

# Sixth meeting of the tripartite working group on the full, equal and democratic participation in the ILO's tripartite governance

## Summary record of proceedings

### Introduction

1. The tripartite working group on the full, equal and democratic participation in the ILO's tripartite governance (TWGD) held its sixth meeting on Tuesday, 19 July 2021, in a hybrid format.
2. The list of members and other participants is in Appendix I.
3. The TWGD had before it a background note prepared by the Office and a draft agenda.
4. **One of the Co-Chairpersons, Switzerland**, recalled that the TWGD had been established to serve as a platform for focused dialogue and for developing proposals on the full, equal and democratic participation in the ILO's tripartite governance, in the spirit of the ILO Centenary Declaration for the Future of Work. Its duration had been extended by the Governing Body at its 344th Session (March 2022). Its final report was due to the Governing Body at its 347th Session (March 2023).

### Adoption of agenda

5. The TWGD adopted the following agenda:
  - Update on the status of ratification of the 1986 Amendment and ratification prospects.
  - Role and functioning of the tripartite Screening Group (paragraph 3.1.1. of the Standing Orders of the Governing Body).
  - Officers of the Governing Body (paragraph 2.1.1 of the Standing Orders of the Governing Body).
  - Any other business.
6. **The representative of the secretariat of the Workers' group** recalled that the Workers had agreed to the TWGD and its mandate on the clear understanding that its priority would be the entry into force of the 1986 Instrument for the Amendment of the Constitution of the ILO (the 1986 Amendment). The approval of the agenda should not be understood as an agreement that the mandate also included the items relating to the Screening Group and the Officers of the Governing Body. The purpose of the meeting was to listen to the views of the Governments on these items.
7. **The representative of the secretariat of the Employers' group** welcomed the opportunity to listen to the views of governments on the items relating to the Screening Group and the Officers of the Governing Body. She generally supported the discussions on ways to democratize and render more efficient and transparent the ILO's governance structure.

8. **The Government member of Argentina** noted that while the TWGD had been constituted primarily to discuss the 1986 Amendment, ratified by Argentina, it was not the only subject relevant to democratization. It was important that the social partners were involved in the discussions regarding the Screening Group and the Officers of the Governing Body, since these topics related to the democratization and efficiency of the ILO.

## Update on the status of ratification of the 1986 Amendment and ratification prospects

9. **One of the Co-Chairpersons, Switzerland**, informed the TWGD that four Member States, namely Turkmenistan, Liberia, Cabo Verde and the Philippines, had ratified the 1986 Amendment since the previous meeting of the TWGD. To date, the 1986 Amendment had been ratified by 121 Member States, including two Members of chief industrial importance (India and Italy). A further four ratifications were required for the 1986 Amendment to enter into force, including at least three ratifications from Members of chief industrial importance. The only two countries in the Africa region that had yet to ratify the 1986 Amendment, Gambia and Sao Tome and Principe, were respectively advancing in the process of ratification. Finally, ahead of the 17th Asia and the Pacific Regional Meeting in December 2022, the Legal Adviser had sent a promotional letter to the Member States in that region that had not yet ratified the amendment.
10. **The representative of the secretariat of the Workers' group** welcomed the progress achieved and the promotional letter sent but noted that the ratifications from Members of chief industrial importance would be the most difficult ones to obtain.
11. **The representative of the secretariat of the Employers' group** took note with interest of the progress made. There was momentum, to which the work of the TWGD, the two Co-Chairpersons and the Office had contributed.
12. **The Government member of Morocco**, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, noted that there was a positive momentum towards the entry into force of the 1986 Amendment. The Africa region presented the highest ratification rate compared to the other regions. Nevertheless, the major challenge of receiving three new ratifications from Members of chief industrial importance remained. As noted in previous meetings of the TWGD, the decision by Brazil to undertake an internal dialogue on the ratification was a positive step. All the constituents should increase their efforts to reach the TWGD objective, in accordance with the resolution on the principle of equality among ILO Member States and the fair representation of all regions in the ILO's tripartite governance adopted by the International Labour Conference at its 109th Session (2021). The Co-Chairpersons should recommend that the Governing Body intensify the efforts with the eight Members of chief industrial importance that had yet to ratify the 1986 Amendment. The Africa group welcomed the efforts and promotional activities undertaken by the current Director-General and expressed the hope that all steps would be taken to allow the newly elected Director-General to further intensify the promotional activities in relation to the 1986 Amendment.
13. **The Government member of Slovenia**, speaking on behalf of the Eastern European group, stated that the group supported the work of the TWGD as it had resulted in the adoption of the resolution in June 2021. This resolution was important for some members of the group as it declared obsolete the notion of "socialist" States of Eastern Europe referred to in the 1986 Amendment.

14. **The Government member of the Philippines** welcomed the continued existence of the TWGD since the entry into force of the 1986 Amendment had not been achieved yet. The recent ratification by the Philippines assisted in reaching that goal.
15. **The Government member of Zimbabwe** welcomed the four new ratifications and called upon the Members of chief industrial importance to show leadership and ratify the 1986 Amendment. As previously proposed, the TWGD should examine the difficulties faced by those Member States to ratify the 1986 Amendment.
16. **The representative of the secretariat of the Employers' group** noted that there appeared to be momentum for the ratification of the 1986 Amendment, and while such processes took time, it was hoped that progress would continue and further positive developments occurred when the new Director-General took office.
17. **One of the Co-Chairpersons, Nigeria**, concluded by requesting the Office to record the deepest gratitude of the TWGD to the current Director-General for his efforts regarding the 1986 Amendment.

### Role and functioning of the tripartite Screening Group (paragraph 3.1.1. of the Standing Orders of the Governing Body)

18. **One of the Co-Chairpersons, Switzerland**, invited the Office to present the content of the background note on this agenda item.
19. **The Legal Adviser** recalled that the Screening Group had been introduced under the reform package of 2011 and served a dual purpose: on the one hand, it established an improved agenda-setting mechanism for the Governing Body and, on the other hand, it responded to the desire of the Governments to be more active as a group, with more effective participation in the work of the Governing Body in both the preparatory and the decision-making processes. During the COVID-19 pandemic from March 2020 through March 2022 the Screening Group had assumed, by necessity, an enhanced role in ILO governance, characterized by extreme frequency of meetings and additional decision-making powers. During that period, the Screening Group, among other things, had reviewed draft documents and proposed decision points to make them suitable for adoption by correspondence. The composition of the Screening Group was provided in paragraph 3.1.1 of the Standing Orders of the Governing Body. The same provision formalized the role of regional coordinators, six of which were recognized today: five regional coordinators corresponding to the five geographical regions and subregions, and IMEC, a trans-regional group. The topic under discussion mostly fell within the principle of the autonomy of the groups. The Office had thus no records of group elections, rotation arrangements or other details regarding governments' representation.
20. **The Government member of Germany**, speaking on behalf of the Government group, reiterated the group's full support to the TWGD. Following the decision of the Governing Body at its 344th Session (March 2022) to extend its mandate for another 12 months, the Government group had undertaken to pursue as high priority internal consultations on the topics on the TWGD's agenda for its sixth meeting. A number of proposals and documents had been submitted by individual or groups of Member States, and discussions with a view to reach consensus were ongoing. The discussions in the TWGD would be taken into account in those discussions.
21. **The Government member of Morocco**, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, commented on the four points highlighted in paragraph 12 of the background note. First, regarding the number of regional coordinators, the notion of "recognized" regional coordinators should be

clarified, as only four geographical regions were recognized, namely Africa, Americas, Asia and the Pacific, and Europe. Second, participation in the Screening Group should be limited to the four geographical groups, to effectively ensure fair representation of all regions and avoid overrepresentation due to membership in multiple groups. Third, while the four geographical groupings should prevail with regard to the functioning of the Governing Body, the question of criteria or process for determining regional groups could be further discussed, keeping in mind the necessity to avoid overrepresentation. Fourth, the enhanced role of the Screening Group was linked to the COVID-19 context, and a return to normal should be progressively envisaged. Any codification of the current practice should be based on full tripartite agreement. Further discussions would be required, possibly by inviting the three Officers of the Governing Body for the period 2021–22 to present to the TWGD the challenges faced during that period. In addition, while acknowledging the ongoing discussions within the Government group, he clarified that the Africa group had not had time to consider the statement prepared on behalf of that group for the purpose of this meeting.

22. **The Government member of Australia**, speaking on behalf of the Asia and Pacific group (ASPAG), noted that, in addition to the ratification of 1986 Amendment, complementary measures needed to be explored by the TWGD in order to achieve full, equal and democratic participation in the ILO's tripartite governance, including the two items concerning the Screening Group and the Officers of the Governing Body on the agenda of the meeting. As the regional group representing 60 per cent of the world labour force, ASPAG looked forward to discussing these issues with other Governments and the social partners, as appropriate. The discussions that were ongoing within the Government group on these topics should be concluded efficiently, in a transparent and open manner.
23. **The Government member of Brazil**, speaking on behalf of the group of Latin American and Caribbean countries (GRULAC), stated that the establishment of the Screening Group had been an important step to enhance the involvement of governments in the decision-making process of the Governing Body and recently for business continuity. Further adjustments could be made to improve regional representation, which should be balanced and avoid double representation. The composition of the Screening Group had broader implications since the current composition had been replicated in other tripartite consultations, to avoid an imbalance in representation. It was thus necessary to rethink this aspect of the Screening Group. The freedom to coordinate positions within the Governing Body on the basis of non-geographical criteria should be maintained and possibly enhanced. For example, the four regional groups could each have two seats within the Screening Group. Finally, the Screening Group should revert to its original role while noting the possibility of future exceptional situations.
24. **The Government member of Canada**, speaking on behalf the group of industrialized market economy countries (IMEC), indicated that it was the group's understanding that no challenge had been raised against IMEC's speaking rights at the Governing Body or of any other regional and non-geographical groupings. The right of any Member State to participate in one or more groupings was not challenged either. Over the years, IMEC had played an active role and, as a substantial cross-regional group, should continue to participate in the Screening Group. The mandate of the Screening Group should remain limited to setting the agenda of the Governing Body. Its exceptional enhanced role during the COVID-19 pandemic should not be codified. Other transparent mechanisms for tripartite consultations could be open to all Member States, especially due to the difficulty to coordinate views within the Government group resulting from its size and diversity. Further discussions, either tripartite or within the Government group, were needed.

25. **The Government member of Sweden**, speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, recalled that the role of the Screening Group had significantly increased during the pandemic and it was important to reduce its scope based on its original mandate. In particular, it should be ensured that the decision-making process remained with the Governing Body, as provided for in the Constitution, since this was a forum where decisions were made in an open and transparent manner. The focus of the TWGD should remain on the entry into force of the 1986 Amendment. The flexibility to join or form different groups was important to Member States and was a key aspect of the autonomy of the Government group.
26. **The Government member of Bangladesh** insisted on the relevance of the question of democratization for Member States, which should thus be discussed within the TWGD. The TWGD needed to make clear recommendations to ensure fair and just representation of governments in the ILO's groupings. Pakistan and the Philippines had made propositions in this regard, which Bangladesh supported while being open to adjustments. Finally, the TWGD could proceed with its agenda without having to wait for a proposal from the Government group.
27. **The Government member of Indonesia** noted that the priority of the TWGD remained the entry into force of the 1986 Amendment. Regarding the other topics on the agenda, discussions were ongoing within the Government group, in particular on the basis of proposals submitted by Pakistan, the Philippines, the Nordic countries and Germany. While it was preferable to adjust the role and composition of the Screening Group, any change to the ILO governance structure should be the result of a comprehensive process where all options were discussed.
28. **The Government member of the Philippines** stated that the entry into force of the 1986 Amendment would not solve the problem of democratization, and there would remain some structures of inequality. For this reason, other topics should be discussed for which the TWGD was the appropriate forum. There had been discussions within the Government group which were complementary to the ones within the TWGD. Since a balanced composition of the Screening Group impacted not only the Government group but also the social partners, the topic was relevant for the TWGD. The special role recognized to IMEC was linked to the financial capacity of its members. In fact, the current situation was the result of historical developments, which ought to be addressed.
29. **The Government member of France** highlighted that the composition of the Screening Group included not only IMEC but also GRULAC as a group that did not correspond to one of the four institutional geographical regions, an element which should be borne in mind when discussing this topic. It was possible for any governments to express positions in an ad hoc fashion within the Governing Body.
30. **The representative of the secretariat of the Workers' group** noted that it was important that the Government group was discussing the representation of governments. Since this matter fell within the Government group autonomy, no comment or position could be expressed on behalf of the Workers' group. The exceptional circumstances of the pandemic had led to an increase of the responsibilities of the Screening Group and, although it was justified at the time, the initial mandate concerning the agenda of the Governing Body should now be restored. Its composition should be balanced, not only among governments but also between the governments and the social partners. The topic, while rightly discussed within the Government group, also impacted the social partners and therefore justified its discussion in a tripartite setting.

- 31. The representative of the secretariat of the Employers' group** observed that the essential concern was to ensure the efficiency of the Screening Group's deliberation and, in terms of participation rights, balance should be ensured between and within groups. Overlapping representation in the Screening Group led to confusion as to the position of some governments. Its composition should reflect as much as possible the four regional groups recognized in the 1986 Amendment. Accordingly, despite the current practice, groups other than geographical ones were not encompassed in the composition of the Screening Group and should not be represented therein. This should not affect the right of governments to consult within their group as they saw fit. Finally, the mandate of the Screening Group should not be modified.
- 32. The representative of the Director-General** provided the following clarifications. With respect to the reference in paragraph 9 of the background note to "six recognized regional coordinators" and the recognition of IMEC, at the time of the reform package of 2011, the intention was that the term "regional coordinators" would relate to the five regions traditionally recognized, including Europe being sub-divided into Eastern and Western Europe, and IMEC. With respect to the latter, the reason may have simply been linked to their recognition as a group of governments in the Governing Body and the prominent role it had taken in the work of the Governing Body as well as in informal consultations. The extension of the status of "regional coordinator" to IMEC was therefore considered a natural step when the Screening Group was created and was intended to be limited to the work of that group. The need to limit the size of the Screening Group had been an important aspect at the time to ensure a reasonable balance between the three groups. The original intention had been to have a group with a mandate limited to the setting of the agenda of the Governing Body and a limited representation across the Government group. At the same time, tripartite consultations had continued to be carried out on a broad range of other issues. They had often involved the same participants as the Screening Group. In the early days of the group, its formal meetings to carry out its mandate and generally convened by the Chairperson of the Governing Body had been differentiated from informal consultations generally convened by the Office to address other issues.
- 33.** With respect to the respective roles of the Government group and the TWGD to discuss the matter, the numbers of participants in the Screening Group for each of the three groups and the related need to ensure a balance between them should be determined on a tripartite basis. On the other hand, the basis for the representation of governments within the tripartite agreed parameters, was clearly a matter to be determined by the Government group having regard to the principle of the autonomy of the groups set forth in the Standing Orders of the Governing Body. The recognition of the four regions in the Introductory note of the compendium of rules applicable to the Governing Body and in the 1986 Amendment, was primarily intended for the purposes of election at the Governing Body and the allocation of seats. Beyond that aspect, it was up to the Government group to decide how to structure itself.
- 34.** With respect to the work of the Screening Group in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, at the beginning, there had been a differentiation between the meetings of the Screening Group to set the agenda of the Governing Body and the consultations on governance issues such as the deferral of the sessions of the Governing Body and the Conference. This differentiation had been made having regard to the mandate of the Screening Group as set forth in the Standing Orders of the Governing Body. However, this distinction faded away over time, all the more so as the same participants were involved in the two streams of discussions. There was no intention to expand the mandate of the Screening Group. Rather, there had been a gradual merge in practice of the two different fora of discussions with the same membership. From the

Office's perspective, the mandate of the Screening Group should henceforth be strictly observed while the possibility of consultations on different issues should be maintained.

35. **The Legal Adviser** indicated that records show that IMEC had been established in the mid-1970s and started presenting group positions in ILO meetings in the early 1990s. While IMEC's membership had probably increased over time, the Office had no information as to the details of that evolution. With respect to exceptional arrangements in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, he recalled that up to two-thirds of the Governing Body's agenda items had been addressed by ballot by correspondence. The drawback of ballot by correspondence was that decisions taken formally under a certain session of the Governing Body were actually taken either before or after the end of that session, blurring the lines between sessions.
36. Responding to the remarks made by the Legal Adviser, **the representative of the secretariat of the Workers' group** highlighted that ballot by correspondence was initially introduced due to the limited timeframe for the virtual sessions of the Governing Body, with the requirement that the question put to this decision-making method be non-controversial. However, more and more substantive questions had been decided upon through ballot by correspondence, an undesirable development which had caused issues for the secretariat of the Workers' group and complaints within the group. This practice should thus not be continued.
37. **The representative of the secretariat of the Employers' group** clarified that, while the autonomy of the Government group should be respected, inputs had been given in order to ensure the efficiency of the TWGD and since the topic had tripartite implications. The modality of ballot by correspondence on non-controversial issues deserved further reflection and was worth exploring on a case-by-case basis. The proposal made by GRULAC could be considered.
38. **One of the Co-Chairpersons, Switzerland**, concluded by summarizing that a majority of the TWGD members considered that the mandate of the Screening Group should remain limited to the setting of the Governing Body agenda. In addition, it had been useful for the TWGD as a whole to be informed that the Government group had started discussions on the question of the representation of governments in the Screening Group. She invited the Government group to share further information with the TWGD in due course. The Co-Chairpersons were committed to contribute to timely discussions in the Government group and their progress.

## Officers of the Governing Body (paragraph 2.1.1 of the Standing Orders of the Governing Body)

39. **One of the Co-Chairpersons, Nigeria**, invited the Office to present the content of the background note on this agenda item.
40. **The Legal Adviser** recalled that the Officers of the Governing Body – consisting of a Chairperson and two Vice-Chairpersons – were regulated by the ILO Constitution and the Standing Orders of the Governing Body, the latter reflecting the constitutional provision. The recent proposal of instituting an additional Vice-Chairperson representing the Government group, thus increasing the number of Officers from three to four, had not been adopted in the context of the 2011 reform because of this constitutional impediment. Instead, it had been agreed to enhance the role of the Government group Chairperson, as reflected in paragraph 21 of the Introductory note.
41. **The Government member of Morocco**, speaking on behalf of the Africa group, noted that further clarifications were needed as regards the possible expansion of the role and functions of the Government group Chairperson raised in paragraph 20 of the background note. Notably, it was necessary to clarify whether this increased role would have an impact on the

applicable legal framework, including the need to provide in the Standing Orders membership in the Governing Body as a condition of eligibility to chair the Government group. Further discussions on this point would be possible, on the understanding that the designation of the Government group Chairperson would be done through consensus and with a geographical rotation.

42. **The Government member of Brazil**, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, stated that the Government group Chairperson should be more involved in the decision-making process within Governing Body. The structure of one Chairperson and three Vice-Chairpersons representing the three constituents had been successfully introduced in ILO's technical and expert meetings. The ILO could build on this experience, since this structure had contributed to building consensus, and safeguarding the neutrality and impartiality of the chairperson. Accordingly, a Government group spokesperson should be included in the composition of the Officers of the Governing Body. He requested clarification regarding the Officers of technical and expert meetings.
43. **The representative of the secretariat of the Employers' group** recognized that there was scope for new ways to enhance the communication and coordination between the Government group spokesperson and the Chairperson. However, the Government group spokesperson should not be formally elevated to an Officer of the Governing Body, as the Standing Orders had already struck a balance between the three groups. The proposal had been discussed and rejected previously. There was currently balance and equality between the groups, and the matter should not be reopened.
44. **The representative of the secretariat of the Workers' group** agreed with the points raised by the representative of the secretariat of the Employers' group. In addition to the Standing Orders of the Governing Body, the number of Officers also appeared in the Constitution of the ILO. It was fully within the autonomy of the Government group to discuss ways to enhance the communication between the Chairperson of the Governing Body and the rest of the governments. She also noted that the Chairperson of the Governing Body was appointed for one year, on a rotational basis, whereas, though elected at each June Session of the Governing Body, the Employers' and Workers' Vice-Chairpersons were in fact appointed for the whole duration of the mandate of the Governing Body. This allowed all regions, on a rotational basis, to be represented within the Officers of the Governing Body. The current tripartite composition of the Officers should thus be maintained.
45. **The Government member of France** noted that, regarding the proposal to have another Vice-Chairperson representing the Governments, it appeared difficult to consider that all Governments could speak with one voice. Nevertheless, there could be different benefits to this proposal. He requested clarification regarding the arrangements followed during the period when the Chairperson of the Governing Body was a Worker member.
46. **The Government member of Morocco**, speaking on behalf of Africa group, requested clarification on the intended benefit of having a new vice-chairperson representing the Governments, and whether enhanced communication between the Chairperson of the Governing Body could be effected without creating such a new position.
47. **The Government member of Argentina** noted that the removal of the duplication or overrepresentation within the Screening Group could reduce the urgency of enhancing the communication between the Chairperson of the Governing Body and the Government group spokesperson.



- 48. The representative of the Director-General** provided the following clarifications. When the Chairperson of the Governing Body was a Worker member during the period 2017–18, there was a Government Vice-Chairperson and an Employer Vice-Chairperson. In addition, there was a Worker spokesperson who nonetheless was not an Officer of the Governing Body. When the possibility of instituting a Vice-Chairperson representing the Government group was discussed in 2010, the objective was to look at the possibility of having not so much a Government Vice-Chairperson but rather three Vice-Chairpersons representing the three groups, as Officers of the Governing Body in addition to the Chairperson. Had this possibility been accepted, when the Chairperson of the Governing Body was a Worker member, there would have been a Worker Vice-Chairperson elected together with the Government and Employer Vice-Chairpersons. The possibility at the time was opposed not only by the Workers' group but also by a number of governments as it was questionable whether a Vice-Chairperson, purporting to represent governments, could indeed reach and express common views of all governments. An important element of the debate at the time was the wording of article 7(7) of the Constitution which referred to "a person representing a government" elected as one of the three Officers of the Governing Body. This meant that it had never been anticipated that the government representative, elected as an Officer of the Governing Body, would or indeed could represent all governments.
- 49.** With respect to the election of three Vice-Chairpersons provided under the Standing Orders for technical meetings and Standing Orders for Meetings of experts, this was mainly because in both cases, the Chairperson of the meeting would generally be an independent person with the expertise on the matters covered by the agenda of the meeting. Hence, there was a need to have three Vice-Chairpersons coming from the three groups. Finally, with respect to reference to "eligibility criteria [...] of nomination of the Government group Chairperson" in paragraph 20 of the background note, the question was indeed whether the Government group Chairperson should be the representative of an elected Government member of the Governing Body only. It was a question for the Government group to determine. If the Chairperson was not a representative of the Government members of the Governing Body, there was no automatic right to speak and special arrangements would have to be made as had been the case for the Government group Chairperson for the period 2021–22. It was the Office understanding that the Government group Chairperson should indeed be appointed from among the elected Governing Body government members. The same question arose also as regards regional coordinators.
- 50. The Legal Adviser** noted that the constitutional impediment, that is to say, the specific reference to two Vice-Chairpersons in the Constitution, was difficult to bypass. As a result, it had been decided to elevate the Government group Chairperson to an Officer in all but in name. In particular, according to paragraph 21 of the Introductory note of the Standing Orders of the Governing Body, "the Chairperson of the Governing Body shall ensure that consultations take place with the Chairperson of the Government group or his or her representative on any matter on which he/she deems it necessary to consult, during the session, the Officers on the conduct of any item of the business of the Governing Body". In other words, the Chairperson of the Governing Body must consult the Chairperson of the Government group on all the matters on which he/she ordinarily consults the Officers. It could be considered whether the paragraph should be transformed into a rule by moving it from the Introductory note to the Standing Orders. The formula of three Vice-Chairpersons representing the constituent groups plus one Chairperson had indeed been adopted for the purposes of technical meetings and meetings of experts under their respective Standing Orders. However, this was not generalized practice; for example, the SRM TWG had only two Vice-Chairpersons, despite the governments' proposals that a third Vice-Chairperson be established.

51. Finally, concerning the question whether the Chairperson of the Government group and the regional coordinators should come from among the elected Government members of the Governing Body, legal clarifications on these matters had been provided by the Office in response to a query in November 2021. According to the those clarifications, while there was no express provision to this effect, the institutional logic and past practice seemed to support the view that only regular and deputy government members of the Governing Body should be eligible for the positions of Chairperson of the Government group and regional coordinators. It was indicative that according to paragraph 20 of the Introductory note, nominations to the functions within the Government group (such as its Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson or regional coordinators) are to be communicated to the Chairperson of the Governing Body after the Governing Body elections. This could only imply that such nominations should be made from among the newly elected Governing Body members. It was up to the Governing Body to decide whether it wished to request the Office to provide proposals codifying that understanding.
52. **One of the Co-Chairpersons, Nigeria**, concluded by noting that discussions would continue within the Government group and that possible amendments could eventually be proposed to the Standing Orders of the Governing Body or the non-binding Introductory note.

### Any other business

53. **One of the Co-Chairpersons, Switzerland**, proposed that the next half-day meeting of the TWGD, in a hybrid format, be set for 4 or 6 October 2022 or 15 or 17 November 2022 and invited the members to indicate their preference to the Office.
54. **The Government member of Brazil**, speaking on behalf of GRULAC, inquired whether the TWGD would be the appropriate forum to discuss the question of hybrid meetings and their continued use. Some Member States were keen to explore this possibility.
55. **One of the Co-Chairpersons, Switzerland**, noted the inquiry and closed the sixth meeting by announcing that the agenda for the next meeting would continue to be set through collective engagement of the members.

## Appendix I

### List of members and other participants

#### Governments

Africa	Americas	Asia and the Pacific	Europe
Algeria	Argentina	Australia	<b>Eastern Europe</b>
Burkina Faso	Barbados	Bangladesh	Bulgaria
Cameroon	Brazil	India	Croatia
Egypt	Canada	Indonesia	Estonia
Ethiopia	Chile	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Lithuania
Gabon	Colombia	Japan	Poland
Malawi	Costa Rica	Lebanon	Slovenia
Mali	Cuba	Nepal	<b>Western Europe</b>
Morocco	Ecuador	Philippines	Belgium
Namibia	Guatemala	Republic of Korea	France
Nigeria	Mexico	Saudi Arabia	Germany
Rwanda	Panama	Thailand	Italy
Uganda	Peru		Spain
Zimbabwe			Switzerland
			United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

#### Employers' group secretariat

- Ms María Paz Anzorreguy, International Organisation of Employers
- Mr Matias Espinosa, International Organisation of Employers

#### Workers' group secretariat

- Ms Raquel González, International Trade Union Confederation

#### Other interested Governments

- China
- Malaysia
- Portugal
- United States of America
- Uruguay