the shortlist laid at the beginning of the CAS. The social partners had worked in good faith to be able to publish the shortlist on the second day of the CAS. Furthermore, considering that double-footnoted cases were discussed first, the

other cases were not discussed until the end of the first week. In conclusion, the Employers' group considered that a change in the practice would be difficult.

22. **The Chairperson** confirmed that the timeline for the publication of the lists of cases would be further discussed at the next meeting.
23. At the request of a **Government representative of Greece, the Director of the International Labour Standards Department** clarified that governments on the longlist would be invited to provide new information on a purely voluntary basis, which would be indicated when the longlist was sent to governments. There would be no specific letters addressed to the governments to that end. Document D1 would refer to the voluntary nature of the process and to the fact that the information provided should not exceed three pages.
24. Following suggestions from a number of participants on the wording that should be used in Document D1 concerning the voluntary nature of the process, **the Chairperson** indicated that since there was agreement on the voluntary nature of the process, it could be left to the Office to work on the language to be used.
25. A **Government representative of Algeria** reiterated his request to extend the length of the document that governments could provide to five pages.
26. **The Director of the International Labour Standards Department** said that for logistical reasons related in particular to translation, the Office was not able to satisfy this request.

III. Special Centenary arrangements

27. **The Director of the International Labour Standards Department** referred to the proposals in paragraphs 24 and 25 of the background note that the first session of the CAS be devoted to the Centenary celebration and explained the content of the curtain-raiser.
28. **The Employer spokesperson** agreed with the Office's proposal. In relation to the key messages for the curtain-raiser, the Employers' group expressed concern about the phrasing of the point concerning *interaction* according to which the CAS "adds political legitimacy to the more technical findings and technical assessments" of the Committee of Experts. The CAS made its own assessment of compliance while taking into account the Committee of Experts' findings, as well as the submission made by governments, workers, and employers during the CAS. The Office should properly describe the role of the CAS in the "curtain-raiser". Additional measures could be taken to celebrate the ILO Centenary, such as the exhibition of photographs and monitors outside the Governing Body room. In addition, the release of the special Centenary publication on the impact of the work of the Committee of Experts and the CAS during the CAS session should be considered.
29. **The Worker spokesperson** concurred with the Office's proposals included in paragraph 24 of the background note and suggested to publish the visual curtain-raiser online. The speaker agreed with the Employers' group that the point on *interaction* should be reformulated. It was not accurate that the role of the CAS was to add political legitimacy to the technical findings and assessments of independent experts. In relation to the Centenary ratification campaign, the speaker expressed hope that governments would be ambitious and go beyond the ratification of one Convention. Furthermore, Conventions identified as up to date by the Standards Review Mechanism (SRM) should be included in the ratification campaign. The Workers' group requested the Office to provide more information on the high-level event on freedom of association and collective bargaining during the ILO Centenary, as well as on the scope, the purpose and the participation in the round table that would take place during the 2019 November–December sitting of the Committee of Experts.

-
- 30. Speaking on behalf of GRULAC, a Government representative of Brazil** welcomed the proposal concerning the celebration of a round table during the 2019 sitting of the Committee of Experts with the participation of the Chairperson of the CAS. This would add the voice of governments to the event. In relation to the messages for the curtain-raiser, the point on *interaction* should be reformulated since the reference to the CAS as a mechanism to add political legitimacy was not accurate. With respect to the point on *tripartism*, the speaker indicated that tripartism was deficient at the CAS, considering that sometimes the CAS did not take account of the voices of governments. The point on *the global conscience of social justice* adequately characterized the CAS as a parliamentary body.
- 31. Speaking on behalf of the Western European Group, a Government representative of Greece** agreed with the Office's proposals as well as with that of the Employers' group to reproduce the curtain-raiser in different monitors. Her group concurred with the statements made by GRULAC and the Employers' and Workers' groups regarding the need of reformulating the point on *interaction*. While welcoming the participation of the Chairperson of the CAS in the round table that would take place during the 2019 sitting of the Committee of Experts, she echoed the request made to the Office of providing further information on this event.
- 32. Speaking on behalf of the Africa group, a Government representative of Algeria** endorsed the programme planned for the Centenary celebration in the CAS and the key messages of the video. However, with regard to the message on *tripartism*, there was a contradiction between the tripartite nature of the CAS and the fact that only the Workers and the Employers played a role in the selection of individual cases. With regard to the round table organized for the next session of the Committee of Experts, the speaker sought confirmation that the President of the CAS would participate in that event.
- 33. A Government representative of Uruguay** noted, with regard to the key messages of the curtain-raiser, that the CAS was "one" of the oldest global monitoring bodies. The message with regard to *tripartism*, as well as referring to the independence of workers' and employers' representatives, should also mention in a positive way the role of Government representatives.
- 34. The Chairperson** took due note of the concerns expressed by the participants in relation to the need to revise the message on *interaction* of the curtain-raiser. He requested clarification from the Office on the other issues raised by the participants.
- 35. The Director of the International Labour Standards Department** indicated, with regard to the ratification campaign, that the dashboard accessible online showed on a daily basis the progress made in the ratification of Conventions and that it did include the follow-up to the SRM decisions. The Director indicated that the publication of the curtain-raiser online and in monitors could be feasible. The Office would also look at the possibility of a photo exhibition. Nevertheless, the Office was not able to accommodate the request of launching the special Centenary publication on the impact of the work of the Committee of Experts in June 2019. With respect to the round table that would take place during the 2019 sitting of the Committee of Experts, the Office had still not received confirmation on the availability of all the participants. In relation to the high-level event that would take place during the ILO Centenary on freedom of association and collective bargaining, she indicated that it was still being discussed within the Governing Body and that the Office would inform the participants when the information became available. Finally, the Office would take due note of the request made by the participants in relation to the reformulation of the point on *interaction* of paragraph 25 of the background note.

IV. Discussion of the General Survey

- 36. The Director of the International Labour Standards Department** explained that the Office's proposal was to structure the discussion of General Surveys around a limited number of questions with a view to make the discussion more focused and outcome oriented. If the participants agreed with the proposal, it should be decided how and who would formulate the questions. The framing questions for the discussion could be addressed during the informal tripartite meeting.
- 37. The Worker spokesperson** indicated that his group would continue to make efforts to reduce the opening statements in order to dedicate more time for the discussion of General Surveys. In relation to the follow-up to these discussions, the Governing Body should continue to debate additional measures to ensure greater policy coherence. The speaker welcomed the possibility of organizing the discussions of the General Surveys on the basis of questions formulated in advance, for instance, during the informal tripartite meeting. The questions should help guide the discussion without limiting its scope. The opportunity to share good experiences should be maintained.
- 38. The Employer spokesperson** welcomed the proposal of devoting more time to the discussion of General Surveys, but recalled that due to the already compressed timetable there was little latitude. The participation of experts during the discussion of General Surveys could be considered on an exceptional basis when the technical guidance was found useful and after consultation of the Officers of the CAS. They agreed to organize the discussion of the General Surveys on the basis of questions. These would help to keep the focus on key issues and come to structure outcomes. The questions should be determined in consultations with the Employers' and Workers' groups and the regional coordinators. Discussions on how to improve the General Surveys should also take place, in particular with regard to the possibility of including a simple recurrent structure for all General Surveys; using diagrams and tables to illustrate trends; and including more background information on the electronic version of the General Survey.
- 39. Speaking on behalf of the Western European Group, a Government representative of Greece** concurred with the proposal of structuring the discussion of General Surveys around questions.
- 40. Speaking on behalf of GRULAC, a Government representative of Brazil** indicated that the discussion of General Surveys should allow for a better understanding of the issues and better participation of all constituents. He concurred with the Employers' group on the difficulty of allocating more time to the discussion of General Surveys. It was precisely for this reason that they had proposed to have preliminary discussions on the General surveys and the outcomes. The idea of structuring the discussion in advance would give constituents more time to reflect and allow for more targeted interventions in order to achieve meaningful conclusions. The speaker expressed concern that assessing the General Survey with a view to preparing the questions would probably be beyond the scope of the informal meeting. Other forms of consulting on this needed to be sought.
- 41. Speaking on behalf of the Africa group, a Government representative of Algeria** expressed support for the proposals to allocate more time to the discussion of General Surveys and allowing experts to participate. Another proposal would be to study the feasibility of discussing the General Survey in another Conference committee, which would give greater importance to the resultant conclusions and recommendations.
- 42. The Director of the International Labour Standards Department** noted the interest expressed by the participants on the proposal of structuring the discussions on the General Surveys around a set of questions. The Office would provide new proposals with regard to

the modalities for framing these questions on which guidance would be sought. Concerning the proposal to create another forum during the ILC to discuss the General Surveys, this was not feasible due to the limited resources allocated to the functioning of the CAS.

V. Preparation, adoption and follow-up of conclusions

- 43. The Director of the international Labour Standards Department** referred to the background note and indicated that the CAS had started to adopt conclusions in 1980. Conclusions had been prepared by the Chairperson of the CAS, in consultation with the Reporter and the Vice-Chairpersons. From 2012, there had been some years of turbulence, which had impacted the functioning of the CAS. However, an agreement between the Workers' and the Employers' groups had helped to overcome those turbulences and, as from 2015, conclusions had been prepared by the Vice-Chairpersons.
- 44. The Employer spokesperson** indicated that while she had listened to the concerns expressed about the role of the Chairperson of the CAS, at the moment, she did not see value in the direct involvement of the Chairperson in the preparation of the conclusions. Conclusions could not be considered in isolation. They came at the end of an entire discussion (now provided in verbatim records), and were adopted with the fundamental objective to provide governments with a road map for action to work towards compliance. Rather than calling for a change in the role of the Chairperson, governments should consider other ways of increasing their participation. The possibility for governments to make submissions on a voluntary basis prior to the beginning of the CAS was an opportunity to influence the discussion. Moreover, submissions that focused on technical (rather than political) aspects of the case would be a way for governments to make suggestions on a possible road map that would be reflected in the conclusions. The process was transparent and governments could influence the debate. The Employers' group remained open to discussion. Nevertheless, there was also a need to take into account the practical realities in the CAS and the need to draft short, concise and clear conclusions.
- 45. The Worker spokesperson** expressed complete agreement with the Employer spokesperson's views. Governments had an adequate role and their effective participation was critical for the development of conclusions. This role started with adequate reporting to the Committee of Experts. Governments had the possibility to submit written information after the publication of the preliminary list of cases, and they were allocated speaking time at the beginning and at the end of the discussions. Conclusions were based on those submissions. The current way of working was based on a consensus which had been difficult to reach. Both Governments' and the Workers' group had considered it extremely unhelpful that divergences had appeared in the past in the conclusions themselves, as the objective of the conclusions was to give clear directions to governments. In 2014, no consensus had been reached on how to deal with such divergences and therefore no conclusions had been adopted except for double-footnoted cases. Since 2015, under the current way of working, the Employer and Worker members had developed conclusions based on consensus for every single case that had been discussed. The Workers' group remained open to discussion but reiterated that there were already a lot of opportunities for governments to make contributions, which would help in reaching agreement on consensual conclusions.
- 46. Speaking on behalf of the Africa group, a Government representative of Algeria** underscored the importance of giving the President of the CAS a more specific role in the preparation of the conclusions in order to consolidate tripartite consensus and, thereby, the supervisory system. It was regrettable that the conclusions did not reflect all of the views expressed. The involvement of the President would make it possible to represent the perspectives of the governments concerned. Besides, fairness required that the government

should be informed of the conclusions before they were pronounced and given the opportunity to express itself before they were formally adopted.

- 47. On behalf of the Western European Group, a Government representative of Greece** welcomed the willingness of the social partners to continue being engaged in the discussion.
- 48. Speaking on behalf of GRULAC, a Government representative of Brazil** considered that the CAS was an important tripartite body that lay at the heart of the ILO supervisory system. However, when it came to drafting conclusions, that Committee was not tripartite, i.e. only employers and workers were involved in the process. This raised a legitimacy problem. While the Chairperson of the CAS had held an important role in the past, it was not suggested that the Chairperson would be responsible for the drafting of conclusions. The Vice-Chairpersons would continue to have a final say but they would consult with and listen to the views expressed by the Chairperson. While recognizing the high level of technical and legal expertise of workers and employers, the Chairperson was also in a position to assess the proposed conclusions from a Government perspective. Governments' involvement through the consultation of the Chairperson, would give the conclusions a higher degree of legitimacy. It was therefore regrettable that the proposal had not gained the support of the social partners for the moment. In 2018, GRULAC objected to the working methods of the CAS. More significant steps had to be taken to achieve progress, which was why the proposal on the role of the Chairperson had been made. These concerns would be alleviated if, after being presented with the conclusions, governments could take the floor immediately before the adoption of the conclusion. Government participation was crucial not only for the preparation of the conclusions, but also for their implementation. If governments did not recognize true tripartite legitimacy in the conclusions, their implementation would become difficult. The consultation of the Chairperson in the drafting of the conclusions, which he emphasized remained the role of the Vice-Chairpersons, and the possibility for the government concerned to respond immediately after the presentation of the proposed conclusions was essential for the governments. This was in line with parliamentary practice. The concerned government should be made aware of the conclusions with reasonable anticipation with a view to be in a position to inform its relevant authorities of the conclusions. This could be done through the organization of a preliminary informal session with the concerned government.
- 49. A Government representative of Lebanon** speaking on behalf of ASPAG fully supported the points raised by GRULAC and the Africa group.
- 50. Speaking on behalf of the Eastern European Group, a Government representative of Poland** indicated that it was important to continue the discussion.
- 51. A Government representative of Uruguay**, while appreciating the comments of the social partners, emphasized that, without questioning the legitimacy of the CAS, it was important to retain some flexibility in the process of preparing the conclusions and to recognize the consultative role of the Chairperson of the CAS.
- 52. The Employer spokesperson** recalled that the Chairperson and the government whose case was under discussion were not prevented from sharing their views with the Vice-Chairpersons. The verbatim record would reflect all the statements made and give visibility to the views expressed. Every aspect of the government's view could not be reflected in the conclusions, in view of their short and concise nature. Where there was no consensus, the government might not appreciate the discussion or be in agreement with all the elements of the conclusions. When a court rendered a decision, although it was understood that the CAS was not a court, it would hear all the arguments of the parties involved, come to a decision and communicate that decision. The possibility for governments to intervene before the adoption of the conclusions would raise the question of whether the Employer and Worker members should be offered an opportunity to take the floor again. This would be a

duplication of the process. Equal opportunities should be given to all parties without any privileges. Governments had the opportunity to make any submission they wished to make. If a government were to take the floor in advance of the presentation of the conclusions and express disagreement with certain aspects of the conclusions, that would be a departure from past practice and would also appear to be a direct challenge to the legitimacy of those conclusions. Furthermore, the opportunity to provide the conclusions in advance had to be thought through carefully. The CAS did not foresee a right of “rebuttal” and governments were not requested to provide an immediate response to the conclusions during the discussion. Any additional concern could be provided by the governments in their reports to the supervisory system. The right of all parties to feel heard should be thought about with an open mind. However, the functionality and integrity of the CAS should also be considered, and no decisions should be taken that undermined its legitimacy.

- 53. The Worker spokesperson** explained that certain elements provided by the Government might not be reflected in the conclusions because there was an absence of consensus between workers and employers on certain issues. There was also not necessarily common agreement on something brought to the attention of the Officers by the government or the Chairperson. Giving the governments the opportunity to respond to proposed conclusions that were not yet adopted would raise a number of questions related to the status of that response, the risk of duplicating the process and the difficulty in bringing the discussion to an end. Another point was that if governments were to be invited to take the floor before the adoption of the conclusions, should the Employers’ or the Workers’ groups or the Employer or Worker members of the member States also be invited to restate their views? All the possibilities that such changes implied should be considered. Governments should take advantage of all the existing opportunities at their disposal to raise issues in their responses during the discussions with a view to help the CAS to elaborate strong conclusions.
- 54. Speaking on behalf of GRULAC, a Government representative of Brazil** indicated that there was a difference of perspective as regards the nature of the CAS. Although the Committee had been compared to a legal court-like body, it was rather a parliamentary body. Therefore parliamentary procedures should apply. When the conclusions were adopted by the Committee, there should be careful consideration and discussion by all parties of the text proposed, in accordance with parliamentary procedures. With regard to the provision of the conclusions in advance, even in a legal court-like procedure, there was clearly no obligation to take the floor again. However, from a diplomatic procedure, it would be relevant for governments to be in a position to provide a structured, meaningful response. His group considered that this could be realized through a one-day advance notice of the text of the proposed conclusions. The speaker asked that this issue be raised again at the next meeting and requested the Office to provide more information on the history of the procedure of the adoption of the conclusions.
- 55. Speaking on behalf of the Africa group, a Government representative of Algeria** emphasized that the same questions had been raised at several meetings and that each side was maintaining its position. It was necessary to assess the action taken and the changes needed for there to be tripartism at all levels and in order to ensure that the process was transparent and fair.
- 56. The Chairperson** noted that there was consensus for further engagement in the process. There was a need for more background information in terms of how the process had been handled in the past and the Office could be requested to provide the next meeting with a historical perspective on the evolving role of the Chairperson. It was also important to consider other implications of the proposed amendments to the process. It came out of the discussion that governments should take into consideration the need for more technical interventions with a view to providing solid arguments to the social partners in the drafting of the conclusions. Both the Chairperson and the member State concerned were not prevented from engaging with the Vice-Chairpersons to ensure that their views were

reflected in the conclusions. The proposal to make the conclusions available to the government in advance raised questions that had to be considered further. The central point remained that the work of the Committee should not be undermined.

- 57. Speaking on behalf of GRULAC, a Government representative of Brazil** recalled that the Chairperson of the CAS had an important role and prerogative as provided for in the Standing Orders of the Conference.