



▶ Record of Proceedings

3A

International Labour Conference – 111th Session, Geneva, 2023

Date: 13 June 2023

Second item on the agenda: Programme and budget and other questions

Report of the Finance Committee

Contents

	Page
1. Programme and Budget proposals for 2024–25.....	3
2. Request for permission to vote in accordance with paragraph 4 of article 13 of the Constitution of the ILO	28
3. Status of collection of Member States’ contributions.....	28
4. Scale of assessments of contributions to the budget for 2024	28
5. Financial report and audited consolidated financial statements for the year ended 31 December 2022.....	28
6. Resolution for the adoption of the Programme and Budget for 2024–25 and the allocation of the budget of income among Member States	28
7. Other questions	30
Resolutions submitted to the Conference	31
Resolution concerning the adoption of the Programme and Budget for 2024–25 and the allocation of the budget of income among Member States.....	31
Resolution concerning the scale of assessments of contributions to the budget for 2024	31
Resolution concerning the financial report and audited consolidated financial statements for the year ended 31 December 2022.....	31

Appendices

I. Address by Mr Gilbert F. Houngbo, Director-General, to the Finance Committee on the Programme and Budget proposals for 2024–25	32
II. Scale of assessments for 2024	33
III. Expenditure budget by appropriation line (in US dollars)	39
Summarized budget of expenditure and income for 2024–25	40
IV. Income budget for 2024–25: Statement of contributions due from Member States for 2024	41

1. The Finance Committee met on 6, 7, 8, 9, 12 and 13 June 2023. Mr Mthunzi Shabangu (Eswatini) was elected Chairperson and Reporter, and Mr Jesús Mario Chacón Carrillo (Mexico) was elected Vice-Chairperson. The Chairperson welcomed to the meeting Mr Dimitrov and Mr Dragún as observers for the Workers' and Employers' groups of the Governing Body, respectively.

1. Programme and Budget proposals for 2024-25

2. The Committee had before it the Director-General's Programme and Budget proposals for 2024-25 (GB.347/PFA/1) and the Director-General's proposals for adjustments to the Programme and Budget proposals for 2024-25 (GB.347/PFA/1/1(Rev.1)), which the Governing Body had first considered at its 347th Session (March 2023). The Committee also had before it Report II, *Draft Programme and Budget for 2024-25 and other questions* (ILC.111/II), in which links were included to the draft minutes of the discussions of the original proposals in the Governing Body (GB.347/PFA/PV).
3. **The Director-General** introduced the Programme and Budget proposals for 2024-25 with a provisional expenditure level of US\$885,303,443. His introductory remarks are attached as Appendix I to the present record.
4. **Mr Dimitrov, speaking on behalf of the Workers' group**, welcomed the focus on social justice in the Programme and Budget proposals for 2024-25 and the proposed creation of a Global Coalition for Social Justice. He noted that tripartism and labour standards were central to the ILO's work and were the main tools to address inequalities and promote social justice. In addition to supporting the implementation of existing standards, the ILO needed to develop new standards to meet contemporary challenges in the world of work if it wished to remain the point of reference for labour standards and employment policy.
5. Recalling the comments made by his group at the 347th Session of the Governing Body in March 2023, he said that, while his group disagreed with certain areas of work in the Programme and Budget proposals for 2024-25, it had ultimately approved the proposals on the understanding that its concerns would be taken into account, and hoped that, despite differing views on some issues, the programme and budget would be adopted without changes.
6. His group reiterated its support for an inclusive approach to equality and non-discrimination and underscored the importance of protecting all workers against discrimination on any ground. A failure to adopt the Programme and Budget proposals for 2024-25 would have far-reaching negative consequences for workers all over the world and would force the ILO to shut down its operations globally at midnight on 31 December 2023. ILO staff would no longer be paid, and workers everywhere would no longer be able to access ILO support or technical assistance.
7. The importance of guaranteeing the continuity of the ILO's work worldwide could not be underestimated. His group was counting on governments to find consensus and called on them to respect the tripartite nature of the Organization by refraining from engaging in policy debates that might entail changes to the programme and budget as adopted by the Governing Body without properly involving the Workers' and Employers' groups, given that the Finance Committee was not tripartite.
8. **Mr Dragún, speaking on behalf of the Employers' group**, said that, despite sometimes having differing views on how the ILO should prioritize its work, the Organization's three constituents had always, through social dialogue, been able to put forward a programme of

work and budget that met with the approval of the Finance Committee. The Programme and Budget proposals for 2024-25, which had been fine-tuned by the Governing Body, reflected the ILO's continued relevance in a world that was still recovering from one of the worst ever health crises while also facing war, high inflation, climate change and other transformative forces, and where challenges to decent work persisted.

9. Members of the Governing Body, including his group, had supported the programme and budget proposals in March 2023 on the understanding that the constituents in each Member State would be able to receive needs-based technical support from the ILO to achieve full, productive and freely chosen employment and decent work for all. His group trusted that the Organization would continue to consult and proactively engage with constituents during the implementation of the programme and budget.
10. Outstanding differences within the Finance Committee were of a cultural nature and concerned the principle of non-discrimination, which was enshrined in the ILO Constitution and the Declaration of Philadelphia. Approval of the budget by the Committee was a prerequisite for the ILO to continue its work. Without that approval, the Organization would not be able to discharge its constitutional mandate and would be deprived, for a period of at least two years, of the means to protect the hard-fought gains of more than 100 years of work. Social dialogue would be put at risk, and the normative framework safeguarding the stability that societies and economies needed to thrive would be undermined. The Decent Work Agenda was demanding and required urgent action. His group therefore trusted that the Finance Committee would take the vital first step of authorizing the ILO to use the resources at its disposal to fulfil its mandate.
11. **Speaking on behalf of the Africa group**, a Government representative of Cameroon said that her group fully endorsed the Director-General's call, in his opening remarks, to strengthen multilateralism and diplomacy within the ILO. Since its inception in 1919, the Organization had consistently promoted the fundamental values of consensus, social dialogue and respect for the cultures, sovereignty and constitutional and legal provisions of its Member States. Those values were the bedrock of the Organization and had to be preserved. Accordingly, her group supported the Programme and Budget proposals for 2024–25, despite having a deep-rooted concern that it had raised on several occasions. It had put forward a number of proposals to achieve a consensual, balanced solution acceptable to all and found it regrettable that no account had been taken of its repeated requests to delete the list of “marginalized communities” set out in paragraph 151 of document GB.346/PFA/1 and the revised list contained in paragraph 160 of document GB.347/PFA/1.
12. The group wished to reiterate its position of principle that official ILO documents should contain universally accepted language and that wording on discrimination should be consistent with Conventions Nos 100 and 111. Account should also be taken of Convention No. 190 and of the Global Call to Action, which contained references to “sex or gender” and to discrimination on all grounds. The group considered that the concept of persons affected by discrimination and exclusion was sufficiently encompassing and that a detailed enumeration of groups such as that contained in paragraph 160 of document GB.347/PFA/1 resulted in the omission of some categories of victims of discrimination and reflected an intention to promote a specific group to the detriment of all others. There was still time to reach an agreement. With that in mind, her group remained open to dialogue and consensus, and had drafted a proposed amendment to the draft resolution related to the adoption of the programme and budget for the consideration of other Member States. The proposed additional text in the draft resolution (underlined) was as follows:

The General Conference of the International Labour Organization,

(a) Referring to the decision of the 347th Governing Body (March 2023) on the Director-General's Programme and Budget proposals for 2024-25, and recalling the fundamental principles of the ILO, in particular, the principle of non-discrimination at work:

1. acknowledges that several groups of Member States expressed their strong reservations, deep concerns and rejection of the listing of vulnerable groups, by using non-universally agreed language in paragraph 160 and in output 5.1.2 of the 2024-25 programme and budget document, GB.347/PFA/1/1.
2. in view of these divergences, recognizes that the implementation of the 2024-25 Programme and Budget should be in accordance with Member States' national constitutions, legislative and regulatory provisions, and within the framework of the national decent work country programmes;
3. requests the Office to use agreed language and references in its future documents, as adopted in Conventions Nos 100 and 111.

(b) In virtue of the Financial Regulations, adopts for the 79th financial period, ending 31 December 2025, the budget of expenditure of the International Labour Organization amounting to US\$... and the budget of income amounting to US\$... which, at the budget rate of exchange of CHF... to the US dollar, amounts to CHF... , and resolves that the budget of income, denominated in Swiss francs, shall be allocated among Member States in accordance with the scale of contributions recommended by the Finance Committee.

- 13. Speaking on behalf of the majority of Member States of the Asia and the Pacific group (ASPAG),** a Government representative of China said that the majority of his group wished to reaffirm its commitment to the fundamental principles and rights at work, in particular the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation. It noted, however, that several groups of Member States had expressed reservations to the use of non-universally agreed language in paragraph 160 of document GB.347/PFA/1.
- 14.** Since November 2022, the majority of ASPAG Member States had been making great efforts to facilitate constructive dialogue among the parties concerned. Taking into account the diverse views that had been expressed, the amendment proposed by the Africa group was based on a balanced approach that could enable the meaningful and successful implementation of the ILO's programme and budget in line with national legislation and Decent Work Country Programmes. The majority of his group further agreed with the Africa group that the language in Conventions Nos 100 and 111 was an appropriate reference for any ILO documents dealing with discrimination in respect of employment and occupation, and supported the allocation of the budget of income among Member States.
- 15. Speaking on behalf of the group of Latin American and Caribbean countries (GRULAC),** a Government representative of Mexico said that his group wished to reiterate its call for an efficient use of resources during the implementation of the programme and budget for the upcoming biennium. Furthermore, it expected adequate and transparent monitoring of all activities carried out thereunder based on sound indicators. With that in mind, it supported the adoption by the Finance Committee of the Governing Body's recommendation to the International Labour Conference to approve a provisional programme level of US\$885,303,443, with the final exchange rate and the corresponding US dollar level of the budget and Swiss franc assessment to be determined by the Conference.
- 16. Speaking on behalf of the group of industrialized market economy countries (IMEC),** a Government representative of the United States of America said that the ILO's work was critical to achieving broad-based sustainable development and inclusive growth and that the ILO's rights-based mandate was the basis of its contribution to the pursuit of social justice. Her

group endorsed the Director-General's programmatic vision as articulated in his first programme and budget proposals and supported an explicit focus on the ILO's social justice mandate and on increased policy coherence within the Organization and with external partners.

17. The programme and budget document was not sufficiently detailed to enable constituents to effectively track and evaluate proposed budgetary reallocations. More detailed budget information should therefore be included in future proposals, either in the relevant document or online. Ultimately, her group considered the requested budget increase to be high in nominal terms. Nevertheless, it appreciated the ILO's efforts to identify additional budgetary efficiencies and fully expected the Organization to undertake the necessary efforts to implement the programme and budget in a cost-effective manner. It wished to reiterate the importance of results-based management and looked forward to the publication of updated technical notes for the implementation of output indicators. In furtherance of its shared commitment to the work of the ILO, her group could support the proposed budget.
18. **Speaking on behalf of the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC)**, a Government representative of Pakistan said that his group wished to respond to three observations that had been made by other Member States. The first observation was that a list of vulnerable groups need not be restricted to internationally agreed grounds of discrimination. In his group's view, the use of wording consistent with universally agreed international labour and human rights Conventions was the most appropriate path forward, as new language would inevitably remain insufficient for those who proposed it and unacceptable to others who opposed it. The selective mentioning of an emerging ground of discrimination while ignoring others was also problematic.
19. The second observation made by some Member States was that failing to mention "sexual orientation and gender identity" in the list would leave "lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons" vulnerable to discrimination. In response, his group wished to recall that, pursuant to ILO Conventions and Recommendations, Member States could, in accordance with their domestic laws, determine potential grounds of discrimination and develop a national policy framework to protect vulnerable groups.
20. The third observation was that opposition to the inclusion of controversial concepts such as "sexual orientation and gender identity" had not been so vigorous in the past. It should be noted, in that regard, that his group had been consistent in its objection to the inclusion of such concepts in intergovernmental documents. It had noticed a trend, in recent years, of inserting non-consensual terminology in technical and financial documents and was concerned about its normative impact and potential for creating legal conflict.
21. In the Programme and Budget proposals for 2024–25, policy outcome 5 required action on sexual orientation and gender identity at the country level. Critically, indicator 5.1.2 established the aim of measures being taken by African and Arab States, many of which were members of the OIC. There was no explanation of how work on outcome 5 would conform to national laws in the event of a legal conflict. That gap could easily be addressed by meeting the concerns of all Member States. His group wished to clarify, however, that merely noting the divergence among Members was insufficient in view of the financial, legal and normative implications of the budgetary document. Against that backdrop, it joined the Africa group in proposing amendments to the draft resolution related to the adoption of the programme and budget. Its proposal was simple: acceptance of the difference of opinion and respect for the sovereign right of countries to implement programmes in line with their laws and culture, and in conformity with their international legal obligations.

- 22. Speaking on behalf of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf (GCC),** a Government representative of Saudi Arabia said that his group supported the statements made on behalf of the Africa group, the majority of ASPAG countries and the OIC. It was important for the Conference to adopt the draft Programme and Budget for 2024–25, so as not to delay support for the ILO in carrying out its mandate. He was therefore open to any proposal that aimed to strike a balance and achieve consensus. He stressed the importance of the targeted policy outcomes and called on the Office to ensure that national and regional contexts and the priorities of the social partners were taken into account in the implementation of programmes and projects. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the world of work, as well as the military and geopolitical crises around the world, required the Organization to redouble its efforts to find solutions to strengthen the capacities of its partners. The Director-General's initiative to launch a Global Coalition for Social Justice represented an important response, but required further discussion, as had been expressed by various States and regional groups during the Governing Body discussions.
- 23.** Some of the components in the programme and budget document were a response to regional and national contexts. Since GCC countries served as a magnet for migrant workers, they were striving to develop their legislative and protection systems to better respond to labour market transformations and enhance their capacity to attract highly skilled workers. They urged the Director-General to ensure that regional programmes for Arab States addressed the priorities of those Member States, namely employment promotion policies and more efficient technical and vocational training. In that way, the regional programme would meet the development priorities of those countries aiming to promote the knowledge economy, innovation, technology and the transition to sustainable green economies. Several GCC countries had been working in cooperation programmes, but they called on the Office to allocate part of the budget for the ILO Regional Office for Arab States to develop Gulf-wide cooperation projects, in order to help achieve more integrated and better aligned national programmes in a broader regional framework, in coordination with the Executive Bureau of the Council of Ministers of Labour of the GCC.
- 24.** With regard to outcome 3, the GCC countries were adopting development strategies to diversify their sources of income and ensure the sustainability of natural resources, expanding investments in the green, knowledge, technology and digital transformation economies. Such transformations required employment policies that shared the same goals, as well as a labour market that could attract skilled workers in an environment of fair competition, and legal protection for all workers. Although they welcomed the Office's guidance, programmes should be implemented in partnership with producers, so that lessons could be learned from regional and international experience to develop suitable employment policies. During the previous discussions of the draft programme and budget at the last two sessions of the Governing Body, the group had expressed its concerns over the use of non-agreed language and, together with several other groups, had made proposals to address the lack of consensus by building on the language that had been adopted during previous sessions of the Conference. The ILO must pursue its important work together with the social partners on the basis of dialogue and consensus. Therefore, the GCC countries once again proposed the adoption of the text that had been agreed during the discussions on the Violence and Harassment Recommendation, 2019 (No. 206). In that way, the definition of vulnerable groups and groups in situations of vulnerability would be consistent with the international labour standards, human rights instruments and national legislation in Member States. His group supported the amendment submitted by the Africa group.

- 25. Speaking on behalf of the Arab group,** a Government representative of Sudan said that his group aligned itself with the statements delivered on behalf of the OIC, the Africa group and the GCC countries, and endorsed the amendment proposed by the Africa group. The Arab group reiterated its rejection of the use of so-called sexual orientation and gender identity in ILO documents, and all attempts to impose terms that were not recognized in international human rights law or international labour Conventions, which clearly contradicted the religious teachings, principles, standards and moral values of a number of Member States. All ILO decisions and outcomes should be based on the equal treatment of all workers and employers, and no group should enjoy benefits or advantages based on their personal choices in such a way that would impact the social and cultural rights of others. States had inalienable sovereign rights to uphold their own cultural, religious and moral values. In view of the immense challenges being faced by many countries, which limited the capacity of the Organization to achieve its objectives, the ILO and its Member States should shift focus to those challenges by supporting multilateral international cooperation. The Office should therefore refrain from using divisive concepts that had not been agreed upon in ILO documents. Consensus-based language should be adopted in order to avert further division, bearing in mind that the Organization was founded with a culture of social dialogue and consensus, which was far from being upheld.
- 26. Speaking on behalf of a group of like-minded countries,**¹ a Government representative of Spain objected to the amendment proposed by the Africa group, as it was not acceptable grounds for consensus. The mandate of the Finance Committee was to approve the budget level contained in the resolution put forward by the Governing Body, in accordance with article 11 of the Standing Orders of the International Labour Conference. The programme and budget was a governance and programmatic document describing the work of the Organization. It was a matter of transparency to include all activities to be accountable to Member States, as well as the programmes and activities carried out on the basis of its social justice and inclusion mandate. The Finance Committee must approve the budget, in order to ensure the continuation of the ILO's work beyond 2023. Not approving the budget would force the Organization to cease its programmes, technical support and support for social partners. She therefore called on the Committee to support the programme and budget, noting that Member States could record their concerns on certain aspects while building consensus. It was important to recall that the Finance Committee was not tripartite, and as such was not an appropriate forum for such discussions.
- 27. Speaking on behalf of the European Union and its Member States,** a Government representative of Sweden said that Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, North Macedonia, the Republic of Moldova, Montenegro, Serbia, Ukraine and Iceland aligned themselves with her statement. The programme and budget was critical, as it aimed to provide the means to develop appropriate human-centred solutions to address the emerging risks and opportunities faced by workers and enterprises. Its adoption was key to fulfilling the ILO's mandate to advance social justice through decent work. The European Union therefore supported the adoption and implementation of the proposed programme and budget.

¹ The group of like-minded countries consisted of Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Honduras, Iceland, Israel, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay, and the European Union and its Member States: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden.

28. **A Government representative of Argentina** supported the original draft decision and rejected the amendment submitted by the Africa group. The ILO was a tripartite organization, so no significant decisions could be taken without the involvement of the social partners. Debates on issues such as individuals in vulnerable groups should be conducted in the Governing Body or in the plenary. Tripartism was an essential characteristic of the Organization since its inception, and it was not reasonable to speak of consensus without the participation of the Workers and the Employers. The duty of the Finance Committee was to ensure the funds for the running of the Organization, so the statements of Governments should be limited to strictly budgetary issues. He requested clarification from the Legal Adviser on whether amendments that went beyond those bounds were appropriate.
29. **A Government representative of Belarus** supported the amendment proposed by the Africa group as well as those Member States that did not agree to include references to discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity in the ILO Programme and Budget for 2024–25. Legislation in most ILO Member States referred to only two biological sexes: men and women. The same was true for the ILO's founding texts, including the ILO Constitution and a whole range of Conference resolutions, which made reference to equality between women and men in the world of work. It was therefore unacceptable to include language in the programme and budget document that was not agreed and was not supported by a majority of countries, that ran counter to the sovereign rights of most States, their ethical standards and religious and cultural traditions. The ILO should take into account the sensitive nature of the issue and respect the approaches of most Member States, including those enshrined in their Constitutions and legislation. The ILO should focus its attention and resources on promoting equal opportunities for men and women and supporting countries' efforts to safeguard labour and social rights for the most vulnerable groups in the labour market: people with disabilities, young people and those with family obligations.
30. **A Government representative of Colombia** said that article 11 of the Standing Orders of the International Labour Conference clearly established the mandate of the Finance Committee, which the proposed amendment exceeded, so it was not an appropriate forum for that discussion. Like the representative of Argentina, he too requested clarification on the competence of the Finance Committee, which was not tripartite, to discuss the amendment that had been submitted. Member States could agree or disagree with the documents submitted by the Director-General, but the Finance Committee could not solve any of the issues by taking a decision regarding the language used.
31. **A Government representative of Egypt** said that his delegation aligned itself with the statements made on behalf of the OIC, the Africa group, the Arab group and the large group of ASPAG countries. Egypt welcomed the vision contained in the programme and budget document for addressing the challenges facing the world of work, while building the capacities of the Organization and its Member States, including through the Director-General's Global Coalition for Social Justice initiative, while achieving financial control and rationalizing expenditure. He also commended the objectives in the ILO's programme for Africa, which reflected many country priorities, including supporting productive employment policies, with a focus on women and youth employment and building the capacities of informal workers, and creating an enabling environment for sustainable small and medium-sized enterprises.
32. Despite supporting the vision and most of the objectives and mechanisms contained in the document, his delegation could not support the inclusion of new categories that were not covered by international human rights law and for which there was no international consensus, under the pretext of discrimination on the basis of so-called sexual orientation and gender identity. Laws and policies, both nationally and internationally, must be applied to all workers

and employers equally, without special protection for any groups or individuals on the basis of their personal choices. Article 23 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) and Articles 6 and 7 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights provided comprehensive protection and promoted human rights as part of the right to work and the rights of workers. Any attempt to circumvent those texts by creating new terminology that contradicted national legislation and the cultural, social or religious beliefs of Member States constituted interference in their internal affairs and undermined the universality of those rights and the consensual nature of international human rights law. Therefore, Egypt rejected the use of terms that had not been universally agreed upon in the Programme and Budget for 2024–25 or any other ILO document. In order to strengthen the international labour agenda, every effort should be made to overcome differences and focus on the immense challenges facing multilateralism by supporting cooperation and joint action. The Organization must use consensus, non-divisive language that could help achieve its objectives, and support the national priorities of Member States. He supported the amendment proposed by the Africa group.

33. **A Government representative of the Russian Federation** said that he supported the proposed amendment, which did not make any significant change to what had been adopted by the Governing Body and was intended to reflect the position of the many States that were opposed to certain unacceptable parts of the draft programme and budget document. The proposal was fully in line with the concept of consensus and deserved support. Arguments that the proposed amendment went beyond the mandate of the Finance Committee were baffling, as it did not go against the Governing Body decision, and even if it did, the Finance Committee did not exist simply to rubber stamp decisions taken by other bodies but could also make suitable amendments.
34. **A Government representative of India** reassured the Director-General of her country's commitment to multilateralism and non-discrimination and supported his efforts to build consensus by including universal language in the document. However, the amendment that had been proposed appeared to be quite flexible and she would be prepared to support it in order not to delay the adoption of the programme and budget.
35. **A Government representative of Indonesia** said that the adoption of the programme and budget was a crucial matter and it was important to take the decision by consensus. Unfortunately, the Governing Body had been unable to reach such a decision, as the document continued to be tainted by politically sensitive and controversial notions that went beyond the ILO's mandate. Numerous efforts by the OIC and others to compromise had been ignored by those on the other side. The principle of non-discrimination was supposed to unify, not divide, and yet the matter remained unresolved. It was regrettable that the situation had diverted focus away from the common concern of social justice and post-pandemic recovery in the world of work. It also reflected the failure to maintain the spirit of consensual and constructive engagement in favour of the more arrogant "winner takes all" approach that plagued the international community. He therefore reiterated his call to use more general and inclusive language in order to achieve universal consensus on the document. It was essential for all constituents to support the Organization's work towards full and productive employment and decent work for all women and men, rather than being dragged down by a notion that was clearly beyond the ILO's core mandate, threatening its credibility. That issue could be resolved somewhere else. Sovereign States had a mandate to protect the principles, standards and values held by their people. Therefore, Indonesia could only support the implementation of ILO programmes at the country level that respected the national sovereignty of Member States. The amendment that had been proposed by the Africa group was intended to enable a

consensus decision, as well as preventing the regular recurrence of similar situations in the future. He strongly supported the proposed amendment.

- 36. A Government representative of Guatemala** reiterated, as his delegation had expressed during the discussions at the 347th Session of the Governing Body, that Guatemala was committed to international labour standards. Guatemala promoted, defended and protected the human rights of all people without discrimination. However, there were reservations as to the use of terms, conditions and provisions that might explicitly or otherwise infringe the Guatemalan Constitution and its internal justice system, including but not limited to terms relating to sexual orientation and gender identity. Nonetheless, approval of the programme and budget was vital, as it would enable the Office to take action in priority areas at the national, regional and global levels, promoting cooperation and tripartite dialogue in the interest of social justice. Adopting the programme and budget would enable the Office to support countries in ratifying and implementing instruments that would strengthen labour rights all over the world. His Government maintained the reservations that had previously been expressed.
- 37. A Government representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran** aligned himself with the statements made on behalf of the Africa group, the OIC and the majority of ASPAG members in support of the resolution concerning the adoption of the programme and budget. He also supported the amendment proposed by the Africa group. The ILO's programme and budget was crucial to the Organization's efficient operation. It indicated constituents' shared knowledge of priorities in terms of policy goals and resource mobilization. A consensus was therefore necessary. Despite lengthy discussions, consensus had not been achieved. That failure required the immediate attention of ILO Member States. The controversy was less about non-discrimination in respect of employment and occupation than about the practice of valuing and giving due weight to the sociocultural context of Member States, which had been called into question. Without a conducive regulatory and cultural atmosphere, attempts to improve the world of work would be of limited impact, placing at risk the effectiveness of ILO activities. Respect for the cultural norms of Member States should be reaffirmed as a basic principle of the ILO. It was necessary to ensure that similar challenges would not arise in the future and that the reservations and concerns expressed by a large number of Member States as to the language of the document should receive due consideration.
- 38. A Government representative of Kenya** voiced her support for the proposal of the Africa group and the language used therein.
- 39. A Government representative of Mexico** said that Mexico aligned itself with the statement by the Government representative of Spain on behalf of a group of like-minded countries. Mexico supported, without amendment, the original resolution adopted by the Governing Body and reiterated that the amendment proposed by the Africa group would not secure consensus. Many of the issues raised therein had been discussed previously in the Governing Body. The programme and budget should transparently reflect the activities of the ILO and should not be restricted as to language used in the document. Mexico could not accept a Finance Committee resolution that referred only to one of the many elements of the programme and budget. The various viewpoints had been adequately reflected in two previous Governing Body sessions. Delegations were encouraged to record their concerns in the same manner during the current discussion. It should be emphasized that the Finance Committee, not being a tripartite body, was not the proper forum for the discussion. It was inappropriate to constrain the programme and budget with respect to the proposed amendment. It was important to respect the autonomy of the Office in implementing the programme and budget. The language referred to in the amendment presented had been part of the programme and

budget of the past two biennia since 2018 and it had been adopted by consensus in the Governing Body, the Finance Committee, and at the International Labour Conference.

- 40. A Government representative of Namibia** reiterated his call for social dialogue and said that there was an opportunity for consensus. The matter at hand had far reaching ramifications for many nations. During the 2018 and 2019 Conference discussions culminating in the adoption of Convention No. 190, and at the 109th (2021) Session of the Conference, Africa had undertaken extensive discussions of the issues that had resurfaced through the inclusion of controversial language in the Programme and Budget proposals for 2024–25. Those previous discussions had proven that consensus was possible in spite of the disputed wording. Subjecting the matter to a vote would not be in the best interests of the Organization or of social justice. The insistence on including language that had not secured consensus risked hampering the work of the ILO and overshadowing more important issues. Some Member States might consequently choose to dissociate themselves from important ILO documents and their implementation. The Africa group’s proposal, supported by many others, was a reflection of approved and universally accepted language which harmed or excluded no one and was not divisive.
- 41. A Government representative of the Syrian Arab Republic** noted that it was important to adopt the Programme and Budget for 2024–25 on the basis of consensus. He rejected all attempts to try to incorporate in the documents terms that ran counter to the principles of many countries, especially when such terms related to sexual orientation and gender identity. He therefore supported the position of the Arab countries, the OIC and China on behalf of the majority of ASPAG in order to achieve consensus and accommodate the needs of countries that could not entertain terminology and language at odds with their sovereignty.
- 42. A Government representative of Japan** said that he appreciated the efforts of the Office and supported the original budget proposal provided it was implemented in a cost-effective manner and that further cost-saving measures continued to be explored. There had already been constructive discussion in the Governing Body in March 2023, and, considering the mandate of the Finance Committee, Japan endorsed the original programme and budget proposals. Japan did not accept the proposal of the Africa group.
- 43. Speaking on behalf of the European Union and its Member States**, a Government representative of Sweden said that Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Moldova, Montenegro, Serbia, Ukraine and Iceland aligned themselves with the statement. She noted that since 2018, the programme and budget had stressed the importance of combating discrimination. The reference to LGBTI had first been introduced in the 2018–19 Programme and Budget. Subsequently, there had been references to the LGBTI+ group in the language of the budget. All those proposals had been adopted by consensus. Accordingly, the Africa group proposal was a regression in relation to the ILO’s commitment to social justice and rights at work, in the face of continued discrimination against LGBTI people. It diminished the recognition of the needs and rights of persons who disproportionately experienced the deprivations of discrimination. The European Union and its Member States would continue to strongly oppose and combat all forms of discrimination on sexual orientation and gender identity at all levels and reiterated its commitment to equality and non-discrimination and to the entitlement of all persons to enjoy the full range of human rights and fundamental freedoms. While dissatisfied with the regression of the original language, EU Member States had voted in favour of the revised text of the programme and budget at the Governing Body in March 2023, in the spirit of compromise. The draft resolution of the Conference as recommended by the March Governing Body should be adopted to ensure that the work of the ILO at the global, regional and national level continues.

44. **A Government representative of New Zealand** aligned herself with the statement by the Government representative of Spain on behalf of a group of countries. She did not support the proposal of the Africa group. The programme and budget, a governance document, had been discussed in a tripartite forum, the Governing Body, where a majority had voted to recommend its approval by the Conference. The business at hand was approval of the allocation and collection of the budget. Amending the draft budget resolution was an inappropriate way to express disagreement. All views expressed would be kept in the official records of proceedings. Emphasizing national constitutions and legislation in the decision point could undermine the universality of international human rights obligations. The ILO sought to prevent discrimination without imposing or changing any national legal framework, policies or activities of its Member States. New Zealand did not support limiting the resolution to the language of Conventions Nos 100 and 111. Sexual orientation and gender had been included as the basis of discrimination in the past three ILO programmes and budgets. He believed that decisions had been made and reflected in the document agreed to at the Governing Body.
45. **A Government representative of Canada** aligned herself with the statement by the Government representative of Spain on behalf of a group of countries. There was a difference in priorities and viewpoints and Canada had been dissatisfied with some aspects of the programme and budget. All countries could express their views at the Finance Committee and during Governing Body meetings. Consensus seemed distant but Members should register all their views in statements that would then be contained in the Finance Committee report, which had expended time on issues lacking consensus. While it remained concerned at the deletion of the term LGBTI+ at paragraph 153, Canada could still accept the programme and budget proposed by the Director-General.
46. **A Government representative of Australia** said that Australia aligned itself with the statement by the Government representative of Spain on behalf of a group of countries. The ILO's fundamental social justice mandate included addressing and preventing discrimination in the world of work for all vulnerable persons, including on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity. Australia respected the integrity of the governance procedures through which the tripartite Governing Body had secured endorsement of the programme and budget proposals in March 2023 and strongly supported its unamended passage in line with long-standing practice at the ILO.
47. **A Government representative of Zimbabwe** said that Zimbabwe had followed the deliberations on the programme and budget for the 2024–25 biennium since the preliminary discussions at the Governing Body session of November 2022, when substantive issues had been discussed, and had noted the introduction of non-consensual language, which had persisted despite express reservations leading to an impasse. Before the March 2023 Governing Body session, Zimbabwe and other African countries had unsuccessfully engaged the Office formally and informally to help develop universally agreed language. As part of the Africa group, Zimbabwe had remained open to dialogue and demonstrated an interest in consensus by proposing amendments to rectify an anomalous situation. It supported the Africa group's proposed amendment, which sought consensus. The Office should remain neutral and avoid the use of non-consensual language in ILO documents.
48. **A Government representative of the United States of America** said that it was critical to preserve space for an engaging and open exchange. Nonetheless, the attempt to amend the budget resolution was a matter for concern. The Conference had never passed a resolution that expressed other than fully united support for the mandate of the ILO to universally promote the elimination of discrimination at work. The amendment proposed by the Africa group would elevate disagreement, not consensus, on one of the fundamental labour rights

of the ILO. The otherwise uncontested mandate to combat discrimination could not be fractured or subjected to caveats when all Members had unequivocally committed to fulfilling it. She expressed serious procedural reservations about adding policy-related amendments to the budget resolution through the Finance Committee, which was not tripartite and was comprised solely of Government representatives, and the precedent it might set. Absent constituents should not be compelled to accept policy-related language that they had not endorsed.

49. **A Government representative of Chile** aligned himself with the statement by the Government representative of Spain on behalf of a group of countries. He supported the programme and budget as adopted by the tripartite Governing Body at its 347th Session. The adopted programme and budget was based on the principle of non-discrimination and equal treatment and included people discriminated against on the basis of their sexual orientation and gender identity.
50. **A Government representative of Malawi** said that approval of the budget was critical and that consensus text adopted in previous ILO sessions should be used to that end. Member States did not condone any form of discrimination on any grounds and thus had ratified the fundamental Conventions that ensured equality. The Director-General had rightly stated that, despite disagreements, all constituents had reaffirmed the principle of non-discrimination. As the ILO was a forum of social dialogue, the principle of consensus should be upheld. Member States should be at liberty to decide what constituted a vulnerable group, as the definition was not universal. She hoped that the proposed amendment by the Africa group, which Malawi supported, would be acceptable, so as to reflect the diverse views previously expressed. Adoption of the programme and budget through consensus would be a win-win situation.
51. **A Government representative of Botswana** supported the non-listing of vulnerable groups by the amendment. The ILO should avoid language deemed offensive or unacceptable to some ILO Member States and confine itself to the approved and universally accepted language used in all ILO documents, especially that used in Conventions Nos 100 and 111.
52. **A Government representative of Panama** supported the approval of the programme and budget as agreed by the tripartite Governing Body, to ensure implementation of programmes. Delaying further decision on the matter was counterproductive.
53. **A Government representative of Algeria** associated herself with the statements made on behalf of the Africa group, the Arab group and the OIC. Paragraph 160 of the Programme and Budget proposals for 2024–25 had been the subject of informal and formal approaches in previous months. Algeria supported any efforts to combat any type of discrimination. From the beginning of discussions and exchanges on the language in the programme and budget, Algeria had encouraged dialogue and consultation to yield an agreed text, with agreed language that transcended differences, forwarding and supporting ideas from various groups. That was consistent with the values and principles of a vast majority of Member States. Mention had been made of majority in the Governing Body. The Governing Body should be more democratic. The ILO had always favoured constructive dialogue and should endeavour to establish a climate of trust among all constituents. The proposal and the amendments from the Africa group were supported by a vast majority of ILO Member States and thus there should be consensus with agreed universal language.
54. **A Government representative of Norway** said that he aligned himself with the European Union statement for both substantive and procedural reasons. He did not support the proposed amendment of the Africa group.

55. **A representative of the Director-General** (Legal Adviser) said that a request had been made for legal advice on the receivability of the proposed amendment of the Africa group. That question touched on two separate issues. The first was whether the Finance Committee was empowered to amend the text of the draft resolution before submitting it to the plenary. That was, technically speaking, clearly the case. In the absence of any specific criteria for receivability, any amendment that, in the mind of the author(s), was likely to yield consensus was receivable and would be treated as usual according to the rules of procedure for committees. There was therefore no legal basis for preventing the Committee from discussing the proposed amendment.
56. The second aspect was more complicated. There was some doubt as to the mandate of the Finance Committee and the scope of its deliberations. That doubt arose because article 11 of the Standing Orders of the International Labour Conference did not contain the word "programme". The mandate of the Committee would therefore be circumscribed to discussing "the arrangements for the approval, allocation and collection of the budget of the Organization". Nor did article 6 of the Financial Regulations mention the programme, referring instead to "budget estimates".
57. Only article 25(1) of the Standing Orders of the International Labour Conference clearly stated that "the Conference shall adopt the Programme and Budget of the following financial period, on the basis of the draft Programme and Budget examined by the Governing Body and approved by the Finance Committee".
58. The basic texts of the Organization, the Constitution, the Financial Regulations and the Standing Orders of the International Labour Conference, established a very special institutional balance in respect of budgetary powers. Under article 13(2)(c) of the Constitution, "the arrangements for the approval, allocation and collection of the budget of the International Labour Organization shall be determined by the Conference by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast by the delegates present, and shall provide for the approval of the budget and of the arrangements for the allocation of expenses among the Members of the Organization by a committee of Government representatives".
59. That fundamental provision, as the Legal Adviser had noted in 1991, institutionalized the coexistence of two opposing principles: on one hand, the supremacy of the Conference, the tripartite organ; and on the other, the pre-eminent role of governments in budgetary matters. Within that unusual balance of responsibilities, the power of the Finance Committee to amend proposals submitted to it could be exercised only in very exceptional circumstances. It acted essentially as a brake on the Governing Body. But there was reciprocal restraint between the Finance Committee and the Governing Body because the Governing Body was a tripartite forum. In light of these considerations, the Committee would be advised to exercise the utmost caution in discussing amendments that might affect that delicate balance in budgetary matters. It would not be free of risk if the Finance Committee were to assert the authority to reopen discussions, especially difficult ones, that had been concluded at the tripartite level of the Governing Body, or if the Finance Committee were to add conditionalities to the approval of the budget that the Governing Body itself was not ready to adopt, or to make general determinations and pronouncements that should usually call for tripartite endorsement. Doing so in a non-tripartite setting would be part of the institutional risk. Nonetheless, this question was, technically, not one of receivability.
60. **A Government representative of Argentina** said that delegates should be cognizant of the sensitivity of the issue at stake. Constituents should not be excluded from discussions because that might ultimately affect the programme of the ILO.

61. **A Government representative of Morocco** acknowledged that the issue was a sensitive one. Before proposing the amendment, the Africa group had held several consultations with the Office. It had only advanced the proposal because it had been allowed.
62. **A Government representative of Pakistan** noted that the Legal Adviser had said there was no impediment to the Committee considering amendments. The Committee was facing special circumstances; discussions at the Governing Body had not been easy, and the unique structure of the Governing Body had not been conducive to a consensus-oriented approach. It was therefore important to recognize the exceptional dimension of the issue at hand. Article 11 quoted by the Legal Adviser and other delegates mentioned consideration of the budget estimates and distribution among the Member States. The elephant in the room was output 5.1.2, which allocated about US\$26 million to activities which would involve certain countries, including members of the OIC and the Africa group. The programming aspect was therefore inextricably intertwined with the mandate.
63. **A Government representative of Senegal** invited Committee members in groups to listen to one another. There was consensus against discrimination and the Africa group was not excluding other groups. Its stance was based on culture, beliefs and national laws. The concept of universality entailed global thinking, but action was always local. The proposed amendment of the Africa group could be adopted without affecting resource distribution or impinging on any group which suffered discrimination. Groups raising objections should examine what the amendment detracted from their position and from the tenets of the ILO. Consensus was achievable, especially given that several resolutions had been brought before the Conference and delegates had always managed to secure consensus by dint of concessions and of mutual tolerance.
64. **A Government representative of Morocco** observed that the Africa group had been alone in making a proposal. During the Governing Body session in March 2023, there had been proposals, including from the OIC, all of which had been rejected. In an institution that touted social dialogue and consensus the response to the proposal of the Africa group had been disappointing. The Africa group was not trying to block adoption of the ILO budget. If there were an effort to work together, a satisfactory outcome could be achieved. It might be advisable to examine other agenda items and, if consensus was not achieved by the following morning, the issue should go to a vote.
65. **A Government representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo** expressed support for the statement by the Government representative of Algeria. It was regrettable that the proposal of the Africa group, which had been well thought out and discussed at length, had not secured consensus. There had been attempts to incorporate non-budgetary issues into the budget and that was a procedural anomaly. The budget itself was acceptable; the difficulty was the extraneous elements. It was necessary to differentiate between the budget and issues that did not obtain consensus. That was the substance of the Africa group proposal.
66. **A Government representative of Sweden** noted that the debate of the day had been very important. Consensus was elusive. However, resorting to a vote at that juncture would be exceptional for the ILO or any United Nations entity. She agreed with the Government representative of Morocco that the Committee should continue discussions on other matters so as to afford itself time to reflect and return to the issue the following morning. Positions had been set out very clearly and delegates owed it to themselves to explore other avenues before moving to a vote.
67. **A Government representative of Zambia** said that the Government of Zambia did not support the listing of vulnerable groups or the use, in any ILO documents, of language that

was not universally accepted. A list could never be exhaustive, which created the risk of favouring certain groups over others. Moreover, a vulnerable group in one State might not be vulnerable in another.

68. It was important to bear in mind national and regional peculiarities and cultural, historical and religious backgrounds when drafting ILO documents. Zambia, as a Christian nation, reaffirmed its long-standing position that references to “sexual orientation and gender identity” or any other terms with a similar meaning were not acceptable. Zambia did not support the concept, which was not in line with its Constitution or its national values, culture, norms or principles, and was deeply concerned by the attempt to introduce the concept in the Programme and Budget proposals for 2024–25 without prior agreement. Such attempts undermined the ILO’s intentions and its core mandate and framework. It was also important to be mindful of the current and future ramifications of voting on such a critical document. With that in mind, Zambia called on the ILO to use the universally agreed language of Conventions Nos 100 and 111 in order to further consolidate the practice of social dialogue and consensus on which the Organization was built.
69. **A Government representative of the Russian Federation** expressed support for the amendment proposed by the Africa group and said that the proposal did not involve blocking any elements of the Programme and Budget for 2024–25, nor did it include wording that was completely unacceptable to most Member States. Indeed, the proposal reflected the position of the majority of Member States and took account of the views of many of the different sides of the argument. It should be noted that those who supported the inclusion of contentious wording had not put forward any compromise proposals.
70. A vote would not be congruous with the principle of tripartism, which formed the basis for the ILO’s work. The Russian Federation could not accept approaches that were not geared towards consensus-building. It therefore called on all its partners to support the Africa group proposal.
71. **A Government representative of Brunei Darussalam** said that her country supported the amendment proposed by the Africa group and aligned itself with the statement made by the OIC, both of which highlighted the importance of respecting diverse opinions and the sovereign rights of ILO Member States. There was a need for further negotiations to uphold the principle of non-discrimination without disregarding State sovereignty and thereby ensure that Members’ collective efforts towards social justice, equal opportunities and social protection were effective, relevant and impactful across diverse contexts.
72. **A Government representative of Argentina** said that his perception was not that most delegations were in favour of the amendment proposed by the Africa group. Rather, members appeared to be divided, with some yet to express an opinion. It was important to bear in mind the principle of tripartism and to recall, in that regard, that the Employers’ and Workers’ groups had no voting rights in the Finance Committee.
73. **A Government representative of Morocco**, noting that the Committee had been unable to reach consensus, requested clarification of the proposed way forward.
74. **A representative of the Director-General** (Treasurer and Financial Comptroller) explained that, in the absence of consensus, the Committee would proceed to vote, by a show of hands, on the amendment proposed by the Africa group. If the proposal was rejected, the Committee would attempt to reach consensus on the original draft decision set out in document GB.347/PFA/1/1(Rev.1). In the case of continued absence of consensus, it would proceed to vote on the draft decision, again by a show of hands. Pursuant to article 11(1) of the Standing Orders of the Conference, a delegate from each of the Governments of the Member States

registered at the Conference could be member of the Committee and entitled to one vote, except for those Member States which had lost the right to vote due to arrears.

75. According to the Committee's records, the members from the following countries did not have the right to vote: Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Dominica, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Lebanon, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Sao Tome and Principe, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Tajikistan, Tuvalu, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and Yemen.
76. The quorum was set by article 43 of the Standing Orders of the Conference at two fifths of the total number of Member States registered at the Conference and entitled to vote. Only votes for or against the motion or amendment counted towards the quorum. If the quorum was not reached, the vote was not valid, and the motion or amendment would fail. In accordance with article 11(6) of the Standing Orders, the Committee's decisions had to be taken by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast for or against, with abstentions not counting.
77. **A Government representative of South Africa** said that it was disappointing that the ILO had failed to translate its support for social dialogue into action. He wished to raise a concern regarding a newspaper article in which a Western diplomat had been quoted as describing the impasse within the Committee as a game of "diplomatic chicken" in which caving in could set an unwanted precedent for other United Nations bodies. He wished to know whether the article was accurate and, if so, what the implications were for a vote within the Committee.
78. **Speaking on behalf of the OIC**, a Government representative of Pakistan expressed his group's intention to vote in favour of the amendment proposed by the Africa group.
79. **Speaking on behalf of the European Union and its Member States**, a Government representative of Sweden said that the European Union and its Member States profoundly disagreed with the proposed amendment, which sought to dilute the ILO's mandate to combat discrimination in the world of work on all grounds, and had put forward a number of proposals to bridge the divide within the Committee and secure consensus. Unfortunately, those proposals had not been accepted. Given the importance of protecting the fundamental values of social justice and equality for all, and the need to ensure the ILO's continued operations beyond 31 December 2023, the European Union and its Member States urged all States present to vote against the proposed amendment.
80. **A Government representative of Chile**, supported by a **Government representative of Argentina**, said that, in her capacity as Chairperson of the Governing Body, she wished to emphasize the importance of including all social partners in the search for a solution. Accordingly, the Employers' and Workers' groups should be given the opportunity to contribute to the discussion.
81. **Speaking on behalf of the Africa group**, a Government representative of Cameroon said that the amendment proposed by her group to the draft decision took into account different points of view and national laws. Despite receiving support from several countries and groups of countries, the proposal had unfortunately not led to a consensual outcome. Her group wished to express its profound disappointment in that respect. It seemed clear that social justice was a concept that certain groups of countries regarded as unfounded, as evidenced by their willingness to ride roughshod over the priorities and values of others with no regard for visible differences. Moreover, the stalemate in negotiations highlighted the desire of certain groups of countries to establish hegemony or even to hold the ILO hostage. The slow progress in ratifying the 1986 Amendment to the Constitution was a perfect illustration of that: two thirds of Member States had ratified the Amendment, yet its implementation continued to be blocked

by eight of the ten Member States of chief industrial importance. Her group called on all Member States, individually and in good conscience, to take responsibility for the hegemonic drift that was taking root within the ILO and to take lasting action for a fairer and more democratic Organization.

- 82. Government representatives of Sudan**, speaking on behalf of the Arab group, **Pakistan**, speaking on behalf of the OIC, **Egypt, the Russian Federation and Saudi Arabia** called on the Committee to proceed immediately to a record vote on the amendment proposed by the Africa group.
- 83. A Government representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland**, speaking also on behalf of Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, the European Union and its Member States, Iceland, Israel, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Peru, the United States of America and Uruguay, expressed deep disappointment that her group's proposals and attempts to find consensus had failed. The ILO was a United Nations body with a mandate to promote social justice and rights at work, including the universally accepted fundamental principle on the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation. Her group had simply sought to defend that mandate and to ensure budgetary certainty so that the ILO could continue its operations beyond 31 December 2023. Diminishing the recognition of the needs and rights of a group who commonly and disproportionately experienced violence, harassment, discrimination and exclusion was a regression that went against her group's deep commitment to social justice and rights, not only in the world of work but also more broadly. Noting the importance of protecting those fundamental values, her group urged all States present to vote against the amendment proposed by the Africa group.
- 84. A representative of the Director-General** (Treasurer and Financial Comptroller) recalled that, in accordance with article 42(5) of the Standing Orders of the Conference, a record vote could be taken if requested by a group or at least one fifth of the members present at the sitting.
- 85.** After an indicative show of hands, it was confirmed that more than one fifth of those present were in favour of the request for a record vote.
- 86.** Put to a record vote, the proposal by the Africa group to amend the draft decision was not adopted, with 63 votes in favour, 64 votes against and 5 abstentions.²

² The results were as follows:

In favour of the proposal: Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Türkiye, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against the proposal: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

The Government members of the following countries abstained from the vote: India, Kiribati, Serbia, Singapore, Thailand.

87. **Speaking on behalf of the OIC**, a Government representative of Pakistan said that his group's position on sexual orientation and gender identity was based on existing international law and on the social norms, values and beliefs that informed the legal systems of the group's members. While his group recognized that its views might not align with those of many other Member States, it was clear that the views of those Member States also failed to align with those of a large number and geographical spread of countries. Recalling that divergence of opinion in a resolution could have provided an amicable path forward towards the implementation of the Programme and Budget for 2024–25, his group's position in that regard stemmed from the most recent meeting of its Council of Foreign Ministers in March 2023, at which it had been agreed not to accept any resolution that created a mandate on sexual orientation and gender identity.
88. **Speaking on behalf of the countries of the GCC**, a Government representative of Saudi Arabia reiterated his concern about continuing technical cooperation with the ILO, particularly in respect of the GCC's national development priorities and the national and cultural context of its member countries. The ILO played a key role, including in the importance of labour standards. National and cultural differences not having been considered in proposing the terminology at issue, the GCC formally rejected the terms used in the programme and budget document. Those terms were not universally accepted, and they were not international human rights principles.
89. **Speaking on behalf of the Arab group**, a Government representative of Sudan noted that the result of the previous vote on the amendment proposed by the Africa group had been very close, which is why the Arab group aligned itself with the general trend expressed by the Africa group and the OIC. Accordingly, the document should be part of the record of the Conference.
90. **The Chairperson** proposed a vote on the original draft decision.
91. **Government representatives of Pakistan and Oman** supported the intervention of the Government representative of Sudan.
92. **Government representatives of Egypt and the Syrian Arab Republic** requested that the Committee proceed to a vote.
93. **A Government representative of Nigeria** reiterated Nigeria's commitment to the protection of all vulnerable workers in the workplace. The unfortunate outcome of the Committee meeting on the contentious item was regrettable, given the ILO's status as a home for social dialogue. Nigeria had previously stated its position on non-consensual wording and strongly supported the proposal of the Africa group. Nigeria would support further consultation towards adopting the budget by consensus, failing which the second round of voting should immediately ensue.
94. **A Government representative of Kiribati** acknowledged the work of the ILO and the division of opinion at the Committee. The ILO budget should be supported so that programmes could be continued.
95. **A Government representative of Egypt** again called for the vote to proceed.
96. **A Government representative of Libya** expressed dismay at the division revealed by the discussion, in the face of unemployment and other issues. He called for the Committee to proceed immediately to a vote.
97. **A Government representative of Nigeria** clarified that in the absence of an agreement, she had called for further consultations; she however maintained Nigeria's support of the amendment proposed by the Africa group.

- 98. A Government representative of Pakistan** stated that as many countries had supported the Chairperson's proposal for a vote, the vote should proceed.
- 99. A Government representative of Sweden**, on behalf of the European Union, requested that the vote be done through a record vote.
- 100.** After an indicative show of hands, it was confirmed that more than one fifth of those present were in favour of the request for a record vote.
- 101.** Put to a record vote, the draft decision was not adopted, with 75 votes in favour, 55 votes against and 1 abstention.³
- 102. A representative of the Director-General** (Treasurer and Financial Comptroller) noted that as the two-thirds threshold required to endorse the programme and budget had not been reached, the Committee could not adopt the budget. The Secretariat would be unable to execute the forward purchase transactions and prepare the documentation showing the final budget totals for adoption by the Committee on Friday, 9 June 2023. Accordingly, the Committee would be unable to recommend any decision to the Conference and the report of the Finance Committee would be transmitted to the Conference without any resolution of the Finance Committee.
- 103. A Government representative of Sudan** noted that the Committee had been afforded reasonable time to achieve a consensus and had failed to do so. African countries had endeavoured to be flexible, but there had been no proposals from the other side respecting the traditions of African, Arab and Muslim countries. That outcome was regrettable and cast doubt on the future of the Organization. The language proposed had not been consensual and an effort had been made to impose it without respecting the cultural identity of certain countries. The ILO was divided and the countries that had attempted to impose a point of view had done so in a manner that would have adverse effects for the future work of the Organization. Countries would take the necessary measures so that their sovereignty, customs and practices were respected.
- 104. A Government representative of Malawi** said that the stalemate in which the Committee found itself was unpalatable to all groups. Africa was not blocking the budget; it wanted to be heard and it was against listing vulnerable groups. The determination of vulnerable groups should rest with Member States. It was not clear who had decided what the vulnerable groups were and their attributes. Consensus texts adopted on the same matter at previous sessions

³ The results were as follows:

In favour of the proposal: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, New Zealand, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts & Nevis, San Marino, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad & Tobago, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against the proposal: Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Cote d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, South Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Turkiye, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

The Government member of the following country abstained from the vote: India.

and discussions through social dialogue should be used instead. The provisions of Conventions Nos 100 and 111 were enshrined in national constitutions and matters of law were not negotiable. The concept of negotiation was based on the notion of the duty to negotiate in good faith. From the outset, Africa had been negotiating in good faith and had for the previous eight months been disposed to resolve the impasse in a spirit of mutual respect. The duty to negotiate in good faith was enshrined in the fundamental principles that governed the ILO. Good faith negotiation was key to resolving differences or disputes between parties. Social dialogue was effective only in the presence of good faith and it appeared that only Africa was willing to negotiate in good faith. It was regrettable that the duty to negotiate in good faith was not being considered as fundamental in resolving the issue at hand. It was not clear that the ILO believed in the social justice and equality that it advocated. Committee members should be more accommodating, adopt a spirit of mutual respect and negotiate in good faith.

- 105. A Government representative of Burkina Faso** agreed that what had happened was very disappointing, particularly in an Organization that usually operated by consensus and on the basis of social dialogue. There appeared to be a double standard at play with regard to the responses to the results of the two rounds of voting. Perhaps there really needed to be a close examination of what had happened. No person, country or measure was better than any other, all members were equal, so consensus decision-making should prevail. Everybody needed to moderate their positions and try to find a real solution, for the sake of the Organization.
- 106. A Government representative of Costa Rica** said that it was not true to say that there had been no proposals made or attempts to bring the two sides together: she personally had been working with colleagues late into the night to do just that, negotiating in good faith. It was very upsetting to see such an important Organization, where social dialogue was built, moving into uncharted waters. A sad and dangerous precedent was being set. Further clarification from the Office of the implications of not approving the programme and budget would be appreciated, so that all delegations could fully understand.
- 107. A Government representative of Zambia** said that, as a Christian nation, Zambia did not support sexual orientation and gender identity, or any other terms with similar meaning. Such concepts were not in line with their national values, culture, norms and principles. Her delegation appreciated the time that been allowed for further consultation and negotiation, though it was a serious concern that consensus had not been achieved and there had needed to be two rounds of voting. What was happening seriously undermined the principles of social justice and dialogue. It was important to see things from the perspectives of others and think critically about the precedent that was being set. Zambia supported social dialogue and urged the Committee to reconsider the non-controversial text that had been proposed by the Africa group, which was respectful of all.
- 108. A Government representative of Libya** said that since the amendment proposed by the Africa group, the OIC and the Arab group had not achieved a majority, perhaps another proposal should be submitted so that the debate could continue. He echoed the request made by the Government representative of Costa Rica for the Office to fully explain the implications of the situation.
- 109. A Government representative of Lesotho** said that the situation that the Committee found itself in was not what anybody wanted. Like other African nations, Lesotho did not support the listing of vulnerable groups in ILO documents. Recognizing that the programme and budget was critical to the ILO's work, she urged the Committee to be transparent and negotiate in good faith.

- 110. A representative of the Director-General** (Treasurer and Financial Comptroller) said that in recent weeks he and the Legal Adviser had spoken to many delegations about the process and decision-making rules in the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee had not made a decision on item 1 of its agenda on the programme and budget. Usually, the report of the Finance Committee would be sent to the plenary at the start of the second week of the Conference. As things stood, it would have to read that the Finance Committee had not made a decision on the level of the budget or the programme. It would then be up to the plenary to decide what to do to fill that void, with the floor open for debate, motions or resolutions. However, there was still time, as the Finance Committee had to discuss the remaining items on its agenda, so if any further requests for the right to vote were received by then, those could be included in the final report.
- 111. The Director-General** said that he was sad to face such an unfortunate situation during his first session of the International Labour Conference as Director-General. He was very concerned that he might not have the means to operate as of 1 January 2024. Indeed, in order to be able to operate on 1 January, the preparatory work needed to begin several months earlier, usually at the end of the summer. He therefore strongly insisted that a budget needed to be adopted.
- 112.** The ILO was the house of social justice, and had to proceed according to the procedures and the Standing Orders of the Conference. However, many delegates already knew his position: dialogue among the various stakeholders was still possible. He was, however, under no illusion, as some positions were very entrenched. He therefore echoed the Government representative of Burkina Faso in urging everybody to moderate their positions. He was very concerned about the impact that such division at the governance level would have on the work of the Office.
- 113.** Lastly, he urged the Committee to refrain from any comments that could be seen as a direct attack on ILO staff. As Director-General, he took responsibility for any act, particularly any act that was deemed to have been incorrect. However, until proven otherwise from a legal perspective, the Office stood by its actions. All checks and balances had been carried out. He understood very well that voting was a sensitive issue, which was why the results had been checked and verified before they were announced. There had been demonstrably no flaws whatsoever in the process.
- 114. A Government representative of Nigeria** said that he still hoped to achieve consensus, but that hope was growing dimmer. There had been progressive dialogue, but it seemed as though they had been talking to themselves. Rather than moving towards a win-win outcome, the space for consensus-building was narrowing and was about to close with a “winner takes all” vote. The discussions had displayed clear disrespect for his region’s position. The region was not seeking to block the budget, but to place on record its displeasure regarding the reference to sexual orientation and gender identity, which was a constitutional matter. Indeed, all ILO Conventions were implemented in line with national laws and practice. He reiterated his support for the Africa group’s proposal, noting that any flexibility on the matter should not be taken as a submission of their sovereign right not to succumb to norms that went against the collective values and ethics of the good people of Nigeria.
- 115. A Government representative of Argentina** requested further clarification from the Office as to whether the Conference, as a sovereign body representing all Member States and the social partners, would be able to adopt the budget without a decision from the Finance Committee, as was possible in national parliaments, for instance.

- 116. A Government representative of Pakistan** responded to the query from the representative of Argentina by saying that even if an organization believed a mandate existed, even on the basis of a vote, as had happened in the United Nations Human Rights Council, its applicability was not binding on Member States. With regard to the situation of differences between Member States and an international organization's assumption of a mandate, that had already been settled by the International Court of Justice.
- 117. A representative of the Director-General** (Legal Adviser) reiterated, as he had indicated to many delegations during informal consultations in the previous weeks, that the Office had had to envisage all working hypotheses, including the situation in which the Finance Committee found itself. If the Committee was unable to report back to the plenary presenting a recommendation on the adoption of the programme and budget, the plenary of the International Labour Conference, as the sovereign supreme deliberative and executive organ of the Organization, had the residual responsibility to handle the question of the Organization's programme and budget for the next biennium. Indeed, by virtue of article 13 of the ILO Constitution, it had the right and obligation to adopt the appropriate financial arrangements to permit the Organization to continue to operate and deliver on its mandate. The President of the Conference would have to invite the tripartite constituents to express their views and hopefully present proposals as how best to address this situation. For instance, individual delegates or a group could put forward a text or request for a vote on a certain text, including the original text that was transmitted to the Conference by the Governing Body, or could submit an urgent resolution. However, none of these hypotheses would need to be tested if some new positive development could occur within the Finance Committee before the presentation of its report to the plenary.
- 118. A Government representative of Djibouti** said that the stalemate was very unfortunate. All delegations needed to take responsibility for the way forward and find a better outcome. In the interest of clarity, it would help if the scenarios referred to by the Legal Adviser were shared with all delegations, so that everyone was on an equal footing and could be prepared for further engagement. As there was no real precedent for the situation, it would be helpful if the Legal Adviser could refer to specific rules of procedure.
- 119. A Government representative of Algeria** said that she regretted the situation that the Committee found itself in, but hoped that they would find a way to adopt the budget. She requested clarification regarding the urgent resolution mentioned by the Legal Adviser. Was that solely for financial matters? It was important for everything to be explained clearly in order to be able to arrive at a positive solution.
- 120. A representative of the Director-General** (Legal Adviser) clarified that the "scenarios" he had referred to were procedural possibilities based on existing practices and the Standing Orders of the Conference. He recalled that he had held, together with the Treasurer and Financial Comptroller, numerous informal consultations with all groups, including the Africa group, to explain the two possible outcomes that had been envisaged for the Finance Committee and their practical and legal implications. The first was a positive outcome, in which a recommendation in the form of a draft resolution, whether amended or not, was sent to the plenary for adoption, as provided for in article 6 of the Financial Regulations and article 25 of the Standing Orders of the Conference. The second was the situation they found themselves in with the Finance Committee being unable to formulate any recommendation to the plenary. As he had indicated on numerous occasions, that situation was not foreseen in the Financial Regulations or other regulatory texts. The more plausible hypothesis was that the Committee would report back its incapacity to agree on a draft resolution and recommend its adoption to the plenary, in which case it would be for the supreme tripartite organ of the Organization in

its plenary composition to take up the matter. As regards urgent resolutions, he clarified that under article 18(8) of the Standing Orders of the Conference, these were not subject to any kind of time limit, and were submitted to the Officers of the Conference who would decide on their admissibility and on the manner in which they would be considered. An urgent resolution in the case at hand would explain the context and challenges of the situation and, in view of the fact that there might no longer be possible to do the forward purchase transactions with the banks while the Conference was still in session, it would have to exceptionally authorize the Treasurer and Financial Comptroller to proceed with those transactions after the closure of the Conference. Urgent resolutions had been used occasionally before with respect to various issues.

- 121. A Government representative of Morocco**, speaking as the coordinator for the Africa group, confirmed that the Legal Adviser and the Treasurer and Financial Comptroller had been present in the group's informal consultations, sometimes at very short notice, and had addressed all the issues raised. An explanatory document had also been shared with the group. Perhaps questions concerning the urgent resolution had not previously been raised, so the further clarification was appreciated.
- 122. A Government representative of Rwanda** took note of the explanations that had been provided as to why his delegation had not been called upon to vote. He had fully supported the proposed amendment submitted by the Africa group, which he believed could have helped find a better way forward on the matter. He hoped that the Office would work together with all Member States and other constituents to find a way to adopt the budget as soon as possible.
- 123. A representative of the Director-General** (Treasurer and Financial Comptroller) explained that in a normal year, following a decision from the Finance Committee on the budget, the Office would proceed to purchase United States dollars on the basis of a forward purchase for the two years of the upcoming biennium, which was an amount of approximately US\$350 million. The Office would then approach a number of banks for spot rates for 1 January for 24 payments during the biennium, in order to set the budget rate of exchange. As things stood, the forward purchase had already been cancelled twice. It normally took at least two days to set up an agreement with the banks – the Office used banks in the United Kingdom, Asia, New York and Switzerland – to check the rates, so as to be able to use the most preferential rate. It had not been able to do that. However, if a decision was reached during the Conference session, it could still be done in the early part of the second week, but any later than that would not leave enough time to do the forward purchase and recalculate the budget and the Swiss franc assessment level that would need to be applied, in time to be adopted by the Conference. That would mean that the Office would not be able to send out letters to Member States in September explaining how much was owed for the upcoming biennium. In that scenario, the Conference would be asked to approve a budget level that was not the final version, and the resolution would have to give the Treasurer the authority to make the forward purchase at a later date. That was why different scenarios had been envisaged, because the timelines involved were quite complex.
- 124. A Government representative of Sweden** said that in the wake of difficulties in approving the programme and budget in Committee, she and the Government representative of Morocco had taken the initiative to hold exploratory talks to find a generally acceptable resolution that the Finance Committee could transmit to the plenary of the International Labour Conference. An intensive discussion had borne fruit and the decision was to appear at the end of the Finance Committee report on item 1 of its agenda, which would include a detailed record of the positions and statements expressed during the Committee's discussions.

125. The following text was accordingly proposed to the Committee to be included in the Committee's decision:

Reaffirming the commitment expressed by all the tripartite constituents during the 347th Session (March 2023) of the Governing Body, as well as in the Finance Committee, strongly reiterated by the Director-General on behalf of the Office, to combat all forms of discrimination and exclusion on any ground for the benefit of all;

Mindful of the different positions expressed on some issues during the discussion on the Programme and Budget at the 347th Session (March 2023) of the Governing Body as well as in the Finance Committee, as reflected in the respective Minutes of the sessions (GB.347/PFA/1/1 and ILC.111/II);

The Committee decided to recommend that the Conference adopt the draft resolution, the text of which appears at the end of the present Provisional Record.

126. It was also proposed that the Office add the following text to the Explanatory Note appearing at the beginning of the final programme and budget document:

This document includes the Programme and Budget for 2024–25, adopted by the 111th Session of the International Labour Conference (ILC), taking note of divergent positions and voting at the 347th Session of the Governing Body as well as in the Finance Committee of the 111th ILC.

127. She said that, with the Committee's approval of the programme and budget subject to these texts, the Office's forward purchase of US dollars could then be authorized.

128. **Speaking on behalf of the Africa group**, a Government representative of Morocco expressed support for the adoption of the ILO programme and budget after difficult and very sensitive discussions. However, the spirit of compromise had ultimately prevailed so that the ILO could implement its budget. The lesson learned was the need to respect the positions of all parties concerned by using agreed language and terminology. The Africa group was naturally against all forms of discrimination, but also wished to highlight the freedom of every Member State to define, in line with its national priorities, the content of cooperation programmes that linked it to the ILO. He expressed gratitude to all the coordinators of political and regional groups, in particular the Government representative of Sweden, with whom he had organized the discussions of the past days, for their understanding, which had given pride of place to shared interests within the ILO. He also expressed appreciation to the Director-General and his team for their patience and expertise, and to the Africa group for its well-known spirit of openness and understanding, which had always underpinned Africa's relationship with the ILO and multilateralism in general.

129. **Speaking on behalf of the OIC**, a Government representative of Pakistan hailed the flexibility and spirit of compromise that had characterized the difficult negotiations. He reiterated the OIC's support to the Organization and to its Constitution, together with the principle of non-discrimination enshrined therein. He confirmed the OIC's agreement with the understanding and compromise reached and thanked everyone involved for their efforts.

130. **A Government representative of the United States of America**, speaking also on behalf of Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay, and the European Union and its Member States, lauded the members of the Committee for their patience and welcomed the agreement on the resolution which allowed approval of the ILO budget for the 2024–25 biennium on the basis of consensus. Committee members had come to the table with strong principled positions, including on the implementation of the ILO's mandate to combat discrimination in employment. Thereafter, extended formal and informal discussions had culminated in a positive result for the ILO. All

Member States had endeavoured to find common ground. Accordingly, she supported the proposal to adopt the programme and budget.

- 131. Speaking on behalf of GRULAC**, a Government representative of Mexico reiterated the group's support for the ILO's mandate and expressed its approval of the programme and budget. The group had been active in seeking agreements and solutions to ensure the continued functioning of the Organization, as the region's cooperation with the ILO was key to the promotion of the highest standard of protection for workers, in the spirit of tripartism and social dialogue. They welcomed the fact that although there had been complex discussions, the commitment of all groups and their intent to reach agreement had prevailed. GRULAC supported the agreement that had been reached.
- 132. A Government representative of Kiribati** expressed gratitude to all those who had worked to achieve a consensus that had sometimes seemed impossible. The consensus that had been reached reflected members' care for their fellow citizens and respect for one another.
- 133. Speaking on behalf of the Arab group**, a Government representative of Sudan expressed satisfaction with the result that had been achieved, noting the compromises that had been made after much negotiation. The whole document was calling on the Organization to combat discrimination. It was important to note, however, that the Arab group had not been involved in the earlier discussions, after having been informed that the working group was restricted to only a limited number of participants. The Arab group was a large group with a significant presence in the Organization, so the Office should not restrict membership to just regional coordinators or representatives. The group's silence with regard to the proposal showed that they were keen for the Organization to continue to function. Hopefully, the Organization would be able to move forward on the basis of unified positions, not just national positions. It was disappointing to see regional groups being treated in such a way. Indeed, it had led to an impasse in negotiations. In the end, the Arab group welcomed the result that had been achieved and the efforts made by the various groups.
- 134. The Chairperson** concluded that, subject to the views expressed by members during the discussion, the Committee approved the Programme and Budget for 2024–25, including the specific points proposed to be included in the Committee's decision and in the Explanatory Note to the final programme and budget document. In accordance with the normal practice and on the basis of the conclusions the Committee had just reached, the Secretariat would execute the forward purchase transactions and prepare a paper (CF/D.4) showing the actual Swiss franc/US dollar exchange rate and also the final budget totals in both US dollars and Swiss francs, for the Committee's consideration under item 6 of its agenda.
- 135. Reaffirming the commitment expressed by all the tripartite constituents during the 347th Session (March 2023) of the Governing Body, as well as in the Finance Committee, strongly reiterated by the Director-General on behalf of the Office, to combat all forms of discrimination and exclusion on any ground for the benefit of all;**

Mindful of the different positions expressed on some issues during the discussion on the Programme and Budget at the 347th Session (March 2023) of the Governing Body as well as in the Finance Committee, as reflected in the respective Minutes of the sessions (GB.347/PFA/PV and ILC.111/Record No. 3A);

The Committee decided to recommend that the Conference adopt the draft resolution, the text of which appears at the end of the present record.

2. Request for permission to vote in accordance with paragraph 4 of article 13 of the Constitution of the ILO

(There was no document under this item.)

3. Status of collection of Member States' contributions

136. The Committee had before it document [CF/D.2](#) on the status of collection of Member States' contributions as at 30 April 2023.
137. **A representative of the Director-General** (Treasurer and Financial Comptroller) reported that, from 1 May 2023 to 6 June 2023,⁴ further contributions for 2023 and prior years amounting to CHF39,270,796 had been received from 26 Member States, the details of which were contained in a [Room Paper](#) under this item.
138. **The Committee took note of the information contained in the document and the update provided.**

4. Scale of assessments of contributions to the budget for 2024

139. The Committee had before it Report II, *Draft Programme and Budget for 2024–25 and other questions* (ILC.111/Report II), which referred, in paragraph 9, to the proposal put forward by the Governing Body at its 347th Session (March 2023) in document [GB.347/PFA/3](#) concerning the adoption of the draft scale of assessments for 2024 as set out in the appendix to that document and reproduced in Appendix II to the present record.
140. **The Committee decided to recommend that the Conference adopt the draft resolution, the text of which appears at the end of the present record.**

5. Financial report and audited consolidated financial statements for the year ended 31 December 2022

141. The Committee had before it the *Financial report and audited consolidated financial statements for the year ended 31 December 2022 and Report of the External Auditor* (ILC.111/FIN); document [CF/D.3](#), which referred to the proposal put forward on the item by the Governing Body at its 347th *bis* Session (5 June 2023); and Report II, *Draft Programme and Budget for 2024–25 and other questions* (ILC.111/Report II), paragraphs 7 and 8 of which referred to the item.
142. **The Committee decided to recommend that the Conference adopt the audited consolidated financial statements for the year ended 31 December 2022, and accordingly that it adopt the resolution, the text of which appears at the end of the present record.**

6. Resolution for the adoption of the Programme and Budget for 2024–25 and the allocation of the budget of income among Member States

143. The Committee had before it document [CF/D.4](#), which contained summarized financial details of the Programme and Budget proposals for 2024–25 and a draft resolution for submission to the Conference.

⁴ Cut-off time: 9 a.m. (CET), 6 June 2023.

144. Following the decision to support the Governing Body's recommendation concerning the programme and budget, the Office had carried out the forward purchase contracts for the ILO's US dollar requirements for the 2024–25 biennium. The appropriate figures now to be inserted in the formal resolution were:

Budget of expenditure in US dollars	879,800,000
Budget of income in US dollars	879,800,000
Budget rate of exchange, Swiss francs per US dollar	0.91
Equivalent budget total in Swiss francs	800,618,000

145. Two tables giving the expenditure budget for 2024–25 by appropriation line and the summarized budget of expenditure and income for 2024–25 are presented as Appendix III of the present record.
146. The statement of contributions due from Member States for 2024 (in Swiss francs) is presented as Appendix IV of the present record.
147. **A representative of the Director-General** (Treasurer and Financial Comptroller) explained that document CF/D.4 showed the final expenditure and income budget following the execution of forward purchase contracts to cover estimated US dollar requirements. The forward purchase contracts were protective measures to ensure that further assessments on Member States would not be required in consequence of any unfavourable foreign exchange movements between the Swiss franc and the US dollar.
148. He advised that, following the forward purchase contracts, the budget rate of exchange for 2024–25 had been established at CHF0.91 per US dollar and the expenditure budget at US\$879,800,000. In Swiss francs, the total amount due from Member States was CHF800,618,000, which represented an overall increase of 4 per cent compared with the 2022–23 biennium.
149. Since 1991, the net premium system had been used to protect Member States and had produced a net premium total of CHF183 million returned to Member states. In 2020–21, the financial period had generated an exceptionally high net premium of some US\$25 million, representing CHF22 million at the rate of 0.915 Swiss francs to the US dollar. At the current rates, the forward purchase for 2024–25 was expected to provide an exchange premium of some CHF16.8 million at the end of 2025, although the final figure would depend on the movement of exchange rates. In accordance with the Financial Regulations, all gains on exchange rate movements arising from those protective measures would be returned to Member States with one half redistributed through the incentive scheme for the early payment of Member States' contributions and the other half refunded to all Member States.
150. **A Government representative of Algeria** requested an explanation on unforeseen expenditure. Even if there were unforeseen expenditure recorded during the previous financial year, it should be itemized and properly dealt with in the budget.
151. **A representative of the Director-General** (Treasurer and Financial Comptroller) proposed in reply that he meet bilaterally with the representative of Algeria to provide an explanation.
152. **The Government representative of Algeria** accepted the proposal.
153. **The Committee decided to recommend that the Conference adopt the draft resolution, the text of which appears at the end of the present record.**

7. Other questions

(There was no document under this item.)

Geneva, 13 June 2023

(Signed) Mthunzi S.F. Shabangu
Chairperson and Reporter

Resolutions submitted to the Conference

Resolution concerning the adoption of the Programme and Budget for 2024-25 and the allocation of the budget of income among Member States

The General Conference of the International Labour Organization,

In virtue of the Financial Regulations, adopts for the 79th financial period, ending 31 December 2025, the budget of expenditure of the International Labour Organization amounting to US\$879,800,000 and the budget of income amounting to US\$879,800,000 which, at the budget rate of exchange of CHF0.91 to the US dollar, amounts to CHF800,618,000, and resolves that the budget of income, denominated in Swiss francs, shall be allocated among Member States in accordance with the scale of contributions recommended by the Finance Committee.

Resolution concerning the scale of assessments of contributions to the budget for 2024

The General Conference of the International Labour Organization,

Decides, in accordance with the established practice of harmonizing the rates of assessment of ILO Member States with their rates of assessment in the United Nations, to adopt the draft scale of assessments for the year 2024 as set out in Appendix II to ILC.111/Record No. 3A.

Resolution concerning the financial report and audited consolidated financial statements for the year ended 31 December 2022

The General Conference of the International Labour Organization,

Decides, in accordance with article 29 of the Financial Regulations, to adopt the audited consolidated financial statements for the year ended 31 December 2022.

Appendix I

Address by Mr Gilbert F. Hounbo, Director-General, to the Finance Committee on the Programme and Budget proposals for 2024–25

Tuesday, 6 June 2023

Good morning, distinguished delegates of the Finance Committee. I am very pleased to be here with you today. The record level of participation is certainly appreciated, and we hope that all the other Committees will have the same level of participation.

This Committee's work is key for the governance of the International Labour Organization. You have, for your consideration, the Programme and Budget proposals for the 2024–25 biennium, together with the scale of assessments of contributions to the budget for 2024 and the audited consolidated financial statements and Report of the External Auditor for the year 2022. The approval of all these items is critical for the continued functioning of the Organization from 1 January 2024.

I would like to reiterate the remarks I made before the Governing Body that the work of the ILO shall continue at all levels – national, regional and global. I have proposed eight policy outcomes and three enablers for the 2024–25 biennium. While the priorities of the Organization are adapted to the evolving needs of our constituents in the world of work, the fundamental principles, including occupational safety and health, have not changed, and we need to achieve our joint objectives in a consensual manner as much as possible.

Despite some divergence of views, I am pleased to say that all constituents have repeatedly reaffirmed their commitment to the principle of non-discrimination on any grounds.

Now that the programme and budget proposals are before the Finance Committee, let me again underline the importance of reaching agreement.

I would invite all of you, all delegates of this Committee, to do your very best to overcome the divisions and differences, and to collectively support the programme and budget, so as to ensure the sustainability of our Organization going forward.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you all and wish you a very successful conclusion to your work today and in the coming days.

Thank you.

Appendix II

Scale of assessments for 2024

State	Draft ILO scale of assessments 2024 (%)	
1	Afghanistan	0.006
2	Albania	0.008
3	Algeria	0.109
4	Angola	0.010
5	Antigua and Barbuda	0.002
6	Argentina	0.719
7	Armenia	0.007
8	Australia	2.112
9	Austria	0.679
10	Azerbaijan	0.030
11	Bahamas	0.019
12	Bahrain	0.054
13	Bangladesh	0.010
14	Barbados	0.008
15	Belarus	0.041
16	Belgium	0.828
17	Belize	0.001
18	Benin	0.005
19	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	0.019
20	Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.012
21	Botswana	0.015
22	Brazil	2.014
23	Brunei Darussalam	0.021
24	Bulgaria	0.056
25	Burkina Faso	0.004
26	Burundi	0.001
27	Cabo Verde	0.001
28	Cambodia	0.007
29	Cameroon	0.013
30	Canada	2.629
31	Central African Republic	0.001
32	Chad	0.003

State	Draft ILO scale of assessments 2024 (%)	
33	Chile	0.420
34	China	15.261
35	Colombia	0.246
36	Comoros	0.001
37	Congo	0.005
38	Cook Islands *	0.001
39	Costa Rica	0.069
40	Côte d'Ivoire	0.022
41	Croatia	0.091
42	Cuba	0.095
43	Cyprus	0.036
44	Czechia	0.340
45	Democratic Republic of the Congo	0.010
46	Denmark	0.553
47	Djibouti	0.001
48	Dominica	0.001
49	Dominican Republic	0.067
50	Ecuador	0.077
51	Egypt	0.139
52	El Salvador	0.013
53	Equatorial Guinea	0.012
54	Eritrea	0.001
55	Estonia	0.044
56	Eswatini	0.002
57	Ethiopia	0.010
58	Fiji	0.004
59	Finland	0.417
60	France	4.320
61	Gabon	0.013
62	Gambia	0.001
63	Georgia	0.008
64	Germany	6.114
65	Ghana	0.024
66	Greece	0.325
67	Grenada	0.001

State	Draft ILO scale of assessments 2024 (%)	
68	Guatemala	0.041
69	Guinea	0.003
70	Guinea-Bissau	0.001
71	Guyana	0.004
72	Haiti	0.006
73	Honduras	0.009
74	Hungary	0.228
75	Iceland	0.036
76	India	1.045
77	Indonesia	0.549
78	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	0.371
79	Iraq	0.128
80	Ireland	0.439
81	Israel	0.561
82	Italy	3.190
83	Jamaica	0.008
84	Japan	8.037
85	Jordan	0.022
86	Kazakhstan	0.133
87	Kenya	0.030
88	Kiribati	0.001
89	Kuwait	0.234
90	Kyrgyzstan	0.002
91	Lao People's Democratic Republic	0.007
92	Latvia	0.050
93	Lebanon	0.036
94	Lesotho	0.001
95	Liberia	0.001
96	Libya	0.018
97	Lithuania	0.077
98	Luxembourg	0.068
99	Madagascar	0.004
100	Malawi	0.002
101	Malaysia	0.348
102	Maldives	0.004

State	Draft ILO scale of assessments 2024 (%)
103 Mali	0.005
104 Malta	0.019
105 Marshall Islands	0.001
106 Mauritania	0.002
107 Mauritius	0.019
108 Mexico	1.222
109 Mongolia	0.004
110 Montenegro	0.004
111 Morocco	0.055
112 Mozambique	0.004
113 Myanmar	0.010
114 Namibia	0.009
115 Nepal	0.010
116 Netherlands	1.378
117 New Zealand	0.309
118 Nicaragua	0.005
119 Niger	0.003
120 Nigeria	0.182
121 North Macedonia	0.007
122 Norway	0.679
123 Oman	0.111
124 Pakistan	0.114
125 Palau	0.001
126 Panama	0.090
127 Papua New Guinea	0.010
128 Paraguay	0.026
129 Peru	0.163
130 Philippines	0.212
131 Poland	0.838
132 Portugal	0.353
133 Qatar	0.269
134 Republic of Korea	2.575
135 Republic of Moldova	0.005
136 Romania	0.312
137 Russian Federation	1.867

State	Draft ILO scale of assessments 2024 (%)	
138	Rwanda	0.003
139	Saint Kitts and Nevis	0.002
140	Saint Lucia	0.002
141	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	0.001
142	Samoa	0.001
143	San Marino	0.002
144	Sao Tome and Principe	0.001
145	Saudi Arabia	1.185
146	Senegal	0.007
147	Serbia	0.032
148	Seychelles	0.002
149	Sierra Leone	0.001
150	Singapore	0.504
151	Slovakia	0.155
152	Slovenia	0.079
153	Solomon Islands	0.001
154	Somalia	0.001
155	South Africa	0.244
156	South Sudan	0.002
157	Spain	2.135
158	Sri Lanka	0.045
159	Sudan	0.010
160	Suriname	0.003
161	Sweden	0.872
162	Switzerland	1.135
163	Syrian Arab Republic	0.009
164	Tajikistan	0.003
165	Thailand	0.368
166	Timor-Leste	0.001
167	Togo	0.002
168	Tonga	0.001
169	Trinidad and Tobago	0.037
170	Tunisia	0.019
171	Türkiye	0.846
172	Turkmenistan	0.034

State	Draft ILO scale of assessments 2024 (%)
173 Tuvalu	0.001
174 Uganda	0.010
175 Ukraine	0.056
176 United Arab Emirates	0.635
177 United Kingdom	4.377
178 United Republic of Tanzania	0.010
179 United States	22.000
180 Uruguay	0.092
181 Uzbekistan	0.027
182 Vanuatu	0.001
183 Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	0.175
184 Viet Nam	0.093
185 Yemen	0.008
186 Zambia	0.008
187 Zimbabwe	0.007
Total	100.000

* The Cook Islands is not at present a member of the UN. The proposed rate of assessment is based on its membership fees in other UN specialized agencies (GB.326/PFA/GMA/1).

Appendix III

Expenditure budget by appropriation line (in US dollars)

	Strategic budget 2022–23 ¹	Strategic budget 2024–25	Strategic budget 2024–25	Strategic budget 2024–25
	(in US\$)	(in constant 2022–23 (US\$))	(recosted (US\$))	(recosted and revalued (US\$))
Part I. Ordinary budget				
A. Policymaking organs ²	54 823 727	53 436 544	56 810 796	56 284 211
B. Policy outcomes	678 434 249	679 273 824	703 638 728	699 622 315
C. Management services ³	66 154 750	66 662 491	69 127 629	68 573 698
D. Other budgetary provisions	46 448 882	46 488 749	48 724 117	48 395 981
Adjustment for staff turnover	-6 903 130	-6 903 130	-7 164 404	-7 111 327
Total Part I	838 958 478	838 958 478	871 136 866	865 764 878
Part II. Unforeseen expenditure				
Unforeseen expenditure	875 000	875 000	875 000	875 000
Part III. Working Capital Fund				
Working Capital Fund				
Total (Parts I–III)	839 833 478	839 833 478	872 011 866	866 639 878
Part IV. Institutional investments and extraordinary items				
Institutional investments and extraordinary items	12 926 722	12 926 722	13 291 577	13 160 122
TOTAL (Parts I–IV)	852 760 200	852 760 200	885 303 443	879 800 000

¹ To facilitate comparison with 2024–25 figures, the 2022–23 budget was restated to reflect the realignment of grade-differentiated standard costs in headquarters and field offices following the revaluation of the recosted budget at the budget rate of exchange of CHF0.90 to the US dollar. ² The strategic budget proposals for policymaking organs include resources from the Official Meetings, Documents and Relations Department, and the Internal Services and Administration Department which directly support governance activities. ³ Management services is comprised of: Office of the Director-General, Ethics function, Evaluation, Independent Oversight Advisory Committee, Internal Audit and Oversight, External Audit costs, Assistant Director-General's Office Corporate Services, Financial Management, Human Resources Development and Strategic Programming and Management.

Summarized budget of expenditure and income for 2024-25

Expenditure	2022-23		2024-25		2022-23		2024-25	
	Budget		Estimates		Budget		Estimates	
	US\$	US\$	US\$	CHF	US\$	CHF	US\$	CHF
Part I								
Ordinary budget	838 958 478	865 764 878	Contributions from Member States	852 760 200	767 484 180	879 800 000	800 618 000	
Part II								
Unforeseen expenditure	875 000	875 000						
Part III								
Working capital fund	-	-						
Part IV								
Institutional investments and extraordinary items	12 926 722	13 160 122						
Total Budget	852 760 200	879 800 000		852 760 200	767 484 180	879 800 000	800 618 000	

Appendix IV

Income budget for 2024-25

Statement of contributions due from Member States for 2024 (in Swiss francs)

Member States	Assessed Contribution for 2024		Earned Credits Distributed in Respect of :			Total Credits	Net Contribution for 2024
			2022 Incentive Scheme	Prior years ⁽¹⁾			
	%	Amount		50% Net Premium	Surplus		
1 Afghanistan	0.006	24 019	-	-	-	-	24 019
2 Albania	0.008	32 025	44	-	-	44	31 981
3 Algeria	0.109	436 337	703	-	-	703	435 634
4 Angola	0.010	40 031	-	1 148	-	1 148	38 883
5 Antigua and Barbuda	0.002	8 006	-	-	-	-	8 006
6 Argentina	0.719	2 878 222	-	-	-	-	2 878 222
7 Armenia	0.007	28 022	38	-	-	38	27 984
8 Australia	2.112	8 454 526	11 976	-	-	11 976	8 442 550
9 Austria	0.679	2 718 098	3 605	-	-	3 605	2 714 493
10 Azerbaijan	0.030	120 093	246	1 007	-	1 253	118 840
11 Bahamas	0.019	76 059	85	-	-	85	75 974
12 Bahrain	0.054	216 167	212	-	-	212	215 955
13 Bangladesh	0.010	40 031	-	1 148	-	1 148	38 883
14 Barbados	0.008	32 025	35	-	-	35	31 990
15 Belarus	0.041	164 127	-	-	-	-	164 127
16 Belgium	0.828	3 314 559	1 002	-	-	1 002	3 313 557
17 Belize	0.001	4 003	1	189	-	190	3 813
18 Benin	0.005	20 015	16	-	-	16	19 999
19 Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	0.019	76 059	-	-	-	-	76 059
20 Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.012	48 037	63	956	-	1 019	47 018
21 Botswana	0.015	60 046	76	-	-	76	59 970
22 Brazil	2.014	8 062 223	-	619 669	-	619 669	7 442 554
23 Brunei Darussalam	0.021	84 065	136	-	-	136	83 929
24 Bulgaria	0.056	224 173	250	-	-	250	223 923
25 Burkina Faso	0.004	16 012	17	-	-	17	15 995
26 Burundi	0.001	4 003	-	-	-	-	4 003
27 Cabo Verde	0.001	4 003	-	-	-	-	4 003
28 Cambodia	0.007	28 022	11	-	-	11	28 011
29 Cameroon	0.013	52 040	-	1 492	-	1 492	50 548
30 Canada	2.629	10 524 124	14 814	-	-	14 814	10 509 310
31 Central African Republic	0.001	4 003	-	85	110	195	3 808
32 Chad	0.003	12 009	-	-	-	-	12 009
33 Chile	0.420	1 681 298	2 137	-	-	2 137	1 679 161
34 China	15.261	61 091 157	-	-	-	-	61 091 157
35 Colombia	0.246	984 760	1 424	-	-	1 424	983 336
36 Comoros	0.001	4 003	-	-	-	-	4 003
37 Congo	0.005	20 015	-	-	-	-	20 015
38 Cook Islands	0.001	4 003	6	-	-	6	3 997
39 Costa Rica	0.069	276 213	-	7 116	-	7 116	269 097
40 Côte d'Ivoire	0.022	88 068	-	-	-	-	88 068
41 Croatia	0.091	364 281	418	-	-	418	363 863
42 Cuba	0.095	380 294	-	-	-	-	380 294
43 Cyprus	0.036	144 111	45	-	-	45	144 066
44 Czechia	0.340	1 361 051	1 685	-	-	1 685	1 359 366
45 Democratic Republic of the Congo	0.010	40 031	16	2 096	-	2 112	37 919
46 Denmark	0.553	2 213 709	2 988	-	-	2 988	2 210 721
47 Djibouti	0.001	4 003	5	115	-	120	3 883
48 Dominica	0.001	4 003	-	-	-	-	4 003
49 Dominican Republic	0.067	268 207	224	-	-	224	267 983
50 Ecuador	0.077	308 238	-	14 108	-	14 108	294 130

Member States	Assessed Contribution for 2024		Earned Credits Distributed in Respect of :			Total Credits	Net Contribution for 2024
			2022 Incentive Scheme	Prior years ⁽¹⁾			
	%	Amount		50% Net Premium	Surplus		
51 Egypt	0.139	556 430	1 008	-	-	1 008	555 422
52 El Salvador	0.013	52 040	54	-	-	54	51 986
53 Equatorial Guinea	0.012	48 037	-	-	-	-	48 037
54 Eritrea	0.001	4 003	-	-	-	-	4 003
55 Estonia	0.044	176 136	210	-	-	210	175 926
56 Eswatini	0.002	8 006	10	-	-	10	7 996
57 Ethiopia	0.010	40 031	-	1 883	-	1 883	38 148
58 Fiji	0.004	16 012	-	344	-	344	15 668
59 Finland	0.417	1 669 289	2 180	-	-	2 180	1 667 109
60 France	4.320	17 293 349	22 500	-	-	22 500	17 270 849
61 Gabon	0.013	52 040	-	4 223	-	4 223	47 817
62 Gambia	0.001	4 003	-	-	-	-	4 003
63 Georgia	0.008	32 025	20	-	-	20	32 005
64 Germany	6.114	24 474 892	20 786	-	-	20 786	24 454 106
65 Ghana	0.024	96 074	-	1 722	-	1 722	94 352
66 Greece	0.325	1 301 004	1 490	42 011	-	43 501	1 257 503
67 Grenada	0.001	4 003	6	74	-	80	3 923
68 Guatemala	0.041	164 127	159	-	-	159	163 968
69 Guinea	0.003	12 009	-	147	-	147	11 862
70 Guinea-Bissau	0.001	4 003	-	-	-	-	4 003
71 Guyana	0.004	16 012	11	-	-	11	16 001
72 Haiti	0.006	24 019	1	-	-	1	24 018
73 Honduras	0.009	36 028	-	1 033	-	1 033	34 995
74 Hungary	0.228	912 705	1 071	23 645	-	24 716	887 989
75 Iceland	0.036	144 111	150	-	-	150	143 961
76 India	1.045	4 183 229	4 524	-	-	4 524	4 178 705
77 Indonesia	0.549	2 197 696	616	-	-	616	2 197 080
78 Iran (Islamic Republic of)	0.371	1 485 146	-	34 623	-	34 623	1 450 523
79 Iraq	0.128	512 396	539	27 295	6 324	34 158	478 238
80 Ireland	0.439	1 757 357	1 923	-	-	1 923	1 755 434
81 Israel	0.561	2 245 734	2 205	-	-	2 205	2 243 529
82 Italy	3.190	12 769 857	15 542	-	-	15 542	12 754 315
83 Jamaica	0.008	32 025	44	-	-	44	31 981
84 Japan	8.037	32 172 834	34 271	-	-	34 271	32 138 563
85 Jordan	0.022	88 068	11	-	-	11	88 057
86 Kazakhstan	0.133	532 411	965	-	-	965	531 446
87 Kenya	0.030	120 093	19	-	-	19	120 074
88 Kiribati	0.001	4 003	-	189	-	189	3 814
89 Kuwait	0.234	936 723	1 365	-	-	1 365	935 358
90 Kyrgyzstan	0.002	8 006	8	717	1 312	2 037	5 969
91 Lao People's Democratic Republic	0.007	28 022	22	-	-	22	28 000
92 Latvia	0.050	200 155	219	-	-	219	199 936
93 Lebanon	0.036	144 111	-	-	-	-	144 111
94 Lesotho	0.001	4 003	6	-	-	6	3 997
95 Liberia	0.001	4 003	6	-	-	6	3 997
96 Libya	0.018	72 056	-	9 189	-	9 189	62 867
97 Lithuania	0.077	308 238	384	-	-	384	307 854
98 Luxembourg	0.068	272 210	349	-	-	349	271 861
99 Madagascar	0.004	16 012	-	459	-	459	15 553
100 Malawi	0.002	8 006	-	147	-	147	7 859
101 Malaysia	0.348	1 393 075	1 504	-	-	1 504	1 391 571
102 Maldives	0.004	16 012	21	-	-	21	15 991
103 Mali	0.005	20 015	23	-	-	23	19 992
104 Malta	0.019	76 059	80	-	-	80	75 979
105 Marshall Islands	0.001	4 003	-	115	-	115	3 888
106 Mauritania	0.002	8 006	11	-	-	11	7 995
107 Mauritius	0.019	76 059	52	-	-	52	76 007
108 Mexico	1.222	4 891 776	-	-	-	-	4 891 776
109 Mongolia	0.004	16 012	-	-	-	-	16 012
110 Montenegro	0.004	16 012	21	-	-	21	15 991

Member States	Assessed Contribution for 2024		Earned Credits Distributed in Respect of :			Total Credits	Net Contribution for 2024
			2022 Incentive Scheme	Prior years ⁽¹⁾			
	%	Amount		50% Net Premium	Surplus		
111 Morocco	0.055	220 170	266	-	-	266	219 904
112 Mozambique	0.004	16 012	4	-	-	4	16 008
113 Myanmar	0.010	40 031	52	-	-	52	39 979
114 Namibia	0.009	36 028	49	-	-	49	35 979
115 Nepal	0.010	40 031	-	-	-	-	40 031
116 Netherlands	1.378	5 516 258	6 728	-	-	6 728	5 509 530
117 New Zealand	0.309	1 236 955	1 515	-	-	1 515	1 235 440
118 Nicaragua	0.005	20 015	23	-	-	23	19 992
119 Niger	0.003	12 009	-	230	-	230	11 779
120 Nigeria	0.182	728 562	-	28 696	-	28 696	699 866
121 North Macedonia	0.007	28 022	38	-	-	38	27 984
122 Norway	0.679	2 718 098	3 788	-	-	3 788	2 714 310
123 Oman	0.111	444 343	541	-	-	541	443 802
124 Pakistan	0.114	456 352	-	13 200	-	13 200	443 152
125 Palau	0.001	4 003	-	-	-	-	4 003
126 Panama	0.090	360 278	185	-	-	185	360 093
127 Papua New Guinea	0.010	40 031	-	-	-	-	40 031
128 Paraguay	0.026	104 080	-	2 734	1 417	4 151	99 929
129 Peru	0.163	652 504	750	17 447	-	18 197	634 307
130 Philippines	0.212	848 655	89	-	-	89	848 566
131 Poland	0.838	3 354 590	4 343	-	-	4 343	3 350 247
132 Portugal	0.353	1 413 091	1 896	-	-	1 896	1 411 195
133 Qatar	0.269	1 076 831	1 527	-	-	1 527	1 075 304
134 Republic of Korea	2.575	10 307 957	9 542	260 329	-	269 871	10 038 086
135 Republic of Moldova	0.005	20 015	12	731	-	743	19 272
136 Romania	0.312	1 248 964	907	-	-	907	1 248 057
137 Russian Federation	1.867	7 473 769	4 042	-	-	4 042	7 469 727
138 Rwanda	0.003	12 009	14	344	-	358	11 651
139 Saint Kitts and Nevis	0.002	8 006	5	115	-	120	7 886
140 Saint Lucia	0.002	8 006	-	-	-	-	8 006
141 Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	0.001	4 003	5	-	-	5	3 998
142 Samoa	0.001	4 003	6	-	-	6	3 997
143 San Marino	0.002	8 006	10	-	-	10	7 996
144 Sao Tome and Principe	0.001	4 003	-	-	-	-	4 003
145 Saudi Arabia	1.185	4 743 662	6 353	-	-	6 353	4 737 309
146 Senegal	0.007	28 022	-	-	-	-	28 022
147 Serbia	0.032	128 099	22	-	-	22	128 077
148 Seychelles	0.002	8 006	3	-	-	3	8 003
149 Sierra Leone	0.001	4 003	-	208	249	457	3 546
150 Singapore	0.504	2 017 557	2 627	-	-	2 627	2 014 930
151 Slovakia	0.155	620 479	806	-	-	806	619 673
152 Slovenia	0.079	316 244	408	-	-	408	315 836
153 Solomon Islands	0.001	4 003	-	48	-	48	3 955
154 Somalia	0.001	4 003	4	115	-	119	3 884
155 South Africa	0.244	976 754	1 474	-	-	1 474	975 280
156 South Sudan	0.002	8 006	32	-	-	32	7 974
157 Spain	2.135	8 546 597	7 148	-	-	7 148	8 539 449
158 Sri Lanka	0.045	180 139	15	-	-	15	180 124
159 Sudan	0.010	40 031	-	-	-	-	40 031
160 Suriname	0.003	12 009	-	-	-	-	12 009
161 Sweden	0.872	3 490 695	4 830	-	-	4 830	3 485 865
162 Switzerland	1.135	4 543 507	6 217	-	-	6 217	4 537 290
163 Syrian Arab Republic	0.009	36 028	-	1 764	-	1 764	34 264
164 Tajikistan	0.003	12 009	-	1 539	-	1 539	10 470
165 Thailand	0.368	1 473 137	1 632	-	-	1 632	1 471 505

Member States	Assessed Contribution for 2024		Earned Credits Distributed in Respect of :			Total Credits	Net Contribution for 2024
			2022 Incentive Scheme	Prior years ⁽¹⁾			
	%	Amount		50% Net Premium	Surplus		
166 Timor-Leste	0.001	4 003	-	384	-	384	3 619
167 Togo	0.002	8 006	-	-	-	-	8 006
168 Tonga	0.001	4 003	1	189	-	190	3 813
169 Trinidad and Tobago	0.037	148 114	187	-	-	187	147 927
170 Tunisia	0.019	76 059	121	-	-	121	75 938
171 Türkiye	0.846	3 386 614	721	-	-	721	3 385 893
172 Turkmenistan	0.034	136 105	19	-	-	19	136 086
173 Tuvalu	0.001	4 003	-	-	-	-	4 003
174 Uganda	0.010	40 031	-	-	-	-	40 031
175 Ukraine	0.056	224 173	172	-	-	172	224 001
176 United Arab Emirates	0.635	2 541 962	2 652	-	-	2 652	2 539 310
177 United Kingdom	4.377	17 521 525	23 858	-	-	23 858	17 497 667
178 United Republic of Tanzania	0.010	40 031	54	-	-	54	39 977
179 United States	22.000	88 067 980	-	2 525 236	-	2 525 236	85 542 744
180 Uruguay	0.092	368 284	151	-	-	151	368 133
181 Uzbekistan	0.027	108 084	-	15 051	5 404	20 455	87 629
182 Vanuatu	0.001	4 003	-	189	-	189	3 814
183 Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	0.175	700 541	-	-	-	-	700 541
184 Viet Nam	0.093	372 287	338	-	-	338	371 949
185 Yemen	0.008	32 025	-	-	-	-	32 025
186 Zambia	0.008	32 025	-	1 033	-	1 033	30 992
187 Zimbabwe	0.007	28 022	-	574	-	574	27 448
TOTAL	100.000	400 309 000	252 846	3 667 101	14 816	3 934 763	396 374 237

(1) Should a Member State pay previous year's contributions prior to the closure of the 111th Session of the International Labour Conference, that Member State's earned credits may change.