

International Labour Conference, 101st Session, 2012

Report IV(2A)

Social protection floors for social justice and a fair globalization

Fourth item on the agenda

ISBN 978-92-2-124495-0 (print)
ISBN 978-92-2-124496-7 (Web pdf)
ISSN 0074-6681

First edition 2012

The designations employed in ILO publications, which are in conformity with United Nations practice, and the presentation of material therein do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the International Labour Office concerning the legal status of any country, area or territory or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers.

Reference to names of firms and commercial products and processes does not imply their endorsement by the International Labour Office, and any failure to mention a particular firm, commercial product or process is not a sign of disapproval.

ILO publications can be obtained through major booksellers or ILO local offices in many countries, or direct from ILO Publications, International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland. Catalogues or lists of new publications are available free of charge from the above address, or by email: pubvente@ilo.org.

Visit our website: www.ilo.org/publns.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	v
INTRODUCTION	1
REPLIES RECEIVED AND COMMENTS	3
OFFICE COMMENTARY	167

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Employers' and workers' organizations

	IOE	International Organisation of Employers
Albania	KSSH	Confederation of the Trade Unions of Albania
Algeria	UGTA	General Union of Algerian Workers
Argentina	CGT	General Labour Confederation
	CTA	Congress of Argentine Workers
Australia	ACTU	Australian Council of Trade Unions
	AiG	Australian Industry Group
Austria	BAK	Federal Chamber of Labour
Bahamas	NCTUB	National Congress of Trade Unions in the Bahamas
Barbados	BWU	Barbados Workers' Union
Belgium	FGTB	General Federation of Labour of Belgium
Belize	BCCI	Belize Chamber of Commerce and Industry
	NTUCB	National Trade Union Congress of Belize
Brazil	CNA	National Agriculture Confederation of Brazil
	CNC	National Confederation of Commerce
	CNI	National Confederation of Industry
	CNS	National Confederation of Health
	CUT	National Federation of Workers of Brazil
	UGT	General Union of Workers
Bulgaria	CITUB	Confederation of Independent Trade Unions in Bulgaria
Cameroon	UGTC	Union Générale des Travailleurs du Cameroun
Canada	CLC	Canadian Labour Congress
	CSN	Confédération des syndicats nationaux
China	ACFTU	All-China Federation of Trade Unions
Colombia	ANDI	National Association of Entrepreneurs
	CTC	Confederation of Colombian Workers
	CUT	Single Confederation of Workers of Colombia
Congo	CSC	Confédération syndicale du Congo

Costa Rica	CTRN	RerumNovarum Confederation of Workers
	UCCAEP	Costa Rica Union of Chambers and Associations of Private Enterprise
Croatia	NHS	Independent Trade Unions of Croatia
Cyprus	OEB	Cyprus Employers and Industrialists Federation
	SEK	Cyprus Workers' Confederation
Czech Republic	ČMKOS	Czech-Moravian Confederation of Trade Unions
	SPD	Confederation of Industry and Transport of the Czech Republic
Djibouti	UGTD	Union Générale de Travailleurs de Djibouti
Dominican Republic	CNTD	National Confederation of Dominican Workers
	CNUS	National Confederation of Trade Union Unity
	CASC	Autonomous Confederation of Class Unions
Ecuador	CEDOCUT	Ecuadorian Confederation of United Class Organizations of Workers
	CSE	Confederación Sindical de Trabajadoras y Trabajadores del Ecuador
El Salvador	CATS	Central Autónoma de Trabajadores Salvadoreños
Fiji	FTUC	Fiji Trades Union Congress
Finland	AKAVA	Confederation of Unions for Academic Professionals
	EK	Confederation of Finnish Industries
	KT	Commission for Local Authority Employers
	SAK	Central Organization of Finnish Trade Unions
	STTK	Finnish Confederation of Salaried Employees
	SY	Federation of Finnish Enterprises
	VTML	State Employer's Office
	France	MEDEF
	SPS	Social Press Union
	UNSA	National Union of Autonomous Trade Unions
Gabon	CGSL	Gabonese Confederation of Free Trade Unions
Germany	DGB	German Trade Union Confederation
Ghana	TUC	Ghana Trades Union Congress
Grenada	PWU	Grenada Public Workers' Union
Guatemala	UNSI TRAGUA	Trade Union of Workers of Guatemala
Guinea	CNTG	National Confederation of Guinean Workers
Honduras	CGT	General Confederation of Workers
	CTH	Confederation of Honduran Workers

Hong Kong, China	HKCTU	Hong Kong Confederation of Trade Unions
Hungary	ÉSZT	Confederation of Unions of Professionals
Iceland	ASI	Icelandic Confederation of Labour
India	HMS	Hind Mazdoor Sabha
Indonesia	KSBSI	Indonesian Prosperity Trade Union Confederation
Islamic Republic of Iran	ICEA	Iranian Confederation of Employers' Associations
Japan	JTUC–RENGO	Japanese Trade Union Confederation
	NK	Japanese Business Federation
Kenya	COTU–K	Central Organization of Trade Unions – Kenya
Republic of Korea	FKTU	Federation of Korean Trade Unions
	KEF	Korea Employers Federation
Latvia	LBAS	Free Trade Union Confederation of Latvia
Lesotho	LLC	Lesotho Labour Council
Malawi	MCTU	Malawi Congress of Trade Unions
Malaysia	MTUC	Malaysian Trades Union Congress
Mali	UNTM	Union Nationale des Travailleurs du Mali
Mauritania	CGTM	Confédération Générale des Travailleurs de Mauritanie
Mexico	CROC	Revolutionary Confederation of Workers and Campesinos
	CTM	Confederation of Mexican Workers
Namibia	NEF	Namibia Employers Federation
	NUNW	National Union of Namibian Workers
Nepal	GEFONT	General Federation of Nepalese Trade Unions
Netherlands	CNV	National Confederation of Christian Trade Unions
	FNV	Netherlands Trade Union Confederation
	MHP	Federation of Managerial and Professional Staff Unions
	VNO–NCW	Confederation of Netherlands Industry and Employers
New Zealand	NZCTU	New Zealand Council of Trade Unions
Norway	LO	Norwegian Confederation of Trade Unions
	NHO	Confederation of Norwegian Enterprise
Pakistan	EFP	Employers' Federation of Pakistan
	PWF	Pakistan Workers' Federation
Panama	CONEP	National Council of Private Enterprise
	CS	Convergencia Sindical
	CTRP	Confederation of Workers of the Republic of Panama

Paraguay	CUTA/CNT	Authentic Single Confederation of Workers/National Confederation of Workers
Peru	CATP	Autonomous Confederation of Peruvian Workers
	CCL	Lima Chamber of Commerce
	CGTP	General Confederation of Peruvian Workers
Poland	NSZZ	Independent and Self-Governing Trade Union “Solidarnosc”
Portugal	CCSP	Confederation of Commerce and Services of Portugal
	CGTP-IN	General Confederation of Portuguese Workers – Intersindical
	CIP	Confederation of Portuguese Industry
	CTP	Portuguese Confederation of Tourism
	UGT	General Union of Workers
Romania	CNS–Cartel ALFA	National Trade Union Confederation “Cartel ALFA”
	CSDR	Democratic Trade Union Confederation of Romania
Russian Federation	FNPR	Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia
Rwanda	CESTRAR	Centrale des Syndicats des Travailleurs du Rwanda
Senegal	CNTS	National Confederation of Workers of Senegal
	CSA	Confédération des syndicats autonomes du Sénégal
Singapore	NTUC	National Trade Union Congress
Slovakia	KOVO	Metalworkers’ Federation
Spain	UGT	General Union of Workers
Sri Lanka	EFC	Employers’ Federation of Ceylon
	JSS	National Employees Union
	NTUF	National Trade Union Federation
Sweden	LO	Swedish Trade Union Confederation
	SACO	Swedish Confederation of Professional Associations
	SN	Confederation of Swedish Enterprise
	TCO	Swedish Confederation for Professional Employees
Switzerland	SGB	Swiss Federation of Trade Unions
	UPS	Confederation of Swiss Employers
Turkey	TÜRK-İŞ	Confederation of Turkish Trade Unions
Ukraine	FPU	Federation of Trade Unions of Ukraine
United Kingdom	TUC	Trades Union Congress

Uruguay	CIU	Chamber of Manufacturers of Uruguay
	PIT–CNT	Inter-Trade Union Assembly – Workers’ National Convention
Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela	CTV	Venezuelan Workers’ Confederation
	FETRATEL	Federation of Telecommunication Workers of Venezuela
Zimbabwe	ZCTU	Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions

Other abbreviations

CEACR	Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations
CEB	United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 1996
IMF	International Monetary Fund
MDG(s)	Millennium Development Goal(s)
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OSH	occupational safety and health
SPF	social protection floor (concept)
SPFs	social protection floors (national implementation)

ILO instruments

Convention No. 81	Labour Inspection Convention, 1947
Convention No. 100	Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951
Convention No. 102	Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952
Convention No. 111	Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958
Convention No. 118	Equality of Treatment (Social Security) Convention, 1962
Convention No. 121	Employment Injury Benefits Convention, 1964 [Schedule I amended in 1980] (No. 121)
Convention No. 128	Invalidity, Old-Age and Survivors’ Benefits Convention, 1967
Convention No. 130	Medical Care and Sickness Benefits Convention, 1969
Convention No. 138	Minimum Age Convention, 1973
Convention No. 157	Maintenance of Social Security Rights Convention, 1982
Convention No. 168	Employment Promotion and Protection against Unemployment Convention, 1988
Convention No. 183	Maternity Protection Convention, 2000

Recommendation No. 67	Income Security Recommendation, 1944
Recommendation No. 69	Medical Care Recommendation, 1944
Recommendation No. 121	Employment Injury Benefits Recommendation, 1964
Recommendation No. 134	Medical Care and Sickness Benefits Recommendation, 1969
2001 Resolution	Resolution concerning social security, 89th Session of the International Labour Conference, 2001
2011 Conclusions	Conclusions concerning the recurrent discussion on social protection (social security), 100th Session of the International Labour Conference, 2011
2011 Resolution	Resolution concerning the recurrent discussion on social protection (social security), 100th Session of the International Labour Conference, 2011

INTRODUCTION

At its 311th Session in June 2011, the Governing Body decided to place a standard-setting item entitled “Elaboration of an autonomous Recommendation on the social protection floor” on the agenda of the 101st Session (2012) of the International Labour Conference. The Governing Body further decided that this question would be governed by a single-discussion procedure in accordance with article 38 of the Standing Orders of the Conference, and adopted the programme of reduced intervals proposed.¹ This decision followed from the Conclusions concerning the recurrent discussion on social protection (social security) at the 100th Session of the International Labour Conference (2011), which stated that “[i]n view of the renewed support for the provision of at least a basic level of social security through establishing social protection floors, there is a need for a Recommendation complementing the existing standards that would provide flexible but meaningful guidance to member States in building social protection floors within comprehensive social security systems tailored to national circumstances and levels of development”.² The appendix to these conclusions set out some elements of a possible Recommendation, which have served as the basis for the elaboration of the questionnaire and this report.

To this end, the Office prepared a summary report on the law and practice in member States.³ The report included a questionnaire to ascertain the views of member States on the scope and content of a possible Recommendation, and to prepare the proposed text. The questionnaire was drawn up taking into account the 2011 Conclusions.

According to the programme of reduced intervals decided by the Governing Body, the Office invited governments to send their replies by November 2011 at the latest.

At the time of drawing up the present report, the Office had received replies from constituents representing 118 member States. This included the governments of the following 98 member States: Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname,

¹ GB.311/6.

² ILO: *Conclusions concerning the recurrent discussion on social protection (social security)*, International Labour Conference, 100th Session, Geneva, 2011, in *Record of Proceedings* (Geneva, 2011), No. 24: Report of the Committee for the Recurrent Discussion on Social Protection (Geneva), para. 31. Available at: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/@ed_norm/@relconf/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_157820.pdf, referred to henceforth as 2011 Conclusions.

³ ILO: *Social protection floors for social justice and a fair globalization*, Report IV(1), International Labour Conference, 101st Session, Geneva, 2011 (Geneva). Available at: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/@ed_norm/@relconf/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_160210.pdf, referred to henceforth as Report IV(1).

Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

In accordance with article 38, paragraph 1, of the Standing Orders of the Conference, governments were invited to give their views after consultation with the most representative organizations of employers and workers. This consultation is obligatory for Members which have ratified the Tripartite Consultation (International Labour Standards) Convention, 1976 (No. 144). The governments of 46 member States indicated that the most representative employers' and workers' organizations had been consulted. The governments of several member States sent the replies of employers' and workers' organizations separately; in some cases, these replies were received directly by the Office. In addition, replies were received from employers and workers of another 20 member States: Algeria, Bahamas, Barbados, Congo, Djibouti, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Iceland, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, New Zealand, Pakistan, Rwanda, Singapore, Slovakia, Spain. A reply was also directly received from the International Organisation of Employers, which is reproduced in the report after the replies from national employers' organizations.

Owing to the particular nature of the subject, recipient ministries were invited to consult with other relevant authorities when formulating replies to this questionnaire. A number of countries have indicated that they have done so; and some submitted the views of other ministries and social security organizations separately.

This report was prepared on the basis of the replies received from governments and organizations of employers and workers to the questionnaire and contains the substance of their observations⁴ together with the Office's commentary on the replies and on the proposed text of the Recommendation. Volume 2(B) of this Report IV contains the French and English versions of the proposed text which, if the Conference so decides, will be the basis for discussion of the standard-setting item on the elaboration of an autonomous Recommendation on the social protection floor at its 101st Session (2012).

⁴ Replies that were received after 30 November 2011 are reflected in this report for the yes/no replies only; however, textual comments could not be taken into account.

REPLIES RECEIVED AND COMMENTS

This section contains the substance of the replies of governments, employers' and workers' organizations to the questionnaire which accompanied Report IV(1). The text of each question is reproduced, followed by the list of respondents grouped according to the nature of the reply (affirmative, negative or other).

In cases where a reply was qualified or clarified by comments, the substance of these is indicated in a summarized form in alphabetical order of countries. Due to limitations of space, similar responses have been grouped together, where possible. Some replies, in particular relating to the preliminary question, provided interesting and useful information on national law and practice with regard to social security. That information has not, however, been reproduced in this report. Comments which reaffirmed the proposition contained in the question without adding additional points have not been reproduced either, in the interest of conciseness. However, the full text of all comments provided has been taken into account in the formulation of the proposed text of the Recommendation.

The Office commentary on the replies to the questions and on the proposed text of the Recommendation may be found in the subsequent section.

General observations

GOVERNMENTS

Norway. The Recommendation's primary purpose is to guide Members which have not yet established satisfactory SPFs tailored to national circumstances and levels of development. Some Members have already implemented comprehensive social protection schemes, with universal coverage and high levels of income security and access to quality health care. Thus, further extension is not possible, and providing higher levels of social security is unfeasible. This should be reflected in the Recommendation. Gender equality and non-discrimination should also be integrated and more visible, as preconditions of social justice.

EMPLOYERS

EFC (Sri Lanka). The SPF Initiative cannot be a "one-size-fits-all" approach as it covers different experiences worldwide, difficult to translate into a global instrument. Any new mechanism should remain general and flexible, leaving this issue to national debate and including progressive implementation suited to the national context.

EK (Finland). A good life comes through work – only rarely can social security play a central role. Moreover, a social security system must be economically sustainable, and sustainability requires sufficient economic growth and a social security system that incentivizes recipients to join the labour market. The system should also include means tests; automatic income transfers for those falling below an income threshold relative to the average salary are unsustainable and likely to become an income trap. It is also difficult to consider temporary foreign funding as sustainable. We agree with the Recommendation.

SN (Sweden). A Recommendation containing detailed rules on national SPFs is not required. There is confusion and uncertainty regarding what should be included in SPFs; they seem to be intended to cover traditional health issues, e.g. access to water, sanitation, housing and health care. Each country must develop its own financially sustainable and realistic solutions based on national conditions. Good economic

development and growth are necessary; the right conditions will create job opportunities in the formal economy, compensate for unemployment and social exclusion, and facilitate the establishment of sustainable and realistic SPFs. Thus, flexible and up-to-date labour market legislation is needed to provide employment incentives; also the workforce should be employable and rules and regulations should offer people sufficient incentives to work. The private sector, which has an important role to play in the supply of services associated with social protection, will be stronger in the future; this should be reflected in any Recommendation.

WORKERS

AKAVA, SAK, STTK (Finland). Emphasize the legal basis of social security, individual and human rights and the right to benefits, the quality of social security systems and services and cost efficiency, as well as financial sustainability. The latter requires a broad funding basis and high employment rates until retirement. Social security systems should also take into account gender equality and be strongly linked to decent work terms and conditions of employment in line, at least, with labour legislation and collective agreements, and to the security and continuity provided by employment relationships. The primary source of income should be work-based earnings if possible; otherwise social security benefits should provide sufficient security.

CTH (Honduras). Agrees with the content of the questionnaire.

Preliminary questions

Qu. 1 *Please indicate any legislation or practice, including case law, programmes and policies, of your country that has not already been provided to the Office in response to the questionnaire submitted under article 19 of the Constitution on social security instruments (please send a copy or web link, if possible):*

Several governments, employers' organizations and workers' organizations provided information on national legislation and policies, or referred to the questionnaire submitted under the General Survey concerning social security instruments in light of the 2008 ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, Report III (Part 1B), International Labour Conference, 100th Session, Geneva, 2011.

Preamble

Qu. 2 *Should the Preamble of the Recommendation recall the Declaration of Philadelphia; the Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948; the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization; and the continuing relevance of ILO social security Conventions and Recommendations, in particular, the Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952 (No. 102), the Income Security Recommendation, 1944 (No. 67), and the Medical Care Recommendation, 1944 (No. 69)?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 98.

Yes: 92. Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia,

Cameroon, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

No: 4. Armenia, Hungary, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tajikistan.

Other: 2. Canada, Dominican Republic.

Comments

Australia. Refer only to fully up-to-date ILO standards, thus preferably to Convention No. 130 (and the accompanying Recommendation No. 134) rather than Recommendation No. 69.

Belarus, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Cameroon, Kenya, Viet Nam, Zambia. These instruments provide the international legal foundations of the SPF.

Belgium, Ecuador. It should also recognize that social security is a human right.

Belize, Sri Lanka. They reinforce the SPF Initiative and the Recommendation.

Canada. Recommendation No. 69 is not considered up to date and not all provisions of other instruments are of continuing relevance. Reference should be made only to up-to-date and relevant instruments.

Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Honduras, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Panama, Romania. These are important instruments.

Czech Republic. Include ICESCR.

El Salvador. Especially reference to Art. 7, 13, 19, 25, 46, 53, 59 of Convention No. 102 as well as to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948, referring to the right to social security which is also stipulated in the national Constitution.

Hungary. These instruments are relevant but Hungary has not yet ratified Convention No. 102 and Recommendations Nos 67 and 69, so would not support that they are recalled.

Lebanon. They highlight the international commitment to a rights-based approach to social security.

Mauritius. Social security has evolved from providing basic income support to making provisions for a series of other human needs acknowledging at the same time the right of access to the services.

Netherlands, Peru, Portugal, Uruguay. These are relevant references and the basis for the right to social security, which should be emphasized.

Nicaragua. Any instrument calling for better working conditions and access to social security is important.

Norway. Should include Convention No. 111.

Paraguay. Should recognize that social security is a human right and the importance of creating national SPFs, and the context of the four inseparable, interrelated and mutually reinforcing pillars of the Decent Work Agenda.

Russian Federation. While new Recommendations should close gaps in social security coverage, existing ILO standards have not yet lost their relevance in extending social security.

Senegal. Include ICESCR, Global Campaign for the Extension of Social Security and Coverage to All, Resolution and conclusions concerning the recurrent discussion on social protection (social security) (2011), Global Jobs Pact, MDGs 5 and 6; Yaoundé Tripartite Declaration on the Implementation of the Social Protection Floor (2010).

South Africa. Convention No. 121 and Recommendation No. 121 should also be considered.

Turkey. As SPFs also include access to health services, relevant Conventions and Recommendations should be recalled.

United States. The Preamble should simply recall the ILO Conventions and Recommendations; delete “and the continuing relevance of”.

Employers

Total number of replies: 24.

Yes: 16. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNS (Brazil), OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CCSP, CTP (Portugal), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 6. CNA, CNC, CNI (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), KEF (Republic of Korea), UPS (Switzerland).

Other: 2. EFP (Pakistan), CIP (Portugal).

Comments

ANDI (Colombia). Convention No. 102 is sufficiently all-inclusive and has the advantage of being a Convention that is flexible and provides protection, as the minimum level of benefits can be determined in relation to the national wage level.

OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), NHO (Norway), IOE. No need for any other reference.

VNO–NCW (Netherlands). Convention No. 102 is not very relevant as it has been ratified by only 47 countries.

EFP (Pakistan). No reference should be made to any Convention not generally ratified by States.

CIP (Portugal). A recommendation is not necessary, as the majority of issues addressed in the questionnaire are the competence of governments of member States.

CTP (Portugal). The main cultural, political, social, economic and constitutional principles, at the origin of the international instruments referred to, must be adapted to the current global context and the new challenges facing social protection schemes.

CIU (Uruguay). Without reference to ILO Conventions and Recommendations.

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 93. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC

(Mexico), CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP-IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK-İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV, FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 0.

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), NTUF (Sri Lanka), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK-İŞ (Turkey), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). Social security is a human right, and the importance of creating national SPFs is increasingly recognized by the international community. The Recommendation should be formulated within the four inseparable, interrelated and mutually reinforcing pillars of the Decent Work Agenda.

CUT (Brazil). Should also highlight the principles of full employment and social justice.

CSN (Canada), CATP (Peru). Include ICESCR.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). For global implementation, it is important to include the various universal declarations.

ČMKOS (Czech Republic). In the context of the current economic and social crisis, these standards are threatened and it is necessary to recall them.

CTM (Mexico). The international legislation has been overtaken by the social realities the world is facing.

CGTP-IN (Portugal). Social protection has been one of the foundations of the ILO's mandate and it is therefore essential that the relevant instruments are mentioned.

UGT (Portugal). Should also refer to the importance of social protection as a mechanism to promote more equitable labour markets and greater peace and social cohesion.

Qu. 3 *Should the Preamble recognize that social security is a social and economic necessity for development and progress, and is:*

(a) an important tool to reduce, alleviate and prevent poverty, social exclusion and social insecurity?

Governments

Total number of replies: 98.

Yes: 94. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho,

Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

No: 4. Honduras, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, United Kingdom.

Comments

Argentina, Paraguay. It is also an important tool to facilitate transition from the informal to formal economy and employment should be central to any extension initiative.

Australia. Social security is most effective when implemented with other supporting structures, e.g. primary education, skills development, employment and community capacity building.

Belize. It is also an important element of economic recovery since those most in need of an SPF spend their disposable income.

Benin. Social security contributes to promoting the economy and maintaining stability in enterprises and serves an important redistributive function.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. Should be supported by decisions and resolutions of an international nature and in universal declarations.

Brazil. Brazil's experience has shown the effectiveness of an SPF in reducing inequities and combating poverty.

Cameroon. Through the coverage of the various branches of social security.

Cuba. Should be recognized as a right within national context according to level of development.

Dominican Republic. Countries should focus their efforts in this area, according to their national circumstances.

Ecuador. It also guarantees access to health care and human intellectual development.

El Salvador. It is also needed to fight more complex social problems (unemployment, poverty, social insecurity) and reduce their impact through the creation of effective measures and reinforcement of relevant employment services and OSH programmes.

Germany. It gives a strong impetus to economic growth and affluence. Functioning social security systems contribute to reducing inequality, protecting people against risks and foster sustainable growth and economic stabilization, also in low- and middle-income countries.

Guatemala. Social security institutions are not only actors; they contribute.

Honduras. The State should reduce and prevent poverty, social exclusion and social insecurity.

Indonesia. The State has to make efforts to provide social security as an enabling safety net for social and economic development as a right of every individual citizen, in order to reduce or eliminate social protection differences.

Japan. Creates security in people's lives, stabilizes the economy and creates employment in social services, which is expected to increase in the future.

Kenya. No meaningful economic development or progress can be attained if the citizens cannot meet their basic needs.

Lebanon. It serves to protect societies from adverse economic shocks (e.g. through unemployment benefits). It is an instrument of intergenerational and intertemporal reallocation of income (pensions), and reducing social insecurity and exclusion (health care).

Lesotho. Achievement of these goals requires other complementary developmental and economic growth activities.

Luxembourg. Recall its function as an instrument to guarantee income.

Malaysia. Economic stability is the main tool to achieve these.

Mauritius. It contributes to social cohesion and better standards of living for the needy and the whole population.

Netherlands. An important condition is an activating social security system, giving people incentives to obtain and maintain decent work.

Nicaragua. The populations covered have better standards of living which impacts on the country's development.

Norway. "Discrimination" should be included.

Peru. It has an important impact on the well-being of the population, particularly on certain segments.

Philippines. It is also important for protecting and enhancing the right to human dignity.

Portugal. Social security is fundamental in establishing income security, preventing and reducing poverty and inequality, and promoting social inclusion and human dignity.

Romania. Social security systems are important tools to prevent, alleviate and reduce poverty.

Russian Federation, South Africa. Through social security, vocational rehabilitation can be linked to skill development for reintegration of injured workers.

Sri Lanka. This is implied by the Preamble.

Switzerland. Modification proposal: "an important tool to reduce, alleviate and prevent poverty and social exclusion".

Turkey. Employment and social security are of vital importance for fighting social exclusion and poverty.

United Kingdom. Development and progress take place in many different contexts; insert "long-term" before "development".

United States. In order to avoid duplication, replace "social and economic necessity for" by "policy instrument to achieve".

Uruguay. It also is an effective tool to progress towards social justice as an important factor of wealth redistribution.

Viet Nam. This is the overall goal of the SPF.

Zambia. Social security is increasingly recognized as a human right.

Employers

Total number of replies: 24.

Yes: 19. AiG (Australia), CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF

(Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), EFP (Pakistan), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CCSP, CIP, CTP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 2. BCCI (Belize), CNA (Brazil).

Other: 3. CNC, CNI (Brazil), SN (Sweden).

Comments

CNC, CNI (Brazil). As this is a responsibility of the government, it should not create any direct or indirect burdens on employers.

CNA (Brazil). The text does not prove any direct link between the SPF and the reduction of poverty and social exclusion.

ANDI (Colombia). A social security model that is sustainable and that provides access to essential services is fundamental for improving productivity and promoting transitions to the formal economy.

OEB (Cyprus), UPS (Switzerland), IOE. This has been the case during the crisis.

MEDEF (France). There is no social protection without economic development. Social security cannot be achieved at the expense of economic growth.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). The experience of developed countries demonstrates this.

VNO–NCW (Netherlands). Only if the “system” is activating.

CCL (Peru). Should highlight the importance of social security for the development and progress of nations.

CIP (Portugal). The main tool is the protection of persons in the labour market through active employment policies.

CTP (Portugal). Social protection systems must be adapted to the country’s economic situation.

SN (Sweden). Economic growth and productivity should be recognized as a requirement for offering people social protection.

Workers

Total number of replies: 92.

Yes: 91. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV (Netherlands), FNV (Netherlands), MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV, FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 0.

Other: 1. TUC (United Kingdom).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD

(Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT (Ecuador), CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), NTUF (Sri Lanka), TÜRK-İŞ (Turkey), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). Social security is an important tool to facilitate the transition from informal towards formal employment. All initiatives related to the extension of social security must be closely linked to employment policy.

CUT (Brazil). Promotes a virtuous circle of production and consumption, and access to basic public policies promoting social and human development such as health care; maternity protection; social protection to the elderly, children and persons with disabilities; as well as access to education and housing.

CITUB (Bulgaria). Should be recognized and strongly emphasized, especially in the current situation where social peace and social prosperity are jeopardized because of a lack of adequate social justice and an increase of poverty and inequality.

CSN (Canada). Should even affirm that this investment produces high returns and cost savings for society.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). Only as a social necessity because as an economic necessity would mean to give priority to financial sustainability over human rights.

CASC (Dominican Republic). The most important tools to fight and eradicate poverty are quality, efficient and non-discriminatory social security systems.

CSE (Ecuador). States should allocate earmarked resources in their budgets to support and guarantee access to the right to social security.

FTUC (Fiji). An important element in reducing poverty.

TUC (Ghana). Essential for the promotion of social inclusion, harmony and economic development.

JTUC–RENGO (Japan). Its primary role is to alleviate social insecurity and exclusion – therefore an important and effective tool for a stable society.

CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), UGT (Spain). A tool to facilitate the transition from informal to formal economy.

CS (Panama). Without social security poverty increases, therefore it is essential to put in place a universal system guaranteeing an SPF which contributes to human development.

UGT (Portugal). Mechanism to promote more equitable labour markets and greater peace and social cohesion.

UGT (Spain). It is also a productive element to reduce poverty and promote social cohesion, and should be linked to employment policies in order to dignify employment to make it a source of social rights.

TUC (United Kingdom). The fact that development takes place in many contexts does not reduce the importance of social security as a tool. Do not support the UK Government's proposal to insert "long-term", as this might encourage the perpetual postponement of addressing the need for adequate appropriate social security.

PIT–CNT (Uruguay). The eradication of these problems promotes lasting social peace.

Qu. 3 (b) *an investment in people that allows them to adjust to necessary structural changes in the economy and labour markets, and an effective automatic stabilizer in times of crisis and beyond?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 97.

Yes: 89. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy,

Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

No: 8. Cuba, Ecuador, Malaysia, Nicaragua, Qatar, Sri Lanka, United Kingdom, Viet Nam.

Comments

Argentina. It complements work through inclusion and income redistribution.

Australia. Medium- to long-term approaches, e.g. integrating social protection policies into macroeconomic and labour market policies, promote strong, sustainable and balanced growth.

Bangladesh. Budgetary allocations for disadvantaged groups contribute to maintenance of social stability and social cohesion in the face of economic uncertainties.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. Each State should strengthen social investments, dependent on its circumstances, in the areas of health care, education, employment and social cohesion.

Brazil. Especially in a context of financial globalization and deregulation.

Costa Rica. Investments in education, training in line with the labour market's needs and reconversion of workers are necessary to face the economic crisis.

Cuba. It is the State's responsibility.

Dominican Republic. Transfers targeted to replace income from employment are an effective tool, but must be transitory in nature and decrease progressively.

France. Provides also more autonomy for women, and limits the impact of humanitarian crises.

Guatemala. To the extent that formal employment is not undermined.

Honduras. Also a preventive investment for other contingencies.

Kenya. Also mitigates unemployment created by downsizing due to technological changes.

Republic of Korea, Lebanon, Nicaragua, Turkey. Unemployment benefits are particularly important.

Latvia. The considerations of 3(a) should prevail, as social security rights protect and guarantee income security.

Lesotho. Restores people's dignity and enables them to interact and engage freely with society.

Mexico. The term "automatic" should not be mentioned.

Malaysia. Structural changes in economy and labour markets should be addressed through a wider economic approach.

Netherlands. Contributes to labour market flexibility and participation, stimulating consumption and creating a level playing field among countries.

Portugal. Underline ways in which it contributes to faster recovery towards inclusive economic growth.

Russian Federation, South Africa. Retraining people with disabilities.

Switzerland. Replace, in French, “amortisseur” by “stabilisateur”.

United Kingdom. Substitute “assists” for “allows” since social security helps people to adjust but cannot guarantee this.

United States. In order to reflect more accurately the active role of social security recipients, replace “allows ... structural changes” by “presents them with the opportunity to adjust to changes”.

Uruguay. Social policies imposing a minimum floor of decent conditions for the reintegration of workers has cushioned the impact of the recent crisis in Latin America.

Employers

Total number of replies: 25.

Yes: 17. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), EFP (Pakistan), CCL (Peru), CCSP, CIP, CTP (Portugal), CIU (Uruguay), UPS (Switzerland), IOE.

No: 6. CNA, CNC, CNI, CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), CONEP (Panama).

Other: 2. NK (Japan), SN (Sweden).

Comments

ANDI (Colombia). Although in agreement with this statement, it is not a subject that should be treated in the Preamble.

MEDEF (France). More than an investment, it is a growth factor. Social protection must go hand in hand with economic development.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). Ideal as a tool to increase people’s life security, but its quality and scope will depend on resources.

NK (Japan). Promoting investment in people contributes to providing a stable foundation for sustainable growth over the medium and long term.

CONEP (Panama). It has very positive effects but it is not an effective “automatic” stabilizer.

CCL (Peru). Investment in human capital is essential to access and remain in employment and to enhance productivity.

CIP (Portugal). Social security should not be seen as an investment mechanism. Benefits should not foster dependency, thus discouraging return to the labour market.

CTP (Portugal). Preparing people to face the new challenges to better adapt to structural changes in the labour market through appropriate vocational training processes.

SN (Sweden). See question 3(a).

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 89. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR

(Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK-İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), PIT-CNT (Uruguay), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 3. BAK (Austria), TUC (United Kingdom), FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 1. CTRP (Panama).

Comments

BAK (Austria). Concerns about the objectifying formulation “investment in people”.

CITUB (Bulgaria). Social security tools are an investment, since they provide the minimum necessary conditions and possibilities for overcoming and preventing unfavourable situations.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). Investment in people is important so long as acquired rights as well as universal mandatory public services are guaranteed.

CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic). Comprehensive social security systems contribute to a just distribution of wealth and enhance resilience of the covered population with regard to cyclical crises.

CSE (Ecuador). Should be established legally and constitutionally, and should not be subject to political decisions.

TUC (Ghana). Enables people to adapt to challenges.

JTUC-RENGO (Japan). Maintains the quality of employment, and contributes to the development of human resources and the participation of people in the labour market.

CTM (Mexico). Offers a better quality of life to people.

CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands). Increases the productivity of the economy.

PWF (Pakistan). Employers should recognize that the expense on social security is in fact investment.

CS (Panama). Vocational education and training for vocational reinsertion of workers are necessary.

CGTP (Peru). Should also encourage the creation of a real unemployment insurance.

CATP (Peru). It is an obligation of the State to develop the dignity of human beings and to adopt adequate investment measures.

UGT (Portugal), UGT (Spain). An important instrument to reduce social conflict and social inequality, in addition resulting in higher economic growth.

SGB (Switzerland). The word “necessary” should be removed. The tendency towards precariousness of employment which endangers social security should be acknowledged.

FPU (Ukraine). Investments in human capital induce efficiency of technical progress and accelerate growth.

TUC (United Kingdom). Supports the UK Government’s proposal.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). An inviolable human right and not a commodity and thus cannot be conceptualized as an investment.

CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). A human capital investment that plays a critical role in times of crisis.

Qu. 4 *Should other considerations be included in the Preamble?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 88.

Yes: 47. Albania, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Serbia, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Zambia.

No: 40. Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Brazil, Burundi, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Egypt, Estonia, Israel, Italy, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Turkey, United States, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Other: 1. India.

Comments

Argentina. Define “SPF”. Link to decent work as the best social protection should be added and the priority of the State should be to put in place the necessary conditions for economic development which allow for the creation of jobs in the formal economy.

Australia. Clarify the scope and intent. In light of the 2011 recurrent discussion, recognize that social security is an important element of member States’ policies on employment participation, broader economic growth and social development and that initiatives related to the horizontal extension of social security must complement and be fully integrated with Members’ employment, development and macroeconomic policies.

Bangladesh. Include the need for progressive development of social security.

Belgium. Recall that formalization of the economy is an essential prerequisite for long-term growth and that efforts must be deployed to combat undeclared work, notably by applying Convention No. 81. Underline the importance of social dialogue in formulating and implementing social security policies. Refer to ICESCR (Art. 9).

Plurinational State of Bolivia. Measures to ensure sustainability of these programmes taking account of the economic forecasts of States.

Cambodia. Consider three approaches: protecting the poorest and most disadvantaged who cannot help themselves through the social services and support; preventing the impact of risks that could lead to negative coping strategies and further impoverishment through the expansion of basic social safety nets; promoting the poor to move out of poverty by building human capital and expanding opportunities.

Cameroon. The tripartite Yaoundé Declaration on the SPF and the Declaration on the Ouagadougou Plan of Action.

Canada. Importance of gender equity in social security.

Costa Rica. Protection as part of health-care services.

Denmark. Social security designed according to national circumstances and economic development.

Dominican Republic. Inclusion of informal economy workers. Particular consideration to the situation of working women and priority to providing access to social benefits and transfers, given the care responsibilities of female heads of family. The SPF, social security and access to basic goods and services should be rights-based to strengthen permanency and compliance.

Ecuador. Importance of migration and need for countries to recognize occupational history and foreigners’ rights.

El Salvador. Comprehensive definition of social security highlighting the obligation of States to work, with the competent institutions towards extension of coverage.

France. Convention No. 183 and other general instruments.

Germany. ICESCR.

Guatemala. Each country or social context has its own characteristics; what works in one does not necessarily function elsewhere.

Honduras. Conventions Nos 121, 128, 130, 168, 183.

India. Highlight the growing significance of social security initiatives at present when countries are fighting the adverse impact of globalization, financial crisis, etc.

Indonesia. ICESCR, Conventions Nos 100 and 111.

Jamaica. ICESCR, World Summit on Social Development.

Kenya. Social security is a basic human right.

Lesotho. Health-related issues, focusing on accessibility by all.

Luxembourg. Better presentation of “social protection”, “social security” and “social assistance”.

Namibia. Yaoundé Declaration on the SPF.

Netherlands. Employment is a prerequisite for social protection, thus the activating role of social security. First goal of social security is to support persons in finding a job. Only if that is not possible must social security provide (basic) income. Benefits must be paid to persons who really need them. Good enforcement is important.

Norway. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Paraguay. Social security is indispensable for equal opportunity, particularly gender equality. Income security is essential for realizing individual freedom, rights and personal choices. Grounded in a rights-based approach based on legal entitlements, the SPF is an integral part of wider horizontal and vertical extension strategies.

Portugal. Reinforcement of solidarity between generations.

Romania. Social security as an important element of connection between human capital and the labour market, taking into consideration its essential role in alleviating inactivity and social exclusion.

Russian Federation. Positive experience of developing countries as additional confirmation that social security can be expanded and constitutes an integral part of progress. Some gaps however remain in the scope of social security systems. New Recommendation as a complement to Convention No. 102 and Recommendations Nos 67 and 69.

Senegal. Need to ensure a just and fair globalization.

Serbia. Significance of social security for overall economic advancement of society/State.

Sweden. Description of SPF concept. Sustainable development and the SPF promote equality in society and contribute to cohesion and security. Employment is a condition for social protection, and member States should prioritize the creation of formal employment. Social protection systems should avoid benefit dependency traps and complement an active labour market policy. Each country must develop its system based on its own conditions.

Switzerland. Reference to the 2011 recurrent discussion, Global Jobs Pact, UN SPF Initiative.

United Kingdom. Add “3(c) a core element within any medium-term national development strategy for economic and social progress”. And “4. Recognizing that sustainable employment is the best route out of poverty and that decent work can help reduce the burden on resources available for the provision of existing social security protections as well as building up the capacity, through contributory schemes, for member States to deal with future crises.”

Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. A clear and simple justification on the need for a new Recommendation.

Zambia. Political will and commitment.

Employers

Total number of replies: 24.

Yes: 15. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNA (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway), EFP (Pakistan), CIP, CTP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 7. CNC, CNI, CNS (Brazil), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru).

Other: 2. OEB (Cyprus), SN (Sweden).

Comments

AiG (Australia). Important economic objectives should be included, such as the maintenance of high levels of employment and high levels of participation in the workforce.

BCCI (Belize). Governments need to strike a balance between social protection and economic empowerment.

CNA (Brazil). Should consider the economic and social characteristics of member States and respect their sovereignty. SPF's are the responsibility of States.

ANDI (Colombia). Social security should be appropriately designed and sustainable in order to promote productivity, employability and economic development.

OEB (Cyprus), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway), CIP (Portugal), CIU (Uruguay), IOE. Employment remains the best social protection. The priority for States is primarily to put in place the conditions necessary to create jobs in the formal economy.

SPD (Czech Republic). See question 2. The Preamble should include: "employment is the best form of social protection".

KEF (Republic of Korea). Social protection should be systematically structured, so that it can promote employment creation.

NEF (Namibia). Should include a reference to the development of strategies to extend the social security platform to the informal economy.

EFP (Pakistan), UPS (Switzerland). Should recognize that employment is the best social protection.

CTP (Portugal). Should consider the new political, social and economic context of the global economy, the new paradigms of the labour market, competition, and the role that social protection systems could have in mitigating the effects of crisis on families and enterprises.

SN (Sweden). Employment is the basis for creating social protection. Countries should give priority to creating the conditions necessary for work in the formal economy. Importance of the private sector in supplying services associated with social protection.

Workers

Total number of replies: 87.

Yes: 78. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CITUB, CUT, UGT (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CTM (Mexico), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP

(Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP-IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK-İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 6. BAK (Austria), COTU–K (Kenya), CROC (Mexico), CSDR (Romania), NTUC (Singapore), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 3. CSN (Canada), TUC (Ghana), TUC (United Kingdom).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), ACTU (Australia), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), NZCTU (New Zealand), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), NTUF (Sri Lanka), TÜRK-İŞ (Turkey), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). Social security is indispensable for equal opportunity, particularly gender equality. Income security is essential for realizing individual freedom, rights and personal choices. Grounded in a rights-based approach based on legal entitlements; the SPF is an integral part of wider horizontal and vertical extension strategies.

CGT (Argentina). Social security ensures democratic participation and equality of opportunities in society, and income security is a basis for personal liberties and personal options. The SPF is an integral component of the wider horizontal and vertical social security extension strategy based on rights.

CTA (Argentina), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), LO (Norway). Social security is indispensable for equal opportunity in society, in particular gender equality.

ACTU (Australia). Social security is an important tool to facilitate the transition from informal employment towards formal employment; therefore the extension of social security must be closely linked to employment policy.

NCTUB (Bahamas). Social security should be provided on a non-discriminatory basis.

BWU (Barbados). Social security provides for equal opportunity in society, especially gender equality. The SPF must be built in the context of a rights-based approach to social security based on legal entitlements.

NTUCB (Belize). To assist in alleviating pressures of a job crisis.

CUT (Brazil). As in Convention No. 102, a broad concept of social security should be used, aiming at a universal and solidarity system linking different areas of public policies and strategies, in particular health care, social assistance, employment and social security.

CITUB (Bulgaria). Social security is in the interests of the entire society, including business, because of its role in ensuring social and political stability and creating a more competitive labour market as well as enhancing labour productivity.

CSN (Canada). Social security is a human right and a responsibility of the State, and contributes to social cohesion and democracy. Gender equality in social security should also be affirmed.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). Universal principles of respect for social justice, human dignity.

ČMKOS (Czech Republic). Need to maintain public systems of social protection based on solidarity and redistribution.

TUC (Ghana). Enabling individuals to fully exercise their human rights.

HKCTU (Hong Kong, China). Indispensable role of social security for equal opportunity, ethnic and gender equality in society, and the realization of individual freedoms and rights and genuine personal choices. The SPF must be built in the context of a rights-based approach founded on legal entitlements.

JTUC–RENGO (Japan). Social security also contributes to creating jobs: employment in the social service sector could grow in the future. Also, its function is to redistribute income based on social solidarity, particularly through social insurance, which should be mentioned.

FKTU (Republic of Korea). Governments need to take proactive policy measures.

CTM (Mexico). Social security provides not only for health-care services but also for adequate and decent social development including housing, security, education, etc.

CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), PIT–CNT (Uruguay). Social security is a right of people and an obligation of States; it contributes to equal opportunity in society, in particular to gender equality. The SPF should be an integral element of wider strategies of horizontal and vertical extension of social security.

CS (Panama). Effects of climate change on health causing new illnesses.

CATP (Peru). Relationship between quality employment (decent work), sustainable development and levels of social security.

CGTP (Peru). Highlight the importance of minimum levels of social protection and the role of the State.

CGTP–IN (Portugal). Emphasize importance of expanding social security systems especially in crisis situations in order to protect citizens and strengthen social cohesion.

UGT (Portugal). Refer to all relevant ILO instruments, emphasizing the role of social security as a human right and as a tool for a more sustainable economic and social development.

UGT (Spain). Social security guarantees gender equality and equal opportunities in society, reduces economic and social inequalities in the labour market, strengthens individual rights and freedoms, citizens' rights and democratic values.

JSS (Sri Lanka). Right to reliable information on the implementation of social security measures.

LO, TCO, SACO (Sweden). Gender equality aspects must be considered and incorporated.

SGB (Switzerland). Social security is indispensable for equal opportunity, particularly gender equality, realizing individual freedom, rights and personal choices. Social security benefits that guarantee such security are also rights to which beneficiaries are entitled.

FPU (Ukraine). Social assistance in cash and in kind should be targeted and addressed solely to those who really need it, and benefits should not be lower than national social guarantees.

TUC (United Kingdom). Insert the word “usually” before “the best route out of poverty” in the UK Government’s proposal. There are families for whom employment is unlikely ever to be a route out of poverty.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Society must allocate all the necessary resources to provide social security to its citizens.

Objective

Qu. 5 *Should the Recommendation provide guidance to Members, with a view to realizing the human right to social security, on:*

(a) building a social protection floor within a wider social security system tailored to national circumstances and levels of development?

Governments

Total number of replies: 97.

Yes: 94. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan,

Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

No: 2. Hungary, United Kingdom.

Other: 1. India.

Comments

Argentina. If the SPF is intended to resolve poverty, it should be universal and without conditionalities.

Australia. Should articulate strong principles regarding extending horizontal coverage of social security while also containing specific guidance to direct actions at the national level.

Bangladesh. Should consider national circumstances, e.g. level of income distribution, social infrastructure, national fiscal space.

Belgium. Insert guidelines or orientations to help Members implementing this (progressive) floor taking account of their social context.

Belize. Social mechanisms vary from country to country.

Benin. The establishment of an SPF should integrate national social security, health and employment strategies.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. Social security as a right should be linked to extended coverage with solidarity and equity. SPF should allow for the development of control, monitoring and evaluation measures.

Cambodia. Depends on national capacities in scaling up existing programmes to cover gaps.

Costa Rica. Include that the SPF should go beyond just providing access to health-care services, education, housing, water and sanitation. Provide outline and definitions of SPF components and content.

Dominican Republic. Guidance needed on expenditure and social budgeting to assess the required financing and set goals to measure extension and desired social and economic impact.

El Salvador. As a human right, social security should be extended to the most unprotected and workers with less formal employment.

Germany. This provides sufficient flexibility and ensures gradual progression towards protection levels of ILO standards, while avoiding reduction in existing protection levels. Also provides guidance on vertical extension, which could include private and civil society actors.

Guatemala. As long as financing is clear. Not credible to assume that the State will finance.

Hungary. Supports efforts to increase social security level and the formation of social security systems tailored to national circumstances, needs and priorities. The SPF can be an important element of the establishment and the development of a State's social security system. As it refers to direct obligations for Members, guidance on their willingness or intent for realizing such goals would be more appropriate.

India. Each country should determine a national strategy and have its own SPF depending on its socio-economic conditions and its priorities based on fiscal space available, linked with employment and other social policies. Proper thrust should be on schemes for informal workers.

Kenya. Validation of the need for an SPF by realizing or highlighting it as a human right within national context.

Lebanon. Research suggests the affordability of social security at practically all levels of economic development. The commitment to strengthening and increasing coverage is required.

Lesotho. Social protection should follow a multi-pillar approach ensuring coverage for all against life-cycle shocks. Set minimum requirements depending on levels of development.

Luxembourg. Be precise and clear and not limited to general considerations.

Malaysia. The ILO should develop a comprehensive guide based on country experiences and adapted to national circumstances.

Mauritius. Will enable countries to define a set of essential basic social security guarantees, through a national SPF, within a system adapted to the national context.

Mexico. A wider SPF should exist depending on national socio-economic conditions and development potential, and be rights-based and compatible with legislative and institutional frameworks.

Netherlands. Should not overlap with the “good practices guide” and other instruments proposed in the plan of action (GB.312/POL/2, November 2011) and should refer to those practical instruments.

Paraguay. Also stress that eradicating poverty is a key objective of the floor.

Peru. Defining an SPF as a base which can be adapted to the particular characteristics of each country which then can progressively lead towards universal social security coverage, allows the development of the process.

Portugal. Provide generic and programmatic guidance.

Senegal, Sri Lanka, Zambia. SPF has to be based on national circumstances.

South Africa. Should set affordable standards according to the level of development.

Turkey. Tailoring national social security systems towards the needs of disadvantaged groups of society contributes to the prioritization of human rights.

United Kingdom. More appropriate to emphasize establishing or building on existing schemes first and then progressively implementing these into a wider social security system. Greater emphasis on country-led processes. Change to: “building social protection floors and systems through country-led processes with a view to establishing national social security systems tailored to national circumstances”.

United States. The chapeau’s description inappropriately frames the document as a human rights instrument purporting to specify content of that human right. Suggest the following options: (1) deleting the reference to the human right; (2) moving that reference to preambular language; or (3) replacing “with a view to realizing” by “in consideration of”. References to social security as a human right should acknowledge their source, Art. 22 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The plural form of social protection floors should be used throughout the Recommendation.

Uruguay. Social security should be a priority of every society, independently of its level of development, but adapted to the economic possibilities of each country.

Employers

Total number of replies: 25.

Yes: 16. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNA, CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), EFP (Pakistan), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CCSP, CTP (Portugal), CIU (Uruguay).

No: 4. CNC, CNI (Brazil), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), CIP (Portugal).

Other: 5. OEB (Cyprus), NHO (Norway), SN (Sweden), UPS (Switzerland), IOE.

Comments

AiG (Australia). The goal of achieving a “wider social security system” is only relevant to nations which do not already have a comprehensive social security system.

ANDI (Colombia). Member States can adopt appropriate measures, based on national circumstances, in order to progressively obtain the levels of necessary social security protection.

OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay). There is no globally applicable unique model. The SPF must adapt to national circumstances.

NHO (Norway), CIP (Portugal), IOE. There is no single model and the SPF should be adapted to national circumstances. Nevertheless, certain components of the floor depend more on social assistance than on social security and are not managed in the same way. Here there is a conflict between the concepts of “a floor” as defined by the ILO in June 2011, and “floors” which would be a set of measures, some linked to social security, some to social assistance.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). Although there is no single model, the ILO can provide guidance and benchmarks which depend on the national situation.

VNO–NCW (Netherlands). The priority is the SPF; the “wider social security system” should depend on national level of development.

CONEP (Panama). Reference should be made to countries’ economic capacity when building a floor.

CCL (Peru). Basic social protection should focus especially on the workers in micro-enterprises.

CTP (Portugal). Each country should have the “freedom” to develop the most appropriate measures. Social protection measures have high costs in public accounts. A balanced and fair social protection platform is needed to avoid social regression.

SN (Sweden). Each country must be able to develop its own solutions based on its own conditions, within the framework of what is realistic and appropriate. National regulations should also promote employment and the return to work.

IOE. The second component of the floor does not fall within the framework of social security but that of health.

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 89. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 2. CUT (Brazil), FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 2. CSN (Canada), TUC (United Kingdom).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), ACTU (Australia), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), NTUF (Sri Lanka), TÜRK-İŞ (Turkey), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). In addition, it is essential to stress that within this context, a key objective of the floor is the eradication of poverty.

CGT (Argentina). If the SPF's objective is to reduce poverty, then it should be universal with no conditionalities attached.

FGTB (Belgium). The SPF should secure a decent standard of living, access to quality social services and adequate income.

CUT (Brazil). The concept of the SPF collides with the notion of social security in Convention No. 102, in the sense that it may establish a new reference for social security ("basic universalism") understood as the combination of the privatization of public services with the provision of minimum service packages to the poor. The reference for social security should be Convention No. 102 and the Decent Work Agenda.

CITUB (Bulgaria). Should direct member States towards integrated policies to guarantee the respective social security minimum, while taking into account the development and the quality of social security.

CSN (Canada). The SPF should ensure a healthy and decent life, depending on national circumstances.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). The SPF must be universal, and not dependent on the level of development of the country.

CTRN (Costa Rica). ILO member States should recognize social security as a fundamental human right and make it universal for all workers.

UGTD (Djibouti). Social protection promotes social progress and reduces social inequalities.

CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic). The reduction of poverty is one of the MDGs. The SPF should not limit the development that some countries have achieved so far, or affect acquired rights.

TUC (Ghana). Guidelines are important to ensure the global provision of basic levels of social protection. Member countries should be encouraged to build on the basic level.

CGTM (Mauritania). The SPF reduces inequalities.

CS (Panama). The SPF should be adopted based on the understanding that it should not be a ceiling with the excuse that it depends on the economic situation of the country.

CATP, CGTP (Peru). Bearing in mind that the SPF should be universal, and with the objective of promoting higher and better levels of social security in line with Convention No. 102 and higher level standards.

CGTP–IN (Portugal). The SPF should not provide an excuse to reduce existing rights.

UGT (Portugal). While all member States should aim for an SPF, its implementation should aim at gradually progressing towards universal coverage.

UGT (Spain). Consider the fundamental principles of the ILO, including responsibility of the State, social solidarity, etc. in pursuing the elimination of poverty and the guarantee of decent work.

TUC (United Kingdom). To maintain broad support for the SPF it is important that there is no suggestion that it is an alternative to strengthening social security.

PIT–CNT (Uruguay). Should highlight the nature of the SPF as a minimum and as a tool which should be combined with productive employment policies within the framework of decent work.

CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Guidance is needed as national circumstances and levels of development vary.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). It is exclusive, interventionist and does not provide guarantees to developing countries.

Qu. 5 (b) *implementing their social protection floor within a social security extension strategy that progressively ensures higher levels of social security to as many people as possible, and is coherent with the Member's social, economic and employment policies?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 96.

Yes: 87. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

No: 6. Estonia, Hungary, Nicaragua, Qatar, Slovenia, United Kingdom.

Other: 3. Canada, India, United States.

Comments

Australia. Reference to “progressively higher levels of social security” does not take into account levels that may already be sufficiently high in some countries. Strategies should also balance the interests of financiers and beneficiaries, by providing for qualifying conditions or mutual obligations. While extension strategies should include both dimensions, the main focus should be on the horizontal extension of coverage since ILO instruments dealing with specific branches of social security already exist.

Belize. “is coherent ... policies” should be replaced by “and is tailored to national economic circumstances and level of development”.

Benin. This will facilitate the effective and efficient implementation of the SPF.

Cameroon. Take into account informal economy workers’ coverage in this strategy.

Canada. Parameters of such strategy should be determined by member States. A strategy should ensure adequate levels of social security to as many people as possible.

Costa Rica. Strategies on how to improve both quality and coverage of social protection are needed. An international SPF would serve as a reference for all countries and oblige member States to comply with it and go beyond.

Cyprus. As long as each Member retains the right to develop its own social policy strategy.

Denmark. After “higher level of social security” insert: “at least in line with the coverage and benefit requirements of Convention No. 102”.

Dominican Republic. It should be directed towards initially establishing a basic package of goods and services, benefits and transfers in a financially sustainable manner (horizontal dimension). The vertical dimension should then be established progressively, based on the labour market, employment indicators, and budgetary and fiscal capacities of the State.

Estonia. A special strategy is not ultimately necessary; it can be part of a general State development strategy.

Germany, Netherlands, Portugal. See question 5(a).

Guatemala. Public–private cooperation initiatives for the creation of employment should be promoted.

Hungary. See question 5(a). In addition, extension can be realized by a combination of various instruments, not only in the framework of a social security extension strategy.

India. SPF implementation and extension should be left to countries, depending on resources and sustainability. Linkages between trade and labour standards (including social security standards) should be removed.

Indonesia. Improvement to higher levels of social security must be implemented gradually according to the ability of each country.

Japan. Social security systems should be combined with employment policies, enabling recipients to return to the labour market as soon as possible.

Kenya. Implementing the SPF will extend coverage regardless of age and employment status.

Latvia. Social security systems should be tailored to national circumstances and levels of development. This system should cover as many people as possible and not ensure the highest possible level in general to all persons, but the level which substitutes the income level of the person concerned.

Lesotho. Higher levels of protection can be achieved through progressive realization of the rights.

Mauritius. Contributes towards progressively closing coverage gaps and moving to more mature systems.

Malaysia. Consider a time frame to design and enforce the policies at national level.

Norway. See general observations.

Panama. The SPF should be built progressively towards optimal levels of social security in relation with the particular situation of each country.

Paraguay. Indicate that “higher levels of social security” should at least meet the levels of protection of Convention No. 102.

Peru. Monitoring systems with clear and measurable indicators are needed to support a workplan that will have medium- and long-term impact and guarantee effective extension to the highest possible number of people.

Romania. Each Member should be able to decide on how to establish, define and implement the SPF; implementation can also be achieved through other documents elaborated nationally.

Russian Federation. Each State should define the most feasible objectives to implement its social security system. While minimum standards should be developed taking account of national specific circumstances, it should be indicated that States need to comply with their national minimum social protection standards.

Serbia. Social security should be a priority for every State, depending upon its economic possibilities.

South Africa. Should provide guidance on the portability of workers’ compensation benefits.

Turkey. Social security systems should be sustainable.

United Kingdom. Problematic for States with well-developed systems, where progressively ensuring higher levels of social security is not always appropriate, leading to negative incentives and benefit dependency. Replace by: “implementing their social protection floor within a sustainable social security extension strategy that progressively ensures adequate levels of social security to as many people as possible, consistent with the Member’s social, economic and employment policies”.

United States. Replace by “implementing their social protection floors within social security extension strategies that strive to progressively extend social security protections, and are consistent with Members’ social, economic and employment policies”.

Uruguay. Members should make more efforts to extend coverage with sufficient benefits, by prioritizing social programmes in national budgets.

Employers

Total number of replies: 27.

Yes: 16. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNA, CNS (Brazil), OEB (Cyprus), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CCSP (Portugal), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 6. CNC, CNI (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), SPD (Czech Republic), CIP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland).

Other: 5. UCCAEP (Costa Rica), NK (Japan), EFP (Pakistan), CTP (Portugal), SN (Sweden).

Comments

AiG (Australia). The goal of progressively achieving “higher levels of social security to as many people as possible” is only relevant to nations which do not already have a comprehensive social security system.

ANDI (Colombia). Should take into account existing economic risks and uncertainties.

UCCAEP (Costa Rica). It is important, but should take into account the national level of development, and should not force countries to take actions which go beyond their means.

OEB (Cyprus), NHO (Norway), CIP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE. To the extent of a country’s financial capabilities and priorities decided in a framework of dialogue with the social partners.

SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France). Adaptation to national circumstances indispensable.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). Comprehensive studies should be made with a view to enhancing policy coordination and ensuring financing.

NK (Japan). It is necessary to ensure a consistent fiscal policy (sound fiscal situation, fiscal management) in addition to social, economic and employment policies.

VNO–NCW (Netherlands). To the extent of national financial capacities.

EFP (Pakistan). The Recommendation should remain within the social security framework and should not reach beyond.

CCL (Peru). It is essential to ensure human and material resources for its progressive implementation.

CIP (Portugal). Implementation is under the competence of national governments, in partnership with social partners.

CTP (Portugal). Change of the current paradigm is mandatory. Specific levels of protection and progressive extension should be a fair and balanced solution and provide residual protection to the poorest.

SN (Sweden). See question 5(a).

IOE. This Recommendation could bring social assistance under the umbrella of social security, which could cause problems at government policy level.

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 87. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FK TU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 3. CUT (Brazil), FPU (Ukraine), FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 3. CSN (Canada), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), TUC (United Kingdom).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), NTUF (Sri Lanka), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). These “higher levels of social security” should at least meet the levels of protection provided for in Convention No. 102.

CUT (Brazil). Referring to Convention No. 102, there should be efforts and investments to reduce the informal labour market, increasing social security through social inclusion by expanding decent work, and combining productive social inclusion with social assistance policies for those groups that may not have access to work.

CITUB (Bulgaria). Social and economic employment policies should be elaborated in such a way as to guarantee the stable, gradual improvement of the quality of social security.

CSN (Canada). Progressively, but as quickly as possible and without possibility of retracting from established levels.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). The progressive extension as a strategy is important to reach not only higher levels but most complete coverage, independent of economic reasons but with real public employment and social policies.

ČMKOS (Czech Republic). This is extremely urgent in view of current neo-liberal policies implemented in response to the crisis that deprive large groups of people of social security.

CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic). The Recommendation should indicate that “higher levels of social security” should at least meet the levels of protection provided for in Convention No. 102, and allow for systematic progression to higher levels.

TUC (Ghana). Member countries’ social, economic and employment policies should integrate social protection measures beyond the basic levels.

JTUC–RENGO (Japan). Coherence with social, economic, and employment policies is important. Coordination with active labour market policies can accelerate society’s virtuous cycle.

CS (Panama). Development should be comprehensive.

CATP (Peru). See question 5(a).

CGTP (Peru). Should consider steps to extend social security coverage to the largest number of workers.

UGT (Portugal). While it is necessary to aim for an SPF in all member States, its implementation should aim at gradually extending protection to achieve universal coverage.

SGB (Switzerland). The goal should be social security for all, not “as many people as possible”.

FPU (Ukraine). Standards of social protection (or social assistance) should be based on socially guaranteed levels only for the most vulnerable, unprotected groups of the society.

TUC (United Kingdom). Disagrees with the UK Government’s proposal. Any Member can set “social, economic and employment policies” that effectively block the extension of social security coverage. Hardly any countries, including the United Kingdom, have social security levels that lead to “negative incentives and benefit dependency”.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). It should not be gradual but guarantee equal social security for all and devote all necessary resources for this purpose.

National social protection floor

Qu. 6 *Should the Recommendation provide that Members should establish and implement as rapidly as possible their social protection floor containing basic social security guarantees that ensure that over the life cycle all in need can afford and have access to essential health care and have income security at least at a nationally defined minimum level?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 95.

Yes: 83. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, South Africa, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia.

No: 10. Benin, China, Cyprus, Hungary, Nicaragua, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Tajikistan, United Kingdom, Zimbabwe.

Other: 2. Guatemala, India.

Comments

Argentina. Delete “afford and”.

Australia. SPFs should be periodically reviewed (noting that certain ILO Conventions include a provision such as: “the Member shall formulate, carry out and periodically review a coherent policy on”).

Bangladesh. Basic social security can ensure security in all other fields of life.

Benin. States implement their SPFs progressively.

Belgium. Recall role of social partners in establishing and implementing national SPFs.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. SPF implementation guarantees compliance with economic, social and cultural rights, indispensable for all.

China. Too ambitious requirement for many States, particularly developing countries, for a long time.

Costa Rica. SPF should be implemented urgently through concrete steps. National commitment is needed.

Cyprus. Income security should be a combination of social security and social assistance taking into consideration the socio-economic realities of each Member.

Czech Republic. Minimum income security should be conditional on individuals' efforts towards improving their position. Access to essential health care can be ensured through subsidized health insurance of children, pensioners, mothers on maternity leave and the unemployed.

Denmark. Should not provide that a nationally defined minimum income level should necessarily be determined if there is agreement that the guarantees secure a sufficient level of welfare. A minimum income level also needs to take into account services individuals are entitled to.

Dominican Republic. Necessary to identify the available fiscal space to finance the initiative, and determine how to implement it, considering sustainability, the State budget and the population's needs.

El Salvador. SPF implementation depends on national economic capacity and social conditions.

France. Minimum income guarantee covering, at a basic level, all social security contingencies appears a high objective to be established and implemented "as soon as possible"; priority could be given to protection in case of incapacity to work (employment injury, invalidity, handicap, old age).

Germany. Need for progressive realization in line with financial and administrative capacities, especially in low-income countries. National minima, fixed by legislation, could allow group-specific differentiation of benefit levels depending on the specific needs of those groups.

Guatemala. Depends on various factors. Need to define possible sources of financing in countries based on international experiences.

Hungary. As this is a matter of national competence, reference to the Member's willingness or intent to realize such goals would be more appropriate.

India. Establishing and implementing a SPF for all should be required, but without time frame. Developing countries face challenges of reaching out to vast populations with limited resources and infrastructure. States should decide when and how to ensure uniform coverage at a nationally defined minimum level.

Indonesia. Prefer "gradually" to "rapidly as possible".

Kenya. Important considering the recent decline in employment income and growth of the informal sector.

Latvia. Clarify "nationally defined minimum level".

Lebanon. Essential health care through universal health-care coverage, unemployment benefits, proportional to the minimum wage, and pensions.

Lesotho. Such minimum guarantees should cover all categories of vulnerable people, young, unemployed and the elderly, including the disabled.

Malaysia. This largely depends on the economic well-being of the country.

Mauritius. A healthy population, and therefore a healthy workforce, will translate into higher productivity.

Mexico. Replace “should” by “should seek to”, and delete “can afford and”. Explain “income security at least at a nationally defined minimum level”. According to their possibilities, States should implement an SPF as soon as possible, to provide protection to their population and better respond to crises.

Netherlands. Implementation of the two-dimensional extension strategy should become a flexible, step-by-step approach, in accordance with the national level of socio-economic development.

Nicaragua. Implementation of this pillar is of great importance for the population, but national resources to finance benefits and social assistance to be provided are needed.

Norway. See general observations.

Panama. Recommended adoption of short-term measures to implement the SPF as a basic guarantee of coverage that a country should offer to its citizens.

Paraguay. Nationally defined minimum levels should be set above the poverty line. Ensuring income security above poverty lines should be a key objective of horizontal extension.

Peru. While the SPF with basic guarantees must be implemented, achieving income security equivalent to a nationally defined minimum would be difficult in the short term for countries with high poverty levels; therefore a progressive and sustainable approach should be pursued.

Portugal. In such a way that member States’ autonomy in defining the respective social protection system model is respected.

Romania. Basic social security guarantees are very important during people’s life cycles, particularly in terms of a nationally set minimum income.

Russian Federation. Participating States must develop their minimum social protection standards as soon as possible and observe them, as absence of such standards, or failure to enforce them, limits migrant workers’ rights to social protection.

Saudi Arabia. Each country should define its needs and priorities; “should” may not be the right term.

Sri Lanka. Implementation depends on available fiscal space.

Tajikistan. Different political (civil confrontation) and economic (global crisis) events in States may make implementation difficult.

Turkey. According to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, everyone has the right to social security. It is part of States’ social responsibility to provide protection for those having no social security against social risks.

United Kingdom. Urgent need in many countries to establish SPFs but such systems must be implemented cautiously. Modify as follows: “the Recommendation provide that Members should as a matter of priority establish a strategy of medium-term objectives for a national social protection floor or systems; and actively seek to achieve these standards in a timely manner, consistent with available resources and the requirements for sound policy design and testing”.

United States. Replace “floor” by “floors”. Replace “guarantees that ensure” by “benefits that seek to ensure”. Add at the end: “in accordance with eligibility criteria and consistent with the Members’ social, economic and employment policies”.

Uruguay. Taking into account the financial possibilities of each country and the gradual application of social policies.

Viet Nam. This is the responsibility of States.

Zambia. For the purpose of human dignity.

Employers

Total number of replies: 24.

Yes: 15. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNA, CNC, CNI, CNS (Brazil), SPD (Czech Republic), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CCSP, CTP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay).

No: 4. ANDI (Colombia), MEDEF (France), KEF (Republic of Korea), CIP (Portugal).

Other: 5. OEB (Cyprus), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), NHO (Norway), EFP (Pakistan), IOE.

Comments

CNC, CNI (Brazil). See question 3(a).

ANDI (Colombia). The SPF should stipulate basic social security guarantees according to national context and time frame, so that States can reach their own goals.

OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), NHO (Norway), EFP (Pakistan), CIP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE. Implementation should be progressive and include consultation with social partners.

KEF (Republic of Korea). SPF should be established and implemented considering national circumstances.

EFP (Pakistan). Due consideration should be given to the country’s specific social, economic and cultural context. It should remain within the framework of social security.

CCL (Peru). Implementation should be progressive, according to the national reality.

CTP (Portugal). See question 4.

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 90. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FK TU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO

(Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK-İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), PIT-CNT (Uruguay), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 1. FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 2. CSN (Canada), TUC (United Kingdom).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS-Cartel ALFA (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), NTUF (Sri Lanka), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK-İŞ (Turkey), PIT-CNT (Uruguay), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). Nationally defined minimum levels should be set above the poverty line. Ensuring income security above poverty lines should be a key objective of horizontal extension.

BAK (Austria). Should be flexible enough to account for national circumstances.

NTUCB (Belize). Health care is a function of the State and should be paid from taxes.

CUT (Brazil). Aiming at achieving higher levels of social protection, a strategic goal is full, universal, public and free access to health-care services at all levels of complexity consistent with the national economic situation.

CSN (Canada). Should ensure a decent and healthy life.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). This should be urgently implemented, as it is an essential obligation for States whether or not they have ratified the Convention.

CTRN (Costa Rica). It is urgent for workers to be able to have access to a minimum level because most countries have not ratified Convention No. 102.

ČMKOS (Czech Republic). Particular attention should be given to the term “those in need”, which is now interpreted as “poor”.

CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic). The sustainability and financial viability of the system put in place must be guaranteed and protected by the country.

FTUC (Fiji), PIT-CNT (Uruguay). Government policy should guarantee the right to a national SPF.

TUC (Ghana). This will avoid social exclusion and ensure that all are able to achieve a certain acceptable minimum standard of living.

MCTU (Malawi). The formulation of such national SPF should involve workers’ representatives.

CTM (Mexico). Social security is a right which should be provided for in the fundamental rights.

CROC (Mexico). The SPF should not replace existing social security institutions.

CS (Panama). The minimum level defined in each country should be equivalent to, or higher than, the level recommended by the ILO, depending on the wealth of the country.

CGTP (Peru). Should set a time frame for the design and the implementation of the plan of action.

CGTP-IN (Portugal). Without undermining existing protection levels.

NTUC (Singapore). All in need should have access to and be able to afford essential health care. A social support system needs to strike a balance between adequate social protection and fostering a sense of individual resilience and personal responsibility.

UGT (Spain). Health care should be affordable, especially for people with lower incomes, and primarily for children, the elderly and in case of maternity; and free at least in cases of accidents at work and occupational diseases.

JSS (Sri Lanka). An independent body should monitor implementation.

TUC (United Kingdom). The UK Government answer offers a ready-made excuse for any government that is looking for excuses; there are enough provisions in the proposed amendment to allow for endless delays.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Should guarantee free and equal public health care to all.

Qu. 7 *Should the Recommendation provide that each Member should provide at least the following basic social security guarantees:*

(a) *all persons ordinarily resident in the country have the necessary financial protection to access a nationally defined set of essential health-care services, including maternal health care?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 96.

Yes: 79. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Serbia, South Africa, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

No: 12. Bahrain, Benin, Botswana, Cameroon, Hungary, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Mexico, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, United Kingdom, Viet Nam.

Other: 5. China, Guatemala, India, Slovenia, United States.

Comments

Australia. In some countries, access restrictions may apply to newly arrived residents. Clarify “ordinarily resident” to enable flexibility for Members.

Austria. Should apply to legal residents.

Belgium, Finland, Switzerland. Clarify “ordinarily resident”.

Belize. Clarify “financial protection” which is too wide in scope. Replace “financial protection to access” by “access to”.

Benin. Not all ordinary residents can have such financial protection.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. States’ scope of action in social security should be extended in line with political, economic and legal circumstances.

Botswana, Malaysia. Should be defined by member States.

China. Refers to the need to distinguish between citizens and migrants. The clause is acceptable if the scope of the prescribed basic social security guarantee is limited to citizens.

Denmark. Specify “ordinarily resident in the country”. “Legally” is preferable to “ordinary”.

Dominican Republic. Each country should ensure the consistency of its legal framework to guarantee these benefits.

El Salvador. Implementation will depend on national economic capacity and social conditions.

Gambia. Difficult to implement without the government’s financial intervention where the majority of the population lives below the poverty line.

Germany, Saudi Arabia. See question 6.

Guatemala. Depends on various factors. How will it be financed?

Honduras. Financial protection is understood as the budgeting for essential health-care services provided by the State.

India. Delete “all persons”: States should determine which groups of beneficiaries can be covered by essential health-care services in case universal coverage cannot be reached immediately.

Indonesia. Referring to basic health needs of each member State.

Jordan. Considering economic and financial feasibility, established through actuarial and feasibility studies.

Kenya. A stable economy takes care of all residents regardless of their nationalities.

Republic of Korea. Member States should decide whether foreigners (including stateless persons) should be eligible for social security guarantees, in accordance with national laws and based on financial, social and cultural circumstances of the country.

Kyrgyzstan. Through medical insurance, excluding maternity protection.

Lebanon. Providing access to health care is one of the main elements of socio-economic development.

Lesotho. Everybody including expatriates in a country should have access to basic health-care services.

Luxembourg. Address length of residence issues and legal residence concept.

Mexico. Define “persons ordinarily resident” and “set of essential health-care services” to avoid confusion. The SPF should include financial guarantees to ensure its consolidation. Public policies should be implemented to generate opportunities for all people to have financial protection sufficient to access basic health-care services, according to economic and employment circumstances.

Nicaragua. Implementation of this pillar should prioritize maternity care which improves national social indicators.

Norway. Replace “ordinarily” with “legally”. Supposing that “maternal” includes pregnancy, childbirth and infants.

Panama, Uruguay. Subject to the economic possibilities of each country.

Paraguay. “Ordinarily resident” is inappropriate in this context: every human being should have access to essential health-care services regardless of his/her nationality or migratory status.

Russian Federation. All persons who actually reside in the country should have effective access to nationally established vitally important medical services, including maternity protection.

South Africa. This includes non-citizens in all countries.

Turkey. Social security is a right for everyone and it is a necessity for a State to provide financial protection for access to essential health services.

United Kingdom. Replace “ordinarily resident” with “habitually resident”. Replace “have the necessary financial protection to access” with “should have access to”, since otherwise, the onus is on individuals to have sufficient financial protection to afford essential health-care services whereas their provision should be free at the point of care.

United States. In the chapeau (7), replace “should provide at least” by “should seek to provide” and replace “guarantees” by “benefits”. Clarify “ordinarily resident”. Add after “health care”, “, consistent with national priorities and broader social, economic and employment policies”.

Viet Nam. Not feasible for low-income countries.

Zambia. Focus on the local poor.

Employers

Total number of replies: 26.

Yes: 20. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNA, CNC, CNI, CNS (Brazil), OEB (Cyprus), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CCSP, CIP, CTP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 3. ANDI (Colombia), SPD (Czech Republic), KEF (Republic of Korea).

Other: 3. UCCAEP (Costa Rica), EFP (Pakistan), SN (Sweden).

Comments

BCCI (Belize). If the person contributes to the fund.

CNC, CNI (Brazil). See question 3(a).

ANDI (Colombia). Maternal health care should be included within the essential health services of each country. A set of health-care services for persons in need, and social assistance for workers, should be defined at national level. The state obligation and the appropriate redistribution of resources should be defined nationally.

OEB (Cyprus), NHO (Norway), CIP (Portugal), IOE. As long as defined on the national scale and to the extent possible. The notion of a “resident” could pose a definitional problem in the case of illegal immigrants. SPF components should promote the return to work.

SPD (Czech Republic). Specify the term “persons ordinarily resident in the country”.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). Specify the term “resident”. Implementation of SPF components that promote the return to work are supported.

KEF (Republic of Korea). Needs for maternity protection are growing as birth rates decrease. Essential health-care services should cover only vulnerable members of society.

VNO–NCW (Netherlands). Target group to be defined at national level. Link to jobseeking is relevant.

NHO (Norway), CIP (Portugal), CIU (Uruguay), IOE. Benefits must not discourage those without a job from seeking work and must, on the contrary, be degressive or include conditions linked to jobseeking.

EFP (Pakistan). Financial protection should be to access social security provisions.

CONEP (Panama). As far as citizens and legal residents are concerned.

CCL (Peru). Will depend on the regulations of each member State.

CTP (Portugal). It must take into account minimum levels of social security contributions, even for reduced time frames.

SN (Sweden), UPS (Switzerland). Social protection systems must be designed at national level.

CIU (Uruguay). The term “financial” should be deleted because protection could be offered through diverse mechanisms.

Workers

Total number of replies: 96.

Yes: 90. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), AKAVA, SAK, STTK (Finland), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany),

TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP-IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV, FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 3. NCTUB (Bahamas), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom).

Other: 3. CUT (Brazil), CTRP (Panama), CSA (Senegal).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), CUT, UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), NTUF (Sri Lanka), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). The term “ordinarily resident” is inappropriate, as every human being should have access to essential health-care services regardless of his/her nationality or migratory status.

NCTUB (Bahamas). In countries with large numbers of illegal residents, this could drain national resources.

NTUCB (Belize). This puts unsustainable pressure on the social security fund, so government finance is needed.

CITUB (Bulgaria). Such texts should refer to other ILO tools and documents.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). Include children in their first year of life with full protection.

CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic). Every human being should benefit from the fundamental right to social security and social protection whether or not he/she is in productive employment.

AKAVA, SAK, STTK (Finland). Increasing cross-border work poses challenges to a permanent residence concept.

UNTM (Mali). Add “including maternal and child health care”.

CTM (Mexico). As a fundamental right.

CS (Panama). Particularly workers in the informal economy should be given support to register in social security programmes.

CATP (Peru). Better quality of life should be ensured by providing them with economic security. Essential health-care services should be defined nationally and through social dialogue.

CGTP (Peru). With priority on maternal health care.

LO, TCO, SACO (Sweden). Including persons in the asylum process and persons without documents.

FPU (Ukraine). Only citizens should be entitled to state social guarantees.

TUC (United Kingdom). Supports the UK Government’s response.

PIT–CNT (Uruguay). Each country should define what is meant by “resident”.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). The State should guarantee health care.

Qu. 7 (b) *all children enjoy income security, at least at a nationally defined minimum level, through family/child benefits in cash or in kind aimed at facilitating access to nutrition, education and care?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 96.

Yes: 82. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Serbia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

No: 9. China, Colombia, El Salvador, Hungary, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritius, Mexico, Saudi Arabia.

Other: 5. Guatemala, India, Kenya, Poland, United States.

Comments

Albania. Children have the right to benefit from social insurance, health insurance and social services.

Argentina. Through contributory, non-contributory systems or both and cover specific labour market situations.

Australia. Relate to the application of Convention No. 138 and include a reference to the relationship between the provision of social security to parents of children and eradication of child labour. Convention No. 138 states that high priority should be given to programmes and measures intended to alleviate poverty and ensure family living standards such as to make it unnecessary to have recourse to the economic activity of children.

Austria. Should apply for legal residents. Irregular migrants and short-term visitors should not be eligible for benefits.

Belize. Important for children's development. Clarify definition of "child".

Benin. Children are among the most vulnerable and must have income security in line with international legal instruments, e.g. the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. Within the limits of their political, economic and legal conditions, States should extend social security with the goal of universality.

China. Since national conditions and social security systems vary considerably, a one-size-fits-all requirement will not favour an effective application of international standards.

Czech Republic. Benefits may be subject to an income test and to the country's financial situation.

Denmark, Germany, Saudi Arabia. See question 6.

Dominican Republic. Coordination between institutions is needed so that national social protection initiatives are developed jointly, in compliance with national legislation.

El Salvador. No compulsory minimum level possible due to differences in economic capacity or purchasing power. Should be established through national policies, allowing implementation taking into account national realities.

Guatemala. Depends on various factors.

India. Providing social security to children encompasses several issues, i.e. assuring employment to parents and supporting educational, nutrition and health-care needs. Hence, commitment to provide such vital services to “all children” should not be part of the Recommendation. States should decide whether to cover all children.

Jordan, Malaysia. See question 7(a).

Kenya. Free basic health services and education to be extended to all children and their families.

Republic of Korea. Each State should take measures to guarantee equal opportunity and an equal start to all children, instead of income security at a nationally defined minimum level.

Kyrgyzstan. The fixed minimum level of allowances is not provided; it is not sufficient for normal nutrition, education and care.

Lebanon. No child should be prevented from the basic right to, e.g. education due to financial distress. Family/child benefits play a central role.

Lesotho. Children should receive the necessary care to grow healthy and into skilled adults. Considering limited resources only vulnerable children should be provided for by the State.

Luxembourg. Envisage reference to other UN instruments recognizing the rights of children.

Mauritius. Consider cost implications of introducing universal family/child benefits.

Mexico. Define “income security at least at a nationally defined minimum level”. States must be able to act within the possibilities permitted by their economic and employment circumstances.

Myanmar. Income security at least at a nationally defined minimum level can create the best conditions for children.

Netherlands. The State can provide income support, but children’s parents remain also financially responsible.

Nicaragua. Important that children are given priority; this will lead to better development of the country.

Norway. A defined minimum level can easily become a standard or even maximum level, without considering each person’s real needs. Emphasize the importance of safeguarding special needs, e.g. of persons with disabilities. Add reference to residence in the country, in line with the wording of questions 7(a), (c) and (d). See also question 7(a).

Panama. Outcome should be adjusted to each country’s legislative social security framework and based on resources.

Peru. Because they are vulnerable, the main object of social protection and represent the country’s future.

Portugal. Member States should be able to modulate access to benefits depending on the revenues of the household. Good health throughout the cycle of life begins in childhood.

Romania. The floor of children’s benefits should be established by Members, depending on their economic situation.

Russian Federation. Measures stimulating States to create decent conditions for provision of nationally established minimum standards of material stability, by means of cash and in-kind family benefits, are needed in the Recommendation, in line with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Turkey. Essential for the economic and social development potential of a society.

United States. Clarify “care”. Replace “enjoy” by “have”. Add at the end “, consistent with national priorities and broader social, economic and employment policies”.

Employers

Total number of replies: 25.

Yes: 17. AiG (Australia), CNA (Brazil), OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CCSP, CIP, CTP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 6. BCCI (Belize), CNC, CNI, CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), KEF (Republic of Korea).

Other: 2. EFP (Pakistan), SN (Sweden).

Comments

BCCI (Belize). Is this affordable?

ANDI (Colombia), CIP (Portugal), SN (Sweden), CIU (Uruguay). See question 7(a).

OEB (Cyprus). With the reservations already expressed.

SPD (Czech Republic). “All children” should be further specified. Tailoring to national circumstances and levels of development should be emphasized.

MEDEF (France). Priorities are children, persons with disabilities, maternal health care, taking into account national circumstances.

NHO (Norway), IOE. See question 7(a). Moreover, models exist which also include conditionalities for the receipt of family allowances, such as conditions linked to schooling.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). Should be defined nationally in order to provide security for children not to leave school and graduate productively.

KEF (Republic of Korea). Ensuring income security for the whole family is more appropriate than supporting children only.

VNO–NCW (Netherlands), CIU (Uruguay). It should have room for conditionalities (e.g. linked to school attendance).

EFP (Pakistan). Not viable for developing and underdeveloped countries.

CCL (Peru). Children should have priority access to health care.

CTP (Portugal). “Vouchers” that can be exchanged for essential goods could also be considered for children.

UPS (Switzerland). To be settled at national level.

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 87. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico),

NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP-IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK-İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 4. CTC, CUT (Colombia), FTUC (Fiji), FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 2. CTRP (Panama), CSA (Senegal).

Comments

CGT (Argentina). The benefits should consider the additional housing needs for extended families.

BAK (Austria). Assuming that the question refers to children up to the age of 15 years or the end of compulsory schooling, it should be considered that access to additional education (including vocational education) should also be facilitated.

NTUCB (Belize). Some are government functions and should be financed by government.

CUT (Brazil). Access to care and education should also be the responsibility of the State. Direct cash transfers facilitate access to nutrition and care and can be linked to education and preventive health care.

CITUB (Bulgaria). For children in institutional care, an allowance should guarantee a decent life and equal status.

CTRN (Costa Rica). Member States should establish universal coverage for children and youth until they can contribute to social security.

CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic). Childcare centres should guarantee comprehensive care to children.

CSE (Ecuador). Should be protected as a human right.

FKTU (Republic of Korea). Such benefits should be provided preferably in kind rather than in cash (e.g. childcare facilities).

CTM (Mexico). As a fundamental right.

PWF (Pakistan). The words “all children enjoy” may be replaced by “every child enjoys”.

CS (Panama). Government should ensure that children receive appropriate nutrition and health-care services free of charge in the most vulnerable areas.

CATP (Peru). This measure is important and would develop what is established in Convention No. 102.

CGTP (Peru). All children should be protected independently of whether the parents contribute.

UGT (Spain). It would be advisable to develop, in the near future, a new standard on protection for dependant children that is adapted to social changes that have occurred since the adoption of Convention No. 102.

SGB (Switzerland). The importance of investing in childhood should be recognized as a contribution to realizing equal opportunities.

PIT–CNT (Uruguay). The minima should be defined in function of the number of dependant children.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). The State should provide all these guarantees.

Qu. 7 (c) *all persons in active age groups ordinarily resident in the country who are unable to earn sufficient income enjoy minimum income security through social assistance, maternity benefits, disability benefits, other social transfers in cash or in kind, or public employment programmes?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 97.

Yes: 78. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Serbia, South Africa, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

No: 14. Bahrain, Belize, Botswana, China, Colombia, Denmark, Hungary, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritius, Namibia, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka.

Other: 5. Guatemala, India, Italy, Slovenia, United States.

Comments

Albania. Not only persons ordinarily resident in active age, but also others who are temporarily resident in the country, including foreigners, having contributed to social insurance schemes.

Australia. Access to these guarantees may be subject to eligibility requirements. Clarify “ordinarily resident” to enable flexibility.

Austria. Should apply to legal residents.

Belgium. These policies should go together with the establishment and development of quality social and public services. Implementation of integrated national policies encouraging productive employment by developing activation measures that promote participation in the formal labour market is important.

Benin. Such guarantees should be foreseen for people in difficult situations.

Belize. Unsustainable for developing countries; should be addressed through right-to-work initiatives.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. Within the limits of their political, economic and legal conditions, States should extend social security with the goal of universality.

Botswana. This should be left to Members to decide.

China. Difficult to define “sufficient income”. Some of these benefits are conditional on the payment of contributions in some countries, and therefore cannot reach all migrants.

Costa Rica. States must ensure that these persons receive a minimum income to survive, whether unemployed, underemployed or in low-skill jobs.

Czech Republic. Subject to the financial situation of the Member and depending on the efforts of the person to improve his/her position.

Denmark. Distinguish between social security and social assistance. See question 7(a).

Dominican Republic. Assistance through public employment programmes should be universal. Policies regarding assistance and transfers should be in line with national economic and social realities, legislation and practice.

El Salvador. A legal framework covering these vulnerable groups prevents social exclusion.

Estonia. Insert “at least at a nationally defined minimum level” for consistency.

Finland, Italy. Clarify “ordinarily resident”.

Germany, Saudi Arabia. See question 6.

Guatemala. How will it be financed and with what resources? Should not be through loans as this would penalize future generations.

Honduras. Isolated social assistance programmes should be incorporated into the country’s social security system.

Hungary. The objectives laid down in the question are agreeable even if Hungary’s provisions on qualifying conditions differ. In view of the diversity of national practices, particular provision forms should not be listed.

India. Provision of minimum income security, unemployment allowance, health-care and disability benefits for “all persons” in a country is not feasible. States, especially developing countries, may wish to prioritize benefits and persons covered according to their socio-economic status, and adopt different models to achieve this goal.

Indonesia. Important to boost their ability to contribute to social security.

Israel. Add: earned income tax credit.

Jordan, Republic of Korea, Malaysia. See question 7(a).

Kenya. Progressively introduce and increase social assistance and public employment programmes for socio-economic stability.

Kyrgyzstan. Exclude “in cash or in kind” – to direct state employment programmes to create permanent decent workplaces.

Lebanon. All persons should be able to enjoy a minimum level of income security. For particularly vulnerable groups, e.g. disabled, special programmes may be useful.

Lesotho. The needs of those who are unable to fend for themselves should be catered for by the State within budgetary allocations and constraints.

Luxembourg. Address also income-related benefits.

Mauritius. Cost implications of such benefits to be considered.

Mexico. Define “in active age groups ordinarily resident in the country”, “social transfers” and “public employment programmes” to enable identification of beneficiaries and policies. Each State should be able to act within the means of its economic and employment circumstances.

Namibia. Namibia does not currently advocate public employment programmes.

Netherlands. Decent (and decently paid) employment remains the best form of social security. Support should be conditional upon residents living in the country to avoid “social security migration”.

Nicaragua. If the country has the necessary financial resources.

Norway. See questions 7(a) and (b).

Panama. Should take into account national normative frameworks and resources.

Paraguay. “Ordinarily resident” is unclear. “Social assistance” should be replaced by “social transfers” which is wider. Reference to minimum wages, not to be set below national poverty lines, should be made in respect of public employment programmes, and of maternity and disability benefits, which should provide income security above the national poverty line.

Philippines. Disability benefits should always be followed by death benefits in case of death due to a work-related injury or sickness.

Portugal. Minimum protection should be ensured by schemes that give a subjective right, subject to means testing. Only where this is not possible should minimum protection be ensured by social services, cash benefits or in kind.

Russian Federation. State employment promotion programmes facilitate the provision of insurance-related benefits to employed persons.

South Africa. Applicable only to work-related disability cases.

Sri Lanka. Benefits should be in compliance with the national situation.

Switzerland. The level of income security needs to be defined at national level, as under 7(b) and (d). Insert after “income security” “, at least at a nationally defined minimum level.”. Clarify “persons ordinarily resident in the country”.

United Kingdom. Replace “ordinarily resident” with “habitually resident”. Each country must decide which methods of income assistance it wants to provide and to whom.

United States. Clarify “ordinarily resident” and “active age groups”. Replace “enjoy” by “have”. Add “child and” before “maternity” and at the end “, consistent with national priorities and broader social, economic and employment policies”.

Employers

Total number of replies: 25.

Yes: 17. AiG (Australia), CNA, CNC, CNI (Brazil), OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CIP, CTP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 5. BCCI (Belize), CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), MEDEF (France), KEF (Republic of Korea).

Other: 3. EFP (Pakistan), CCSP (Portugal), SN (Sweden).

Comments

BCCI (Belize). The word “all” is too all-inclusive. Would the contributors subsidize the rest? And how?

CNC, CNI (Brazil). See question 3(a).

ANDI (Colombia), SN (Sweden). See question 7(a).

OEB (Cyprus), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), NHO (Norway), CIP (Portugal), IOE. As long as benefits are not implemented all at the same time.

SPD (Czech Republic). Tailoring to national circumstances and levels of development should be emphasized.

MEDEF (France). This is not a priority.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). Benefits should not lead to unemployment.

KEF (Republic of Korea). A minimum income security level should not be included given the differences in income levels across countries. However, encouraging working-age groups to earn at least a minimum income through public employment programmes is appropriate.

VNO–NCW (Netherlands). Should be implemented progressively.

NHO (Norway). See question 6.

EFP (Pakistan). A programme with tripartite consensus may be developed nationally.

CONEP (Panama). Legal residents.

CCL (Peru). Depends on the budgetary situation of each country.

CCSP (Portugal). Should be linked to public employment measures.

CTP (Portugal). The subsequent role of these individuals with respect to effective jobseeking and their integration into active employment policies and vocational training should be considered.

UPS (Switzerland). To be settled at national level, in particular the notion of resident.

CIU (Uruguay). Benefits should not discourage jobseeking and should be implemented progressively. The term “enjoy” should be replaced by a term which is more coherent with the issue.

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 83. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), ACFTU (China), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CTM (Mexico), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 7. NCTUB (Bahamas), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CROC (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), FPU (Ukraine), FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 3. CUT (Brazil), CTRP (Panama), CSA (Senegal).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), NZCTU (New Zealand), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), NTUF (Sri Lanka), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). “Ordinarily resident” is unclear. “Social assistance” should be replaced by “social transfers” which is wider. Reference to minimum wages, not to be set below national poverty lines, should be made in respect of public employment programmes, and to maternity and disability benefits, which should provide income security above the national poverty line.

CGT (Argentina). The term social assistance should be replaced by the wider term “social transfers”. “Social assistance” may result in stigmatization and poverty traps. It is essential to mention minimum wages as a key reference and basis for the financing of contributory systems.

ACTU (Australia). The term “ordinarily resident” should be clarified. Wages payable under public employment programmes should not be less than minimum wages otherwise applied, and the level of maternity and disability benefits should also refer to minimum wages and provide income security above the national poverty line.

NTUCB (Belize). Some are government functions and should be financed by government.

CUT (Brazil). Access to social assistance should be provided to those in need, regardless of nationality and legal status. National minimum wages in public employment programmes, as well as disability pensions and maternity benefits, should be above the poverty line.

CSN (Canada). This should also include unemployment.

ACFTU (China). Despite national differences, certain basic social protection provisions such as social assistance, minimum income guarantee and public employment programmes, should be provided in all countries.

CTM (Mexico). Through social assistance programmes.

CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands). “Social transfers” would be a better term than “social assistance”. Public employment programmes should provide the minimum wage, which should be above the national poverty line. Maternity and disability benefits should provide income security above the national poverty line.

CS (Panama). Government should assume the financial responsibility and not burden contributors.

UGT (Spain). The term “ordinarily resident” is inappropriate in the case of health. The term “social assistance” is not appropriate as, in some countries, it could be understood as discretionary benefits which are conditional on available funding, and not enforceable as a subjective right.

SGB (Switzerland). Minimum income security should refer to minimum wage as regards public employment programmes, beyond the poverty line. “Incapacity” can have a pejorative connotation; benefits should be guaranteed independently of the cause of incapacity.

FPU (Ukraine). This may lead to dependency behaviour among the working-age population

TUC (United Kingdom). Supports the UK Government’s response.

PIT–CNT (Uruguay). The term “social assistance” should be replaced by “social security benefits” as these benefits are part of the social security system which have contributory and non-contributory benefits. Wages in public employment programmes should be set at a level higher than the benefit level provided by the SPF.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). The issue is not to ensure incomes but that the State guarantees employment as well as social security.

Qu. 7 (d) *all persons in old age ordinarily resident in the country enjoy income security, at least at a nationally defined minimum level, through benefits in cash or in kind?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 97.

Yes: 84. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

No: 8. Bahrain, Hungary, Republic of Korea, Mexico, Peru, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Serbia.

Other: 5. China, Guatemala, India, Italy, United States.

Comments

Australia, Italy. Clarify “ordinarily resident”.

Bangladesh, Benin, Turkey. Because they are among the most vulnerable in society and require income security.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. Within the limits of their political, economical and legal conditions, States should extend social security with the goal of universality.

China, Finland, Jordan, Republic of Korea, Malaysia. See question 7(a).

Cyprus. Through schemes whose qualifying conditions are set by each State.

Denmark, Saudi Arabia. See question 6.

Dominican Republic. In compliance with the legal rules on social security in force. Specify that under no circumstance should the defined minimum level be lower than the poverty line. Elderly persons should receive comprehensive care in homes and centres catering to care and health services.

Ecuador. As a priority they should receive specialized aid and assistance, as well as free health care and universal old-age pensions.

France. Provided it consists in retirement coverage.

Germany. Take into account principles of diversity, pluralism and respect for social needs, as well as social policy traditions and existing institutional structures.

Guatemala. Each country should decide and establish this minimum level based on its actual financing possibilities.

Honduras, Netherlands, Portugal, South Africa. See question 7(c).

Hungary. Should be a relative income guarantee, with a means-tested element.

India. Ensuring a minimum level of income security to “all persons in old age” would be difficult to achieve for developing countries. States should decide the type of benefits they can secure for older persons keeping in view their national financial capacities.

Indonesia. Implementation should be effected gradually over time and strengthened by legislation, in line with the country’s circumstances.

Kenya. Criteria for eligibility depending on economic status and vulnerability.

Lesotho. These cash or in-kind benefits could possibly be means-tested.

Mexico. Define “persons in old age ordinarily resident in the country” and identify who it includes. Public policies strengthening older peoples’ income through social security benefits, as long as they have participated actively in the formal economy, should be promoted. Each State should be able to act within the means of its economic and employment circumstances.

Norway. See questions 7(a) and (b).

Paraguay. Nationally defined minimum levels must in no case be below the national poverty line. Clarify “ordinarily resident”.

Romania. The floor of benefits for elderly people should be established by Members, depending on their economic situation.

Switzerland. Level of income security to be defined at national level.

United Kingdom. Replace “ordinarily resident” by “habitually resident”.

United States. Clarify “ordinarily resident”. Add, after “old age” “, as defined by national legislation,”. Replace “enjoy” by “have”. Add at the end “, consistent with national priorities and broader social, economic and employment policies”.

Employers

Total number of replies: 25.

Yes: 18. AiG (Australia), CAN, CNC, CNI (Brazil), OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway), CCL (Peru), EFP (Pakistan), CCSP, CIP, CTP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 5. BCCI (Belize), CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), MEDEF (France), KEF (Republic of Korea).

Other: 2. CONEP (Panama), SN (Sweden).

Comments

CNA, CNC, CNI (Brazil). See question 3(a).

ANDI (Colombia), SN (Sweden). See question 7(a).

OEB (Cyprus), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway), EFP (Pakistan), CIP (Portugal), IOE. To the extent possible.

SPD (Czech Republic). See question 7(c).

MEDEF (France). This is not a priority.

KEF (Republic of Korea). Due to the ageing of society, only persons who cannot support themselves should be supported.

CONEP (Panama). Legal residents.

CTP (Portugal). The eligibility rules for pensions need to be adapted to provide fair levels of return in order for future generations to also access benefits. “Vouchers” which could be exchanged for essential goods or services could complement the benefits.

CIU (Uruguay). The term “enjoy” should be replaced by a term which is more coherent with the issue.

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 84. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United

Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 5. CTC, CUT (Colombia), CROC, CTM (Mexico), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 4. CSN (Canada), TUC (Ghana), CTRP (Panama), CSA (Senegal).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), NTUF (Sri Lanka), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). Nationally defined minimum levels must in no case be below the national poverty line. “Ordinarily resident” lacks clarity.

NCTUB (Bahamas). If they are legally entitled to be in the country.

CGT (Argentina), FNPR (Russian Federation), PIT–CNT (Uruguay). Minimum levels should not be below the national poverty line.

CUT (Brazil). Should also consider social security agreements that protect workers’ contributions paid in other countries and financial compensation among States. The minimum wage should be the reference for benefit levels. Benefits should be provided to all elderly people, regardless of contributions.

CSN (Canada). Should ensure a healthy and decent life.

NHS (Croatia). People in old age are especially vulnerable and should be guaranteed at least minimum income security.

CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic). Social security should be based on universality and solidarity. The elderly should also receive comprehensive care in specialized homes.

CEDOCUT (Ecuador). Replace “ordinarily resident” by “resident or person in transit in every country, regardless of his/her legal condition and status”.

SPS, UNSA (France). Taking life expectancy into account.

TUC (Ghana). Should also provide for long-term care of the aged, depending on the national context.

HMS (India). Should be based on universality without discrimination.

CATP (Peru). Guaranteeing the financial means to these vulnerable groups will also help to invigorate the domestic economy.

CGTP (Peru). Independent of contributions based on the principle of universality.

TUC (United Kingdom). Support the UK Government’s response.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). It is not income security but full social security for all.

Qu. 8 *Should the Recommendation provide that:*

- (a) *basic social security guarantees should be legally recognized as a right that is enforceable through simple and rapid complaint and appeal procedures defined by national laws or regulations ?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 97.

Yes: 84. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic,

Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, Gambia, Germany, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Suriname, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

No: 9. Benin, China, France, Mexico, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, United States.

Other: 4. Cambodia, Canada, Guatemala, India.

Comments

Australia. Social security entitlements as part of national SPFs should be enforced consistently with national laws and regulations. Enforcement should be strong and citizens have a right to simple and swift complaint mechanisms.

Bangladesh. Depends on national circumstances. Enforceability of rights is still a challenge in many countries.

Belgium, Philippines. Should be guaranteed through legal procedures at no or little cost.

Benin, El Salvador, Indonesia, Malaysia, Netherlands. National laws and regulations determine complaint and appeal processes.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. For administrative disputes, these guarantees should exist at management level or in regulatory bodies. For contentious issues there should be labour and social security judiciary authorities.

Canada. Should be determined by the competent authority and reflect the nature of the benefit.

China. Introducing complaint and appeal mechanisms would not support the realization of social protection's objective to promote social justice and harmony.

Denmark. Replace "simple and rapid" by "transparent".

Dominican Republic. The SPF should have such a mechanism even if simplified, accompanied by monitoring and control mechanisms.

Ecuador. Simplified complaint procedures are needed.

France. Simple and rapid procedures are favoured for enforceable rights. These should take into account the means of financing of the SPF and respect by future beneficiaries for their obligations and other entitlement conditions such as residency.

India. Enactment of legislation is time-consuming and requires national consensus. Law enforcement is another challenge requiring suitable infrastructure and manpower. Countries with vast populations and facing poverty and unemployment challenges cannot afford to guarantee social security as a legally enforceable right.

Kenya. An enforcement structure should be developed with built-in checks and controls with the government's involvement.

Lesotho. These rights should be protected by legislation.

Luxembourg. Only a right enforceable in the courts allows the realization of these objectives.

Mauritius. An appeal mechanism ensures fairness, transparency and equity.

Mexico. The recognition of basic social security guarantees should be subject to national circumstances and the level of development of each country.

Nicaragua. Any social assistance programme to be implemented in a country should have legal backing.

Paraguay. State supervisory institutions such as labour inspection have the obligation to ensure that people receive benefits they are entitled to. Governments should be encouraged to ratify relevant ILO standards.

Peru. Requirements and mechanisms ensuring the effective delivery of basic guarantees must be as simple and as effective as possible to limit and avoid inability to comply.

Russian Federation. National legislation should define both extrajudicial procedures and judicial protection of rights of interested persons to main social guarantees. In addition, minimum terms of claims and complaints examination are necessary for proper dispute resolution.

Sri Lanka. Difficult to institutionalize these rights.

Switzerland. Propose: “basic social security guarantees should be established by national legislation; the latter should provide for simple and rapid complaint and appeal procedures”.

Turkey. Social security rights should be guaranteed through clear procedures.

Uruguay. Social security rights which are not easily enforceable through administrative or judicial means affect the enjoyment of a fundamental human right.

Zambia. Should be implemented progressively.

Employers

Total number of replies: 25.

Yes: 12. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNA, CNC, CNI, CNS (Brazil), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CCSP, CTP (Portugal).

No: 11. ANDI (Colombia), OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway), EFP (Pakistan), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

Other: 2. CIP (Portugal), SN (Sweden).

Comments

CNC, CNI (Brazil). See question 3(a).

ANDI (Colombia). Regular mechanisms should be strengthened and procedures rendered more swift and effective.

OEB (Cyprus), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway), EFP (Pakistan), CIU (Uruguay), IOE. Each country should decide whether this should be a statutory right.

MEDEF (France). Not as an enforceable right.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), CIP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland). To be decided at the national level.

KEF (Republic of Korea). Basic social security should be recognized as a legal right for vulnerable members in society to maintain a minimum livelihood.

NEF (Namibia). Careful not to over regulate without the possibility of enforcement.

VNO–NCW (Netherlands). Should be in consultation with social partners.

CCL (Peru). Procedures to obtain access to health care and pensions should be simplified.

SN (Sweden). See question 7(a).

Workers

Total number of replies: 92.

Yes: 92. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV, FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 0.

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), NZCTU (New Zealand), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), NTUF (Sri Lanka), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). State supervisory institutions such as labour inspection have the obligation and the capacity to ensure that all people receive the benefits they are entitled to. Governments should be encouraged to ratify the relevant ILO standards.

BAK (Austria). A rights-based approach is indispensable.

NTUCB (Belize). This adds more administrative cost.

CUT (Brazil). Should also involve stakeholders and monitoring of policies.

CITUB (Bulgaria). Otherwise this right cannot be guaranteed to a sufficient extent.

CSN (Canada). A rights-based approach presupposes that the State provides legal assistance necessary to exercise social rights.

NHS (Croatia), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), PIT–CNT (Uruguay). The State has the obligation to monitor implementation and to make sure that those who are entitled to them actually receive the benefits.

TUC (Ghana). A non-enforceable right loses its meaning; countries should provide accessible means for ensuring enforcement.

HKCTU (Hong Kong, China). Complaint and appeal procedures should be independent of administrative procedures.

KSBSI (Indonesia). Labour inspection should have the obligation and capacity to ensure that all people receive the benefits they are entitled to.

JTUC–RENGO (Japan). The rights of social security should be clearly set forth.

CATP (Peru). Simple rules that permit the enjoyment of these rights should be established, as well as administrative or penal sanctions for those who impede the exercise of this right.

CGTP (Peru). A simple and impartial procedure should be established.

CGTP-IN (Portugal). Fundamental rights should be recognized both in contributory and non-contributory schemes.

JSS (Sri Lanka). Should include specific provisions in the relevant laws to deal with cases of violation.

SGB (Switzerland). Need for fast procedures where people are in urgent need of support. Institutions must ensure that persons entitled to benefits be informed and effectively receive them.

CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Procedures should be as easy as possible.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Not as a procedure but as a guarantee.

Qu. 8 (b) *legal and institutional frameworks should set out benefits as well as qualifying conditions that are reasonable, proportionate, transparent and non-discriminatory?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 96.

Yes: 89. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Suriname, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

No: 3. Malaysia, Sri Lanka, Switzerland.

Other: 4. Guatemala, India, Kenya, United States.

Comments

Belgium. Policies are needed to ensure access to social security rights to all workers, including those in atypical employment.

Belize. Review terminology: “reasonable” and “proportionate” are subjective. Refer to specific social and economic indicators.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. Benefits and qualifying conditions in national legislation should be based on the principles of universality, solidarity, sustainability, equity and transparency.

Dominican Republic. SPF protection should be guaranteed to the whole population in compliance with legislation in force.

Ecuador. Equality and equity prevent discrimination.

El Salvador. Based on principles of equity, equality, proportionality, good management and in harmony with national social reality.

France. Reasonable, proportionate, transparent and non-discriminatory obligations should also be mentioned.

Guatemala. For social assistance non-discriminatory conditions can be considered but not for contributory schemes.

India. The development of legal and institutional frameworks and the definition of benefits and qualifying conditions cannot be enforced on a universal basis.

Indonesia. Gradual implementation should take into account health facilities and geographic conditions.

Kenya. Should take into account actuarial considerations and should also be tied to the prevailing cost of living (basic needs).

Republic of Korea. In line with national circumstances.

Lesotho. Avoid discrimination at all cost, but allow differentiation through means tests or behavioural conditions.

Malaysia. Legal frameworks to be determined by national policies.

Mexico. In line with the principle of equity and in compliance with national circumstances and levels of development.

Switzerland. SPF modalities must be defined at national level. Entitlement conditions are within States' competence. Proposal: "appropriate legal and institutional frameworks and effective management mechanisms should be established".

United States. Define "proportionate".

Zambia. Responds to a human rights approach to social protection.

Employers

Total number of replies: 24.

Yes: 14. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNA, CNC, CNI, CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), NEF (Namibia), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CCSP, CTP (Portugal).

No: 1. KEF (Republic of Korea).

Other: 9. OEB (Cyprus), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), EFP (Pakistan), CIP (Portugal), SN (Sweden), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

Comments

CNC, CNI (Brazil). See question 3(a).

OEB (Cyprus), UPS (Switzerland), IOE. Too vague to comment.

SPD (Czech Republic). Tailoring to national circumstances and levels of development should be emphasized.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). How can the Recommendation do so?

KEF (Republic of Korea). It is more appropriate to set out qualifying conditions that are reasonable and transparent rather than comprehensive support for income security.

VNO–NCW (Netherlands). What is meant by "legal and institutional frameworks"? Other options than a statutory right should be possible and decided at national level.

EFP (Pakistan). Progressive implementation to be decided by each country.

CCL (Peru). There should be no discriminatory treatment in health care.

CIP (Portugal). The question is not clear. Legislation does not have to assign benefits. It should clearly stipulate the qualifying conditions.

SN (Sweden). See question 7(a).

CIU (Uruguay). Should be clarified. The benefits should consider conditions such as measures to stimulate job search and the return to formal employment.

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 92. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), CNTG (Guinea), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV, FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 0.

Other: 1. CSN (Canada).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), FGTB (Belgium), CUT, UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), NTUF (Sri Lanka), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). In addition, benefits foreseen under the SPF should be related to contingencies provided for in Convention No. 102.

BAK (Austria). While welcoming a comprehensive non-discriminatory approach, consideration should also be given to implicit underlying value judgements (male breadwinner model, single parents), which can lead to structural discrimination against women.

FGTB (Belgium). Access to social security should also be guaranteed to workers in atypical and precarious employment.

NTUCB (Belize). Legislation is difficult to change to adjust benefits.

CUT (Brazil). The “universality” of social security systems should be defended.

CITUB (Bulgaria). In certain cases, benefits can be conditional.

CSN (Canada). Non-discrimination should aim at real equality (taking into account individual situations) rather than formal equality. Different treatment does not always produce inequality, and identical treatment can lead to inequality.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). Universal, fair and effective rights should be guaranteed.

CTRN (Costa Rica). Countries should aspire to higher levels of protection.

NHS (Croatia). Qualifying conditions should cover as many people as possible.

CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic). Benefits should be guaranteed to all without discrimination.

TUC (Ghana). Member countries should sensitize their citizens about social protection provisions.

JTUC–RENGO (Japan). Legal and institutional frameworks should be neutral to sex, lifestyle, and gender.

CATP (Peru). Social security encourages social inclusion and cohesion.

CGTP–IN (Portugal). Qualifying conditions should not exclude those in need; proportionality and relevance should be ensured according to national circumstances.

Qu. 9 *Should the Recommendation provide that the basic social security guarantees should be nationally defined with due consideration to the following aspects:*

(a) *Minimum levels of income security should correspond at least to the monetary value of a nationally defined basket of essential goods and services that is needed to live in health and decency?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 96.

Yes: 71. Albania, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

No: 21. Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Belarus, Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Norway, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Switzerland, Tajikistan, United Kingdom, United States.

Other: 4. Guatemala, India, Slovenia, Viet Nam.

Comments

Australia. More appropriate for these minimum levels to correspond to criteria such as those in (b). Income security levels should take into account individuals' income and assets, shared responsibility and incentive to move to the labour market or other activities. Consider appropriate conditionality for the payments and services received.

Bangladesh. Should be nationally determined.

Belarus. Different indicators can be used for their determination (e.g. subsistence wage, minimum consumption). Implementation depends on the State's financial capacities and the need to support poor people.

Benin. Avoids discrimination in the redistribution of resources allocated to the SPF and ensures coherence between national social protection policy and economic situation.

Cambodia. Needs to be defined through a thorough assessment.

Canada. This should be more flexible as States may not have a "nationally defined basket of essential goods and services that is needed to live in health and decency" or an agreed single poverty line.

China. This basket should be defined by each State according to national circumstances.

Costa Rica. Such a basket should be institutionalized.

Cuba. Should correspond to economic possibilities, level of development and political will concerning the equitable redistribution of resources.

Czech Republic. Defining life in “decency” is problematic; individual efforts aimed at improving individuals’ own situation should also be considered.

Denmark. Such a basket does not allow for individual or regional differences.

Dominican Republic. Focus also on the definitions of decent work and decent wage or living wage.

Ecuador. Wage ceilings and amounts of such a basket for the family should be determined.

El Salvador. They should be based on effective national legal minimum wage.

Germany. National practices of fixing minimum levels of income security are usually based on a minimum of goods and services, but follow different methods, none of which (e.g. baskets) should be prioritized.

Guatemala. It can be stated in legislation; but financing needs to be defined.

India. A fixed way of defining income security will be impractical considering the diversity of country experiences.

Kenya. Important to determine their effectiveness and objectivity.

Latvia. Ensure that such a basket is defined in a way that equally meets the needs of all society groups and remains adequate in the future.

Lebanon. These minimum levels should correspond to a decent “living wage”.

Lesotho. The monetary value of such a basket is often used to determine poverty lines; the same yardstick should be used to determine minimum levels of income security.

Luxembourg. States should decide on the approach to be used in defining the minimum income security level, considering the diversity and range of instruments available.

Mauritius. These minimum levels should also be reviewed at regular intervals in line with increases in costs of living.

Nicaragua. Important to define these minimum levels for improving national standards of living and social indicators.

Norway. What are considered essential goods and services is not fixed and varies with regions, life stage and time. See also question 9(b).

Peru. Considering countries’ social and legal situations.

Saudi Arabia. The appropriate minimum level of income and available financing sources should be defined nationally.

Switzerland. Fixing such minimum levels is in the State’s competence. Proposal: “Minimum levels of income security should be fixed so that every person can live in health and decency”.

Tajikistan. Not all countries can pay minimum guarantees at the consumer basket level, so it is preferable to indicate other income levels, as stipulated in national legislation.

United Kingdom. More flexibility and options needed to meet national circumstances. Replace “should” with “could” and delete “at least”. These changes should allow scope for national systems to support the vulnerable but also minimize risks such as benefit dependency, keeping in mind the need to develop sustainable and affordable SPFs.

United States. While all countries should have SPFs, they should be determined by national political processes. However, sub-federal governments and varying unique geographical regions within countries can make it difficult to impose one standardized formula. Add “, tailored to and consistent with national circumstances and policies,” after “nationally defined” in the chapeau (9).

Uruguay. Highlight the need for progressive extension of coverage based on political and social commitments, considering the diversity in national circumstances and in the development of social protection systems.

Viet Nam. The purpose is good but unlikely to be implemented in low-income countries.

Zambia. Considering each State’s level of development.

Employers

Total number of replies: 25.

Yes: 11. BCCI (Belize), CNA, CNC, CNI, CNS (Brazil), MEDEF (France), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), CCL (Peru), CTP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland).

No: 9. AiG (Australia), ANDI (Colombia), OEB (Cyprus), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), EFP (Pakistan), CONEP (Panama), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

Other: 5. SPD (Czech Republic), NHO (Norway), CCSP, CIP (Portugal), SN (Sweden).

Comments

AiG (Australia). This is not necessarily the best way to calculate minimum levels of income security, particularly for developed nations.

CNC, CNI (Brazil). See question 3(a).

CNS (Brazil). Minimum levels should ensure human dignity.

ANDI (Colombia). The SPF should not be measured according to one single variable or a single pre-established criterion, such as monetary values (9a) or a threshold predefined by law (9b), but be based on a multidimensional approach.

OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), NHO (Norway), EFP (Pakistan), IOE. This definition is too restrictive. Minimum levels should be defined at the national level.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). Minimum levels could be defined in national tripartite dialogues.

KEF (Republic of Korea). Access to essential health care should be ensured without increasing poverty risks. This should promote individual responsibilities, and provide for reasonable levels of private expenditure so as to avoid public deficits due to excessive health-care expenditure.

VNO–NCW (Netherlands). Ideally yes, but affordability should also be an important factor.

CONEP (Panama). Depends on the capacity of each country.

CCL (Peru). Depends on national budgets, which should prioritize health and education.

CIP (Portugal). It is under the competence of member States. The provision is too restrictive.

SN (Sweden). See question 7(a).

UPS (Switzerland). Minimum levels must be defined at national level.

CIU (Uruguay). This is a restrictive definition.

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 90. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan),

COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 2. ACTU (Australia), FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 1. TUC (United Kingdom).

Comments

CUT (Brazil). Should refer to minimum wage, or to another criterion that goes beyond the poverty line defined by the IMF and the World Bank. Should include a broader view of social security not limited to cash transfer programmes, in line with Convention No. 102.

CITUB (Bulgaria). This approach is important as it links minimum income to objective needs in each context.

NHS (Croatia). Should include guidance for Members to define basket of essential goods and services.

UGTD (Djibouti). Purchasing power and standard of living should be considered.

CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic). Should also relate to the concepts of decent work and a living wage. Regulations that limit access to benefits and services as well as co-payments should be cancelled.

TUC (Ghana). The definition of a minimum level must take into account a globally accepted level.

UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala). Should be based on minimum standards as established by the ILO and other agencies.

COTU–K (Kenya). Minimum levels of income should be equivalent to a living wage.

CTM (Mexico). This is an appropriate and correct measure. Will it be sustainable for developing countries?

CATP (Peru). Through a process of social dialogue.

CGTP (Peru). This is part of the principle of flexibility provided for in ILO standards and should be adopted through social dialogue.

FPU (Ukraine). Need for annual review of the consumer basket, taking into account the inflation index and its actual value at the end of each year.

TUC (United Kingdom). We agree with the UK Government about the need for flexibility in (a), but we are concerned that the minimum level of income security should be set by reference to objective criteria.

PIT–CNT (Uruguay). Should not be below the national poverty line.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Security should not be a function of levels of income.

Qu. 9 (b) *Minimum levels of income security may correspond to agreed poverty lines, defined income thresholds for social assistance benefits, or other income levels defined in national law and practice?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 95.

Yes: 83. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic,

Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

No: 10. Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, Hungary, Kyrgyzstan, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, Qatar, Switzerland.

Other: 2. Guatemala, India.

Comments

Argentina. Complying with the aims of Convention No. 102 for the most vulnerable groups who receive subsistence income.

Bangladesh. Will help to determine the extent of support required for each stratum of society.

Belgium. Refer to the EU poverty definitional criteria (Strategy 2020): at-risk poverty rate, severe material deprivation and people living in households with very low work intensity.

Benin, Nicaragua. Considering national circumstances.

Canada. See comment under question 9(a) above.

China. In principle, but individual or family assets, including assets in kind, should be taken into account when calculating these minimum levels.

Costa Rica. Important to rely on new methodologies which take into account countries with least protection realities.

Czech Republic, Switzerland. See question 9(a).

Denmark. No distinction made between social security and social assistance. Consider that not all countries have defined such levels, and that levels may also depend on personal assets.

Dominican Republic. The minimum level of income should be set above the poverty line. It should be measured based on acceptable social development indicators while preserving solidarity and sustainability.

Ecuador. Minimum ceilings should be determined to achieve and plan social security budgets.

El Salvador. Allows the inclusion of the unprotected.

Germany. These minimum levels must refer to national circumstances. Minimum income schemes cannot include fixed income thresholds, as eligibility depends on individual need.

India. To be decided by States, taking into account parameters defined in national law and practice.

Israel. Add: taking into consideration the overall economic situation of the country.

Kenya. Subject to actuarial valuations and cost of living (basic needs).

Lesotho. Members should decide between using absolute or relative poverty lines.

Luxembourg. A first step can be to reach a minimum subsistence level, but as a medium-term objective, a minimum social level should be explicitly mentioned.

Netherlands. To be agreed upon and implemented at national level.

Norway. Income security should be combined with other services, aimed at giving the individual better possibilities of obtaining a more sustainable income. See question 7(b). We understand the different approaches to the establishment of a minimum level of income security mentioned in question 9(b) to be alternatives to the approach set out in question 9(a), so that a member State which has established a minimum level of income security according to the principles of (b) will not be required to determine a nationally defined basket of essential goods and services as mentioned in (a).

Paraguay. It should not prevent governments from setting such levels above the poverty line but should provide that the latter cannot be below the poverty line.

Peru. It is in contradiction with point (a). It should be according to beneficiaries' needs.

South Africa. To be applicable in calculating workers' compensation benefits for employees.

Zambia. Provides a basis for monitoring progress.

Employers

Total number of replies: 25.

Yes: 13. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNA, CNC, CNI (Brazil), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), CONEP (Panama), CCSP, CTP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay).

No: 6. CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), MEDEF (France), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), EFP (Pakistan), CCL (Peru).

Other: 6. OEB (Cyprus), NK (Japan), NHO (Norway), CIP (Portugal), SN (Sweden), IOE.

Comments

CNC, CNI (Brazil). See question 3(a).

ANDI (Colombia), EFP (Pakistan). See question 9(a).

OEB (Cyprus). Should be determined at the national level. Degressive mechanisms should be established to encourage return to work.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). Poverty lines and income thresholds must be defined by social partners.

NHO (Norway), IOE. Attention should be paid to the different definitions of the threshold which should be defined at national level. Degressive mechanisms should also be established to encourage return to work.

NK (Japan). To avoid discretionary public administration, it is important to ensure transparency and fairness in the application of laws and regulations.

VNO–NCW (Netherlands). Consequences for the national budget are missing. Moreover, benefits should not discourage people from returning to work.

CCL (Peru). The poorest should have priority in social security.

CIP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland). It should include measures to encourage the return to work.

CIP (Portugal). See question 9(a).

SN (Sweden). See question 7(a)

CIU (Uruguay). This should include measures to encourage job search and the return to formal work.

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 84. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA

(France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 7. CUT (Brazil), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CROC (Mexico), CSDR (Romania), CTV, FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 2. CSN (Canada), LBAS (Latvia).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), NTUF (Sri Lanka), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). Should not prevent governments from setting income security levels above the poverty line, but should provide that minimum levels of income security cannot be below the poverty line.

BAK (Austria). Provision of needs-based benefits, e.g. based on a poverty line (such as 60 per cent of median income) would be useful.

NTUCB (Belize). Should consider a living wage.

CUT (Brazil). The poverty lines used by the World Bank and IMF are very low. An alternative could be the minimum wage of the countries, whose values should ensure an adequate living standard.

CSN (Canada). Should ensure a healthy and decent life.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). Should be reasonable and not constitute barriers to access to health-care services for those who do not have the financial capacities.

HMS (India). Should involve all stakeholders and have a bearing on national realities.

CATP (Peru). Should involve the social partners.

CGTP (Peru). See question 9(a).

UGT (Portugal). Should secure a decent life for individuals and their family; poverty line may be insufficient to ensure this.

UGT (Spain). Should establish a universally accepted minimum threshold.

SGB (Switzerland). Minimum levels should provide guarantees beyond survival and prevent social exclusion.

PIT–CNT (Uruguay). Minimum income levels should not be below the national poverty line.

CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Should correspond to national legislation and practice.

- Qu. 9** (c) *Financial protection for essential health-care goods and services should be sufficient to ensure access whenever required, without increasing the poverty risks and vulnerability of those in need of health care?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 94.

Yes: 84. Albania, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

No: 7. Argentina, China, El Salvador, Estonia, Hungary, Peru, United Kingdom.

Other: 3. Guatemala, India, United States.

Comments

Benin. This concerns economic organization and vision; social protection and the economy must be conciliated.

Bangladesh. Economic progress is sine qua non for such guarantees.

Cambodia. SPF implementation will take a long time for developing countries.

China. The requirement is set too high to be implemented.

Costa Rica. While the basket of goods and health-care services can differ from country to country, access to these should be financially secured.

Dominican Republic. To include in the SPF horizontal dimension. Implementation and coverage scope should be consistent with the sustainability of the system.

Ecuador. Financing should be technically planned. Sound calculations should be made.

El Salvador. Considering the economic realities and levels of poverty.

Gambia. Requires the government's financial intervention or inclusion into existing social security schemes.

Guatemala. See above.

Hungary. This would have a direct impact on States' exclusive rights to determine the level of national social security guarantees.

India. Considering the existing medical infrastructure and available resources. A basic minimum level of health-care services has to be carefully determined for selected beneficiaries considering their income and entitlements.

Kenya. Access to publicly provided basic health facilities for all citizens is imperative.

Lebanon. Universal health-care coverage would deliver financial protection against catastrophic health expenditures.

Lesotho. All people should have free access to health care. The means should be left to States, provided that the necessary goods and services are available.

Mauritius. See question 6.

Mexico. Define “essential health-care goods and services”.

Netherlands. In many countries this is a far away goal and will not be possible in the coming years.

Turkey. Countries should define their national financial protection levels.

United Kingdom. Essential health care must be free at the point of care. Modify: “Access to essential health-care goods and services should not increase poverty risks and vulnerability of those in urgent need of health care.”

United States. Meaning should be clarified. Replace “access ... health care” by “that people do not risk poverty or other financial vulnerability if they become sick and need health services”.

Employers

Total number of replies: 24.

Yes: 16. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNA, CNC, CNI, CNS (Brazil), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CTP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay).

No: 1. ANDI (Colombia).

Other: 7. OEB (Cyprus), NHO (Norway), EFP (Pakistan), CCSP, CIP (Portugal), SN (Sweden), IOE.

Comments

CNC, CNI (Brazil). See question 3(a).

ANDI (Colombia). See question 9(a).

OEB (Cyprus), NHO (Norway), EFP (Pakistan), UPS (Switzerland), IOE. See question 9(b).

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). The return to work should be encouraged.

VNO–NCW (Netherlands). If possible.

CONEP (Panama). Depends on the economic capacity of each country.

CCL (Peru). The most vulnerable groups should be prioritized.

CCSP (Portugal). Add: “, according to national circumstances and levels of development” at the end of the sentence.

CIP (Portugal), SN (Sweden). See question 7(a).

CTP (Portugal). The future viability of social security systems in some countries is at risk due to imbalance between revenue and expenditure.

CIU (Uruguay). See previous comments; “financial” should be deleted because protection could be offered through diverse mechanisms.

Workers

Total number of replies: 94.

Yes: 91. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), ACFTU (China), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE

(Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV, FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 1. TUC (United Kingdom).

Other: 2. CUT (Brazil), CSN (Canada).

Comments

BAK (Austria). Social services, in particular advice and other support, should be available for vulnerable groups.

CUT (Brazil). Access to health care must be public, universal and free.

CSN (Canada). Maternal health protection should be free.

ACFTU (China). Establishing a public health service with a view of protecting the rights and general health of its population is part of the basic duty and responsibility of the Government.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). Payments should be reasonable and should not constitute barriers to access health-care services for those who do not have the financial capacities.

CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic). The population should be covered irrespective of the level of income, on the basis of solidarity.

TUC (Ghana). Should take into account the national health risks.

UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala). Mechanisms for such protection should be found.

MTUC (Malaysia). As health-care costs are increasing significantly, financial protection is essential.

CATP (Peru). Establishing appropriate and effective financial protection without increasing the risks of poverty is essential.

CGTP (Peru). As long as it does not increase costs for workers.

TUC (United Kingdom). We support the UK Government's proposal.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). That would promote equity and justice.

Qu. 9 (d) *The levels of basic social security guarantees should be regularly reviewed through a transparent procedure prescribed by law?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 97.

Yes: 91. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago,

Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

No: 3. Czech Republic, Lithuania, Uruguay.

Other: 3. Canada, Guatemala, India.

Comments

Benin. With the objective of improving these minimum levels.

Canada. Not necessarily by law.

Cuba. Flexibility needed for adjustment.

Czech Republic. Should be determined at national level; legislation perhaps not necessary where there is already good practice.

Denmark. Not necessarily prescribed by law. Take national circumstances into account, also considering whether benefits are automatically adjusted in line with prices/wages.

Dominican Republic. Focusing on rights and transparency. Should prevent overlap, distortion of reality, evasion. Qualitative and quantitative levels of coverage to be reviewed periodically.

El Salvador. Internal control measures and procedures should be set up for each competent social security institution to evaluate, improve benefits and extend coverage. These could also be codified.

France. This will be efficient if the initial mechanism includes serious monitoring and evaluation modalities.

Guatemala. See previous comments.

India. While this is important, it may not always be possible to enforce through legal means. Delete: “procedure prescribed by law”.

Kenya. Adjustments should be pegged to fluctuations in economic factors.

Lesotho. These guarantees could also be subjected to annual indexation.

Luxembourg. Envisage mechanisms for adjustment to the cost of living (inflation) and to the standard of living (salaries).

Mauritius. Some flexibility is proposed, e.g. the review could be made based on the law or by administrative/policy decision.

Mexico. This is indispensable to measure improvements and impact of the measures. Benefits provided by various conditional transfer programmes must be indexed to the national price index to fulfil their function.

Nicaragua. Generally regulated and adjusted in line with inflation.

Senegal. Taking into account the cost of living for cash transfers.

United States. Delete “prescribed by law”; it is not necessary.

Uruguay. The legislative reforms procedure can be a rigid mechanism.

Employers

Total number of replies: 23.

Yes: 19. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNA, CNC, CNI, CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), OEB (Cyprus), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), EFP (Pakistan), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CIP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 1. MEDEF (France).

Other: 3. CCSP, CTP (Portugal), SN (Sweden).

Comments

CNI (Brazil). See question 3(a).

CNS (Brazil). Regular reviews are important to adapt to changing situations and reduce social inequality.

ANDI (Colombia). In some cases, a system should be established through legislative means that allows these minimum levels to be updated, such as for certain medical benefits.

MEDEF (France). To be determined depending on the situation of each country and notably of the procedures of consultation with social partners.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). By the social partners.

CCL (Peru). Should be continuously monitored and controlled.

CCSP (Portugal). Add “according to national circumstances and levels of development” at the end of the phrase.

CIP (Portugal). It is governments’ responsibility in accordance with national socio-economic development.

CTP (Portugal). In accordance with the economic situation of each country.

SN (Sweden). See question 7(a).

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 92. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 1. FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Comments

CGT (Argentina), BAK (Austria), NTUCB (Belize), CUT (Brazil), MCTU (Malawi), CATP, CGTP (Peru). This should include participation of social partners.

CSN (Canada). With a view to increasing benefits and ensure the redistribution of wealth.
 CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic). These reviews should ensure transparency and active participation of all stakeholders.
 UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala). Should positively improve the situation for workers and their families.
 HKCTU (Hong Kong, China). Guidance should be provided on the reasonable interval of regular reviews.
 COTU–K (Kenya). According to fluctuations in prices.
 CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania). Should be reviewed periodically in a transparent procedure, at least every 24 months.
 UGT (Spain). According to the requirements of Convention No. 102 and other ILO standards.
 PIT–CNT (Uruguay). Procedures and goals should be set, with the participation of social partners, in order to maintain benefit levels and prevent them being used as an adjustment variable for the economy.
 CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Periodic reviews should be done, as well as actuarial/financial calculations to ensure the financial equilibrium of the system.
 FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). This is exclusive and stratifies.

Qu. 9 (e) *The establishment and review of the levels of these guarantees should include an effective social dialogue involving representative employers' and workers' organizations, as well as beneficiaries and relevant public authorities?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 97.

Yes: 92. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, South Africa, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

No: 2. Lithuania, Qatar.

Other: 3. Canada, Guatemala, India.

Comments

Australia. In some countries where social security is tax-financed rather than contributory, workers' and employers' organizations may have little formal role in social security management. Social dialogue including social partners, as well as organizations representing beneficiaries and relevant public authorities would be more appropriate.

Benin. Enables a consensus to be reached on the SPF implementation.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. Development is fundamental for social protection.

Botswana. Helps understanding of beneficiaries' needs.

Canada. Replace "an effective social dialogue" by "consultations".

Costa Rica. Extend participation to other groups, e.g. the private sector.

Cuba. This should appear in national legislation.

Denmark. Some countries have universal non-contributory schemes which do not necessarily involve social dialogue, but where the national parliament legislates after consultations with relevant stakeholders.

Dominican Republic. Focus on democracy and participation. These discussions and consultations should be based on actuarial studies and real projections and implementation costs.

India. Multi-stakeholder consultation and consensus is necessary.

Kenya. Involve all stakeholders through education sessions, symposiums and annual conferences.

Lesotho. Involvement of all stakeholders in the guarantee review process is paramount, and of the government.

Mexico. Participation of employers and workers, and particularly of beneficiaries, is critical to establish and maintain an adequate SPF that improves the quality of life of the population.

Myanmar. Enables beneficiaries to receive effective benefits.

Nicaragua. Consent of all parties involved is important.

South Africa. Include health-care providers for workers' compensation.

Turkey. A sound balance should be established between the State and social partners. Social guarantees should be agreed on by effective social dialogue to guarantee social wealth and peace.

Uruguay. Social dialogue mechanisms should be used to define reforms to be undertaken.

Employers

Total number of replies: 23.

Yes: 16. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNS (Brazil), OEB (Cyprus), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), EFP (Pakistan), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CCSP, CTP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 5. CNA, CNC, CNI (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), NEF (Namibia).

Other: 2. CIP (Portugal), SN (Sweden).

Comments

BCCI (Belize). This should involve labour economists who understand that any demands to the fund would have financial and fiscal implications.

CNA (Brazil). Effective social dialogue must involve only social partners, not beneficiaries, whose interests can be defended by workers' representatives.

ANDI (Colombia). While the statutory review procedure must be subject to tripartite dialogue, the concrete adjustment of the benefits must be left to independent technical agencies.

KEF (Republic of Korea). Benefit levels should be determined through social dialogue with workers and employers.

NEF (Namibia). Beneficiaries are not defined, and it is not clear who should represent them. Social partners are capable of representing their interests and concerns.

CCL (Peru). Tripartite social dialogue should allow agreements to promote health care for workers.

CIP (Portugal). The social dialogue must involve representatives of employers and workers.

SN (Sweden). See question 7(a).

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 93. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV, FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 0.

Comments

CGT (Argentina), CGTP (Peru). See question 9(d).

BAK (Austria), CUT (Brazil), CEDOCUT (Ecuador), PIT–CNT (Uruguay). This should include the participation of social partners.

CITUB (Bulgaria). This promotes transparency and a better reflection of interests and needs.

CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic). Community organizations and society should also participate in order to guarantee levels of transparency.

UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala). In order to avoid a situation where certain governments and business co-opt or use certain trade union leaders for their own interests, it would be good to include trade unions or employers recognized or referred by the ILO.

PWF (Pakistan). It may be required that this should involve the mostly representative employers' and workers' organizations working at national level.

CS (Panama). Technical expertise should be included.

CATP (Peru). Under equal conditions, through timely and effective social dialogue done in good faith.

UGT (Spain). According to ILO standards relating to social dialogue and tripartism.

CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). All social actors should participate including the recipients of benefits.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Social dialogue should generate binding policies on this issue.

- Qu. 10** *Should the Recommendation provide that the social protection floor should:*
(a) *facilitate effective access to essential goods and services as defined at national level?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 96.

Yes: 90. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

No: 4. Costa Rica, Ecuador, Latvia, Lithuania.

Other: 2. Guatemala, Paraguay.

Comments

Belgium. Facilitate also access to quality social and public services.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. See above.

Cameroon. Such as access to health care, education and social security.

Costa Rica. Desirable but not advisable.

Dominican Republic. Guidance should be provided on what is considered as essential goods and services from the perspective of social security legislation in force.

Ecuador. Goods and services should be defined at the global level and countries should participate in this process.

El Salvador. These are fundamental human rights.

Gambia. Available access to essential consumer goods and services for the needy in the name of solidarity.

Germany. Minimum income schemes in Germany define “access to essential goods and services” only in specific areas; otherwise average consumption expenses are used to fix the value of the monthly benefit level.

Guatemala. Sources of financing should be defined.

Hungary. See questions 5(a) and 5(b).

India. The affordability of the SPF should be determined by member States.

Kenya. Minimum levels of essential goods and services should be made explicit/detailed.

Kyrgyzstan. Taking into consideration the economic possibilities of the country.

Latvia. See question 9(a).

Lesotho. Government should promote and facilitate access to essential goods and services as defined at national level.

Luxembourg. It is not easy to define “essential goods and services” in the Recommendation; defining them only at the national level may weaken the scope of the Recommendation.

Mauritius. Effective access will be possible through flexibility in the design and implementation of national SPFs, based on national circumstances and priorities.

Mexico. Should take into account the circumstances and levels of development of each country. Public policies are required to ensure effective access to these goods and services.

Norway. Need for clarification. Should member States make sure that goods and services are actually available for persons with sufficient funds to purchase them, or provide benefits in kind (goods and services) to those who do not have such funds? If the latter, while granting persons in need access to essential goods and services may be one way to alleviate their social and economic burden, in a well-functioning monetary economy the transfer of funds would in most cases be sufficient, effective and convenient. Such access should also be non-discriminatory.

Paraguay. The Recommendation should provide guidance to member States on how to define these essential goods and services, bearing in mind the key objective of the SPF: to lift people out of poverty.

Peru. According to the principles of universality and equality.

United States. Replace “floor” by “floors” in the chapeau (10); add “, tailored to and consistent with national circumstances and policies” at the end of 10(a).

Uruguay. Modify “(a) tend to facilitate ...”.

Employers

Total number of replies: 24.

Yes: 19. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNA, CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CCSP, CTP (Portugal), SN (Sweden), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 3. CNC, CNI (Brazil), NEF (Namibia).

Other: 2. EFP (Pakistan), CIP (Portugal).

Comments

ANDI (Colombia). Effective access to essential goods should be a fundamental objective of the SPF. A normative instrument is not the best way to obtain the extension of social security coverage.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). With mechanism to return to work.

NEF (Namibia). Extending SPF to goods would create difficulties.

EFP (Pakistan). As defined in the social security framework.

CCL (Peru). The Ministry of Health should have the necessary budgetary resources.

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 86. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD,

CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), LBAS (Latvia), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN, UGT (Portugal), FKTU (Republic of Korea), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 3. CTC, CUT (Colombia), FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 4. BWU (Barbados), LLC (Lesotho), GEFONT (Nepal), PWF (Pakistan).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), NTUF (Sri Lanka), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). Should provide guidance on the definition of essential goods and services included in the SPF, bearing in mind its key objective: lifting people out of poverty.

CUT (Brazil). Without prejudice to contingencies laid out in Convention No. 102.

TUC (Ghana), SGB (Switzerland). Should provide guidance on the definition of essential goods and services.

CATP (Peru). Should be defined through social dialogue, complying with ICESCR.

CGTP (Peru). See above.

CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania). The term “facilitate” does not sufficiently reflect “guaranteed access to goods and services”.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). There should not be any floor.

Qu. 10 (b) *and promote productive economic activity and formal employment?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 98.

Yes: 94. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan,

Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

No: 3. Italy, Kyrgyzstan, United Kingdom.

Other: 1. India.

Comments

Australia. One objective of the SPF is to provide persons with a social safety net that assists them to be in productive economic activity, training and formal employment.

Bahrain. Transforming the poor into employers by providing credit facilities and enabling them to become active and productive.

Benin. Promotion of the formal sector will enable persons in the informal sector to move to it.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. See question 9(e).

Botswana. This can help to reduce poverty among citizens.

Brazil. The SPF, as part of a comprehensive protection programme, is the entry point for those who are totally unprotected. It should be linked to national economic development and policies related to the Decent Work Agenda.

Cambodia. Should also promote employment in the informal sector and the formalization of the sector.

Costa Rica. The strength and financial viability of most social security systems are based on contributory schemes.

Czech Republic. Supporting formal employment and economic activity are effective preventive measures, but employment also needs to ensure social, moral and economic protection.

Dominican Republic. Member States should establish strategies to progressively reduce informal employment.

Ecuador. Member States should seek to promote mainly formal employment.

El Salvador. It is necessary to guarantee access to formal employment, which would increase access of the population to social services.

France. The close link with employment promotion is an essential condition for the SPF's success.

Germany. While social security measures should be designed so as to encourage formal employment, protection also needs to be ensured for workers in the informal economy, as long as the formal economy cannot absorb all workers.

Guatemala. It is the only way to exit from poverty and to be covered by contributive or other schemes.

India. Each member State should provide decent working opportunities but not necessarily "formal employment", as the size of formal and informal sectors may be beyond member States' capacity to change. The words "formal employment" should, therefore, be deleted. Efforts should be channelled towards extension of benefits for the unorganized sector.

Italy. This is a task of active employment policies.

Kenya. Stakeholders and government should target employment creation in policy formulation and implementation.

Lebanon. Formal employment should be encouraged, and should not be overtaxed in comparison with other economic activities. This confirms socio-economic linkages.

Lesotho. Government and other stakeholders should jointly promote productive economic activity and formal employment to enable labour market integration and reduce pressure on the government budget.

Luxembourg. It is essential to promote the move from the informal economy to the formal economy.

Mauritius. The provision of basic levels of social security helps to create a population that is sufficiently healthy, well nourished, educated and better employable in the formal economy.

Namibia. Should give more attention to the informal economy because it is fast outgrowing the formal economy.

Nicaragua. Will constitute an incentive for workers to organize themselves and strive to obtain formal employment.

Paraguay. Should also highlight the importance of contributory mechanisms to ensure the sustainability of comprehensive social security systems.

Philippines. Social protection programmes for occupationally disabled persons must be designed to meet their individual needs and to integrate them into suitable employment.

Portugal. Economic activity and the wealth generated by States will generate the resources to promote formal employment and the protection of people.

Turkey. Extending social security will enable the insured and beneficiaries to contribute to the transition from the informal to the formal economy, and add to national income.

United Kingdom. The promotion of economic activity and formal employment should not be at the expense of vulnerable groups working in the informal sector. We suggest including “where appropriate, transition to” so that the new sentence reads “promote productive economic activity and where appropriate, transition to formal employment”.

Uruguay. Establishing public policies that promote formal employment is essential for social security systems that are largely contributive.

Employers

Total number of replies: 24.

Yes: 22. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNA, CNC, CNI, CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), EFP (Pakistan), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CCSP, CTP (Portugal), SN (Sweden), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 2. NEF (Namibia), CIP (Portugal).

Comments

CNC, CNI (Brazil). See question 3(a).

CNS (Brazil). In the framework of a policy to maintain national competitiveness and sustainable employment.

ANDI (Colombia). SPFs should promote the formalization of the economy and avoid providing benefits to workers in the informal economy that are identical to those provided to workers in the formal economy.

MEDEF (France). Essential condition to implement SPFs. Tool for combating informal employment.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). Very important and should be planned very precisely.

NEF (Namibia). Replace “should” by “could”.

CCL (Peru). Should stimulate economic activity and formal employment.

CIP (Portugal). The promotion of economic activity and formal employment should not be directly included in the framework of a social protection strategy. It is the responsibility of the governments of the member States and should not be inserted in a provision of a Recommendation.

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 91. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV, FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 2. CSDR (Romania), TUC (United Kingdom).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), MTUC (Malaysia), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), NTUF (Sri Lanka), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). The Recommendation should also highlight the importance of contributory mechanisms to ensure the sustainability of comprehensive social security systems.

CUT (Brazil). Reinforcing decent work, the promotion of social justice, reduction of poverty and inequality, and gender equity.

CITUB (Bulgaria). Extremely important, otherwise dependence and consumption will be encouraged and misuses stimulated.

CSN (Canada). Through the creation of quality, non-precarious employment and reasonable working conditions.

TUC (Ghana). Social protection measures should move beneficiaries out of need into self-sufficiency.

UNSATRAGUA (Guatemala). Should also highlight the importance of contributory mechanisms to ensure the sustainability of comprehensive public social security systems and not private or licenced systems.

MCTU (Malawi), UNTM (Mali). As well as decent formal employment.

MTUC (Malaysia). The Recommendation should also highlight the importance of contributory mechanisms to ensure the sustainability of comprehensive social security systems.

CS (Panama). Promote decent work.

CATP (Peru). Through employment policies established in Conventions Nos 122 and 131.

CGTP (Peru). As long as employment creation ensures labour rights, workers' benefits and decent work.

CGTP-IN (Portugal). The professional (re)integration of beneficiaries is fundamental but beneficiaries should not be forced to accept jobs of poor quality, insecure and poorly paid or unpaid employment.

UGT (Portugal). Should emphasize the link between the enhancement of social protection and the functioning of labour markets, namely in terms of qualifications, working conditions, fair salaries, fighting informal economy and promoting formal employment.

UGT (Spain). Regulated formal employment is a source of rights based on contributions.

SGB (Switzerland). Promoting economic activity should mainly aim at employment creation.

FPU (Ukraine). National employment policies should promote full, productive and freely chosen employment by all appropriate means, including social security. Attention should also be paid to measures securing professional mobility, unemployment protection and appropriate employment opportunities.

TUC (United Kingdom). Supports the UK Government's response.

PIT-CNT (Uruguay). Within the framework of the Decent Work Agenda

CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Through the creation of decent jobs.

Qu. 10 (c) *be implemented in close coordination with other policies enhancing skills and employability, reducing informality and precariousness of employment, creating decent jobs, and promoting entrepreneurship and sustainable enterprises?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 98.

Yes: 96. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

No: 0.

Other: 2. India, Senegal.

Comments

Australia, France. See question 10(b).

Bangladesh. Depends upon economic conditions.

Benin. Creates synergies between different social policies.

Botswana. Harmonization of policies is key to avoid duplication of efforts.

Brazil. Essential to establish a coordination mechanism between different policies so as to ensure a unified government policy.

Canada. Social security is an important tool to reduce, alleviate and prevent poverty, social exclusion and social security when it is provided in combination with active labour market measures such as training designed to improve employability and labour force participation.

Costa Rica. Also with public policies in health, pensions, environment, education and others.

Czech Republic. Should be ensured through an appropriate combination of different policies (employment, economic, educational and social) that lead to a sufficient level of flexibility and labour market mobility while ensuring adequate protection of workers and social stability.

Dominican Republic. Essential to establish public policy framework based on common objectives.

Ecuador. Should be a priority of the State. Without policies for inclusion and for the redistribution of wealth, there would be no model for social security.

El Salvador, Guatemala. Enhances efficiency and avoids duplicating efforts.

Honduras. Crucial also in the planning process and other public policies.

India. Implementation of the SPF requires close coordination with schemes and programmes for skill development, employment generation and promoting entrepreneurship for the vulnerable and needy.

Lebanon. Should be coordinated with national employment plans and public policies in this respect.

Lesotho. Increased formal employment translates into increased revenue for the government, and higher investments into the livelihoods of the people without necessarily creating dependency.

Luxembourg. Integrating quality employment (in terms of salary and social security) should be envisaged.

Mauritius. Social security benefits should not constitute disincentives for employers to offer, and workers to seek, employment. Closer integration of social and economic policies will contribute to more sustainability within the social security system.

Netherlands. A well-functioning flexible labour market, decent employment and room for entrepreneurial activities are important conditions.

Paraguay. Should also recognize that quality public services and fair fiscal policies are essential to ensuring high levels of quality employment, that collective bargaining contributes to ensuring a fair sharing of productivity gains and reducing the gender pay gap, and that high levels of employment, the promotion of decent jobs and the setting of adequate wages are key to ensuring the financial sustainability of comprehensive social security systems.

Peru. Should promote coherence between social security and employment policies, within the framework of decent work.

Portugal. The main objective of social security is to guarantee basic rights and support working and non-working citizens in various eventualities with which they might be confronted throughout their lives.

Senegal. Mainly national employment and professional training policies.

Serbia, Zambia. Need for policy coherence.

Sri Lanka. Social protection policy cannot be effectively implemented in isolation.

Turkey. Social policy should contribute to including socially or economically disadvantaged groups in formal employment.

Employers

Total number of replies: 24.

Yes: 20. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNA, CNCCNI, CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CCSP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 1. CIP (Portugal).

Other: 3. EFP (Pakistan), CTP (Portugal), SN (Sweden).

Comments

CNA, CNC, CNI (Brazil). See question 3(a).

ANDI (Colombia). States should develop policies and temporary incentives to encourage the formalization of the informal economy, promoting entrepreneurship and sustainable enterprises. The formal economy cannot finance the extension of social protection to the informal economy.

SPD (Czech Republic). Delete “and precariousness of employment”. In order to create jobs, enterprises need a broad range of various types of employment relationships.

MEDEF (France). Assessment differs depending on the national level of development.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). Employment provides the best social protection, especially for the transition from the informal economy to the formal economy.

EFP (Pakistan). Would be too complicated.

CCL (Peru). This is essential. The exorbitant extra costs and bureaucratic obstacles that impede formalization, namely that of SMEs, should be eliminated.

CIP (Portugal). See question 10(b).

CTP (Portugal). A paradigm change regarding active and passive employment policies is needed to transform these to be more useful for citizens and enterprises, to better prepare for working life.

SN (Sweden). Need for flexible and up-to-date labour market legislation which offers the right incentive for employment.

Workers

Total number of replies: 92.

Yes: 90. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 1. FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 1. CSN (Canada).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), NTUF (Sri Lanka), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). Quality public services, good social and physical infrastructure and fair fiscal policies are essential in ensuring high levels of quality employment. Extending the coverage of collective bargaining through the application of efficient mechanisms must be part of an integrated SPF implementation strategy. High levels of employment, the promotion of decent jobs and the setting of adequate wages are all vital elements for the financial sustainability of comprehensive social security systems.

ACTU (Australia). It would be beneficial to define or clarify the term “decent jobs”.

BAK (Austria). Should include effective access for youth to general and vocational education (after mandatory school age). Education policy should ensure that children from poor and vulnerable families enjoy the same opportunities as other children.

CUT (Brazil). Social security should be a strategic part of the country’s development model, as a basis for social justice, income distribution and promotion of equal opportunities.

CSN (Canada). Activation policies are legitimate if supporting reintegration into employment, but not at all costs, for any job and conditions. The concept of “suitable employment” should be included. Minimum wage increases and return to school programmes and vocational training are also important.

NHS (Croatia). Social security should be seen as an “umbrella” for those who are in need and at the same time a bridge towards new employment.

CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands). Quality public services including child-care facilities and a good social and physical infrastructure are important, as is collective bargaining for a fair sharing of productivity gains through social protection mechanisms.

CATP (Peru). Social policies should be coordinated and supported by an efficient labour administration system in line with Convention No. 150.

UGT (Spain). Add: strengthening of collective bargaining and social dialogue to redress the informality and precarious employment, labour administration, public employment services and effective active employment policies; an efficient and fair fiscal policy; social infrastructure to facilitate, e.g. the compatibility between work and care, affordable transportation to the workplace, health monitoring, etc.

SGB (Switzerland). Employment, family, fiscal and equality policies also play a key role in guaranteeing social security to all. Importance of coordination and employers’ responsibility.

FPU (Ukraine). Governments, employers and workers should break the vicious circle of precarious employment and unemployment due to loss of qualifications and lower earnings. Better opportunities for adjustment of qualifications to changing demand may effectively support productive economic activity and employment.

Qu. 11 *Should the Recommendation provide that Members may use different means and approaches to implement the basic social security guarantees of their social protection floor, including universal benefit schemes, social insurance, public employment programmes and employment support schemes as well as social assistance schemes that provide benefits to people with low income, or appropriate combinations of such measures?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 98.

Yes: 93. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

No: 4. Denmark, El Salvador, Hungary, Peru.

Other: 1. Guatemala.

Comments

Australia. For implementation under all national conditions, it is important to highlight the need for activities to be context-specific and nationally defined, recognizing that countries have different social needs, development objectives and fiscal capacity to achieve them.

Bangladesh. This is very much needed.

Belize. Delete “including universal benefit schemes ... appropriate combinations of such measures”.

Benin. Will allow each Member to choose the most appropriate mechanism for the implementation of the basic guarantees of its SPF.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. Within the limits of their political, economic and legal conditions member States should extend social security with the goal of universality.

Botswana, Sri Lanka. Means and approaches need to be adapted to national circumstances.

Denmark. Social assistance should not be part of the social security guarantees. SPFs encompass social security and social assistance and not vice versa.

Dominican Republic. Different perspectives can be applied, e.g. universality, conditionality, or of a transitory nature, depending on the benefit. SPF benefits, services and transfers should be based on demand or social needs and provided within a system based on solidarity, and sustainable and coherent with the economic and financial situation of the State.

Ecuador. The State should protect the most vulnerable and those excluded from society.

El Salvador. Although this type of measure is the responsibility of the State, its implementation is tripartite and therefore consultation with, and validation by, all sectors is necessary.

France. Should detail the different possibilities of designing and financing SPFs without omitting contributory schemes.

Germany. Mention means and approaches that include private and civil society actors (private insurers, cooperatives, microfinance institutions).

Guatemala. Financing should be defined.

Honduras, Mauritius. According to national circumstances.

Hungary. Different means and approaches may be used according to national practice in implementing basic social security guarantees. Given the diversity of national systems, not useful to list specific instruments.

India. It may also be provided that universal application of social security schemes should be decided by States, as they may address this in a phased manner.

Indonesia. Especially to boost microinsurance in a development context and implement SPF in the informal sector.

Kenya. Guide members on approaches and modalities which they can customize.

Latvia. This would provide guidance to countries when developing and improving their systems.

Lebanon. Universal schemes are essential and should be the main instruments; however, special schemes may be necessary to include people with special needs, according to the national context.

Lesotho. Should allow member States to set up their systems as they see fit so long as the objective of providing adequate SPF is met.

Luxembourg. Only a combination of different means can achieve the expected results.

Namibia. Does not support unemployment benefits due to concerns about dependency and a negative influence on the productive workforce.

Paraguay. Should also emphasize the importance of the universality of the SPF, as no one should be excluded. However, listed implementation mechanisms deliver different outcomes and vary in terms of poverty eradication. Guidance is needed on which instruments are best suited to achieve the double objective of universality of access to social security schemes and predictability of income security.

Peru. The term “approaches” should not be used, as the assumptions which give rise to these means are based on the principles of social security.

Portugal. Should be sufficiently flexible to allow for different protection mechanisms and combinations thereof.

United Kingdom. Replace “to people with low income” with “on a targeted basis”.

United States. Replace “floor” by “floors”; add “tax rebate policies” after “social insurance”, replace all references to “schemes” by “systems”.

Uruguay. Effective universal coverage involves using the full range of alternatives in terms of existing programmes, schemes and policies.

Viet Nam. It may be difficult to identify the extent to which the combination of such measures is appropriate.

Zambia. Provided this results in the employment of vulnerable social groups.

Employers

Total number of replies: 24.

Yes: 19. AiG (Australia), CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), EFP (Pakistan), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CCSP, CTP (Portugal), SN (Sweden), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 4. BCCI (Belize), CNA, CNC, CNI (Brazil).

Other: 1. CIP (Portugal).

Comments

ANDI (Colombia). Should include that member States can use different means to implement the basic social security guarantees in their SPFs; support for employment and productive enterprises is also important.

MEDEF (France). Largest degree of freedom should be left to member States. In any case, no additional charge on enterprises.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), UPS (Switzerland), IOE. A wide range of models already exists.

KEF (Republic of Korea). While social insurance is based on cost sharing, those who do not have the financial capability should be provided support through state contributions.

CCL (Peru). Depending on assigned budget.

CIP (Portugal). Under the competence of the governments of member States.

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 89. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 3. CUT (Brazil), CSDR (Romania), FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 1. CSN (Canada).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), NZCTU (New Zealand), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay),

NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), NTUF (Sri Lanka), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). Universality is essential to the SPF: no one should be excluded. Given the variation in outcomes and impact on poverty eradication of the listed implementation mechanisms, guidance should be provided as to which instruments are best suited to achieve both universality of access to social security schemes and predictability of income security.

CGT (Argentina). The universal nature of the SPF should be emphasized, especially for the least-protected contingencies. Strategies for the extension of coverage should not be limited to assistance programmes based on conditionalities, but built on a comprehensive system based on rights.

CUT (Brazil). Minimum guarantees must be anchored in common law to be universal.

CITUB (Bulgaria). These schemes are part of social security and should be used for the above purposes.

CSN (Canada). Provided that this leads to effective results.

NHS (Croatia). A combination of these means is probably the best approach.

CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands). Should provide guidance on which instruments are best suited for achieving universality.

CATP (Peru). Different means and approaches may be used to implement the basic guarantees, but this should not mean a reduction in the level of benefits under the false pretence of progressive extension of social security rights.

CGTP (Peru). Should be part of a comprehensive plan including various universal benefit schemes.

FNPR (Russian Federation). Should emphasize the importance of the universality of the SPF.

UGT (Spain). For countries with few resources, a combination of methods may produce inequities if policies are not adequately administered.

TUC (United Kingdom). Supports the UK Government's response.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). The issue is not low wages but that the State guarantees the equilibrium.

CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). These types of measures should be included as they address those with the lowest incomes.

Qu. 12 *Should the Recommendation provide that, to be effective, the implementation of the national social protection floor requires an appropriate mix of preventive and promotional measures, benefits and social services?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 97.

Yes: 91. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, Gambia, Germany, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

No: 1. Hungary.

Other: 5. China, Dominican Republic, France, Guatemala, India.

Comments

Benin. Will enable a higher number of beneficiaries to have access to SPF benefits.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. See above.

Cameroon. Through different means in line with Convention No. 102.

China. Cannot be achieved now, but can serve as a development goal.

Dominican Republic. The rational use of the services and the rights and obligations of individuals should also be promoted to ensure the system's sustainability.

El Salvador. Through awareness raising of social partners on the importance of complying with labour standards in employment, OSH and hygiene.

France. Link with an appropriate combination of modes of financing.

Guatemala. Especially prevention of chronic illness.

India. No need for preventive measures.

Kenya. To avoid overdependence on one aspect, which could slow economic growth.

Latvia. Adequate SPFs necessitate a proper mix of social insurance, social assistance and social services, and employment policy.

Lebanon, Sri Lanka. To be determined by States in accordance with national context.

Lesotho. The SPF should be structured in such a way that it is preventive, curative and promotional in order to ensure that vulnerable people receive necessary assistance through various means, supplemented by public works and the promotion of entrepreneurship.

Luxembourg. Prevention is essential and should be supported in discussions at all levels.

Mauritius, Portugal. See question 11.

Mexico. For the policies to be effective, preventive measures, benefits and social services should be considered.

Netherlands. Effective implementation depends on the creation of carefully tailored national instruments and solutions.

Philippines. Social protection must include adequate OSH and accident prevention in the work environment.

South Africa. Need to provide prevention strategy on occupational injuries and diseases.

Turkey. All institutions should work in coordination to guarantee effective social protection.

United States. Replace "floor" by "floors".

Employers

Total number of replies: 24.

Yes: 18. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), EFP (Pakistan), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CTP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 5. CNA, CNC, CNI (Brazil), CCSP, CIP (Portugal).

Other: 1. SN (Sweden).

Comments

ANDI (Colombia). The gradual development of a viable system which provides protection to all, and especially to those most in need, requires the combination of preventive and promotional measures.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). With feedback for further revisions and modifications.

CCL (Peru). Health prevention is fundamental.

CCSP (Portugal), SN (Sweden). To be decided at national level, respecting national circumstances and levels of development.

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 90. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 2. CSDR (Romania), FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 1. CSN (Canada).

Comments

CITUB (Bulgaria). Facilitates achieving the main objective, so that people can live decently and be able to manage by themselves, especially when they are fit for work.

CSN (Canada). Investing in preventive health and safety at work avoids expenditure for disability benefits, in addition to protecting the physical and psychological integrity of workers.

CTC, CUT (Colombia), TUC (Ghana). Prevention is important and should be emphasized.

CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic). The implementation of a strategy for promotion and prevention in health is fundamental for the efficiency of the system.

UNSI TRAGUA (Guatemala). Should effectively protect and benefit all persons so that they have the right and the access to a decent life irrespective of age and gender.

CATP, CGTP (Peru). Appropriate policies on promotion and prevention are important.

SGB (Switzerland). Should also provide information on effective and ineffective combinations of measures.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). There should not be a floor.

Qu. 13

Should the Recommendation provide that:

- (a) *Members may choose different options to mobilize the necessary resources to ensure financial and fiscal sustainability of their social protection floor, taking into account the contributory capacities of different population groups?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 96.

Yes: 90. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia.

No: 4. Bulgaria, Peru, Qatar, Tajikistan.

Other: 2. India, Paraguay.

Comments

Australia. See question 11. To be flexible, a list of possible options for Members to finance SPFs, such as publicly funded schemes and co-contributory schemes, may be included.

Bangladesh, Indonesia, Nicaragua. Should consider the circumstances and capacities of each country.

Benin. Will ensure the solvency of those who contribute to the SPF financing.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. Within the limits of their political, economic and legal conditions, States should extend social security towards universality, based on income capacity and solidarity.

Cameroon. Should consider contributory capacities for social insurance, and public finances regarding social assistance.

Dominican Republic. Guidance needed on the evaluation of social security expenditure, the social budget and on the reports of contribution collection authorities. Necessary to implement control mechanisms to detect contribution evasion, non-registration and fraud.

Ecuador, Kenya. SPF financing should be determined by each State.

El Salvador. Collecting contributions is important to guarantee financial sustainability over time and effective delivery.

India. Different options should be explored for mobilizing the necessary finances for implementation.

Lebanon. Options for such mobilization should be presented and explored, but all programmes must be guaranteed by the State as provider of last resort.

Lesotho. Governments should create an enabling environment through contributory schemes for those with contributory capacity. Social safety nets should be provided for those without contributory capacity.

Luxembourg. A socially equitable distribution of the financial burden should be sought.

Mexico. The term “options to mobilize the necessary resources to ensure financial and fiscal sustainability of their social protection floor” should be defined. Each member State should define financing mechanisms.

Netherlands. In consultation with social partners.

Paraguay. The financial capacity of member States to implement the SPF would be strengthened through the formalization of employment and enterprises, contributory systems as well as progressive tax systems, mechanisms to tackle tax erosion and tax evasion and the introduction of a financial transaction tax.

Peru. While the term “choose” requires that the options are already predefined, a certain margin of options should exist to implement the best possible conditions in line with national circumstances.

Portugal. Could include clauses that provide for the existence of various mechanisms without, naturally, restraining member States in decisions that will always be defined at national level.

Senegal. Preferable to promote access free of charge, considering the weak contributory capacity of beneficiaries who are poor and vulnerable.

South Africa. Employers’ contributions to the workers’ compensation schemes must be linked to the risk profile of the industry as well as individual company accident rate experience.

Turkey. Programmes should be designed considering each group’s contributory capacities.

United States. Replace “ensure” by “provide for”; and “floor” by “floors”.

Zambia. Developing countries will need the support of cooperating partners to set the base.

Employers

Total number of replies: 25.

Yes: 21. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNA, CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway), EFP (Pakistan), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CCSP, CTP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 3. CNC, CNI, CIP (Portugal).

Other: 1. SN (Sweden).

Comments

BCCI (Belize). Different options should be employed to garner the necessary resources at a predictable level, in line with countries’ special needs and levels of development.

CNA (Brazil). The SPF should provide benefits proportional to contributions paid.

ANDI (Colombia). Most social security schemes need to be reviewed to better reflect demographic changes, present financial realities, the increasing role of private schemes, and the contributory capacity of the different population groups. Thus, different means exist to achieve the goals of a sustainable system.

OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway), EFP (Pakistan), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE. In consultation with social partners.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). Resource mobilization is vital and must be defined with the social partners.

CCL (Peru). Member States should decide on the best way to finance their SPF.

CTP (Portugal). Contributory capacities need to be taken into account as some countries already have high tax and contributory burdens and there is no room left for manoeuvre.

SN (Sweden). See question 12.

Workers

Total number of replies: 90.

Yes: 79. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), LBAS (Latvia), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 5. CUT (Brazil), CTC, CUT (Colombia), FKTU (Republic of Korea), FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 6. CGT (Argentina), UGTD (Djibouti), LLC (Lesotho), GEFONT (Nepal), PWF (Pakistan), FNPR (Russian Federation).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), NZCTU (New Zealand), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). The registration of informal businesses and of informally employed workers would strengthen the financial capacity of Members to implement the SPF. Contributory systems have a strong potential to strengthen the horizontal and vertical extensions of social security coverage. Progressive tax systems, mechanisms to tackle tax erosion and tax evasion, and a financial transaction tax are important means to increase fiscal space.

NTUCB (Belize). With major focus on government contribution.

CUT (Brazil). Social security should be financed by society through a combination of several stable sources of funding. Employment creation and transition to formal employment, including social protection guarantees, should be promoted, as well as tax reforms to establish fair taxation.

CITUB (Bulgaria). The tax system is important, particularly with respect to high-income groups.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). Random mobilization of resources results in losses or insufficient benefits. Therefore, services should be assured to benefit and promote general well-being of individuals, and resources reallocated.

NHS (Croatia). Strengthening contributory capacities of different population groups will result in a strong social security system.

ČMKOS (Czech Republic). Some reforms lead to further deepening of tax inequalities. Rising inequality of insurance burden between employees and self-employed persons may lead to “solidarity of the poor with the rich”.

CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic). Members should have the right to freely choose the registration of informal businesses and workers, and contributory schemes can help to strengthen Members' financial capacity to implement their SPFs.

CTM (Mexico). The principle of proportionality for those in this situation should be established.

CS (Panama). National and supranational enterprises should finance programmes of social security through proportional taxation.

CATP (Peru). This range of options should be developed in line with Convention No. 102.

CGTP (Peru). Businesses that manage funds should contribute to the contributions of workers; at present they only profit from the system. Workers' funds should not be allowed to be invested on the stock exchange given the high risk of loss.

NSZZ (Poland), NTUF (Sri Lanka). Registration of informal businesses and of informally employed workers would strengthen the financial capacity of Members to implement the SPF. Contributory systems have a strong potential to strengthen the horizontal and vertical extensions of social security coverage.

CGTP-IN (Portugal). Social protection systems must be financially sustainable, taking into account that contributory systems are financed by workers and employers, without questioning the diversification of funding resources.

UGT (Portugal). Should mention various instruments, including improving tax collection systems, combating informal economy and reorientation of public expenses.

UGT (Spain). Individuals with limited resources should not have to bear a heavy burden (Convention No. 102). Benefits which represent a certain proportion of earnings should preferably be financed by contributions, and those that protect all residents through taxes. The financial capacity of the State should be strengthened through fair and progressive tax and inspection systems.

SGB (Switzerland). Progressive tax systems, as well as the registration of informal businesses and of informally employed workers would strengthen the financial capacity of Members to implement the SPF. Contributory systems have a strong potential to ensure the financial and budgetary viability of SPFs.

PIT-CNT (Uruguay). Intergenerational and intragenerational solidarity between population groups that have the capacity to contribute to the SPF, as well as general taxation, can ensure the financial and fiscal sustainability of the SPF.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). The State cannot be hostage to mercantilism and cartelization of social security.

CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). As long as this is done in a tripartite manner through social dialogue.

Qu. 13 *and, more specifically, that:*

(b) these options may include better enforcement of tax and contribution obligations, reprioritizing expenditure, and broadening the revenue base?

Governments

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 80. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Mauritius, Malaysia, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia.

No: 11. Australia, Belize, Bulgaria, Ecuador, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Trinidad and Tobago.

Other: 2. India, United States.

Comments

Australia. Should focus on design of SPFs rather than on how extra revenue may be created. Should emphasize the need for governments to reprioritize expenditure to allocate funds to social security systems, or develop innovative ways to fund them, rather than relying on broadening revenue bases or enforcement of tax.

Bangladesh. Simplification of tax process, accountability and transparency should be ensured.

Benin. Will enable Members to better manage their resources and diversify sources of revenues.

Dominican Republic. Actions should be coordinated with labour and fiscal inspection services, authorities charged with contribution collection and monitoring, and awareness raising. Optimizing contribution collection in contributory and mixed systems is critical, as well as state contributions to social assistance programmes.

Ecuador, Portugal. Within the scope of competence of the State.

El Salvador. Each State and its tax authorities should establish the contribution mechanisms.

Germany. These measures (which represent only a few possible options) should refer only to countries with insufficient fiscal resources; they should be encouraged to design their fiscal system so as to ensure basic social protection.

Guatemala, Nicaragua, Peru. According to national circumstances.

India. Links between taxation and revenue generation and social protection should not be prescribed.

Indonesia. Consider the capability of each country, including cross-subsidy from capable group.

Mexico. Specify who is responsible for “better enforcement of tax and contribution obligations”. States must establish more effective mechanisms of coordination between fiscal and social security policies.

Turkey. Countries should first develop expertise on how to use their own resources in the most efficient way, and reallocate these resources in the best manner. Application for international assistance should follow.

United States. Too detailed. If specific suggested actions are to be included, insert “inter alia” after “may include”.

Zambia. Governments must show commitment to social protection.

Employers

Total number of replies: 25.

Yes: 11. BCCI (Belize), CNS (Brazil), OEB (Cyprus), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway), CCL (Peru), CTP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), IOE.

No: 10. AiG (Australia), CNA, CNC, CNI (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), SPD (Czech Republic), NEF (Namibia), CONEP (Panama), CCSP (Portugal), CIU (Uruguay).

Other: 4. MEDEF (France), EFP (Pakistan), CIP (Portugal), SN (Sweden).

Comments

BCCI (Belize). A widened tax base that supports efficient revenue collection and transparency.

ANDI (Colombia). Imposing additional fiscal burdens on enterprises should not be considered a source of financing for social protection schemes, since it would threaten the sustainability of enterprises in difficult times. However, the Recommendation should not enter into this level of detail.

OEB (Cyprus), NHO (Norway), IOE. The notion of broadening the revenue base does not automatically mean an increase in taxes on business, which would actually be counterproductive. All financing-related matters should be left to national actors. Moreover, businesses operating formally cannot be asked to pay to provide coverage for workers in the informal economy.

MEDEF (France). Rather no.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). As long as “broadening the revenue base” does not mean increasing taxes which will increase the informal economy, and make the formal economy cover the costs of the informal economy.

NEF (Namibia). These options go way beyond extending the SPF.

VNO–NCW (Netherlands). Prudence is necessary to avoid an increase in the informal economy.

EFP (Pakistan). Recommendation to be limited to 10(a).

CONEP (Panama). There has been an escalation of taxes during the last ten years.

CCL (Peru). The health sector should be given priority in budget allocations.

CCSP (Portugal). Too specific, national options should be allowed.

CTP (Portugal). See question 13(a).

SN (Sweden). See question 12.

UPS (Switzerland). This must not lead to an increase in taxes on enterprises.

CIU (Uruguay). Questions regarding financing should be decided by social actors.

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 90. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 2. ACTU (Australia), FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 1. LBAS (Latvia).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), NZCTU (New Zealand), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), NTUF (Sri Lanka), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey),

ZCTU (Zimbabwe). Better enforcement of tax and contributory obligations requires adequate tax and labour inspections.

CGT (Argentina). In addition to broadening of the tax base, progressive taxation can also support the reduction of inequalities and equality of opportunities, as well as measures to prevent types of contract which evade or hide the employment relationship.

CUT (Brazil). Supervision systems, and tax and labour inspections, should be improved.

CSN (Canada). The tax base should also be broadened by increasing taxation on the rich and enterprises, luxury goods, a financial transaction tax and combating fiscal paradises.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). Fundamental rights should be respected, such as pension rights and family wealth.

NHS (Croatia). Better enforcement of tax and contribution obligations will result in better financial and fiscal sustainability.

TUC (Ghana). Through social dialogue.

LBAS (Latvia). Question not clear.

CTM (Mexico). Should be based on the principle of proportionality.

CATP (Peru). This would ensure the sustainability of the system.

CGTP (Peru). This is the cornerstone of the system.

UGT (Spain). Effective tax and labour administration is essential.

SGB (Switzerland). Social security should be prioritized in expenditure decisions.

PIT-CNT (Uruguay). The tripartite contributory nature of the social security system must be emphasized, without prejudice to tax funding, based on progressive tax systems which tax primarily capital.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). The State must guarantee social security.

Qu. 14 *Should the Recommendation provide that the national social protection floor should, in principle, be financed by domestic resources, while noting that some low-income countries may need to have recourse to transitional international financial support?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 82. Albania, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia.

No: 9. Argentina, Belize, Benin, Ecuador, Egypt, Latvia, Nicaragua, Peru, Saudi Arabia.

Other: 2. India, Panama.

Comments

Argentina. Each country should choose the most appropriate strategy to implement its SPF.

Bangladesh. Transitional financial support is required.

Belgium. Should not incur additional financial burden for enterprises. Policies that stimulate formalization contribute to increasing public revenues for financing higher levels of protection. Labour inspection services contribute to extension strategies.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. Extension within the limits of States' political, economic and legal conditions and with the goal of universality.

Cameroon. Privilege subsidies for the implementation of the SPF.

Canada. Delete "financial"; "support" can include monetary support and take other forms, e.g. assistance in developing systems, programmes and policies.

Costa Rica. Mention the source of financing and that the administration of funds should ensure the sustainability of social protection.

Dominican Republic. The State should ensure the appropriate use of funds from contributions and of public funds. International cooperation should prioritize grants and horizontal cooperation.

Ecuador. Financing should be decided by each State. Principles should be guaranteed, not the financing.

Egypt. Could weaken national capacities to guarantee an effective SPF.

El Salvador. International financial support should be considered, as many developing countries do not have the necessary financial resources to improve their levels of social protection, combined with difficulty in contribution catchment.

Germany. A reference to transitional international assistance is agreeable but no reference should be made to permanent assistance or to a mandatory international funding mechanism.

Guatemala. Should be in the form of grants rather than loans, and its use rigorously monitored.

India. Should be financed through domestic resources to retain the independence of policy decisions. Using international funding should be decided by States depending on needs and priorities.

Indonesia. Transitional international financial support is prioritized for social assistance.

Japan. International cooperation should be promoted to transfer professional knowledge and experience, and financial assistance.

Kyrgyzstan. In the form of a grant.

Luxembourg. International solidarity, e.g. through setting up of a special fund for the implementation of an SPF in some economically least-developed countries.

Mauritius. Domestic financing entails long-term sustainability.

Mexico. At the country level, it is fundamental that ILO collaboration be provided through nationally driven initiatives in which financial support and its scope are clearly defined.

Netherlands. Using domestic resources guarantees an effective priority-setting process and use of instruments, as well as a country's responsibility for its own national SPF.

Nicaragua. External financing increases external debt. The use of domestic resources should be based on sound fiscal planning.

Norway. Funding, distribution, management, supervision, etc. of transitional international financial support should not be addressed further. These questions still need to be resolved in bi/multilateral agreements.

Saudi Arabia. Financing sources should be defined nationally.

Senegal. International assistance expresses solidarity in the implementation of national SPFs at national and international level, especially since this initiative is a global response to poverty.

Sri Lanka. International financial support for low-income countries should be based only on the country's economic situation and conditions.

Switzerland. Recourse to international financial assistance should be transitional and accompanied by a reimbursement plan. The SPF should be developed so as to be financed by national resources.

United Kingdom. Add: "External financing may be necessary particularly during a crisis; in a post-conflict situation; or as social protection comes to replace repeated annual emergency food aid in addressing chronic food insecurity".

United States. Replace "noting" by "recognizing"; and "international financial support" by "assistance".

Zambia. See question 13(b).

Employers

Total number of replies: 26.

Yes: 16. AiG (Australia), OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CCSP, CTP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 6. BCCI (Belize), CNA, CNC, CNI, CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia).

Other: 4. NK (Japan), EFP (Pakistan), CIP (Portugal), SN (Sweden).

Comments

BCCI (Belize). A dual approach, taking into consideration both domestic resources and those from international donors.

CNA (Brazil). Should not include a reference to international financial support.

CNS (Brazil). To be sustainable, social security should always be financed from domestic resources.

ANDI (Colombia). Although serious efforts of collaboration are essential, this is optional and does not need to be mentioned.

OEB (Cyprus), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), NK (Japan), NHO (Norway), IOE. While many developing countries are in need of external assistance, the long-term objective is exclusively national financing in order to guarantee the sustainability of the floors.

MEDEF (France). Conditional upon international financing being provided at the onset and on a punctual basis.

NK (Japan). The transfer of expertise and experience is a more important form of international support than financial assistance.

NEF (Namibia). Who would actually be able to supply international financial support?

VNO–NCW (Netherlands). International financial support should only be temporary.

EFP (Pakistan). Many developing countries may need external assistance.

CCL (Peru). Domestic resources are the base; international support can come on top of that.

CIP (Portugal). In the current crisis international financial support should be possible for any country as long as they meet eligibility requirements.

SN (Sweden). See question 12.

UPS (Switzerland). The objective is financing by domestic resources.

CIU (Uruguay). The long-term objective is financing by domestic resources to guarantee the sustainability of the floors.

Workers

Total number of replies: 92.

Yes: 89. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), CGTP–IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 2. CSDR (Romania), FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 1. NSZZ (Poland).

Comments

CGT (Argentina). Apart from some very specific and cyclical situations, countries should find both the fiscal space and contributory resources to achieve the levels indicated in the initiative.

CITUB (Bulgaria). International financial help is disputable, especially when it is not gratis.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). As long as it is executed within an objective and real framework.

CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic). The State should maintain its responsibilities as guarantor, and in ensuring efficiency and financial sustainability.

TUC (Ghana). Countries should be encouraged to use domestic revenue in funding social protection policies.

UNSI TRAGUA (Guatemala). Specific time frames should be defined, since failure to do so would allow tax evasion or evasion by employers and government liability to continue.

CGT (Honduras). Systems should be self-supporting.

JTUC–RENGO (Japan), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Because temporary financial support alone does not create a sustainable SPF, it is important to transfer expert knowledge and know-how.

COTU–K (Kenya), FPU (Ukraine). International support should not be accompanied by conditionalities.

CGTM (Mauritania). Financing could include taxing certain activities (e.g. mobile telephony) or oil and mining revenues.

CTM (Mexico). This measure would go beyond assisting developing-country member States. Measures to control resources should be implemented.

CS (Panama). Long-term loans at low interest rates should be administered in order not to affect investment programmes in the country.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Social security cannot be a mechanism for domination and indebtedness of countries.

National social security extension strategy

Qu. 15 *Should the Recommendation provide that Members should design, through an effective social dialogue process, a long-term social security extension strategy that identifies gaps in protection and seeks to close them by building a comprehensive social security system?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 97.

Yes: 86. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Gambia, Germany, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia.

No: 6. Estonia, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Nicaragua, Peru.

Other: 5. Canada, Denmark, Finland, Guatemala, India.

Comments

Argentina. As long as the legitimate democratic spheres of political and parliamentary representation are upheld.

Australia. Providing context to the establishment of a national SPF, this strategy will be an important mechanism through which Members may progressively focus on both extending horizontal coverage and examining social security levels including eligibility requirements and levels of benefits.

Bangladesh. Social dialogue and consultation among all sections of society can help develop this strategy.

Benin. Appropriate; will help to close coverage gaps.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. The immediate task is not only to consolidate the protection measures and promote an SPF, but to ensure that member States effectively benefit from these.

Canada. The parameters of such a strategy should be determined by Members after consultation. Replace “an effective social dialogue process” by “a consultation process”. Points 15 and 16 may be reordered.

Czech Republic. Should include not only social dialogue of tripartite partners, but also discussions with representatives of non-governmental organizations, social service providers, persons with disabilities, etc.

Denmark. Appears to be too normative with respect to Members who already have comprehensive and developed social security systems.

Dominican Republic. Should be based on an evaluation of social security expenditure, coverage and progress achieved.

Ecuador. All work towards the extension of social security is positive. Social dialogue helps to create agreement and consensus.

El Salvador. With the participation of other social actors such as workers' and employers' associations, the private and public sector, it would help to create a comprehensive social security system and thus extend it to the informal economy.

Finland. Should aim at the gradual development of social security; the Recommendation should be worded more generally.

Germany. Various social security instruments should be coordinated in a systemic approach and be coherent with other policy areas.

Guatemala, Peru. According to country context.

Hungary. Implementation conditions, including economic and labour market developments, should be examined, and relevant national policies included.

India. Social dialogue should be applied at all stages of decision on the extension of the SPF, the identification of constraints and measures to overcome the gaps.

Kenya. Ensures relevance, commitment and viability.

Lebanon. Piecemeal solutions should be replaced by a comprehensive social security system.

Lesotho. Adequate and full coverage of social protection should be the objective of all member States. Existing coverage gaps should be closed, if necessary through progressive realization.

Luxembourg. The development of a strong and comprehensive social security system remains the principal objective.

Mauritius. The full realization of social security rights can only be achieved progressively. This principle is well recognized within the UN human rights framework.

Mexico. This indispensable comprehensive long-term strategy should aim at achieving equitable economic growth, social cohesion and decent work, as mentioned in the 2011 Conclusions.

Norway. See general observations. Replace "strategy ... close them" by "strategy in order to ascertain whether there are gaps in the protection, and, if so, to seek to close them". However, the social security system should also approach people who are not integrated in the formal economy.

Paraguay. A comprehensive social security system should provide universal coverage in the nine contingencies with guaranteed minimum replacement rates in line with Convention No. 102.

Portugal. Recommending such measures might be useful to ensure that population groups are not being left without social protection.

Romania. Members should decide if a national strategy should include all sectors and priorities. Existing national strategies and policies should be taken into account.

South Africa. Need to establish linkages and alignment between different social security agencies.

Turkey. Will be beneficial for establishing a realistic and sustainable social security system to identify and close protection gaps.

United Kingdom. Add "as resources become available" at the end.

United States. Add at the end “, tailored to and consistent with national circumstances and policies”.

Viet Nam. As a matter of urgency.

Employers

Total number of replies: 24.

Yes: 17. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), EFP (Pakistan), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CTP (Portugal), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 4. CNA, CNC, CNI (Brazil), UPS (Switzerland).

Other: 3. CCSP, CIP (Portugal), SN (Sweden).

Comments

AiG (Australia). A social security extension strategy is only appropriate in nations which do not already have a comprehensive social security system.

CNS (Brazil). Relevant for social dialogue, as the entire society is responsible for the financing of social security.

ANDI (Colombia). The strategy to structure appropriately the essential criteria for the SPF should be long term in nature.

MEDEF (France). While being realistic on the future objectives and without imposing strict rules.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). With the contribution of social partners.

CIP (Portugal). See question 9(e).

CCSP (Portugal). Add “according to national circumstances and levels of development and” between “design” and “through an effective”.

SN (Sweden). See question 12.

UPS (Switzerland). Before envisaging extension, the issue of sustainable financing must be examined.

Workers

Total number of replies: 95.

Yes: 89. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 0.

Other: 6. CSN (Canada), AKAVA, SAK, STTK (Finland), UGT (Portugal), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), NTUF (Sri Lanka), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). A comprehensive social security system provides universal coverage, addresses the nine contingencies of Convention No. 102 and guarantees replacement rates at least at the level of the Convention.

CUT (Brazil). Based on the nine contingencies in Convention No. 102 and the principles of universality, solidarity and comprehensiveness.

CSN (Canada). The strategy should aim at a comprehensive analysis of the situation and prioritize long-term solutions over expensive and inefficient short-sighted solutions.

CTC, CUT (Colombia), CTV, FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Should be based on social dialogue.

AKAVA, SAK, STTK (Finland). Social security systems need to be developed on a tripartite basis, so that they address the changing needs of wage earners, working life and society.

TUC (Ghana). Some guidelines for the social security extension strategy should be provided.

CATP (Peru), UGT (Spain). Should be based on international social security standards.

FPU (Ukraine). The social security system should be targeted solely to those who truly need it.

PIT–CNT (Uruguay). The strategy should permit ratification of, and compliance with, ILO Convention No. 102 as the minimum standard for social security.

Qu. 16 *Should the Recommendation provide that a Member's social security extension strategy should:*

(a) prioritize the implementation of a social protection floor?

Governments

Total number of replies: 96.

Yes: 84. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Gambia, Germany, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia.

No: 8. Bangladesh, Cameroon, Guatemala, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Saudi Arabia.

Other: 4. Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, India.

Comments

Bangladesh. It would be an undue and unfair pressure on a Member until the required economic progress and stability is achieved.

Benin. The SPF ensures a minimum of protection to a large share of the population.

Cyprus. This might be more of a priority for developing countries.

Czech Republic. Should take into account the national circumstances.

Dominican Republic. Particular attention should be paid to the sustainability of the system.

El Salvador. This base for social security would be strengthened with the integrated work of all the social security institutions.

Estonia. See question 5(b).

Finland. See question 15.

Guatemala. The first priority is to ensure financial stability in the medium/long term and to plan the gradual extension of coverage according to available resources.

Hungary. As the SPF is only one possible instrument for the implementation of basic social protection, such prioritization would have negative impacts on the evaluation of established practices.

India. It is of utmost importance to prioritize the SPF, especially for developing countries.

Kenya. The SPF will progress faster with the extension of coverage.

Latvia. The term “prioritize” is not the right one; all components of SPF should be equally developed and implemented.

Lesotho. The SPF should be a priority for member States, including through budget allocations.

Luxembourg. This is the starting point.

Malaysia. Multiple factors to be considered before the SPF is prioritized.

Mauritius, Nicaragua. The extent of implementation will however depend on availability of funds.

Mexico. The establishment of an SPF should be progressive according to the circumstances and levels of development of each country.

Myanmar. Should provide for a long-term social security extension strategy that builds a comprehensive social security system.

Netherlands, Paraguay. Clear timetables are of great importance.

Peru. The implementation of an SPF is a priority.

Romania. See questions 5(b) and 15.

Saudi Arabia. Priorities to be defined nationally.

Turkey. Implementing an SPF is important to minimize the risks arising in economic and social development.

United Kingdom. Add “or system” at the end.

United States. Replace “floor” by “floors”; add at the end “, consistent with national priorities and broader social, economic and employment policies”.

Employers

Total number of replies: 25.

Yes: 11. AiG (Australia), ANDI (Colombia), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), CCL (Peru), CCSP, CTP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay).

No: 7. BCCI (Belize), CNA, CNC, CNI, CNS (Brazil), KEF (Republic of Korea), CONEP (Panama).

Other: 7. OEB (Cyprus), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), NHO (Norway), EFP (Pakistan), CIP (Portugal), SN (Sweden), IOE.

Comments

BCCI (Belize). It should be left to policy-makers to determine whether they would want to be confined to a floor, based on a detailed analysis.

CNS (Brazil). Access to social protection should be given priority.

ANDI (Colombia). A sustainable SPF should be established which does not jeopardize medium- to long-term finances of the State.

OEB (Cyprus). A priority for developing countries, less so for developed ones.

SPD (Czech Republic). Tailoring to national circumstances and levels of development should be emphasized.

NHO (Norway), IOE. Depending on the country context. While it is a priority for some countries, for others (notably developed countries) less so, as there is also the matter of reforming existing social security systems.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). Priorities will depend on national context as well as the phase of implementation of SPF.

EFP (Pakistan). May encourage member States.

CCL (Peru). The first floor of social protection is a priority.

CIP (Portugal). It is only for governments of member States to decide on the priority. By giving priority to the implementation of social protection, other areas may be sidelined.

SN (Sweden). See question 12.

UPS (Switzerland). Depends on national context. For some countries, the reform of existing schemes is a priority.

Workers

Total number of replies: 92.

Yes: 90. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB

(Switzerland), TÜRK-İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT-CNT (Uruguay), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 1. FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 1. UGT (Portugal).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), JTUC-RENGO (Japan), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS-Cartel ALFA (Romania), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), NTUF (Sri Lanka), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK-İŞ (Turkey), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). Countries should define a clear time frame for implementation.

CGT (Argentina). The implementation of the SPF should be a priority.

CUT (Brazil). Yes, as long as the floor is understood as a transitional step towards higher levels of social security.

CITUB (Bulgaria). Should commit to constant adaptation of the SPF to the growing needs of individuals and society.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). To guarantee the effective, fair and universal right to access all services without imposing any administrative burdens.

CATP (Peru). The extension strategy should not imply the reduction of current levels of coverage nor levels of benefits.

CGTP (Peru). Supports the principle of universality.

UGT (Spain). The priority should be pursued for a stipulated period that is not too long. The SPF is not the culmination but the beginning of a process that should lead to the ratification of Convention No. 102.

PIT-CNT (Uruguay). Specific budgetary priorities must be set.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). The priority is for social security.

CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). This should be a priority for any government.

Qu. 16 (b) *simultaneously seek to provide progressively higher levels of income security and access to health care to as many people as possible and as soon as possible?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 96.

Yes: 83. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Gambia, Germany, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia.

No: 8. Costa Rica, Guatemala, Hungary, Republic of Korea, Lithuania, Poland, Slovenia, United Kingdom.

Other: 5. Canada, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, India.

Comments

Australia. Assumes that all Members must seek to raise levels of income security and health-care access, and does not acknowledge that there is, and must be, an upper limit. Accordingly, replace “progressively higher” by “adequate” or “optimum”.

Bangladesh. Depends on the strength of the national economy to undertake and sustain such a programme.

Belize. Might happen out of necessity but not simultaneously with extension strategy.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. It is the Members’ obligation to meet the social protection needs and requirements of their people in the most efficient manner and based on their resources.

Canada. Should recognize that “progressively higher levels” may not be required in some countries.

Denmark. Question 16(a) should stand alone and not be confused with question 16(b).

El Salvador. Can be done through periodical analysis of living standards, basic basket of goods and the increase of the effective legal minimum wage of each country.

Estonia. See question 5(b).

Finland, Romania. See question 15.

Germany. Parallel to the establishment of an SPF, protection against additional risks (such as loss of productive capital, unemployment, employment injury) should be encouraged, possibly through voluntary insurance mechanisms.

Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico. According to national circumstances.

Hungary. Aims at providing an increasing level of income security, yet this aim can be supported by a broader development strategy.

India. Depends on the country’s socio-economic status and availability of resources. No timeline should be prescribed.

Kenya. Higher levels of income will however be a gradual process.

Republic of Korea. Should be flexible to allow for decisions according to national social and financial circumstances whether to simultaneously provide higher levels of income security and access to health care or prioritize them.

Lebanon. Universal access to health care is the first step in this direction.

Lesotho. Benefits should be set at a level sufficient to enable beneficiaries to live a decent life; levels should be regularly reviewed to ensure that they do not create dependency.

Malaysia. Income levels are influenced by multiple factors and often have contingent economic consequences.

Mauritius. It is a priority for all public authorities to close social security coverage gaps.

Myanmar. Implementation of the SPF will enhance opportunities and benefits for every Member.

Paraguay. Essential to work simultaneously on both the vertical and horizontal extensions of social protection.

Peru. Income security and effective access to health care are two fundamental pillars of social protection.

Portugal. Desirable to have a minimum floor to start from, without neglecting the reinforcement and improvement of social protection systems in line with national circumstances and possibilities.

Sri Lanka. Levels of income security should be based on affordability.

Turkey. Enables individuals to enjoy social security at a higher level, which will in turn increase levels of both individual and social wealth in line with national circumstances.

United Kingdom. Taken together with question 16(a), these two paragraphs seem to confuse which elements need to be prioritized. Suggest removing the word “simultaneously”.

Uruguay. The extension of a universal SPF should not erode existing contributory schemes, but complement them.

Employers

Total number of replies: 25.

Yes: 12. AiG (Australia), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), CCL (Peru), CCSP, CTP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay).

No: 9. BCCI (Belize), CNA, CNC, CNI, CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), UCCAEP (Costa Rica), EFP (Pakistan), CONEP (Panama).

Other: 4. OEB (Cyprus), CIP (Portugal), SN (Sweden), IOE.

Comments

AiG (Australia). Only relevant in countries which do not have a comprehensive social security system.

BCCI (Belize). Most governments should strive towards this but the economic reality may not allow for implementation “as soon as possible”.

ANDI (Colombia). Providing progressively higher levels of income security contradicts the objective “as soon as possible”. Wider levels of health-care services should be provided in the medium or long term based on national circumstances and social dialogue.

UCCAEP (Costa Rica). In a social security system progressiveness is most important.

OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), UPS (Switzerland), IOE. Yes as an objective, but this would depend on the realities of each country.

MEDEF (France). Taking into account the situation of each member State.

EFP (Pakistan). This goes beyond social security.

CCL (Peru). Improvements should be planned according to the national situation.

CIP (Portugal). Only governments have the competence to determine their ability to provide progressively higher levels of social benefits in line with national circumstances.

SN (Sweden). See question 12.

CIU (Uruguay). These are two different issues which depend on the realities of each country.

Workers

Total number of replies: 92.

Yes: 89. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech

Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV, FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 2. NTUC (Singapore), TUC (United Kingdom).

Other: 1. UGT (Portugal).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), ACTU (Australia), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), NTUF (Sri Lanka), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). It is essential to work simultaneously on both the vertical and horizontal extensions of social protection.

CGT (Argentina). Terms such as “to as many people as possible and as soon as possible” contradict the proposed standards.

TUC (Ghana). Should focus on groups most in need of protection.

HKCTU (Hong Kong, China). Guidelines should be provided on acceptable levels of income security and access to health care according to the national financial situation.

UNTM (Mali). Add “to as many people as possible and eventually to all citizens”.

CATP (Peru). Progressive extension should be measured through indicators agreed upon through social dialogue.

CGTP (Peru). Without damaging the quality of services.

SGB (Switzerland). Access to health care and income security should be universal guarantees. Clear maximum delays should be formulated.

TUC (United Kingdom). The wording could be confusing.

PIT–CNT (Uruguay). Measures to extend social protection closely linked to decent work policies should be established.

CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). All governments should seek to raise standards of living through social security.

Qu. 17 *Should the Recommendation provide that Members whose economic and fiscal capacities are insufficient to implement the entire range of guarantees of the social protection floor should stipulate in their social security extension strategy approximately when and in what sequence the entire set of guarantees could be introduced, and how the domestic resources to cover projected expenditure could be mobilized?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 94.

Yes: 73. Albania, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Gambia, Germany, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam.

No: 17. Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, China, Cyprus, Czech Republic, El Salvador, Hungary, Italy, Republic of Korea, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago.

Other: 4. Estonia, Finland, Guatemala, India.

Comments

Argentina. Such stipulation would be excessive.

Bangladesh, Guatemala. According to country context.

Belgium. Could be accompanied by ILO technical assistance for requesting States.

Benin. Members must consider their economic and fiscal capacity in the implementation of their expansion of social security.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. Within the limits of their political, economic and legal conditions, States should extend social security with the goal of universality.

Cambodia. Need for a collective and participatory costing of integrated and comprehensive social protection programmes with various scenarios of targeting mechanisms.

China. The content of the social security extension strategy should be determined by each member State.

Costa Rica. The periods should be reasonable; thus it is advisable to specify them.

Cyprus. Might be too strict. Economic conditions may also hamper implementation in many countries.

Czech Republic. In view of the difficulties of agreeing on an approximate schedule, this should be included in the form of possibility (“Members could ...”).

Ecuador. One should also think about a common global fund, where the industrialized countries contribute a higher share.

El Salvador, Peru. Should be adapted according to the national socio-economic context.

Estonia. See question 5(b).

Finland, Romania. See question 15.

Gambia. This has financial implications for the government.

Honduras. Suggest an implementation plan.

Hungary. The determination of such details and preparation of such a strategy belongs to national competencies.

India. Member States should not be required to lay down a definite time frame for the extension of the entire set of social security guarantees to all beneficiaries.

Kenya. Ensures progressive implementation.

Republic of Korea. Should be flexible in accordance with national social and financial circumstances.

Latvia. Where SPF components are missing, there should be some mid-term plan on when the minimum guarantees could be introduced.

Lebanon. Plans should stipulate clearly the time of sequencing, steps and incentives, and the resource allocation necessary for implementation.

Lesotho. Countries should commit to when they wish to achieve the required SPF coverage, and where the necessary funds will come from. Cooperating partners should however support those with financial difficulties.

Luxembourg. Planning should envisage specific objectives.

Malaysia. Member States have sovereignty to determine the allocation of resources pertaining to social security strategies.

Mauritius, Turkey. The phasing of the implementation process would definitely be helpful in situations of insufficient economic and fiscal capacity.

Mexico. A basic social security package is feasible as long as it is introduced progressively according to national circumstances, and financed, where necessary, through a progressive increase of public expenditure or from an increase in contributions and taxes.

Netherlands. Public expenditure is a matter of political choice. Expenditure planning and timetables are necessary conditions; more efficient combinations of existing programmes and projects can be useful.

Nicaragua. The implementation of the SPF must be well planned.

Portugal. An internal matter for each member State. It would be agreeable if the text limited itself to setting the sequence.

Switzerland. The strategy must be defined at national level, taking into account national circumstances. Members should define the elements, steps and schedule of their strategy as well as the resources necessary for its implementation.

United Kingdom. Could be strengthened to: “Members whose economic and fiscal capacities are insufficient to implement the entire range of guarantees of the social protection floor should stipulate in their social security extension strategy approximately when and in what sequence the entire set of guarantees will be introduced, and how they plan to mobilize the domestic resources required.”

United States. Replace “the social protection floor” by “their social protection floors”.

Uruguay. The implementation process should be planned, taking into account available resources and necessary institutional capacities. Once a decision on a medium- to long-term strategy is taken, the budget and commitments can be defined.

Employers

Total number of replies: 25.

Yes: 6. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNS (Brazil), NEF (Namibia), CCL (Peru), CTP (Portugal).

No: 16. CNA, CNC, CNI (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway), CONEP (Panama), SN (Sweden), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

Other: 3. EFP (Pakistan), CCSP, CIP (Portugal).

Comments

BCCI (Belize). The implementation plan adopted should be matched with developmental goals and objectives, including on education, investment and economic factors.

ANDI (Colombia). Progressive levels of compliance should be set for goals taking into account national circumstances. Specific time frames for achieving the strategy should be avoided. However, macro-level objectives to be reached by countries could be provided.

OEB (Cyprus), NHO (Norway), IOE. Too much of a constraint; the current financial situation in many countries would preclude such a provision.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). Countries face difficulties to do so due to their current financial situation and the economic crisis.

KEF (Republic of Korea). Stipulation in the Recommendation of when and how would not be effective since the introduction of the guarantees, taking into account economic and fiscal considerations, cannot be done in the short term.

EFP (Pakistan). Should be with active consultation of all partners.

CONEP (Panama). Should not compel countries.

CCSP (Portugal). Yes, to the progressive introduction of the guarantees; but no, regarding the time frame “when” and form(s) of domestic resource mobilization. These issues should be decided at the national level.

CIP (Portugal). A time frame might create expectations which governments may be unable to meet due, for instance, to the economic realities of the country or unexpected crisis.

SN (Sweden), UPS (Switzerland). Each country must be able to develop its own solutions based on its own conditions.

CIU (Uruguay). Not appropriate in the current global economic situation to establish a timetable of this type.

Workers

Total number of replies: 91.

Yes: 88. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand),

PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP-IN (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK-İŞ (Turkey), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV, FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 2. CSDR (Romania), FPU (Ukraine).

Other: 1. UGT (Portugal).

Comments

CITUB (Bulgaria). Should be applied not only to Members whose economic and fiscal capacities are insufficient, but in general.

CSN (Canada). Without a timeline there is a risk of stagnation.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). Cannot be indefinite in time.

UGTD (Djibouti). By adopting plans of action for a determined period with objectives and progress indicators.

TUC (Ghana). Should be agreed through social dialogue.

UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala). Should clearly stipulate periods or deadlines, and implementation mechanisms, in order to ensure that people definitely have social security.

HMS (India). Yes, with the participation of groups. Contribute more from profit earnings.

CS (Panama). The time frame needed to implement social inclusion programmes should be part of the national budget process.

CATP, CGTP (Peru). Should mention that the economic and financial capacities should respect international human rights instruments and ILO labour standards.

TUC (United Kingdom). Supports the UK Government's response.

PIT–CNT (Uruguay). Should recall the economic and social importance of social security and its role as stabilizer in times of crisis. Sufficient guarantees should be provided through the adoption of laws.

CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Should allow flexible time frames and flexibility in resource mobilization.

Qu. 18 *Should the Recommendation provide that Members should consider establishing mechanisms, based on effective social dialogue, to further extend social security coverage and build a comprehensive social security system, in line with national social needs and economic and fiscal capacities, on the basis of the Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952 (No. 102), and other ILO Conventions and Recommendations?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 96.

Yes: 90. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Gambia, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad

and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam.

No: 4. Cameroon, Canada, Hungary, Latvia.

Other: 2. Finland, India.

Comments

Australia. Reflecting the 2011 Conclusions, “up-to-date” should be included in references to ILO social security standards (see question 2).

Benin. Mechanisms intended to pursue the extension of social security coverage should be based on effective social dialogue and in line with national social needs and economic capacities.

Canada. Members should consider establishing mechanisms, after consultation, to further extend social security coverage and a comprehensive social security system taking into account relevant provisions of ILO instruments.

Czech Republic. Should reflect the obsolescence of certain elements of Convention No. 102, as mentioned during the 100th Session of the Conference (2011).

Dominican Republic. Should be based on an agreement regarding the minimum guarantees, services and benefits established by legislation, jurisprudence and international treaties. Representatives from social partners as well as others should participate in the dialogue.

El Salvador. The participation of workers and employers in the creation of long-term proposals is key in decision-making by States given their important inputs on rights and obligations.

Guatemala. See above.

India. ILO social security standards can provide guidance to member States to build their social security system.

Indonesia. Delete text after “fiscal capacities”.

Kenya. Social dialogue would enhance commitment and ownership.

Lebanon. Providing a basic SPF is very important; however, the further extension of provisions is necessary too.

Lesotho. Minimum requirements as defined by Convention No. 102 may still be high for some States, which should start with whatever they can afford and build on it.

Luxembourg. Convention No. 102 remains up to date, and there is a need to explicitly refer to it.

Mauritius. Such a mechanism would effectively contribute to the elaboration of a comprehensive social security system.

Mexico. The term “effective social dialogue” should be clearly defined in order to identify participating actors. While social security coverage should be extended, there should not be a reference to Convention No. 102, since this should be achieved according to the conditions of each member State.

Netherlands. We should be realistic about Convention No. 102: for many countries these standards are predominantly of symbolic value in the coming years. For other countries the detailed standards do not take into account recent policy developments in the field of social security.

Norway. See general observations.

Peru. Citizens' participation will reaffirm the support that guarantees the viability and continuity of strategies that are implemented progressively for the extension of social security.

South Africa. See question 2.

Turkey. Will ensure more effective and efficient functioning of the social security system, and increase overall levels of satisfaction.

United States. Add “, social policies, priorities” after “social needs”. Replace “, on the basis of” by “. In doing so, Members may wish to consider”.

Uruguay. Social dialogue is a relevant instrument to move towards a better and more efficient social security system; and Convention No. 102 continues to be a relevant international instrument.

Employers

Total number of replies: 25.

Yes: 10. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), MEDEF (France), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CTP (Portugal).

No: 9. CNA, CNC, CNI (Brazil), SPD (Czech Republic), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), CIP (Portugal), SN (Sweden), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay).

Other: 6. OEB (Cyprus), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), NHO (Norway), EFP (Pakistan), CCSP (Portugal), IOE.

Comments

ANDI (Colombia). Social dialogue is essential and should promote the formalization of the economy and avoid the negative effects of a situation where the benefits provided to informal workers are the same as those provided to workers in the formal economy.

OEB (Cyprus), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), NHO (Norway), CIP (Portugal). Convention No. 102 is only one reference. Others exist (such as the World Bank, the OECD and the IMF) for developing these mechanisms and are often more up to date and practical.

SPD (Czech Republic). An international framework already exists and various other international organizations are part of it. The implementation of Conventions and other international obligations is primarily the responsibility of member States.

MEDEF (France). In the very long term.

VNO–NCW (Netherlands), CIU (Uruguay). Convention No. 102 is just one reference among others.

EFP (Pakistan). No reference to Convention No. 102 is needed.

CONEP (Panama). The dialogue should in addition cover other aspects.

CCL (Peru). The extension of coverage should be comprehensive.

CCSP (Portugal). Provided that the clause contemplates a possibility and not an obligation, replace “should consider” by “could consider”.

SN (Sweden). See question 17. Convention No. 102 should be recognized as a source among others, such as the OECD and the IMF.

UPS (Switzerland). Convention No. 102 is one reference among others that are more practical.

Workers

Total number of replies: 91.

Yes: 90. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada),

UNSI TRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV, FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe)

No: 0.

Other: 1. UGT (Portugal).

Comments

CGT (Argentina). Should be based on effective social dialogue which ensures the full involvement of the beneficiaries, participation and representation through social partners and rights-based outcomes.

CITUB (Bulgaria). All relevant ILO instruments should be incorporated.

UNSI TRAGUA (Guatemala). Should identify concrete international guidelines, which can be incorporated at the national level.

HMS (India). Other ILO Conventions on social security and human rights should be included.

MCTU (Malawi). Social partners should actively participate in the establishment of the mechanisms according to Convention No. 102.

CGTP (Peru). As long as effective social dialogue exists and results are binding, so that an agreed-upon policy can be established.

PIT–CNT (Uruguay). The importance of Convention No. 102 as the fundamental standard for building sustainable social security systems should be reaffirmed.

CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Through social dialogue, social security should be progressively extended to the whole population.

Qu. 19 *Should the Recommendation encourage Members to take measures, as early as possible in national social and economic development processes, to ensure the ratification and the effective implementation of the Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952 (No. 102), as well as other ILO instruments considered relevant to the national context?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 95.

Yes: 78. Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Gambia, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam.

No: 15. Armenia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Canada, China, Colombia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Indonesia, Malaysia, Namibia, Peru, Saudi Arabia, United States.

Other: 2. Finland, India.

Comments

Australia, Netherlands. See question 18.

Bangladesh, India, Indonesia. The ratification of a Convention depends on national circumstances and is up to member States to decide.

Belgium. ILO standards are universal, flexible, innovative and constructive.

Benin. The ratification and effective implementation of these Conventions will give Members credibility in international institutions and provide a good basis for the establishment of their SPF.

Cambodia. An assessment of the possibility for ratification should be conducted.

Canada. Should encourage members to “consider” the ratification and effective implementation of instruments considered relevant to their national context. It would be appropriate to update Convention No. 102 to remove discriminatory and non-gender-sensitive provisions.

China. The ratification of ILO Conventions rests within the sovereign power of member States. Although it is necessary to encourage and assist member States to ratify ILO Conventions, it is not appropriate to set out a timetable for ratification.

Czech Republic. While Convention No. 102 remains a fundamental ILO instrument and its ratification and implementation should be a fundamental long-term goal of every Member, progressive development and the broadening of the SPF may take a long time.

Dominican Republic. Taking into account the level of advancement in the implementation of economic, social and labour policies, the demands and needs of society.

Ecuador. If it is favourable and applicable to the country.

El Salvador. It is important to make a call for ratification.

Estonia, Latvia. This could include other international treaties (e.g. European Code of Social Security) which ensure at least minimum levels of social security.

Finland. See question 15.

Guatemala. See above.

Kenya. Taking measures early will facilitate preparation, pre-implementation and sensitization.

Lesotho. While ratification of Conventions is highly encouraged, it should however not prevent Members from implementing the SPF.

Luxembourg, Peru, Uruguay. Convention No. 102 is essential and it is necessary to encourage member States to ratify it.

Mauritius. Member States should ensure that their national social security policies are based on the provisions of the relevant ILO instruments, thereby facilitating the ratification and effective implementation thereof.

Mexico. In so far as possible.

Namibia. Member States should ratify each Convention at their own pace and when they are ready.

Nicaragua. Important, as the ILO is the organization that looks after the welfare of workers.

Portugal. Improving protection is always desirable; it should not depend on economic and financial conditions.

Turkey. Important for accelerating the development processes of countries, preventing injustice in income distribution, and providing social security for all.

United States. Should encourage Members to take measures, as early as possible, to consider ratification and effective implementation of Convention No. 102, consistent with the 2011 Conclusions in terms of the role of governments.

Viet Nam. To ensure the overall trend among ILO member States.

Employers

Total number of replies: 25.

Yes: 7. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), MEDEF (France), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), CCL (Peru), CCSP (Portugal).

No: 12. CNA, CNC, CNI, CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), SPD (Czech Republic), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), CONEP (Panama), SN (Sweden), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay).

Other: 6. OEB (Cyprus), NHO (Norway), EFP (Pakistan), CIP, CTP (Portugal), IOE.

Comments

ANDI (Colombia). The 2001 Resolution did not foresee a new normative process as a way of achieving higher levels of social security coverage. Countries should ratify the Conventions once they meet the conditions, otherwise it will lead to non-compliance.

OEB (Cyprus), IOE. Without being opposed to the idea, employers are reticent because this is a complex Convention which is both difficult to implement and ambiguous on the role of the private sector.

SPD (Czech Republic). The implementation of Conventions and other international obligations is primarily the responsibility of member States.

MEDEF (France). This must remain an incentive.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). While it is necessary to take measures as soon as possible, this requires various social, economic, cultural and legal considerations.

VNO–NCW (Netherlands). This seems useless because it is a complex Convention that has been ratified by only 47 countries.

NHO (Norway). While not against the promotion of Convention No. 102, the new Recommendation should not be a watered-down version of it, as it is both difficult to implement and ambiguous on the role of the private sector.

EFP (Pakistan). Member countries should only ratify the Convention once they are duly prepared.

CONEP (Panama). It is for each country to decide.

CCL (Peru). Convention No. 102 is the only instrument that defines the nine traditional branches of social security and sets minimum standards for each.

SN (Sweden). See question 17.

UPS (Switzerland). It is a complex Convention (European model) that is difficult to apply.

IOE. The 2011 Conclusions included this point. It is therefore difficult to avoid a call for ratification of Convention No. 102.

Workers

Total number of replies: 94.

Yes: 92. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech

Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), AKAVA, SAK, STTK (Finland), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV, FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 1. NUNW (Namibia).

Other: 1. UGT (Portugal).

Comments

CGT (Argentina). Ratification of Convention No. 102 should be a priority. Other social security Conventions and Recommendations should also be included.

CUT (Brazil). ILO member States should establish goals for ratification and effective implementation of Convention No. 102.

CITUB (Bulgaria). Ratification reflects ambitions to progress in social security, yet monitoring of observance is also essential.

CSN (Canada). A wide ratification of Convention No. 102 remains essential. It is appropriate to address the gender language without putting the Convention into question.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). Members should be encouraged to extend social security coverage.

AKAVA, SAK, STTK (Finland). Convention No. 102 should be ratified as widely as possible.

UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala). Mechanisms should be defined to monitor compliance with international standards.

CATP (Peru). Countries that have ratified Convention No. 102 and have received CEACR observations should make the necessary efforts to comply with its provisions within specified time frames.

PIT–CNT (Uruguay). The SPF is a minimum.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). As a mechanism for progress.

Qu. 20 *Should the Recommendation contain an annex listing all ILO instruments of possible relevance to national social security extension strategies, and should the Recommendation provide that this list could later be updated by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 84. Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Gambia, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi

Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam.

No: 4. Armenia, Germany, Lithuania, Netherlands.

Other: 5. Canada, China, Denmark, Finland, Guatemala.

Comments

Bangladesh, Cameroon. Such a list could serve as guidance.

Belgium. See question 19. Could refer to the periodic ILO *World Social Security Report* to avoid enumeration of all ILO instruments.

Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia. These instruments serve as reference for countries in the implementation of their social security strategies.

Canada. Only up-to-date instruments of direct relevance should be included.

China. Requests further explanations from the Office on the reason for the possible inclusion of such an annex.

Dominican Republic, Honduras, Hungary, Kenya, Panama. Useful as a reference.

Ecuador. Requires in-depth analysis to determine whether it is necessary or not.

El Salvador. Such a list would be an additional tool for countries to decide on the relevance of these instruments.

Finland. See question 15.

Germany. A balance needs to be found between greater clarity regarding existing instruments and the effort associated with updating such a list.

Guatemala. According to country context.

India. Relevant ILO social security Conventions should be indicated.

Latvia. With some doubts on practical/legal use of such a list.

Luxembourg. Promotion of the ratification of ILO instruments requires good information.

Mauritius. This will allow members to achieve more coherence with, and adherence to, international labour standards in the formulation of their social security extension strategies.

Mexico. As long as this list serves only as reference and does not involve obligations for member States.

Netherlands. Such a list could be one of the instruments in the foreseen plan of action.

Nicaragua. It is important because the ILO is the organization that looks after the welfare of workers.

Norway. Such a list should also include instruments aiming at gender equality and non-discrimination.

Peru. It would support member States in ratifying the Conventions; it would also be appropriate to have guidance for its implementation and use.

Senegal. It should also include strategies and techniques to extend social security in the informal sector and reaffirm the need to strengthen ILO technical support.

Turkey. Updating by the Governing Body would ensure its relevance in view of changing global labour conditions.

Employers

Total number of replies: 26.

Yes: 10. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNA, CNS (Brazil), MEDEF (France), KEF (Republic of Korea), EFP (Pakistan), CCL (Peru), CCSP, CTP (Portugal).

No: 13. CNC, CNI (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway), CONEP (Panama), SN (Sweden), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

Other: 3. NK (Japan), EFP (Pakistan), CIP (Portugal).

Comments

ANDI (Colombia). The ratification of Conventions should not be an end in itself. The extension of coverage should be a global approach and progressive in nature.

OEB (Cyprus), NHO (Norway), IOE. Not useful, as the ILO Conventions are known. The Recommendation should not be an ILO catalogue. Moreover, the update would be complex, useless and a waste of time.

MEDEF (France). As examples.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). More useful to send it to each country rather than annexed to the Recommendation.

NK (Japan). It would be sufficient if, when a new instrument is issued, the ILO as part of its daily operations were to provide the information to Members which are considering creating or revising their system.

NEF (Namibia). Not critical.

VNO–NCW (Netherlands), EFP (Pakistan), CONEP (Panama). Not necessary.

CCL (Peru). The Conventions and Recommendations should be updated and unified.

SN (Sweden). See question 17. No need for a list of already known ILO instruments.

UPS (Switzerland). This is not about establishing an ILO catalogue.

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 91. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV, FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 1. CUT (Brazil).

Other: 1. UGT (Portugal).

Comments

CUT (Brazil). The Preamble invites member States to ratify all relevant Conventions.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). Very important. States should be committed to this fundamental human right as they are committed to the realization of the 1998 ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and its Follow-up.

UNSI TRAGUA (Guatemala). Should be improved in order to achieve universal social security for everyone in every nation.

CGT (Honduras). The extension should depend on the economic possibilities of the State.

CATP (Peru). These are not the only instruments that should guide strategies, see e.g. the ICESCR.

CGTP (Peru). All social security instruments should be disseminated.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). To improve existing mechanisms.

Qu. 21 *Should the Recommendation provide that the national social security extension strategy, including a social protection floor, should be part of and conducive to the implementation of the Member's social and economic development plans?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 94.

Yes: 87. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Gambia, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam.

No: 5. Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Malaysia, Romania.

Other: 2. Finland, India.

Comments

Benin. Because of its contribution to economic and social development.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. Every member State should have an SPF as a basis for its economic and social development.

Burundi. Notably the poverty reduction strategies and frameworks.

Cameroon. Why not include it in the strategies for growth and employment?

Dominican Republic. To ensure maximum social impact, this initiative requires coordination between institutions regarding planning and budgeting as well as strategies and objectives.

Ecuador. Should be a priority for member States.

El Salvador. This strategy should be based on a national development plan since the proposals concern improvements in the long term and thus should not be affected by political decisions.

Finland, Romania. See question 15.

Guatemala. Financing sources for the short, medium and long term should be identified.

Honduras. It is necessary to include the national social security strategy in the national plans.

Hungary. While being part of national competencies, the extension strategy should be adopted as an integral part of a broader social and economic development plan.

India. Decisions regarding the incorporation of the SPF in such plans may be left to the discretion of member States.

Kenya. This will be the baseline for all members.

Latvia. In view of the diversity of national social and economic development plans, this may be too detailed. Nevertheless, every national development strategy should include social security.

Lebanon. Integration with social and economic development plans is necessary.

Lesotho. The national extension strategy and SPF should be part of socio-economic development plans with a view to building a coherent system and ensuring ownership of beneficiaries.

Luxembourg, Portugal, Senegal. Economic and social development should be closely linked and mutually reinforcing.

Mauritius. Clear links and coherence should be established between the national extension strategy and social and economic policy objectives.

Mexico. The national strategy, including the SPF, should be set out in national legislation, national development plans and corresponding sectoral plans, according to national circumstances.

Nicaragua. Should be part of national development plans, so as to ensure greater access to social benefits, improve the standards of living, and thus social indicators.

Peru. In line with national economic development.

United States. Replace “floor” by “floors”; and “part of” by “consistent with”.

Employers

Total number of replies: 24.

Yes: 17. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNA, CNS (Brazil), OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), EFP (Pakistan), CCL (Peru), CTP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 7. CNC, CNI (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), CONEP (Panama), CCSP, CIP (Portugal), SN (Sweden).

Comments

ANDI (Colombia), CIP (Portugal). Each country should set its own national extension strategy.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). The lack of a development plan may cause negative results such as encouraging unemployment.

CONEP (Panama). Each State should define its priorities taking into account its capacities.

CCL (Peru). Health care should be an issue of particular focus for governments.

CCSP (Portugal). This approach seems too ambitious for all ILO Members. Replace “should be part of” by “could be part of”.

SN (Sweden). See question 17.

Workers

Total number of replies: 91.

Yes: 88. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 2. CSDR (Romania), FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 1. UGT (Portugal).

Comments

NTUCB (Belize). Should also focus on a government's financial obligations.

CITUB (Bulgaria). Necessary for the operationalization of the strategy.

UGTD (Djibouti). SPFs should be defined as the fundamental leverage of such plans.

CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic). Should mention national decent work plans as guidance.

TUC (Ghana), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Social protection measures should be an integral part of social and economic policies.

UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala). This policy should be a priority in every country, including the whole of society, especially the most marginalized, vulnerable and unprotected, with emphasis on children, youth and the elderly.

CGT (Honduras). Should not be subject to presidential terms, but be continued until achieved.

JTUC–RENGO (Japan). The national social security extension strategy should be the foundation of national strategies for growth and development.

CTM (Mexico). As long as it does not violate the fundamental guarantees of each State.

CATP, CGTP (Peru). Ensures a planned and sustainable implementation.

PIT–CNT (Uruguay). Social security is a stabilizer and revitalizer of the economy, while the role of the State is as guarantor and administrator.

Qu. 22 *Should the Recommendation provide that the gradual formalization and development of the economy should be conducive to strengthening people's income security and their access to health care?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 94.

Yes: 89. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi,

Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Gambia, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam.

No: 2. Malaysia, United Kingdom.

Other: 3. Finland, India, Paraguay.

Comments

Bangladesh. Though formalization of the economy is an objective, the growing informal economy must be considered when implementing social protection.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. Access to health care without exclusion or discrimination.

Costa Rica. New initiatives covering other non-fundamental needs should be developed as countries develop economically and socially.

Czech Republic. Income security and the level of health care depend on the national economy.

Dominican Republic. This will strengthen contribution collection.

Finland. See question 15.

Guatemala. This is the only means to expand coverage in a technically and financially sustainable way.

Honduras. And to the strengthening of the comprehensive social security system.

Hungary. Further clarification would be required with regard to the gradual formalization of the economy.

India. Members normally accord due importance to economic development and providing basic income security and health care to workers both in the formal and informal sectors. There does not appear any rationale/justification for this provision.

Kenya. The state of the economy is key because it determines viability of promotional measures, benefits and social services.

Lebanon. Status in economic activity, whether formal or informal, should not prevent access to health care.

Lesotho. Economic growth is vital in the development of sound income security. The system should enable people to graduate from informal to formal employment.

Luxembourg. Economic development is not an end in itself, but a means to advance social development.

Mauritius. Economic development contributes to enhanced well-being through basic social security measures.

Mexico. Social and economic policies are complementary and mutually supportive.

Namibia. Members should be allowed to grow economically and transfer gradually into formalization in line with their available resources.

Nicaragua. If economic development is a source of employment, social insurance can extend coverage and is financially strengthened.

Paraguay. Formalizing the economy matters, but formalizing employment relationships is equally important.

Peru. Adjustment of SPFs to the economic realities of countries would enhance social inclusion.

Senegal. Realizing healthy and profitable growth for all through solid redistribution of wealth is necessary to fight poverty.

Turkey. Informality leads to an inefficient use of health and social resources. As the economy formalizes, the provision of health services will be more efficient.

United Kingdom. Clarification needed.

Employers

Total number of replies: 25.

Yes: 20. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNA, CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway), EFP (Pakistan), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CCSP, CTP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 3. CNC, CNI (Brazil), SN (Sweden).

Other: 2. OEB (Cyprus), CIP (Portugal).

Comments

ANDI (Colombia). SPFs should promote the formalization of the economy.

OEB (Cyprus), IOE. Income security is best served through employment. The SPF is a means to formalize the informal economy. The establishment of benefits for informal workers risks having a negative effect on formal work, by encouraging workers to tend towards the informal economy.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). The priority must be to secure jobs and incomes, otherwise this may lead to gradual informalization.

NHO (Norway). Through securing a job.

CONEP (Panama). Strengthening depends on the development of the economy.

CIP (Portugal). It is up to member States to know the right moment to do so.

SN (Sweden). See question 17.

CIU (Uruguay). The SPF is a means to formalize the informal economy. The benefits should not have a negative effect on formal work.

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 83. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC (Dominican Republic), CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC

(Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP-IN (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 1. FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 9. CSN (Canada), CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT (Ecuador), LLC (Lesotho), GEFONT (Nepal), PWF (Pakistan), UGT (Portugal), CNTS (Senegal).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), NZCTU (New Zealand), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), NTUF (Sri Lanka), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). Not only does the formalization of the economy matter, but the formalization of working relationships is equally important.

CGT (Argentina). Strengthening industrial relations is essential for the portability of labour, union and social security rights associated with the formalization of employment.

BAK (Austria). Measures are needed to avoid indecent working conditions and working poverty through adequate wage levels and better employment opportunities for parents through the enhanced provision of childcare.

CUT (Brazil). The transition to formal employment should be strengthened through the principles of universality, equity and taking into account group and individual needs.

CITUB (Bulgaria). Social prosperity should be the essence of the successful development of the economy, otherwise it would be an end in itself.

CSN (Canada). Responsibility of the State for labour market regulation, quality of employment and ensuring non-discrimination.

TUC (Ghana). May be linked to the Decent Work Agenda.

CTM (Mexico). Should not violate the fundamental guarantees of each State.

CATP (Peru). Gradual formalization and the development of the economy should be part of a national decent work plan in order to avoid improvization and erratic implementation of policies.

SGB (Switzerland). The formalization of employment relationships is equally important.

TUC (United Kingdom). An unobjectionable provision.

PIT–CNT (Uruguay). Should also emphasize the concept of development with social justice.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). It should not refer to a level of income.

CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). This is a priority in all economies.

Qu. 23 *Should the Recommendation provide that the national social security extension strategy should address the needs of specific groups in urban and rural areas, in particular indigenous people, minorities, migrant workers, persons with disabilities and chronic illness, persons living with or affected by HIV, and orphans and vulnerable children?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 94.

Yes: 73. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Gambia, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

No: 16. Bahrain, Belize, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Hungary, Italy, Republic of Korea, Lithuania, Malaysia, Qatar, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Viet Nam.

Other: 5. Canada, Dominican Republic, Finland, India, Romania.

Comments

Argentina, Switzerland. Refer to the specific needs of vulnerable groups without listing categories of persons.

Bangladesh, Belize, Cambodia. Should address the needs of all kinds of vulnerable groups.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. The needs of specific groups should be part of the extension of social protection coverage leading towards its universalization.

Cameroon. The extension of social security should cover all levels of society, such as workers in the informal economy.

Canada. The specific groups to be addressed by security strategies should be determined by the competent authority after consultation.

China. “Migrant workers” needs to be defined.

Costa Rica. No sector should be excluded from social security programmes.

Cyprus. Vulnerable groups should be addressed in general, so as to allow for more flexibility with regard to specific national circumstances.

Denmark. The starting point must be a needs assessment, not a group identity.

Dominican Republic. These needs should be considered within public policies related to these groups.

Ecuador. Members of vulnerable groups should be most urgently looked after.

El Salvador. Social security must be a fundamental human right without distinction or preferential treatment.

Estonia. Special schemes should not be preferred to universal schemes.

Finland. See question 15.

France. Social security systems cover the population as a whole or at least wide layers of the population. Member States, taking into account their national circumstances, should define qualifying conditions.

Gambia. Full and complete social security coverage for people in these categories is needed, based on solidarity.

Germany. Eligibility criteria should be designed in an objective way, that is a basic level of protection for all plus an addition in case of special needs. Persons with disabilities should have access to social security systems, and to specific measures according to their needs.

Guatemala. These are the responsibility of the State and not of contributory schemes.

Hungary. Some groups need to be specifically addressed in the context of social security. Nevertheless, it is preferable to include a general reference to the needs of the most disadvantaged and most vulnerable groups rather than a detailed list.

India. The social security requirements of specific vulnerable groups should be actively considered.

Indonesia. Delete “chronic illness”, and link with the national definition of essential health care.

Kenya. Needs of vulnerable groups mentioned are crucial in achieving social security objectives.

Republic of Korea. See question 7(a).

Latvia. The approach (mentioning specific groups) could be more general.

Lebanon. Only if part of a universal benefits system, and not as a substitute for universality.

Lesotho. All categories of vulnerable people should have priority in accessing SPF benefits, irrespective of their colour, sex, age, race, religious or political affiliation.

Luxembourg, Mauritius. The most vulnerable are most in need of social protection.

Mexico. National extension strategies should address the needs of specific groups according to national circumstances, and should at least provide health protection.

Netherlands, Portugal. Vulnerable groups should not be specified in such detail.

Nicaragua. When implementing extension strategies, the specific needs of each group must be considered.

Norway. Identifying particularly vulnerable groups in order to give them priority when developing and extending social security is a sound practice. The main goal must, however, remain coverage for all.

Panama. Outcomes should be adjusted to the development in each country of the legislative framework on social security based on resources.

Peru. Each country should have the possibility to define the population groups which should be protected.

Romania. See question 15. Social security measures implemented in each member State should address particular needs of vulnerable categories.

Senegal. The approach must be non-discriminatory, inclusive and based on solidarity.

Serbia. Families with children are also vulnerable groups that need to be provided with assistance and support to reach a minimum level of income security, equal opportunities for an independent life and social inclusion.

Sweden. Favours a general welfare system, equal for everyone. A list of groups should be avoided as such a list can never cover all vulnerable groups.

Turkey. Using positive measures in order to prevent already existing discrimination (positive discrimination) is legitimate; therefore it is appropriate to emphasize the needs of specific groups.

Ukraine. All population groups should be entitled to social security independent of the place of living, physical capacity, health status and social status of individuals needing benefits.

United Kingdom. The SPF should provide a minimum set of guarantees to those in need; listing some specific groups risks further isolating groups not mentioned in this list. Suggest “the national social security extension strategy could specifically address the needs of vulnerable groups” leaving it to national strategies and stakeholders to determine which groups are most vulnerable.

United States. The list of vulnerable people may differ from country to country, such as racial or religious minorities. Replace “in particular” by “such as older persons,”; after “HIV,” add “women workers,”.

Viet Nam. These groups will be beneficiaries of the SPF, but the SPF is for everybody and every community.

Employers

Total number of replies: 25.

Yes: 9. AiG (Australia), CNA, CNS (Brazil), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), CCL (Peru).

No: 11. BCCI (Belize), CNC, CNI (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), NHO (Norway), CONEP (Panama), CIP (Portugal), SN (Sweden), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay).

Other: 5. OEB (Cyprus), EFP (Pakistan), CCSP, CTP (Portugal), IOE.

Comments

ANDI (Colombia). National strategies should follow criteria of proportionality and equality. Special benefits for those in need should be established, depending on the national situation.

OEB (Cyprus), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway), EFP (Pakistan), UPS (Switzerland), IOE. An endless list should be avoided; it is sufficient to mention that the needs of vulnerable groups should be taken into account.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). Preferable to be specific and prioritize.

CONEP (Panama). The examples are not necessary as each country has different groups with different needs.

CCL (Peru). Social security should first address the needs of the most vulnerable.

CCSP (Portugal). The specific groups should be a national decision, although the Recommendation can give some common examples. Thus, replace “in urban and rural areas, in particular” by “such as,”.

CTP (Portugal). It would be more accurate to use a wider scope as there are other groups that should not be discriminated against.

SN (Sweden). See question 17. Listing specific groups should be avoided as not all vulnerable groups can be covered.

CIU (Uruguay). It should limit itself to affirming that the needs of vulnerable groups should be addressed in each country context.

Workers

Total number of replies: 96.

Yes: 87. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN (Portugal), CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV, FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 5. CROC (Mexico), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden).

Other: 4. AKAVA, SAK, STTK (Finland), UGT (Portugal).

Comments

NCTUB (Bahamas). Must address issues related to illegal migrants.

NTUCB (Belize). This might seem discriminatory.

CUT (Brazil). Social security should be universal and based on the principle of equity, in order to ensure protection of the most vulnerable groups.

CITUB (Bulgaria). The needs of the categories mentioned are different, and would require specific tools and different approaches.

CSN (Canada). If the same treatment is applied regardless of a person's particular situation, this may lead to discrimination. Special needs therefore need to be taken into account in order to achieve real equality.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). The obligation to guarantee certain minimum levels under the ICESCR (as interpreted by the CESCR in General Comment No. 3) does not apply only to primary essential health care, but to other minimum guarantees.

CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CGTP (Peru). Should take into account gender equality.

AKAVA, SAK, STTK (Finland). Social security and health services for the disadvantaged should be emphasized. In view of national differences, the definition of vulnerable groups should be left to member States.

TUC (Ghana). The list should be broadened to include all vulnerable persons.

UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala). Specific surveys should be undertaken to assess living conditions of the specific population groups.

JTUC–RENGO (Japan). Should include affirmative action and support for social minorities.

MCTU (Malawi), CROC (Mexico). Should be inclusive and non-discriminatory.

LO (Norway). Identifying particularly vulnerable groups is a sound practice, yet the main goal must remain coverage for all.

CS (Panama). Persons with disabilities and chronic illness should receive special treatment.

CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), FPU (Ukraine). Social security policies should favour certain categories of people, but consider all types of needs.

UGT (Spain). Listing vulnerable groups is dangerous because it can lead to omission.

LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden). Favour a general welfare system, equal for everybody.

SGB (Switzerland). Add families, young persons, persons excluded from the labour market, elderly.

TUC (United Kingdom). The wording as it stands allows governments to include groups that are particularly vulnerable in a given member State and discourages excluding those listed.

PIT-CNT (Uruguay). Should include minorities, and be based on gender equality and non-discrimination.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). It is and should be for all.

Qu. 24 *Should the Recommendation provide that the social security extension strategy should set out how the Member plans to improve existing social security coverage within a specific time frame?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 94.

Yes: 63. Albania, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Cambodia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Gambia, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

No: 27. Argentina, Armenia, Belarus, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Malaysia, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Serbia, Switzerland, Viet Nam.

Other: 4. Finland, India, Romania, Suriname.

Comments

Bangladesh, Benin. Will allow Members to define progressive steps towards the extension of social security.

Belarus. Need to consider social needs and States' financial capacities when extending coverage within a specific time frame. The specific character of these measures does not allow clear deadlines for implementation to be set.

Plurinational State of Bolivia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Mexico, Peru. Member States should set their own priorities based on their socio-economic conditions.

Cameroon. The implementation of a social security strategy should not be a constraint for Members.

Canada. See question 23.

China. This objective is too high to be achieved by the majority of member States.

Czech Republic. This is an essential element of every strategy, and therefore does not need to be included here.

Ecuador. This requires Members to have plans which can be achieved in the medium to long term.

El Salvador. This does not depend on a single decision, but is the outcome of an agreement of the different sectors, as well as other factors including financial resources and demographics.

Finland, Romania. See question 15.

France. Members should be encouraged to set themselves objectives and details.

Hungary. While this belongs to national competencies, such plans may be considered by Members during the preparation of such strategy.

India. It is not possible to lay down or adhere to time limits. However, member States can be advised to accord suitable priority to this area.

Kenya. Commitments within a given time frame will ensure that Members take action; a detailed action plan is necessary.

Republic of Korea, Switzerland. See question 17.

Kyrgyzstan. Through decision of a tripartite commission.

Lesotho. This may be necessary to ensure that member States comply with their own commitments.

Luxembourg. A specific time frame facilitates implementation and stakeholders' involvement.

Malaysia. Should not define one standard time frame, but reflect member States' needs.

Mauritius. Realistic and proper planning would facilitate implementation.

Netherlands. See above.

Norway. See general observations.

Portugal. This is part of national competence. Recent global events and the economic crisis indicate that States might not be able to comply with their obligations.

Suriname. The specific time frame should be set after ample consideration and tripartite consultations.

Uruguay. Should consider only approximate time frames, the international and national context, the initial level from where a country starts and the progressive implementation of the strategy.

Employers

Total number of replies: 25.

Yes: 10. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), SPD (Czech Republic), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), IOE.

No: 12. CNA, CNC, CNI, CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), MEDEF (France), KEF (Republic of Korea), CCSP, CTP (Portugal), SN (Sweden), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay).

Other: 3. OEB (Cyprus), EFP (Pakistan), CIP (Portugal).

Comments

ANDI (Colombia). Fixed time frames should be avoided, but targets could be established.

OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), NHO (Norway), IOE. The term "specific time frame" is too vague.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). Does "specific time frame" refer to the development of the strategy or the implementation? It should be set accordingly.

KEF (Republic of Korea). Stipulating in the Recommendation the need to set a specific time frame places excessive responsibilities on Members.

EFP (Pakistan). Gradual development.

CCL (Peru). Should be defined by government.

CCSP (Portugal). The provision seems too ambitious. Thus, replace “extension strategy should set out” by “extension strategy could set out”.

CIP (Portugal). Should be defined by the member State. The term “specific time frame” is vague.

SN (Sweden). See question 17. Member States should determine time frames for evaluation of their social protection and if there is a need and scope to improve it.

UPS (Switzerland). This is too detailed. Each country must choose its own system.

CIU (Uruguay). The global economic situation is not appropriate to fix such a time frame.

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 89. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), ACFTU (China), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 3. CSDR (Romania), FPU (Ukraine), FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 1. UGT (Portugal).

Comments

CUT (Brazil). As long as extension strategies respect the ILO Constitution and Convention No. 102 and ensure participatory governance mechanisms and monitoring.

CITUB (Bulgaria). These are the usual parameters of every strategy.

ACFTU (China). It is absolutely necessary and useful to set up a social protection extension strategy with a time frame for the improvement of the existing social protection coverage.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). It is important to do it within a fixed time frame.

UGTD (Djibouti). Targets and indicators measuring the efficiency of the SPF at national level should be adopted.

TUC (Ghana), CS (Panama). Should encourage Members to develop this plan through the social dialogue process.

UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala). Essential in measuring progress, stagnation or decline in the situation of people, and the effective allocation of resources.

MCTU (Malawi). Existing social security elements should be mainstreamed in line with this instrument.

CATP (Peru). This would help to measure progress.

UGT (Portugal). Should not be too rigid in this regard.

CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Each Member should be given a reasonable time frame.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Social security as a right should be applicable immediately.

Qu. 25 *Should the Recommendation provide that the social security extension strategy should specify targets with regard to the progressive achievement of full population coverage, the range and levels of benefits, as well as the financial means to cover the related expenditure?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 94.

Yes: 71. Albania, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, France, Gambia, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Mauritius, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam.

No: 20. Argentina, Armenia, Canada, Colombia, Cyprus, Denmark, El Salvador, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Republic of Korea, Malaysia, Mexico, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Slovenia, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom.

Other: 3. Finland, India, Romania.

Comments

Bangladesh. Helpful as a measure of progress, yet economic growth is essential for coverage.

Benin, Cyprus. See question 24.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. Each member State must analyse its social impact.

Cameroon. The implementation of the strategy should be assessed in a feasibility study.

Canada. See question 23.

Denmark. Too ambitious. More softly worded objectives or goals would be preferred to targets.

Dominican Republic. These should be indicative in nature. Guidance should be provided on the financing (fiscal space, social budget).

Ecuador. States should evaluate and set out goals.

El Salvador. It is necessary to define the population that benefits from social protection coverage, qualifying conditions, and the extension of the range and quality of benefits and social services.

Finland, Romania. See question 15.

France, Netherlands. See above.

Germany. Targets should be avoided as they require a set of indicators, which would undermine the non-binding character of the Recommendation.

Guatemala. Essential to indicate the means to cover the costs.

Hungary. While this is part of national competencies, Members may consider specifying such targets during the preparation of such strategy.

India. Time frames or specific objectives for coverage and benefit levels should not be provided, due to national circumstances and changing conditions.

Kenya. Highlighting specific targets will set out a to-do list, which will mitigate the possibility of leaving out any one category.

Republic of Korea, Switzerland. See question 17.

Lesotho. This can be used as performance measurement benchmarks and for monitoring and evaluation.

Luxembourg. Clear and specific objectives should be formulated.

Mauritius. Implementation will be more effective.

Mexico, Portugal, Sri Lanka. States should establish their goals and objectives on the basis of their circumstances and capacities.

Nicaragua. This plan should be supported by a study and should contain all the elements identified.

Peru. Countries can use as a reference objectives and indicators, including for the long term, to evaluate progress in extending social protection.

United Kingdom. Such detailed requirement, covering the entire population, is unrealistic for States with limited financial and other resources.

Uruguay. Ensures the sustainability of systems and programmes.

Employers

Total number of replies: 25.

Yes: 6. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), NEF (Namibia), CCL (Peru).

No: 15. CNA, CNC, CNI (Brazil), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway), CONEP (Panama), CCSP, CTP (Portugal), SN (Sweden), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay).

Other: 4. OEB (Cyprus), EFP (Pakistan), CIP (Portugal), IOE.

Comments

ANDI (Colombia). The extension strategy should fix goals and specify, in general terms, the means to cover the expenditure.

OEB (Cyprus), NHO (Norway), UPS (Switzerland), IOE. Too much of a constraint; strategies can change over time depending on public finances.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). Only if there is feedback and revision of milestones, especially regarding financing.

KEF (Republic of Korea). Stipulating the need to specify targets, the range and levels of benefits, and the financial means to cover the related expenditure creates excessive responsibilities.

VNO–NCW (Netherlands). Too detailed. Ideally Members should develop a strategy for extension.

EFP (Pakistan). Should be part of national strategy.

CONEP (Panama). Depends on the development of the economy.

CCL (Peru). Depends on the plans and programmes of the government.

CIP (Portugal). Only member States have the competence to specify goals, scope and benefit levels, as well as the financial means to develop the objectives referred to.

CCSP (Portugal). The provision is too ambitious and specific; it should respect national circumstances.

SN (Sweden). See question 17.

CIU (Uruguay). Relevant strategies can change over time.

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 88. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 3. CTC, CUT (Colombia), FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 2. CSC (Congo), UGT (Portugal).

Comments

CUT (Brazil). See question 24.

CITUB (Bulgaria). Extremely important, especially in respect of the financial means.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). This would lead to a failure to provide services.

CASC (Dominican Republic). Should take into account national circumstances.

UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala). Specific goals should be fixed such as the extension of specific social services.

HMS (India). Periodical assessments would be good.

CS (Panama). Statistics, review and monitoring should be included in social security programmes.

CATP (Peru). Every system should have clear indicators and measurable objectives.

CGTP (Peru). There should be clarity with respect to financing.

UGT (Portugal). Should not be too rigid in this regard.

SGB (Switzerland). Priorities and delays should also be mentioned.

FPU (Ukraine). Should exclude wording related to progressive achievement of full population coverage.

TUC (United Kingdom). The existing wording provides for “progressive achievement of full population coverage” which does not require unrealistic attainments.

Qu. 26 *Should the Recommendation provide that the social security extension strategy should seek, as appropriate, to build on existing institutional capacities and social security schemes such as social insurance or social assistance schemes?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 94.

Yes: 80. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi,

Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Gambia, Germany, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

No: 8. Denmark, Guatemala, Hungary, Lithuania, Peru, Russian Federation, Sweden, Viet Nam.

Other: 6. Croatia, Finland, India, Malaysia, Paraguay, Romania.

Comments

Austria. In some circumstances this may be useful, in others it may be better to design a system from scratch.

Belgium. Should not prevent the reform of certain systems or institutions where it is necessary to increase efficiency.

Benin. Each country should decide whether to rely on existing institutional capacities and experiences, which may prevent pitfalls in the implementation of the strategy.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. See question 23.

Brazil. The SPF strategy should be based on pre-existing policies including social assistance, social insurance and employment generation policies.

Cameroon. Social security reform builds on existing structures.

Denmark. See question 11.

Dominican Republic. The use of structural and technical resources should be optimized.

Ecuador. Support should be technical as well as economic.

El Salvador. Otherwise it would not respond to the needs of the insured.

Finland, Romania. See question 15.

France. If they are efficient.

Germany. The SPF should be designed in a transparent way with clear and efficient regulations, based on existing national procedures, systems and institutions. International cooperation should also be based on existing institutional capacities and national ownership.

Guatemala. These initiatives should not be supported by existing contributive social security schemes, but underpinned by new sources of financing, other than loans.

Hungary. While such strategy is part of national competencies, Members may consider building on existing institutional capacities and social security schemes during its preparation.

India. Revising existing schemes and institutional capacities is more viable and cost-effective than the introduction of new schemes.

Kenya, Luxembourg. Existing institutional capacities contribute greatly in terms of experience and infrastructure.

Kyrgyzstan. Social insurance should be stable and social assistance could change depending on different factors.

Lebanon. Where such schemes exist, and are relatively well-functioning, they should be built upon.

Lesotho. Member States should maximize the capacity of existing institutional structures and capacities in progressively introducing the SPF.

Malaysia. Not relevant.

Mauritius. This will impact positively on the financial implications of the measures to be introduced.

Mexico. National strategies should seek to achieve maximum efficiency and effectiveness regarding the organization and operation of their social security systems.

Netherlands. “Reinventing the wheel” is a waste of time and money. However, new forms of social protection based on national circumstances should not be excluded.

Paraguay. Depends on national circumstances. National capacities and schemes should be assessed to evaluate the possibilities.

Peru. Depending on national circumstances.

Russian Federation. Certain types of social support, such as social services, may be provided outside social insurance and social assistance.

Senegal. Capacities of relevant public institutions should be taken into account, e.g. ministries responsible for social protection.

Sweden. Member States decide how to build their SPF, either based on existing structures or from scratch.

United States. Replace all references to “schemes” by “strategies”.

Viet Nam. Depending on the priorities of each member country.

Employers

Total number of replies: 25.

Yes: 19. AiG (Australia), CNA, CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), SPD (Czech Republic), OEB (Cyprus), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CCSP, CTP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 4. BCCI (Belize), CNC, CNI (Brazil), SN (Sweden).

Other: 2. CIP (Portugal), EFP (Pakistan).

Comments

BCCI (Belize). Social assistance schemes are found in economies able to achieve economies of scale and large contributions from a large and formal working class.

ANDI (Colombia). Social security should be a long-term objective to be achieved in a coordinated and realistic way. Existing social security schemes such as social insurance or social assistance programmes should participate in this effort.

OEB (Cyprus), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), NHO (Norway), UPS (Switzerland), IOE. Certain schemes and systems also need to be reformed.

VNO–NCW (Netherlands). Only if the existing schemes are adequate and affordable.

CCL (Peru). Existing social security schemes should be provided support and improved. This is better than starting without a base.

CIP (Portugal). An issue that concerns only Governments.
SN (Sweden). See question 17.

Workers

Total number of replies: 92.

Yes: 75. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC (Dominican Republic), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), ÉSZT (Hungary), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), CTV, FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 2. CUT (Brazil), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China).

Other: 15. BWU (Barbados), UGT (Brazil), CTRN (Costa Rica), CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), ASI (Iceland), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), LLC (Lesotho), UGT (Portugal), PIT–CNT (Uruguay).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). Depending on national situations. A thorough assessment of national capacities and schemes should be carried out to evaluate the possibilities.

NTUCB (Belize). These schemes should be tax-financed.

CUT (Brazil). Although the contributory pillar is important, the State's responsibility and the concept of social security should be reinforced.

CSN (Canada). If this is effective.

CATP (Peru). The existing institutional capacities and social security schemes should be used as the base to progress with extension in line with Convention No. 102.

CGTP (Peru). Should be based on legislation.

FNPR (Russian Federation). Depends on national circumstances.

LO, TCO, SACO (Sweden). Inequalities should not be built into the system.

PIT–CNT (Uruguay). Depending on national circumstances, timetables for compliance with the principles stipulated in Convention No. 102 should be set.

CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Extension can be achieved through social assistance or social insurance schemes if financed from the national budget.

Qu. 27 *Should the Recommendation encourage Members to close coverage gaps of persons with contributory capacity through contributory schemes where appropriate?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 94.

Yes: 83. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, France, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam.

No: 6. Cyprus, El Salvador, Gambia, Hungary, Malaysia, Sweden.

Other: 5. Denmark, Finland, India, Israel, Italy.

Comments

Argentina. The SPF should aim at the formalization of the economy and registered employment.

Austria. See question 26. Whether contributions can be used to close coverage gaps needs to be assessed case by case.

Bangladesh. It promotes a sense of belonging and develops contributory schemes.

Benin. Allows broadening the scope of benefits offered by contributory schemes.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. Contributory schemes should cover all the groups of guilds and trades who profit from their activity. The State must cover the remaining part.

Cameroon. Should take into account the self-employed.

Cyprus, El Salvador. States should determine how to close coverage gaps.

Czech Republic. Members should decide on financing in line with national circumstances.

Dominican Republic. This is part of the progressive extension of coverage.

Ecuador. Solidarity ensures that all can access social security.

Finland. See question 15.

France. This is a condition for national participation and cohesion.

Guatemala. If they have contributory capacities they can obtain it through private providers.

Hungary. While such a strategy is within national competencies, Members may consider such possibilities during preparation of strategies.

India. Decisions regarding contributory schemes vary depending on the availability of funds and contributory capacities of beneficiaries.

Israel, Italy. Needs clarification.

Kenya, Lesotho, Paraguay, Romania. Workers and employers with a contributory capacity should participate in contributory schemes.

Lebanon. Some schemes, such as health care, may be more cost-efficient if provided universally and through tax funding.

Luxembourg. Promotes the idea of solidarity and the acceptance of the pooling of social risk among the members of the group.

Mauritius. Broadening the revenue base in order to close coverage gaps will put less pressure on public financing, but may necessitate bold policy decisions on the part of governments.

Mexico. The term “coverage gaps” should be defined to avoid confusion. Closing coverage gaps through contributory systems could be complicated because of the growing incidence of informal employment.

Netherlands. National systems should be based upon (and can only be financed through) the principle of solidarity between population groups.

Sweden. The system should be general and for all persons.

United States. Replace “schemes” by “strategies”.

Employers

Total number of replies: 25.

Yes: 7. AiG (Australia), CNA (Brazil), MEDEF (France), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), CONEP (Panama), CTP (Portugal).

No: 14. BCCI (Belize), CNC, CNI, CNS (Brazil), SPD (Czech Republic), OEB (Cyprus), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway), CCL (Peru), SN (Sweden), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

Other: 4. ANDI (Colombia), CCSP, CIP (Portugal), EFP (Pakistan).

Comments

ANDI (Colombia). Should be clarified.

OEB (Cyprus), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), NHO (Norway), CIP (Portugal), CIU (Uruguay), IOE. This does not fall within the mandate of the Recommendation, but rather of Convention No. 102.

EFP (Pakistan). Can be considered at country level depending on feasibility and monitoring capacity.

CCL (Peru). Solidarity is a principle of social security.

CIP (Portugal). States should not be encouraged to cover the differences in people’s ability to pay through appropriate schemes.

CCSP (Portugal). Social dialogue should be part of the process; add “where appropriate and after consulting the most representative employers’ and workers’ organizations”.

SN (Sweden). See question 17.

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 85. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada),

UNSIETRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 6. CUT (Brazil), LBAS (Latvia), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 2. CSN (Canada), UGT (Portugal).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), UNSIETRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), NTUF (Sri Lanka), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). Workers and employers with contributory capacity should take part in contributory schemes.

CGT (Argentina). This will strengthen contributory schemes and ensure the sustainability of the system.

NCTUB (Bahamas). Members should be mandated, not only encouraged, to close the coverage gap.

NTUCB (Belize). This must be done gradually, with a contribution from business.

CUT (Brazil). The implementation of universal benefits should rely on solidarity-based taxation.

CITUB (Bulgaria). Enhances national solidarity, social justice and homogeneity in society.

CSN (Canada). Freedom of association and collective negotiation should not be impeded.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). Important in order to protect vulnerable members.

ČMKOS (Czech Republic). There is a trend to replace contributory systems by tax-financed systems in order to restrict the rights (entitlements) of beneficiaries.

CTM (Mexico). As long as the principles of equality and proportionality are respected for contributors.

CATP (Peru). Would ensure a correct implementation of the system and acceptance.

CGTP (Peru). A differentiated system can be set up.

LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden). The system should be general and equal for all persons.

SGB (Switzerland). Workers and employers with contributory capacity should participate in contributory schemes.

PIT–CNT (Uruguay). Reaffirm the principles of social security, especially participation of social partners, universality and solidarity.

CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). SPFs should also cover persons with contributory capacity.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). The schemes should not and cannot be contributory.

Qu. 28 *Should the Recommendation provide that the design of the national social security extension strategy, its time frame and periodicity of updates, should be subject to effective social dialogue?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 94.

Yes: 84. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Gambia, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam.

No: 5. Hungary, Lithuania, Malaysia, Qatar, United Kingdom.

Other: 5. Denmark, Estonia, Finland, India, Romania.

Comments

Argentina. As long as the legitimate democratic rules of political and parliamentary representation are respected.

Australia. See question 9(e). Members should consult with social partners as well as with representatives of beneficiaries.

Bahrain. The strategy should be subject to a consensus among all factors of production.

Bangladesh. Enhances awareness.

Benin. This allows the involvement of all stakeholders involved in the process with a view to achieving satisfactory results.

Cameroon. Through tripartite dialogue, involving the government and the most representative employers' and workers' organizations.

Canada. The term "effective social dialogue" should be replaced by "consultations".

Costa Rica. This concerns all the economic and social stakeholders.

Denmark. See question 9(e).

Dominican Republic. In line with the demands and needs of society, considering the available human, material and fiscal resources.

Ecuador. Dialogue should always be the means to adjust objectives.

El Salvador. The social security system directly involves governments, employers and workers through tripartite mechanisms.

Finland, Romania. See question 15.

Guatemala. Should not be pressurized to adopt models from other countries.

Hungary. See question 27.

India. Social dialogue should be an essential part of the social security extension strategy, but may not include the timing of implementation.

Kenya. Necessary for the conceptualization and drawing up of a long-term plan.

Lebanon. The participation of social partners is very important.

Lesotho. A system that enjoys ownership of its beneficiaries is highly likely to meet its objectives and agreed time frames.

Luxembourg. NGOs should also be included in this social dialogue.

Mauritius. Facilitates consensus among stakeholders and leads to a more effective implementation of the strategy.

Mexico. The inclusion of the social actors involved in the design and implementation of social policies is fundamental to achieving the desired results.

Nicaragua. Should be based on a consensus of all parties involved.

Paraguay. Effective freedom of association and collective bargaining rights are key for the success of SPF-related measures.

Portugal. Social security systems are dynamic instruments, subject to permanent adjustment and adaptation to new realities and inclusion of atypical groups of workers.

Russian Federation. Social dialogue takes into consideration the interests of employers, trade unions, other public organizations and social groups. Levels of guarantees should be reviewed through transparent and open procedures established by law, which will facilitate reaching higher levels of protection in conformity with ILO social security standards.

United Kingdom. Replace “effective” with “meaningful” and add at the end of the sentence “with workers, employers and representatives of groups in society outside the labour market.”.

Employers

Total number of replies: 24.

Yes: 20. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNA, CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), SPD (Czech Republic), OEB (Cyprus), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), EFP (Pakistan), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CCSP, CTP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 3. CNC, CNI (Brazil), SN (Sweden).

Other: 1. CIP (Portugal).

Comments

CNA (Brazil). Social dialogue should always be promoted and integrated in ILO Recommendations.

ANDI (Colombia). Social dialogue has demonstrated its usefulness for establishing systems based on consensus that respond to the changing needs of the globalized economy.

OEB (Cyprus), UPS (Switzerland), IOE. With reservations expressed in the previous points.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). Must be subject to effective dialogue among social partners, whose roles should be clearly defined.

CCL (Peru). This is for the government.

SN (Sweden). See question 17.

Workers

Total number of replies: 92.

Yes: 91. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV, FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 0.

Other: 1. UGT (Portugal).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), GEFONT (Nepal), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PPWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), NTUF (Sri Lanka), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). Effective freedom of association and collective bargaining rights are key conditions for the success of measures related to the SPF.

NTUCB (Belize). Paramount to the success of the initiative because of its financial implications.

CUT (Brazil). Freedom of association, the right to organize, and collective bargaining need to be ensured.

CITUB (Bulgaria). Involvement of social partners guarantees that different viewpoints are reflected in the strategy and in the implementation.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). Ensures that rights can be fully enjoyed.

NHS (Croatia), CGTP (Peru), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Should be through social dialogue.

CTM (Mexico). Should be considered in national development plans.

CATP (Peru). Ensures correct implementation and acceptance of adopted measures.

TUC (United Kingdom). Social dialogue is meaningful where it is effective. A point about dialogue with groups in society outside the labour market could be included, but this should be a separate point from the section on social dialogue, which is a different – and well-understood – concept.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Social dialogue is more inclusive than tripartite dialogue.

Guiding principles for the extension of social security

- Qu. 29** *Should the Recommendation provide, in line with the Conclusions included in the Resolution concerning the recurrent discussion on social protection (social security) adopted at the 100th Session (June 2011) of the International Labour Conference, that the extension of social security, including the implementation of the social protection floor at the national level, should be guided by the following principles:*
- (a) *universal coverage;*
 - (b) *progressive realization;*
 - (c) *coherence with macroeconomic, employment and other social policies;*
 - (d) *general responsibility of the State;*
 - (e) *diversity of means and approaches, including of financing mechanisms and delivery systems;*
 - (f) *adequacy of benefits and fair balance of the interests of those who finance social security schemes and those who benefit from them;*
 - (g) *non-discrimination;*
 - (h) *gender responsiveness and gender equality;*
 - (i) *entitlement to benefits defined by law;*
 - (j) *financial, fiscal and economic sustainability;*
 - (k) *good governance, including sound financial management and administration;*
 - (l) *involvement of employers' and workers' organizations through effective social dialogue mechanisms regarding design, governance and supervision.*

Governments

Total number of replies: 95.

Yes: 91. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam.

No: 2. Latvia, United Kingdom.

Other: 2. Denmark, India.

Comments

Argentina. Without principle (f).

Benin, Mauritius, Nicaragua. All the above principles should underpin social security strategies.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. These long-standing principles constitute the fundamental pillars of social security.

Cameroon. Gender should not be included.

Canada. (l) should reflect the wording of 9(e) and include after the word “organizations” the wording “as well as beneficiaries and relevant public authorities”. The term “effective social dialogue” should be replaced by “consultations”.

Costa Rica. Other groups should be included in principle (l).

Denmark. Concerning (l), see question 9(e).

Dominican Republic. Should ensure consistency with national legislation in force.

El Salvador. As the foundation of social security, all these should be consistently applied by the competent public institutions. It is important to reinforce coordination in view of limited resources.

Germany. (j) could consider environmental sustainability, in line with the UN CEB Green Economy Initiative.

Guatemala. See above.

Hungary. These principles are important in providing basic social security to as many people as possible. See also questions 5(a) and 5(b).

India. Modify: (a) “coverage of beneficiaries”; (d) “general responsibility of the State and other stakeholders”; (i) “entitlement to benefits provided under schemes/programmes”.

Kenya. All these principles reflect the basic tenets of social protection roles and the responsibilities of stakeholders, and should therefore be part of the guiding principles.

Latvia. States should decide on these principles based on already existing principles that guide national social security systems.

Lebanon. Agree to (e) as long as it does not lead to segmentation or excessive complexity, and is not a hindrance to economies of scale.

Lesotho. All the above principles are extremely important in designing and implementing any social protection system; add: “patriotism, redistribution and social cohesion”.

Luxembourg. Should be based on the 2011 Conclusions.

Mexico. Principles (a), (d), (g), (j) and (k) constitute basic principles which all social security schemes must observe. (h) “gender responsiveness and gender equality” is included under (g) “non-discrimination”.

Panama. These are basic principles which guarantee optimal social protection in an efficient and equitable manner.

Portugal. These guiding principles are commonly accepted, and already guide the design of social security systems.

Romania. All principles mentioned above are necessary for guiding national strategies and decisions. The principle of universal coverage is acceptable if defined as the right of each person to have access to social protection measures stipulated by law.

Sweden. (h) delete “gender responsiveness” because it is an unclear concept. In (k) add “transparent” before “sound”.

Turkey. Efficient social security systems should be based on a sustainable, fair and comprehensive structure, with due regard to formalization of the economy, in line with minimum standards and principles in national and international instruments.

United Kingdom. This section would sit more comfortably after the Preamble section. Combine (a) and (b): “progressive realization of universal coverage” as many member States will need to focus what resources they have on the most vulnerable. (h) replace “gender responsiveness” with “responsive to the specific needs of men and women, and supporting greater gender equality”. SPFs must be designed in such a way that resources are used efficiently and sustainably; therefore in (k) add “and attention to cost-effectiveness” after “administration”. Social security systems should not replace decent work as a means out of poverty for those able to undertake productive employment, and should protect individuals from poverty while facilitating their access to decent work; therefore add two new bullets: (m) “decent work is the most effect means out of poverty”; (n) “where working-age benefit recipients are able to work, social protection systems should promote their employment and their responsibility to find work.”.

United States. Replace “floor” by “floors”; after “national level,” add “consistent with national priorities and broader social, economic and employment policies.”.

Uruguay. The principle of solidarity should be included given its political relevance for modern social security, although it can be considered as being implicitly included in most principles.

Employers

Total number of replies: 25.

Yes: 18. AiG (Australia), CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), SPD (Czech Republic), OEB (Cyprus), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), EFP (Pakistan), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CCSP, CIP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 4. BCCI (Belize), CNA, CNC, CNI (Brazil).

Other: 3. NK (Japan), CTP (Portugal), SN (Sweden).

Comments

BCCI (Belize). Universal coverage is desired by most governments, but a reality check dictates that those not covered will have to be subsidized by contributors.

ANDI (Colombia). All the principles should have the same status.

OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), UPS (Switzerland), IOE. With reservations on principle (a) as regards the statutory right.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). Each country should be able to decide on the conditions of each principle.

NK (Japan). “Consideration of demographic conditions” should be added to the list of principles.

VNO–NCW (Netherlands). Nuanced approach with respect to (a), (d) and (i).

SN (Sweden). Principles (f), (g), (h), (j) and (k) can form part of the Recommendation. For the others, it should be up to each country to develop its own solutions based on its own conditions.

CIU (Uruguay). Considering that universal coverage refers to the SPF which is determined by each country. Principle (j) should figure as (b).

Workers

Total number of replies: 92.

Yes: 92. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN, UGT (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV, FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 0.

Comments

BAK (Austria). Principle (h) is essential.

NCTUB (Bahamas). Universal coverage with special international assistance for Members with illegal migrants.

NTUCB (Belize). Participation of the social partners in administration is also critical.

CEDOCUT (Ecuador). Through social dialogue with real tripartism.

UNSI TRAGUA (Guatemala). Should clearly define clearer principles, which must be extended.

FKTU (Republic of Korea). Add to (e): financing mechanisms and delivery systems “should be of public character, because they are critical in guaranteeing working conditions for welfare service workers and providing quality services”.

MCTU (Malawi). Must be comprehensive.

CGTM (Mauritania). In function of each country’s specificities.

CROC (Mexico). Respect of human rights.

CATP (Peru). The principles of equality and solidarity as well as of transparency should also be added.

CGTP (Peru). All are included.

UGT (Spain). Should also include an additional principle: “the absence of profit-seeking”, despite not being commonly accepted.

TUC (United Kingdom). Universal coverage and progressive realization are central to the SPF. Suggest to add the word “usually” to new principle (m) proposed by the UK Government.

CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Agreement with resolution adopted by the Conference in 2011.

Monitoring of progress

Qu. 30 *Should the Recommendation provide that Members monitor, through appropriate mechanisms, the extension of social security, including the implementation of their social protection floor and progress towards achieving universal coverage as well as higher levels of protection?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 94.

Yes: 89. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam.

No: 4. Cyprus, Hungary, Malaysia, Saudi Arabia.

Other: 1. India.

Comments

Belgium. Should also measure a lack of progress and describe action taken for improvement.

Cuba. Mechanisms should be defined and established nationally considering needs and particular features.

Dominican Republic. Should evaluate the pertinence of a legal revision and implementation mechanisms, coherence of the system with legislative framework and availability of fiscal space.

Ecuador. Constant evaluation and measurement of impact is recommended.

Guatemala. Indicators showing the social, economic and political development of each country should be developed.

India. Regular implementation monitoring should include universal coverage. Strong monitoring mechanisms to be developed nationally, but no monitoring by external agencies.

Lebanon. Adjusting policies based on monitoring and evaluation may be beneficial for equity and efficiency.

Mauritius. Primordial for reducing the risk of mismanagement, promoting efficient use of resources and effectiveness in reaching agreed objectives.

Mexico. Monitoring helps to improve policies to detect problems, find solutions, assess whether goals are met, and ensure transparency, efficient use of public resources and accountability.

Romania. See question 29.

Russian Federation. Data obtained can be used for developing and updating the national extension strategy and identifying regulation gaps.

Sweden. Other methods of data collection might be appropriate.

Turkey. Potential beneficiaries should be involved in the monitoring of non-contributory social protection to ensure that the system guarantees minimum standards for a decent life.

United Kingdom. Replace “universal coverage ... protection” by “universal coverage of adequate levels of protection”.

United States. Add “domestically” before “monitor”; replace “floor” by “floors”.

Uruguay. Periodic evaluation requires production of reliable statistical information.

Employers

Total number of replies: 26.

Yes: 13. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), CCL (Peru), CONEP (Panama), CCSP, CTP (Portugal), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway).

No: 8. CNA, CNC, CNI, CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), SN (Sweden), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay).

Other: 5. OEB (Cyprus), NK (Japan), EFP (Pakistan), CIP (Portugal), IOE.

Comments

ANDI (Colombia). Monitoring mechanisms with fixed time frames should be avoided. Goals can be fixed by region and subject to periodic revision by governments.

OEB (Cyprus), NHO (Norway), IOE. This Recommendation should not be used to make up for the deficiencies of Convention No. 102. It must stand alone and not be used for other ends.

SPD (Czech Republic). Delete “towards achieving universal coverage”.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). As long as these monitoring mechanisms are integrated with others.

NK (Japan). Should not impose excessive burdens on the private sector; add “The content and method of the monitoring should be decided in light of the burden level and cost of the administrative procedures.”

NEF (Namibia). Without adequate monitoring the exercise could become ineffective.

EFP (Pakistan). Monitoring for SPF only.

CCL (Peru). Monitoring is essential to achieve the goals set.

CIP (Portugal). All initiatives should be consulted on with the social partners in order to guarantee the monitoring process.

SN (Sweden). Countries must be able to develop their own solutions based on national conditions.

UPS (Switzerland). Places too much emphasis on extension as opposed to financing possibilities.

CIU (Uruguay). Each country should monitor policies as part of good administrative practices.

Workers

Total number of replies: 91.

Yes: 89. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO

(Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 1. FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 1. UGT (Portugal).

Comments

CGT (Argentina). Should provide guidance on the term “appropriate mechanisms”, which could include scheduled targets towards universal coverage, SPF expenditure as a percentage of GDP, an annual evaluation by the national parliament, or a tripartite advisory group to implement the SPF.

CITUB (Bulgaria). Monitoring is essential to ensure effective implementation, extension of coverage and the realization of objectives.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). Should ensure at least essential minimum levels and coverage.

CTRN (Costa Rica). Should also consider which are the most appropriate mechanisms in order to ensure national commitment.

UGTD (Djibouti). These mechanisms should be used to determine the coverage rate and the real impact of implementation actions.

TUC (Ghana). Must provide for a tripartite monitoring committee.

UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala). Should be stipulated in line with international and national guidelines.

CGT (Honduras). A mechanism to measure progress will need to be established.

CATP (Peru). The methodology to measure progress as well as the process of transition towards more and better levels of social protection in line with Convention No. 102 should be decided.

CGTP (Peru). Standardizing monitoring guidelines would be appropriate.

UGT (Portugal). With the participation of social partners.

SGB (Switzerland). Evaluations should be made regularly and be publicized, enabling other Members to benefit from experiences.

TUC (United Kingdom). We support the UK Government’s response.

CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Every State must realize the monitoring of the extension of social security through its internal mechanisms.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). We reject the floor.

Qu. 31 *Should the Recommendation provide that appropriate monitoring mechanisms should include:*

(a) *regular collection, compilation and publication of social security statistics based on administrative records and household surveys?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 95.

Yes: 87. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg,

The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam.

No: 7. Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Malaysia, Qatar, Saudi Arabia.

Other: 1. India.

Comments

Austria. Clarify which organization would collect data, and what are the reporting requirements.

Belize. Most appropriate mechanism to be decided by States. Delete “based on administrative records and household surveys”.

Cameroon. Household surveys could be used as performance indicators.

China. Replace “and” by “or”. Administrative records are more accurate and reliable than household surveys, which serve only as a reference. No need to collect, compile and publish both.

Dominican Republic. Should also include information from inspection.

El Salvador. As means for evaluating social security systems, this would help to detect other benefit needs and allow comparison and information-sharing among States.

Finland. Solid base for a functional system of statistics.

Germany. Should be provided by existing structures, e.g. ILO *World Social Security Report*, which could be used as a basis for monitoring.

Hungary. To be determined nationally.

India. Accessibility to social security programmes could be included in periodical surveys on income levels, literacy, etc.

Indonesia. Publication should be done gradually.

Kenya. Detailed data requirements/statistics need to be formulated and recommended.

Lesotho. Will enable performance measurement and cross-national comparison.

Luxembourg, Nicaragua. Statistics are essential to ensure monitoring.

Mauritius. Would allow for evaluation of the operational efficiency of social security schemes.

Mexico. Complete, detailed and updated statistics are a prerequisite and essential requirement to formulation of policies, execution of programmes and evaluation of progress.

Norway. Statistics should be disaggregated by sex.

Peru. Clarify the use of statistics. Evaluate feasibility of a minimum set of indicators to evaluate extension progress.

Portugal. Statistics are indispensable to know the reality, take adequate decisions and correctly evaluate their impacts and for comparative analyses at national and international levels.

Sri Lanka. Depending on national ability to collect data.

Turkey. Financially sustainable and efficient policies depend on the existence of appropriate monitoring and evaluation mechanisms and publicly available statistical information.

United Kingdom. No non-essential reporting to international bodies; reporting must be based on needs of States according to their own targets and monitoring mechanisms.

United States. Recognition should be made that some financially strapped countries may have problems implementing an oversight system.

Employers

Total number of replies: 24.

Yes: 16. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNA (Brazil), OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), CONEP (Panama), CCSP, CTP (Portugal), CCL (Peru), UPS (Switzerland), IOE.

No: 6. CNC, CNI, CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), SN (Sweden), CIU (Uruguay).

Other: 2. EFP (Pakistan), CIP (Portugal).

Comments

BCCI (Belize). Public disclosure of investments and divestments of funds should be accessible.

ANDI (Colombia). Countries are competent to measure and establish the controls and mechanisms to monitor what they consider suitable and effective.

MEDEF (France), EFP (Pakistan). Taking into account the capacity of each member State.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). The monitoring system should be developed as a process including all these elements.

VNO–NCW (Netherlands). Consultation of social partners (their experiences).

CCSP (Portugal). Insert “according to national available resources and other reasonable limitations” before “appropriate monitoring mechanisms”.

SN (Sweden), CIU (Uruguay). See question 30.

Workers

Total number of replies: 92.

Yes: 89. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV, FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 2. CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica).

Other: 1. UGT (Portugal).

Comments

CITUB (Bulgaria). Important to ensure completeness and correctness of any progress evaluation.

CSN (Canada). Such assessments are essential for sound policy-making.

CTRN (Costa Rica). The ILO should provide support to develop universally applicable indicators that correctly include the informal economy.

ČMKOS (Czech Republic). Evaluation and analysis of statistical data are equally important.

UGTD (Djibouti). The implementation of the SPF should consider national economic growth.

CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic). This information should be transparent and readily available.

UNSTRAGUA (Guatemala). Should be supported by fully reliable national and international organizations, and be widely disseminated at the national and international level.

CTM (Mexico). As long as its implementation is possible.

CATP (Peru). These mechanisms should be appropriate and accepted by social partners; other private sources should be considered.

SGB (Switzerland). Published statistics should be accompanied by critical analysis informing on level of progress and identifying remaining gaps.

TUC (United Kingdom). We support the UK Government's response except for the point about "non-essential" reporting as formulated: recording should also be for the purposes of the citizens of member States.

CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Statistics are basic for all social security systems, and they can be complemented by household surveys.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Registers are essential.

Qu. 31 (b) *any other mechanism? If so, please specify:*

Governments

Argentina. Other ad hoc surveys, specific social security indicators, records from the social security systems.

Australia. Evaluation through the mechanisms listed in question 31(a) in consultation with social partners, beneficiaries' and, as appropriate, contributors' representatives.

Bahrain. Public opinion surveys to evaluate the quality of services provided.

Bangladesh. Set assessment yardsticks for cross-national comparison.

Belgium. Integrate corrective measures.

Benin. Expertise and counter-expertise, financial, institutional and organizational audits.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. Parametric analysis.

Botswana. Regular ILO publication on social security statistics.

Cameroon. Surveys by social security institutions.

Costa Rica. Impact analysis and methods to measure service quality. International social security "ranking" should be annually published.

Dominican Republic. Need for guidance on mechanisms for planning, budgeting, execution, monitoring and evaluation of activities of providers, as well as timetables for regular performance assessment.

El Salvador. Control and monitoring of coverage in the formal and informal economy; optimization of social security contributions and benefit payment procedures.

Finland. Other possibilities to be taken into account, such as combinations of administrative and survey data.

France. The ILO should identify good practices.

Gambia. Determine national poverty levels.

Honduras. National population census or other relevant national surveys.

Indonesia. Coordination and consultation among stakeholders; random spot-check in regions; assessment and evaluation.

Kenya. Direct reporting/feedback mechanism by the population (automated/online suggestion box).

Lebanon. Appropriate linking between relevant ministries and social partners.

Lesotho. Database (national registry) for registration of vulnerable groups and poverty maps to prioritize assistance.

Malaysia. Monitoring mechanism to be determined by member States.

Mauritius. Regular meetings with stakeholders.

Myanmar. People should know about the social security system through, e.g. media, pamphlets and education.

Netherlands. Where relevant, in consultation with social partners.

Nicaragua. Regular exchanges between countries that implement the SPF.

Paraguay. Include targets and indicators, e.g. time frame towards universal coverage impact on poverty level, expenditure as a percentage of GDP, annual progress reports discussed in parliaments, tripartite advisory groups, etc. ILO technical assistance needed to develop universally applicable indicators.

Peru. Creation of a global observatory on extension progress under ILO auspices.

Russian Federation. Collection and analysis of data from population surveys.

Sri Lanka. Tripartite forum to monitor progress.

Sweden. Follow and evaluate access to social security for different groups.

Turkey. Public opinion polls, poverty research, poverty maps, subsistence indexes, etc.

United States. Supports language that appropriate mechanisms must be put in place to guard the individual privacy of covered workers and beneficiaries, including legal and technical measures to protect individually identifiable information on covered workers and beneficiaries.

Employers

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). Should include monitoring and evaluation and giving feedback and guidance to each country.

NK (Japan). Introduction of a national ID system for all citizens should be considered.

CCSP (Portugal). Should report regularly on information collected to national social partners.

SN (Sweden). See question 30.

CIU (Uruguay). Actuarial studies and studies on the impact of SPF benefits and their relationship with formal and informal employment.

Workers

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT (Argentina), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), NTUF (Sri Lanka), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK-İŞ (Turkey), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). Could include targets and indicators such as a time frame towards universal coverage, impact on the poverty level, expenditure as a percentage of GDP, annual progress reports discussed in parliaments, tripartite advisory groups, etc. The ILO should offer technical assistance to develop universally applicable indicators.

CTA (Argentina). The ILO should provide technical assistance to develop globally applicable indicators.

CITUB (Bulgaria). Social impact assessment method should be used.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). States should ensure the exercise of the relevant rights without discrimination.

JTUC–RENGO (Japan). Neutrality and fairness of systems should be monitored through gender audits.

CROC (Mexico). Records of social security institutions.

CATP (Peru). NGOs, the ILO, trade unions, universities, etc.

CGTP (Peru). Faculty of economics, law and sociology, NGOs.

UGT (Portugal). The creation of structures, e.g. tripartite observatories, is essential for strategy and implementation monitoring and evaluation.

UGT (Spain). Quantitative and qualitative indicators should be provided, e.g. impact of SPF policies on health indicators and poverty levels, innovative initiatives to eradicate poverty, and social partners' positions and proposals.

PIT–CNT (Uruguay). Tripartite monitoring mechanisms should have sufficient information to evaluate real progress, and should be supported by the ILO.

Qu. 32 *Should the Recommendation provide that social security statistics should include for each category of benefit the number of protected persons and beneficiaries, and the amount of benefits, as well as levels and patterns of expenditure and financing?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 95.

Yes: 85. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam.

No: 8. Cyprus, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Malaysia, Peru, Qatar, Saudi Arabia.

Other: 2. India, Japan.

Comments

Belize. Estimate also the number of persons who need protection but are not benefiting from the scheme.

Benin, Finland. Essential in monitoring and evaluating the functioning of the social security system.

Canada. Refer also to statistics disaggregated by gender.

Cyprus. May add to budgetary and administrative burden on countries, and be complicated to apply to informal economy workers.

Czech Republic. Define statistics flexibly to accommodate national social systems' particularities.

Dominican Republic, Ecuador. Such information helps to improve decision-making and targeting of products and services.

El Salvador. Would provide an updated registry on social security coverage, and improve administrative procedures.

France. Monitoring cost should be kept reasonable and supported by the mechanism.

Germany. Amount of statistical information mentioned disproportionate to the expected insights.

Guatemala. Include administrative costs.

Hungary, India, Malaysia. Detailed rules should be determined by States.

Japan. Include "in principle" or "generally".

Kenya. Would enhance forward planning and review.

Republic of Korea, Mauritius. More detailed statistics enable better monitoring and social security policies.

Nicaragua. Fundamental information on the development of coverage and benefit levels.

Norway. Objects to the last part on financing if the intention is to require detailed statistics on the financing of individual branches of social insurance. This would be unavailable in countries with comprehensive government-run social insurance schemes, with typically one single contribution rate.

Peru. Measurement variables should be the numbers of protected persons and beneficiaries, which could be provided by all countries.

Portugal. Would contribute to guaranteeing financial sustainability.

Russian Federation. Would allow comprehensive assessment of levels of social security and transparency of financial flows and ensure proper control of expenditures.

Turkey. Effective and efficient social protection programmes should be based on quantitative data.

United States. It may be more appropriate to refer to "methods" of financing rather than "patterns" of financing. To achieve fair extension of benefits, encourage, where possible, that social security statistics should show separate aggregate data for vulnerable groups in society, as mentioned in question 23.

Employers

Total number of replies: 25.

Yes: 14. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNA, CNS (Brazil), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), NHO (Norway), CONEP (Panama), CCSP, CTP (Portugal), CCL (Peru), UPS (Switzerland).

No: 7. CNC, CNI (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), SPD (Czech Republic), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), SN (Sweden), CIU (Uruguay).

Other: 4. OEB (Cyprus), EFP (Pakistan), CIP (Portugal), IOE.

Comments

ANDI (Colombia). States should define the most appropriate measurement mechanisms.

OEB (Cyprus), NHO (Norway), IOE. Could prove more complicated for workers in the informal economy.

MEDEF (France). Good governance is fundamental.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). Only if statistics are available and accessible, especially for the informal economy.

VNO–NCW (Netherlands), EFP (Pakistan). Too detailed; to be decided at national level.

CCSP (Portugal). Include “according to national available resources and other reasonable limitations”.

SN (Sweden). See question 30.

UPS (Switzerland). In general this would be difficult for the informal economy.

CIU (Uruguay). See question 30. If maintained, information on the number of non-reached persons, especially in informal employment, should be included.

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 90. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 2. CSDR (Romania), FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 1. UGT (Portugal).

Comments

FGTB (Belgium). Should also include access and quality indicators.

CUT (Brazil), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), PIT–CNT (Uruguay). International comparability of data should be promoted.

- CITUB (Bulgaria). Sources of financing are subject to statistical analysis.
- CTC, CUT (Colombia), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala). Should be defined precisely to avoid exploitation for political reasons.
- CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic). Should take prevention into account.
- TUC (Ghana), HMS (India). Should be widely disseminated.
- LO (Norway). Objects to the last part if the intention is to collect detailed statistics on the financing of individual branches of social insurance (e.g. contribution rates), which is not possible for countries with comprehensive government-run social insurance schemes.
- CATP (Peru). Would allow permanent monitoring of coverage levels.
- UGT (Portugal). Should limit itself to providing guidance, since many countries might not, at least at an initial stage, favourably reply to such complex demands.
- SGB (Switzerland). Statistics should also include persons who have not claimed their right.
- ZCTU (Zimbabwe). National social security institutions should be responsible.

Qu. 33 *Should the Recommendation provide that, in designing or revising the concepts, definitions and methodology used in the production of social security statistics, Members should take into consideration relevant guidance of the International Labour Organization, including the International Conference of Labour Statisticians and, as appropriate, of other international organizations?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 91.

Yes: 81. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

No: 8. Belize, Germany, Hungary, Lithuania, Malaysia, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Viet Nam.

Other: 2. India, Paraguay.

Comments

Australia. Refer also to other international organizations' work to promote policy coherence in the multilateral system.

Bangladesh. As far as possible.

Benin, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Finland, Kenya, Netherlands, Peru. Use of internationally accepted instructions and guidelines is advisable.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. Combine ILO and national experience.

Czech Republic. National statistical needs may vary. ILO guidelines should generally apply to statistics intended for international comparison.

Dominican Republic. The ILO should be the lead organization in internationally comparable social security statistics, which are important and facilitate the exchange of experience through horizontal cooperation.

El Salvador. Relevant international legal instruments, ILO instruments, and guidance of the International Conference of Labour Statisticians, Committee of Experts, ILO Governing Body and others, are very valuable legal tools.

France. Provided these are grouped and made accessible for States as well as for other national stakeholders (e.g. institutions, funds, social partners).

Gambia. Other organizations such as the International Social Security Association (ISSA).

Germany. Taking into account existing national and supranational (e.g. EU) statistical requirements, change to “encourage”.

Guatemala. The social, economic and political context of each country should be respected.

Honduras. A technical agency in each country should formalize the definitions, considering those developed by the ILO.

Hungary, India. Should be determined by member States.

Republic of Korea. Necessary to clarify the definitions used for social security statistics and ensure consistency in production of statistics, since they are produced by various organizations.

Lesotho. Highly necessary for producing standardized statistics for comparison and planning.

Mauritius. Helps to ensure coherence and consistency.

Mexico. Should be complemented through experience of other authorities and agencies, e.g. WHO, OECD.

Paraguay. The value of statistics is enhanced if they are internationally comparable. The ILO should be the lead organization in social security statistics and provide guidance.

Portugal. Harmonization allows comparative data analysis. Consider, however, that EU Member States are subject to EU guidance, directives and regulations concerning statistics.

Sri Lanka. Should also consider national standards and practices.

Sweden. Delete “as appropriate”.

United Kingdom. Add: “of other international organizations such as the World Bank, IMF, and regional development banks”.

Employers

Total number of replies: 25.

Yes: 17. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNS (Brazil), OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), NHO (Norway), EFP (Pakistan), CCL (Peru), CCSP, CTP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 6. CNA, CNC, CNI (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), CONEP (Panama).

Other: 2. CIP (Portugal), SN (Sweden).

Comments

ANDI (Colombia). There should be no obligation to set policies according to given restricted guidance. Studies by international agencies can serve as optional reference.

OEB (Cyprus), NHO (Norway), IOE. Delete “as appropriate”. Should be more positive and call for coherence and cooperation among international organizations.

SPD (Czech Republic), SN (Sweden), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay). Delete “as appropriate”.

MEDEF (France). Coherence of international institutions.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). Collaboration is appropriate and essential.

CONEP (Panama). Each country should use its own methods. Information and guidance from the ILO is pertinent.

CIP (Portugal). This is the responsibility of member States, which should decide whether it is necessary to seek the guidance of the ILO or other international organizations.

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 86. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV, FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 2. CSN (Canada), CSC (Congo).

Other: 5. UGTD (Djibouti), LLC (Lesotho), GEFONT (Nepal), PWF (Pakistan), UGT (Portugal).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), NTUF (Sri Lanka), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). The value of statistics is greatly enhanced if they are internationally comparable. The ILO should be the lead organization in social security statistics and provide guidance.

CSN (Canada). Should be limited to the ILO, and not include other international organizations.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). It should be considered as an essential standard.

CITUB (Bulgaria), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), CATP, CGTP (Peru). Comparability with other countries should be ensured.

UGT (Portugal). ILO technical assistance for definition and/or review of statistics.
FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). As long as they are neither closed nor biased.

Qu. 34 *Should the Recommendation provide that Members should contribute to an exchange of information, experiences and expertise on social security policies and practices among themselves and with the International Labour Office?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 95.

Yes: 88. Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam.

No: 4. Malaysia, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom.

Other: 3. India, Kenya, United States.

Comments

Bahrain. Would contribute to the progress of national programmes.

Bangladesh, Benin, Mauritius. Mutual benefit through experience sharing.

Belgium. Such exchange should be formalized.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. ILO Conventions and Recommendations, when ratified, should be implemented and adjusted to current needs.

Cambodia. Clarify the purpose of “exchange of information”. An integrated evaluation framework should be developed to inform policy-makers, evaluate policy impacts, and mobilize resources. National capacity in initiating and conducting evidence-based research for development should be strengthened.

Costa Rica. The ILO should systematize and publicize experiences.

Dominican Republic. Make available good practice references.

Ecuador. Beneficial; would contribute to national development.

El Salvador. Would allow results of actions and measures taken by States to be known; a valuable social indicator.

Germany, Hungary. Should not be mandatory.

Guatemala. The social, economic and political context of each country should be respected.

India. Would help to promote social security extension strategies.

Kenya. Avoids reinventing the wheel.

Lesotho. Tantamount to knowledge and essential in improving SPFs.

Luxembourg. An essential role of the ILO.

Mexico. Access to statistics and results of various experiences allows comparison and reorientation. Desirable to set up a base of good practices.

Myanmar, Peru. Essential for improving social security systems.

Nicaragua. To learn from achievements and improve policies implemented.

Paraguay. Use the ILO concept of decent work indicators as a framework to facilitate this exchange.

Portugal. Recommendation must stipulate exchange of information and other social security policy and experiences, emphasizing importance of task to guarantee efficiencies and improvement.

Romania. Given the role of the ILO to facilitate the exchange of best practices and information, States should also contribute to this exchange.

Russian Federation. Would facilitate utilization of new instruments and approaches to realization of the main social guarantees in national social security systems.

Senegal. Make use of ITC–Turin and privilege exchanges in its training courses for social partners. Promote the reinforcement of social actors and governments’ capacities.

Turkey. Would contribute to more effective policies.

United Kingdom. Instead of generalized requirements to do so, encourage information sharing between States or with other bodies, e.g. ILO, in response to specific regional or country-led initiatives.

United States. Replace “should contribute” by “may contribute”.

Uruguay. Successful country experiences could provide valuable information for those exploring systems reform, taking into account national economic possibilities.

Employers

Total number of replies: 24.

Yes: 20. AiG (Australia), BCCI (Belize), CNS (Brazil), ANDI (Colombia), OEB (Cyprus), SPD (Czech Republic), MEDEF (France), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), VNO–NCW (Netherlands), NHO (Norway), EFP (Pakistan), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CCSP, CTP (Portugal), UPS (Switzerland), CIU (Uruguay), IOE.

No: 3. CNA, CNC, CNI (Brazil).

Other: 1. CIP (Portugal).

Comments

ANDI (Colombia). The SPF should be structured comprehensively.

OEB (Cyprus), NHO (Norway), CIU (Uruguay), IOE. Social partners should be encouraged to participate in these exchanges; they should also be more involved in ILO activities.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). Exchange of knowledge, information, expertise and experience should be encouraged.

VNO–NCW (Netherlands). Voluntary exchange of experiences is useful.

CCL (Peru). This important work should be done by the ILO.

CIP (Portugal). Nothing to preclude regarding the possibility of exchange on the matter.

Workers

Total number of replies: 93.

Yes: 92. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CGT, CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), NCTUB (Bahamas), BWU (Barbados), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT, UGT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC, CSN (Canada), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), NHS (Croatia), SEK (Cyprus), ČMKOS (Czech Republic), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), SPS, UNSA (France), CGSL (Gabon), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), KSBSI (Indonesia), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), COTU–K (Kenya), FKTU (Republic of Korea), LBAS (Latvia), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC, CTM (Mexico), NUNW (Namibia), GEFONT (Nepal), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CS, CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), NSZZ (Poland), CGTP–IN (Portugal), CNS–Cartel ALFA, CSDR (Romania), FNPR (Russian Federation), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), KOVO (Slovakia), UGT (Spain), JSS, NTUF (Sri Lanka), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), SGB (Switzerland), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), FPU (Ukraine), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), CTV, FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 0.

Other: 1. UGT (Portugal).

Comments

KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), CTA (Argentina), ACTU (Australia), FGTB (Belgium), UGT (Brazil), UGTC (Cameroon), CLC (Canada), CSC (Congo), CTRN (Costa Rica), SEK (Cyprus), UGTD (Djibouti), CASC, CNTD, CNUS (Dominican Republic), CEDOCUT, CSE (Ecuador), DGB (Germany), TUC (Ghana), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CNTG (Guinea), CGT (Honduras), HKCTU (Hong Kong, China), ÉSZT (Hungary), ASI (Iceland), HMS (India), LLC (Lesotho), MCTU (Malawi), MTUC (Malaysia), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CNV, FNV, MHP (Netherlands), NZCTU (New Zealand), LO (Norway), PWF (Pakistan), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), NSZZ (Poland), CNS–Cartel ALFA (Romania), CESTRAR (Rwanda), CNTS, CSA (Senegal), KOVO (Slovakia), NTUF (Sri Lanka), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), ZCTU (Zimbabwe). The ILO concept of decent work indicators could be used as a framework to facilitate this exchange of information and good practices.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). Guidance on measures and implementation is important.

CATP, CGTP (Peru). Systematic information facilitates implementation.

UGT (Portugal). The ILO plays a key role in promoting such practices.

SGB (Switzerland). The ILO should encourage these exchanges by ensuring an adequate platform.

TUC (United Kingdom). The ILO should be able to call for information exchange at a global level.

CTV (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). Could be addressed by country group, e.g. Andean Community, MERCOSUR, etc.

FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela). The problem is a global one, not a partial one.

Other issues

Qu. 35 *Should the Recommendation include other elements not mentioned in this questionnaire?*

Governments

Total number of replies: 82.

Yes: 26. Argentina, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Botswana, Cameroon, China, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, Germany, Guatemala, Indonesia, Kenya, Lebanon, Lesotho, Mexico, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Philippines, Senegal, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

No: 54. Albania, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, Estonia, France, Honduras, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uruguay, Viet Nam.

Other: 2. Dominican Republic, India.

Comments

Argentina. Define difference between the SPF and the extension of social security. Highlight link between the labour market and social security and the importance of Convention No. 102 for setting minimum standards in social security.

Plurinational State of Bolivia. Social security as a human right should be linked to the extension of coverage.

China. Include a definition of minimum social protection.

Costa Rica. Consider the notion of social responsibility.

Czech Republic. Emphasize the need for capacity building, and the inherent flexibility of the SPF concept.

Ecuador. Recognition of different forms of social protection, besides allowing countries to decide their action plan and specific products.

El Salvador. Comprehensive definition of social security; participation of the informal economy; considerations on the fluidity of benefit delivery, on the implementation of better contribution systems, and on process of contributions to the national economy in terms of labour savings.

Finland. MDG 1 and the social dimension of sustainable development.

France. Give a balanced treatment to rights and obligations.

Germany. Could include reference to enhanced South–South and triangular cooperation. Provide a framework to allow low-income countries, in line with their own priorities and capacities, to provide a minimum level of social security.

Guatemala. The social, economic and political context of each country should be respected. Financing is very important.

India. Address the social security needs of informal workers separately.

Indonesia. Capacity building and technical assistance facilitated by the ILO.

Kenya. Involvement of the target groups at the design stage.

Lebanon. Provision of income support to first-time jobseekers, and giving special care to programmes addressing labour market drop-outs (training, public employment schemes).

Lesotho. Address: clustering member States by level of development; participation of all stakeholders in decision-making process; periodic progress reports; discouraging dependency and promoting graduation; inclusion of other basic needs (access to food, safe drinking water and housing); equal access rights for expatriates, permanent and temporary residents; checks and balances; portability of entitlements in contributory schemes; user-friendly dispute regulation procedures.

Luxembourg. Reopening a discussion on issues having found consensus at the Conference in 2011 would be counterproductive.

Mexico. Incorporate a valuation of the costs and sources of financing of social protection policies proposed; strategies for the extension of services; identification of high-priority groups and repercussions of the extension of social security coverage on medical services.

Netherlands. Stronger cooperation between international organizations, social partners and NGOs will be necessary in the years ahead. Policy coherence and practical cooperation “in the field” are needed to be more effective in reaching our goals on social security.

Philippines. Implementation of all social security programmes by a single government agency.

Senegal. Financing and governance techniques of SPF mechanism, but also political will of member States in establishing SPFs. Policies promoting access to social housing should be promoted for employees and the most vulnerable.

Sweden. The Recommendation should apply only to States that have not ratified core ILO Conventions. Title should be “Recommendation on basic social protection benefits”, maybe adding “social protection floor to facilitate dissemination and underline its importance”. Ratification of relevant ILO Conventions by member States as an objective.

United Kingdom. Mention the risk of negative incentives (i.e. benefit dependency) that can be triggered by social protection and suggest how to mitigate these.

United States. Include the role of the ILO with respect to collecting social security information, disseminating information on good practices and monitoring progress towards the extension of social security. Members should coordinate and integrate social security programmes domestically to avoid unnecessary duplication in the provision of benefits, costly and inefficient institutional overlapping of responsibilities that might undermine the long-term financial viability of social security protection.

Employers

Total number of replies: 18.

Yes: 3. ANDI (Colombia), ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran), CIU (Uruguay).

No: 13. AiG (Australia), CAN, CNC, CNI, CNS (Brazil), OEB (Cyprus), MEDEF (France), KEF (Republic of Korea), NEF (Namibia), EFP (Pakistan), CONEP (Panama), CCL (Peru), CTP (Portugal).

Other: 2. VNO–NCW (Netherlands), IOE.

Comments

ANDI (Colombia). The concept of “sustainable enterprise”, reflecting the three pillars of development: economic growth, social progress and environmental aspects. The needs derived from the SPF must be satisfied within the frame of national fiscal sustainability and of businesses.

ICEA (Islamic Republic of Iran). Should also highlight the role of social dialogue throughout the design, implementation and monitoring; the role of the private sector; national definition and financing of SPFs; policy coherence with economic and employment policies.

VNO–NCW (Netherlands). Should also highlight the role of activating policies (stimulating people to accept work), as well as reducing the informal economy.

CIU (Uruguay). Should emphasize more clearly that economic development and employment creation are the best forms of social security; also that the SPF should: not be an incentive for people to remain in the informal economy; avoid creating dependency; encourage labour market participation and formalization of employment.

Workers

Total number of replies: 60.

Yes: 32. CGT, CTA (Argentina), NCTUB (Bahamas), FGTB (Belgium), NTUCB (Belize), CUT (Brazil), CITUB (Bulgaria), CTC, CUT (Colombia), CTRN (Costa Rica), CEDOCUT (Ecuador), FTUC (Fiji), CGSL (Gabon), PWU (Grenada), UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala), CGT (Honduras), HMS (India), FKTU (Republic of Korea), MCTU (Malawi), UNTM (Mali), CGTM (Mauritania), CROC (Mexico), CTRP (Panama), CUTA/CNT (Paraguay), CATP, CGTP (Peru), CESTRAR (Rwanda), LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden), FPU (Ukraine), ZCTU (Zimbabwe).

No: 20. KSSH (Albania), UGTA (Algeria), ACTU (Australia), BAK (Austria), CSC (Congo), NHS (Croatia), SPS, UNSA (France), TUC (Ghana), ÉSZT (Hungary), COTU–K (Kenya), CTM (Mexico), CS (Panama), CSA (Senegal), NTUC (Singapore), NTUF (Sri Lanka), TÜRK–İŞ (Turkey), TUC (United Kingdom), PIT–CNT (Uruguay), FETRATEL (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

Other: 8. CSN (Canada), UGTD (Djibouti), CNUS (Dominican Republic), CSE (Ecuador), CNTG (Guinea), JTUC–RENGO (Japan), LO (Norway), UGT (Portugal).

Comments

CGT (Argentina). Financing of the initiative; and national regulatory frameworks that can limit misuse, such as outsourcing, pseudo-cooperatives for workers, or other aspects that lead to job insecurity; these are key to ensuring that the initiative is sustainable and socially inclusive.

NCTUB (Bahamas). Illegal workers and how they are treated.

FGTB (Belgium). The development of social security systems is closely linked to progress in other policy spheres. Points (a) to (m) in paragraph 20 of the 2011 Conclusions should therefore be included.

NTUCB (Belize). Who is ultimately responsible for payment of the scheme?

CUT (Brazil). Member States should be invited to develop the SPF to reach equivalence with the minimum wage as proposed by international labour standards.

CSN (Canada). Should recall the need for public supervision of benefit schemes and ensure that social security contributions are not used for other purposes.

CTC, CUT (Colombia). States should adopt obligations of behaviour and of results, as well as measures and commitments that are neither conditional nor limited. In the context of respect for and guarantee of human rights, they should at least ensure the minimum levels for all the basic forms of social security.

CTRN (Costa Rica). Considering the global growth of the informal economy, ratification of Convention No. 102 is important, as well as providing another instrument which is in line with reality.

CEDOCUT (Ecuador). Effective participation of workers' representatives in the establishment of SPFs; regular adjustments of social insurance to ensure its proper functioning in the interest of workers and their families.

CSE (Ecuador). Improvement of the quality of services offered.

UNSITRAGUA (Guatemala). Member countries should effectively comply with standards of the ILO and other international organizations related to social justice. Legal and political instruments should be urgently created to penalize any act of corruption and impunity by public and private officials.

CNTG (Guinea). Include training on transparent administration of social security, envisage meetings on exchange of information and experiences. Comparative studies on countries at same level of development needed.

CGT (Honduras). In addition to the SPF, there should be a social security system which can cover the entire population and this system must be guaranteed by the State and inclusive.

HMS (India). Should take into account racial and social discrimination.

JTUC-RENGO (Japan). Should underline gender equality and affirmative action, as well as the framework for participation of stakeholders.

FKTU (Republic of Korea). Emphasis on the role of the government and efforts to secure financial resources.

UNTM (Mali). Communication and empowerment of beneficiaries.

CGTM (Mauritania). OSH and the use of social security indicators as evaluation tools.

CTRP (Panama). All social security systems should be universal in nature and based on solidarity; and governments should provide economic support to sustain these systems.

CATP, CGTP (Peru). Social security education should be strengthened.

UGT (Portugal). Should also contribute to promoting equality between men and women.

CESTRAR (Rwanda). According to countries' needs.

LO, SACO, TCO (Sweden). Gender perspective should be strengthened to ensure equal access for women. Should also call for the ratification of all relevant ILO Conventions by all member States.

FPU (Ukraine). Should support development of social budgets.

OFFICE COMMENTARY

General observations

A large number of replies show a broad general consensus with respect to the possible content of the proposed Recommendation concerning national floors of social protection. The number of replies received from governments is indicated in table 1; the Office also received 26 distinct replies from employers' organizations and 94 from workers' organizations. Replies received by 30 November 2011 could be taken into account.¹

Table 1. Replies from governments

Question No.	Yes	No	Other	Total	Question No.	Yes	No	Other	Total
2	92	4	2	98	13(b)	80	11	2	93
3(a)	94	4	0	98	14	82	9	2	93
3(b)	89	8	0	97	15	86	6	5	97
4	47	40	1	88	16(a)	84	8	4	96
5(a)	94	2	1	97	16(b)	83	8	5	96
5(b)	87	6	3	96	17	73	17	4	94
6	83	10	2	95	18	90	4	2	96
7(a)	79	12	5	96	19	78	15	2	95
7(b)	82	9	5	96	20	84	4	5	93
7(c)	78	14	5	97	21	87	5	2	94
7(d)	84	8	5	97	22	89	2	3	94
8(a)	84	9	4	97	23	73	16	5	94
8(b)	89	3	4	96	24	63	27	4	94
9(a)	71	21	4	96	25	71	20	3	94
9(b)	83	10	2	95	26	80	8	6	94
9(c)	84	7	3	94	27	83	6	5	94
9(d)	91	3	3	97	28	84	5	5	94
9(e)	92	2	3	97	29	91	2	2	95
10(a)	90	4	2	96	30	89	4	1	94
10(b)	94	3	1	98	31	87	7	1	95
10(c)	96	0	2	98	32	85	8	2	95
11	93	4	1	98	33	81	8	2	91
12	91	1	5	97	34	88	4	3	95
13(a)	90	4	2	96	35	26	54	2	82

¹ Replies that were received after 30 November 2011 are reflected in this report for the yes/no replies only; however, textual comments could not be taken into account.

The Office has received a rich set of detailed comments in response to the questions raised in the questionnaire. Some of these comments are recurrently emphasized by many respondents in relation to a number of different questions. The Office presents these comments in this general part. Other comments, made in respect of specific questions, are addressed in more detail below.

One recurring comment from governments and employers' and workers' organizations, expressed in respect to almost all questions, is the importance and the need for the development of any extension strategy – as well as its implementation and monitoring – to be tailored to and consistent with national circumstances and priorities, and to take into account national capacities and available resources. In addition, a number of comments stress that national SPFs should consistently be referred to in the plural form.

This point is addressed in the proposed Recommendation which sets out a flexible framework and formulates guidance for Members for the development of their own social protection floors and wider social security extension strategies. The term “social protection floors” (in the plural form) is used when referring to implementation at national level in different countries, whereas the singular form is used to refer to the general concept. Accordingly, the proposed title of the Recommendation – Recommendation concerning national floors of social protection – highlights the fact that there is no one model, and that the floors are defined nationally. The singular is used in the proposed short title – Social Protection Floor Recommendation, 2012 – for semantically easier reference.

Another recurrent theme in the replies is the need for the progressive implementation of national social security extension strategies, including SPFs. Many respondents stress that, based on national circumstances and priorities, the extension of social security through different types of benefits may have to proceed sequentially and gradually. This pragmatically acknowledges limited financial, fiscal and institutional capacities in a number of member States.

Taking these concerns into account, the proposed Recommendation stresses the principle of progressive realization in Paragraphs 1, 3, 4, 13 and 14.

Furthermore, a significant number of respondents explicitly reaffirm their commitment to the standards laid down in Convention No. 102 and other relevant ILO social security instruments, which are considered as key references for the improvement of social security.

This is reflected in the Preamble and in Paragraphs 1, 17 and 18 of the proposed Recommendation.

A number of governments and employers' and workers' organizations also highlight the need to clearly define the SPF concept and other specific terms used in the proposed Recommendation, such as the terms “(ordinarily) resident”, “care”, “active age groups”, or “child”.

For the purpose of the proposed Recommendation, the term “social protection floors” is introduced and explained in Paragraph 2 of the proposed Recommendation. The term “basic social security guarantees” is introduced and explained in Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the proposed Recommendation. Other terms used in the proposed Recommendation are subject to definition at the national level in line with the existing international obligations of the Member concerned and considering the guidance provided by other ILO standards.

Several governments emphasize that many countries already have comprehensive SPFs in place, and already provide benefits which reach at least the scope and levels stipulated in Convention No. 102 and other relevant Conventions. For such countries, the priority may be to maintain adequate levels of protection.

This point is addressed in Paragraphs 1, 4, 13 and 14 of the proposed Recommendation.

Preliminary question

QUESTION 1

Respondents provided references to national legislation and practice, offering a rich background for the preparation of the proposed Recommendation.

Preamble

QUESTIONS 2–4

The large majority of respondents (governments: 94 per cent, employers: 67 per cent, workers: 100 per cent) agree that the Preamble should recall the Declaration of Philadelphia, 1944; the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948; the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, 2008; and the continuing relevance of ILO social security Conventions and Recommendations, in particular Convention No. 102 and Recommendations Nos 67 and 69. Most respondents emphasize the importance of the right to social security as a human right. Two governments voice concerns regarding the inclusion of Recommendation No. 69, given its status.² One government and some employers' organizations also express reservations concerning the reference to the continuing relevance of these instruments.

Some governments and workers' organizations suggest including further references, including to the ICESCR, the CEDAW, the CRC, other ILO instruments (such as Conventions Nos 81, 100, 111, 121, 128, 130, 168, 183 and Recommendation No. 134), the Decent Work Agenda, the Global Jobs Pact or the Yaoundé Tripartite Declaration on the Social Protection Floor (2010), the MDGs, the UN SPF Initiative and the 2011 discussion.

In light of the comments received, the Preamble has been drafted in a concise manner, limiting itself to references to fundamental international instruments including the ICESCR, in particular its Articles 9, 11 and 12, as well as a reference to the 2011 Resolution and Conclusions concerning the recurrent discussion on social protection (social security).

The large majority of respondents (governments: 96 per cent, employers: 79 per cent, workers: 99 per cent) agree that the Preamble should recognize that social security is a social and economic necessity for development and progress and an important tool to reduce, alleviate and prevent poverty, social exclusion and insecurity. The majority of respondents (governments: 92 per cent, employers: 68 per cent, workers: 96 per cent) further agree that social security is an investment in people that allows them to adjust to necessary structural changes in the economy and labour markets, as well as an effective automatic stabilizer in times of crisis and beyond.

Several respondents highlight the role of social security in promoting human dignity and social justice. Some governments, employers' and workers' organizations propose to add an explicit reference to the promotion of equal opportunity and gender equality in the Preamble, to underline the role of social security in facilitating the transition from informal to formal employment and in the importance of employment generation, and the necessity of linking the extension of social security to employment policy and sustainable economic development.

² These comments may refer to the decision of the Governing Body to maintain the status quo with regard to Recommendation No. 69, following the review of ILO standards undertaken by the Working Party on Policy regarding the Revision of Standards (Cartier Working Party); see GB.276/LILS/WP/PRS/1. The interim status of this instrument means that it is not considered as fully up to date, but still relevant in certain respects. Accordingly, it was included as one of the instruments surveyed by the CEACR in *Social security and the rule of law: General Survey concerning social security instruments in light of the Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, 2008*, Report III (Part 1B), International Labour Conference, 100th Session, Geneva, 2011. In its report, the CEACR underlined the "continued pertinence and usefulness" of Recommendations Nos 67 and 69 and noted that "their universal approach to social security are still pertinent, in particular in terms of the guiding principles they set forward for national law and practice and for ILO action on the extension of social security to all" (paras 50 and 53).

Various governments and employers' organizations highlight that (decent) employment remains the best form of social protection.

In light of these comments, the Preamble explicitly recognizes the human right to social security and the social and economic functions of social security.

Objective

QUESTION 5

Question 5(a). The vast majority of respondents (governments: 97 per cent, employers: 64 per cent, workers: 96 per cent) confirm that the proposed Recommendation should provide guidance to Members on the establishment of SPFs within wider social security systems tailored to national circumstances and levels of development. Several respondents emphasize that national needs, priorities and capacities should be taken into account; and that affordability and sustainability should be ensured. Establishing national SPFs is considered by some respondents as an essential means to eradicate poverty and to extend coverage to workers in the informal economy.

Question 5(b). A majority of respondents (governments: 91 per cent, employers: 59 per cent, workers: 94 per cent) also support that the proposed Recommendation should provide guidance on the implementation of SPFs within a strategy that progressively ensures higher levels of social security. In this regard, a number of respondents stress that the progressive extension to "higher levels of social security" should reach at least the levels of Convention No. 102. Furthermore, they note that it is essential to integrate national social security strategies with national social, economic and employment policies.

Considering these comments, Paragraph 1 of the proposed Recommendation formulates the objectives of the proposed instrument. References to the human right to social security and to the prevention and reduction of poverty are explicitly made in the Preamble.

National social protection floors

QUESTION 6

Establishment of national social protection floors

The large majority of respondents (governments: 87 per cent, employers: 63 per cent, workers: 97 per cent) agree that Members should establish and implement, as rapidly as possible, their SPFs that ensure that over the life cycle all in need can afford and have access to essential health care and have income security at least at a nationally defined minimum level. Several respondents emphasize that the guarantees that constitute the SPF should be defined as a matter of national responsibility, should respond to national circumstances, priorities and needs, and should be implemented progressively in line with national economic, financial, fiscal and administrative capacities.

Some employers' and workers' organizations emphasize that the establishment of national SPFs should include consultations with social partners. Workers' organizations stress that minimum income security should ensure income levels above the poverty line, and voice concern that the establishment of SPFs should not undermine existing protection levels.

In light of the above, the proposed Recommendation, especially in Paragraphs 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6, emphasizes national responsibility for establishing, completing and maintaining SPFs in line with national circumstances, needs, priorities and capacities. The need for consultations and effective social dialogue in these processes is established as a principle in Paragraph 3 and is also addressed in Paragraphs 7 and 13.

QUESTION 7

Basic social security guarantees

For each of the four sub-questions, the large majority of governments and employers' and workers' organizations confirm that the proposed Recommendation should guide Members in providing at least a set of basic social security guarantees, including access to essential health-care services and income security throughout the life cycle. Several respondents note that Members may find different ways to ensure access to health care and income security, in line with their national circumstances, needs, priorities and capacities.

In light of the above, the proposed Recommendation uses the term "guarantees" consistently in Paragraphs 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 12 to allow for flexibility in the choice of the methods and policies for achieving the intended social protection outcomes of SPFs. References in questions 7(a)–7(d) to specific benefits which may be used to give effect to basic social security guarantees are mentioned in Paragraph 9 of the proposed Recommendation.

Question 7(a). A majority of respondents (governments: 82 per cent, employers: 77 per cent, workers: 94 per cent) support the inclusion in the proposed Recommendation stating that all residents should have the necessary financial protection to access essential health services, including maternal care. Certain governments note that maternal health care should be clearly defined and prioritized. Some respondents further suggest that priority should also be given to children's access to health care. One government mentions that guidance should be provided with regard to the prioritization of beneficiaries in cases where universal coverage cannot be immediately achieved. Several respondents requested the clarification of the term "financial protection", maintaining that different ways of provision can ensure effective access to health services.

In light of the above, Paragraph 5(a) of the proposed Recommendation stipulates that Members should provide for access to a nationally defined set of goods and services, constituting essential health care, including in the case of maternity.³ This guarantee should ensure that persons in need of health care should not face hardship and an increased risk of poverty due to the financial consequences of accessing health care, as set out in Paragraph 7(a) of the proposed Recommendation. Furthermore, the proposed formulation of Paragraph 5(a) is flexible so as to allow for different options of provision and financial protection with regard to ensuring access to health care.

Paragraph 6 of the proposed Recommendation refers to the personal scope of the guarantees and sets out that, subject to their existing international obligations, Members should provide the basic social security guarantees to at least all residents and children, as defined in national laws and regulations. In this context, it may be noted that the General Comment No. 19 of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights states, regarding the right to social security, that "[a]ll persons, irrespective of their nationality, residency or immigration status, are entitled to primary and emergency medical care".⁴ Furthermore, the CEACR, in reference to the scope of application of constitutional guarantees relating to social security, noted that, "extending the right to social security, including the right to medical care, to non-citizens is a key challenge for many societies today. With regard to the non-citizens, even where they are in an

³ Such a nationally defined set of goods and services constituting essential health care may be guided by the definition of medical care benefit laid down in Article 10 of Convention No. 102 and Article 13 of Convention No. 130.

⁴ UN ECOSOC, 2008: *General Comment No. 19: The right to social security E/C.12/GC/19* (Geneva, Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights), available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/type,GENERAL,,,47b17b5b39c,0.html>.

irregular status on the territory of another State, such as undocumented workers, they should have access to basic benefits and particularly to emergency medical care.”⁵

Question 7(b). A majority of respondents (governments: 85 per cent, employers: 68 per cent, workers: 94 per cent) agree to the inclusion in the proposed Recommendation of income security for children as a basic social security guarantee. Several comments underline the importance of income security for children as a human right, for promoting equal opportunities and for national economic and social development. However, certain respondents are concerned about the reference to “all children”, pointing to the limited financial capacities of developing countries. Some respondents suggest clarifying the terms “child”, “care” and “education” (which could include vocational education); others propose the inclusion of access to other goods including housing. Several respondents propose to include a reference to residence in line with the wording in questions 7(a), (c) and (d), whereas other governments insist that no child should be denied basic rights. Two governments suggest the inclusion of a reference to the relationship between the provision of social protection to parents and the eradication of child labour.

In light of the above, Article 5(b) of the proposed Recommendation provides for the guarantee of basic income security for children, at least at a nationally defined minimum level, providing access to nutrition, education, care and any other necessary goods and services. Paragraph 6 of the proposed Recommendation provides that the basic social security guarantees referred to should apply to all children, as defined in national laws and regulations, subject to Members’ existing international obligations.

Question 7(c). A majority of respondents (governments: 80 per cent, employers: 68 per cent, workers: 89 per cent) agree that the proposed Recommendation should include minimum income security for those who are unable to earn sufficient income. Several respondents further underline that special programmes for groups with special needs, such as persons with disabilities, may be useful. Several comments also highlight the importance of unemployment benefit programmes and links with employment policies, namely public employment programmes. Workers’ organizations stress that the latter should provide wages at least at the minimum wage level. Several respondents suggest replacing the term “social assistance” by “social transfers”, as the latter term is wider. Some comments refer to the need to define the level of income security to be ensured.

In light of the above, Paragraph 5(c) of the proposed Recommendation explicitly sets out that such guarantees of basic income security should be provided, at least at a nationally defined minimum level, for persons in active age who are unable to earn sufficient income, including in case of sickness, unemployment, maternity and disability. Persons in active age are understood as those persons who are not children and not persons in old age, as defined in national legislation, subject to Members’ existing international obligations. This is deemed to be inclusive of persons with special needs. The reference to nationally defined minimum levels of income in Paragraph 7(b) of the proposed Recommendation opens the possibility of setting benefit levels consistent with appropriate benchmarks which could also include minimum wage levels.

Question 7(d). A clear majority of respondents (governments: 87 per cent, employers: 72 per cent, workers: 90 per cent) support the inclusion of income security guarantees for residents in old age in the proposed Recommendation. Some respondents emphasize that Members should define benefit levels and qualifying conditions, including the definition of “old age”, in line with national circumstances. Workers’ organizations emphasize that minimum levels should not be below the national poverty line, and that guarantees provided should be based on the principle of universality.

⁵ ILO, 2011: *Social security and the rule of law: General Survey concerning social security instruments in light of the Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, 2008*, op.cit., para. 260.

Paragraph 5(d) of the proposed Recommendation provides for basic income security, at least at a nationally defined minimum level, for persons in old age. Persons in old age are understood as persons above a specific age, as defined in national laws and regulations, subject to Members' existing international obligations.

QUESTION 8

Legal nature of basic social security guarantees

Question 8(a). The large majority of respondents (governments: 87 per cent, employers: 48 per cent, workers: 100 per cent) agree that the proposed Recommendation should state that basic social security guarantees should be legally recognized as a right that is enforceable through simple and rapid complaint and appeal procedures defined by national laws or regulations. However, some governments and employers' organizations emphasize that it is the Members' prerogative to decide whether such guarantees should be provided as a statutory right. Several respondents stress the importance of effective supervisory mechanisms, such as labour inspection, as well as facilitating access to such procedures by limiting associated costs to a minimum and offering legal assistance. Some respondents express concerns about limited institutional and financial capacities in developing countries.

Question 8(b). In addition, the large majority of respondents (governments: 93 per cent, employers: 58 per cent, workers: 99 per cent) agree that the proposed Recommendation should state that legal and institutional frameworks should set out benefits as well as qualifying conditions that are reasonable, proportionate, transparent and non-discriminatory. Several respondents suggest clarifying the terms "reasonable" and "proportionate". Workers' organizations stress that the benefits to be provided under the SPFs should be related to the contingencies covered by Convention No. 102.

In light of the above, Paragraph 8 of the proposed Recommendation sets out that basic social security guarantees should be established by law, and that the range, qualifying conditions and levels of the benefits giving effect to these guarantees should be specified in national laws and regulations. It further sets out that effective, simple, rapid, accessible and inexpensive complaint and appeals procedures should also be specified.

QUESTION 9

Level of basic social security guarantees

Question 9(a). Most respondents (governments: 74 per cent, employers: 44 per cent, workers: 97 per cent) agree that minimum levels of income security should correspond at least to the monetary value of a nationally defined basket of essential goods and services that is needed to live in health and decency. However, some respondents consider the concept of a basket not flexible enough to capture the diversity of approaches used in national legislation and policies for defining minimum levels of income security. Furthermore, they note that such baskets may vary across regions, life stages and over time; and that minimum income levels should also take into account differences in individual needs. While some employers' organizations state that the definition should not be too restrictive, some workers' organizations stress that minimum levels should be defined based on objective criteria.

Question 9(b). There is also wide agreement among respondents (governments: 87 per cent, employers: 52 per cent, workers: 90 per cent) on the proposition stating that minimum levels of income security may correspond to agreed poverty lines, defined income thresholds for social assistance benefits, or other income levels defined in national law and practice. Some respondents note that the calculation of such levels should take into account individuals' incomes and assets.

Workers' organizations underline that minimum income levels should be set at, or above, the poverty line in order to allow a decent life.

In light of the above, Paragraph 7(b) of the proposed Recommendation is drafted in a way that is sufficiently flexible and meaningful to be applicable in diverse national contexts. It sets out that basic income security should allow life in dignity, and that nationally defined minimum levels of income may correspond to the monetary value of a set of necessary goods and services, national poverty lines, income thresholds for social assistance or other comparable thresholds established by national law or practice. It also explicitly mentions the possibility that nationally defined minimum levels of income may take into account regional differences. Responsiveness to special needs is addressed in Paragraphs 3(c) and 16.

Question 9(c). A clear majority of respondents (governments: 89 per cent, employers: 67 per cent, workers: 97 per cent) agree that financial protection for essential health-care goods and services should be sufficient to ensure access whenever required without increasing the poverty risks and vulnerability of those in need of health care. Some respondents stress that essential health-care services should be free at the point of care; others insist on the need to ensure financial protection.

In light of the above, Paragraph 7(a) of the proposed Recommendation is drafted in a way that clarifies the nature of the guaranteed outcome of financial protection for essential health-care goods and services. It states that persons in need of health care should not face hardship and an increased risk of poverty due to the financial consequences of accessing essential health care.

Question 9(d). A vast majority of respondents (governments: 94 per cent, employers: 83 per cent, workers: 99 per cent) concur that the levels of basic social security guarantees should be regularly reviewed through a transparent procedure prescribed by law. However, some respondents suggest that such procedures could also be defined by means other than legislation.

In light of the wide consensus, Paragraph 7(c) of the proposed Recommendation states that the levels of basic social security guarantees should be regularly reviewed through a transparent procedure that is established by national laws and regulations.

Question 9(e). There was wide agreement among respondents (governments: 95 per cent, employers: 70 per cent, workers: 100 per cent) that the establishment and review of the levels of these guarantees should include effective social dialogue involving representative employers' and workers' organizations, as well as beneficiaries and relevant public authorities. Some respondents highlight the need to design such consultation procedures according to the nature of the benefit and to include stakeholders who are relevant in the national context. While some respondents note that such participation should focus on employers' and workers' organizations, others are in favour of a broader dialogue including other stakeholders.

In light of the wide agreement, Paragraph 7(d) of the proposed Recommendation sets out that representative organizations of employers and workers and, as appropriate, representatives of other organizations and persons concerned should be involved in the establishment and review of the levels of these guarantees.

QUESTION 10

Broader objectives and coherence with other policy areas

Question 10(a). Most respondents (governments: 94 per cent, employers: 79 per cent, workers: 92 per cent) agree that the SPFs should facilitate effective access to essential goods and services as defined at national level. Whereas some respondents consider this to be a matter of national competence, others suggest that the proposed Recommendation should guide Members in defining which essential goods and services should be included in SPFs.

In light of the above, Paragraph 4 of the proposed Recommendation states that the basic social security guarantees should together secure effective access to goods and services defined as necessary at the national level. This clarifies that the definition of which goods and services are necessary to secure a life in dignity is the responsibility of Members.

Question 10(b). A vast majority of respondents (governments: 96 per cent, employers: 92 per cent, workers: 98 per cent) concur that the SPFs should promote productive economic activity and formal employment. Several respondents stress that the promotion of the formalization of employment, as well as contributory mechanisms, are key to ensuring the sustainability of comprehensive social security systems. Other respondents highlight that such emphasis on the formalization of employment should not lead to a situation where workers in the informal economy are left unprotected.

In light of the overwhelming support, Paragraph 10(b) of the proposed Recommendation reflects the wording of the question.

Question 10(c). The large majority of respondents (governments: 98 per cent, employers: 83 per cent, workers: 98 per cent) agree that the SPFs should be implemented in close coordination with other policies enhancing skills and employability, reducing informality and precariousness of employment, creating decent jobs, and promoting entrepreneurship and sustainable enterprises. Highlighting the need for policy coherence, several governments stress the importance of effective policy coordination between employment and social policies. Some employers' organizations underline the need to promote the formalization of the informal economy, entrepreneurship and sustainable enterprises. Some workers' organizations highlight the role of public policies ensuring quality social services, social infrastructure, fair fiscal policies in promoting high levels of quality employment, decent jobs and the setting of adequate wage levels, which will in turn support the implementation of SPFs within comprehensive social security systems.

In light of the overwhelming support, Paragraph 10(c) of the proposed Recommendation states that, in implementing national social protection floors, Members should ensure coordination with other policies that enhance skills and employability, reduce precariousness of employment, and promote decent work, entrepreneurship and sustainable enterprises. The terms "decent work" and "precariousness" are used because they encompass a broad range of relevant aspects. The reduction of informality is understood as part of the objective of promoting productive economic activity and formal employment, as set out in Paragraph 10(b) of the proposed Recommendation.

QUESTION 11

Pluralism of methods and approaches

The large majority of respondents (governments: 95 per cent, employers: 79 per cent, workers: 96 per cent) agree that Members may use different means and approaches to implement the basic social security guarantees of their SPFs, including universal benefit schemes, social insurance, public employment programmes and employment support schemes as well as social assistance schemes that provide benefits to people with low income, or appropriate combinations of such measures. Some governments suggest that, given the diversity of national systems, the listing of possible options is not useful. Others suggest that such options should also include means and approaches provided by private actors and civil society. Some employers' organizations point to the wide range of existing models. Most workers' organizations suggest that guidance should be provided as to which instruments are best suited to achieve universality of access and predictability of income security.

In light of the above, Paragraph 9 of the proposed Recommendation is drafted in a way that reflects the wide range of possible approaches that can be used to give effect to the social security

guarantees of SPFs and achieve their desired outcomes, using the most effective and efficient combination of benefits and schemes in the national context. These include child and family benefits, sickness and health-care benefits, maternity benefits, disability benefits, old-age benefits, survivors' benefits, unemployment benefits and employment guarantees and employment injury benefits, as well as any other social benefits in cash or in kind. Schemes providing such benefits may include universal benefit schemes, social insurance schemes, social assistance schemes, negative income tax schemes, public employment schemes and employment support schemes.

QUESTION 12

Mix of preventive and promotional measures, benefits and services

Most replies (governments: 94 per cent, employers: 75 per cent, workers: 97 per cent) concur that, to be effective, the implementation of national SPFs requires an appropriate mix of preventive and promotional measures, benefits and social services. Several respondents mentioned relevant areas for such measures, including preventive health care, occupational safety and health (OSH) and accident prevention as well as employment services.

Paragraph 10(a) of the proposed Recommendation reflects the wide consensus expressed on this question.

QUESTION 13

Mobilization of financial resources

Question 13(a). The majority of respondents (governments: 94 per cent, employers: 84 per cent, workers: 88 per cent) agree to the proposition that Members may choose different options to mobilize the necessary resources to ensure the financial and fiscal sustainability of their SPFs, taking into account the contributory capacities of different population groups. Some respondents suggest the inclusion of a list of possible options in the proposed Recommendation. Employers' organizations stress that decisions on resource mobilization should involve social partners. Workers' organizations highlight the potential of contributory systems to strengthen the extension of social security in both the horizontal and vertical dimensions,⁶ and mention progressive tax systems, enhanced collection of taxes and a financial transaction tax as possible options to increase fiscal space.

Question 13(b). A majority of respondents (governments: 86 per cent, employers: 44 per cent, workers: 97 per cent) also concur that options for resource mobilization may include better enforcement of tax and contribution obligations, reprioritizing expenditure and broadening the revenue base. However, some governments voice concerns about linking revenue generation and social protection, and about an undue focus on raising extra revenue as opposed to reprioritizing existing social expenditure. Several employers' organizations note that such options should not increase taxes on business, and that the contributions from employers operating in the formal economy should not be used to finance coverage for workers in the informal economy. Several workers' organizations point to the need for adequate tax and labour inspection capacities to ensure better enforcement of obligations.

In light of the above, Paragraph 11 of the proposed Recommendation is drafted in a way that takes into account that Members may use a wide range of financing methods.

⁶ As defined in paragraphs 8–11 of the 2011 Conclusions.

QUESTION 14

Financing and international support

The large majority of respondents (governments: 88 per cent, employers: 62 per cent, workers: 97 per cent) agree that national SPFs should, in principle, be financed by domestic resources, while noting that some low-income countries may need to have recourse to transitional international financial support. Several respondents stress that, where such support is necessary, it should not relieve States of their responsibility for the provision of social security. Several replies also note that international support should not be limited to financial support, but could also include technical assistance.

In light of the above, Paragraph 12 of the proposed Recommendation puts forward national resources as the first means of financing SPFs, while acknowledging that Members with insufficient economic and fiscal capacities may seek transitional international assistance. This would also include non-financial forms of assistance.

National strategies for the extension of social security

In the interest of clarity, a number of issues related to national social security extension strategies addressed in questions 15–17 and 24–28 have been consolidated in Paragraphs 13 and 14 of the proposed Recommendation. These two Paragraphs define the general objectives and provide guidelines on the development and implementation of such strategies.

QUESTION 15

Establishing national social security extension strategies

The vast majority of respondents (governments: 89 per cent, employers: 71 per cent, workers: 94 per cent) agree that Members should design, through an effective social dialogue process, a long-term social security extension strategy that identifies gaps in protection and seeks to close them by building a comprehensive social security system. Some governments note that priority should be given to persons in need, or the most vulnerable. Others indicate that closing coverage gaps, especially in the informal economy, should be a priority. Almost all workers' organizations and some governments consider that a comprehensive social security system should provide universal coverage, addressing the nine contingencies laid down in Convention No. 102, with benefits guaranteed at the level set in the Convention. Some stress the importance of including all stakeholders in the design, implementation and monitoring processes, including but not limited to the ILO tripartite constituency. Some respondents highlight the contribution of such strategies to ensuring the sustainability of, and continuing commitment to, social security as well as their contribution to equitable growth, social cohesion and decent work.

These comments and concerns are addressed in Paragraphs 13 and 14 of the proposed Recommendation.

QUESTION 16

Contents of national social security extension strategies

Question 16(a). A majority of respondents (governments: 88 per cent, employers: 44 per cent, workers: 98 per cent) agree that the proposed Recommendation should provide that Members' social security extension strategies should prioritize the implementation of SPFs. This, as pointed out in some comments, is of particular importance for developing countries as it ensures protection at a basic level to the largest share of their population. Some workers' organizations also underline, in this regard, the role of SPFs in guaranteeing universal access and coverage. One government further indicates that there should be no prioritization among the four

components of the SPFs, which should be equally developed and implemented. Individual workers' organizations raise the following issues: the extension strategy should not lead to a reduction of existing levels of social security; the SPFs should be a transitional step towards higher levels of social security; and the SPFs should adapt to changing individual and social needs. A majority of workers' organizations and some governments indicate that clear time frames for implementation need to be defined. Some governments and employers reiterate the need to establish sustainable SPFs in line with national financial capacities, and to extend coverage gradually depending on available resources. The need to establish SPFs according to national circumstances and levels of development, and to ensure the SPFs' consistency with national priorities and broader social, economic and employment policies, are also reaffirmed by some governments and employers' organizations.

Question 16(b). At the same time, a significant majority of governments (86 per cent), workers' organizations (97 per cent) and many employers' organizations (48 per cent) agree that national extension strategies should seek to provide, simultaneously, higher levels of income security and access to health care to as many people as possible and as fast as possible. Some comments note that it is the obligation of all governments to seek to raise standards of living through social security and to meet the social protection needs and requirements of their people in the most efficient manner. Some respondents raise again the relevance of this objective for countries that already have high levels of social security in place.

Some comments also point out possible contradictions in the formulation of the proposition under this question. The use of the term "simultaneously" is said to create confusion as to which should be the priority element of extension strategies. The use of the term "to as many people as possible" in question 16(b) is considered to conflict with the objective of universal coverage of the SPFs. For the purpose of clarity, one workers' organization suggests adding "and eventually to all its citizens". On the contrary, many comments indicate clear support for a progressive approach, in accordance with the national situation and capacities, and in coherence with national social, economic and employment policies. In this regard, one workers' organization indicates that the proposed Recommendation should provide guidelines on the levels of income security and access to health care that would be acceptable, taking into account the financial situation of Members.

In light of these comments, the proposed Recommendation provides, in Paragraph 13, that national social security extension strategies should prioritize the implementation of national SPFs, and seek to provide higher levels of protection to as many people as possible and as soon as possible with a view to progressively building and maintaining comprehensive and adequate social security systems coherent with national policy objectives. In addition, Paragraph 14 of the proposed Recommendation sets out the process for the establishment of national social security extension strategies which includes setting objectives reflecting national priorities, identifying gaps in protection, and closing those gaps through appropriate measures. This also addresses the concern raised by some about the use of the term "simultaneously" in question 16(b).

QUESTION 17

Sequencing and time frames for implementation of social security extension strategies for Members with insufficient financial capacities

A majority of respondents (governments: 78 per cent, employers: 24 per cent, workers: 97 per cent) agree that the proposed Recommendation should provide that Members whose economic and fiscal capacities are insufficient to implement the entire range of guarantees of the SPFs should stipulate in their social security extension strategies approximate time frames as well as the sequencing and the financing of the entire set of SPF guarantees. Some mention that it would be advisable to specify reasonable periods for ensuring the progressive implementation of extension strategies and for closing gaps in the provision of SPF guarantees and preventing

stagnation. While the importance of flexibility is emphasized by some, notably in view of the financial implications of implementing SPF guarantees, others indicate a preference for specific objectives, steps, implementation mechanisms and sequencing, as well as expenditure planning, to be clearly stipulated in their extension strategies.

Some governments and employers' organizations find such stipulations too strict or constraining. Others consider that these are matters that fall within the competence of the State or that should be defined in the light of the national socio-economic context, and be formulated in line with other developmental goals and objectives. Some employers' organizations refer more specifically to the current financial situation of certain countries. Prevailing economic and financial crises may make it difficult for countries to establish time frames and to plan the mobilization of necessary resources.

Addressing these comments, Paragraph 14 of the proposed Recommendation sets out a logical framework for the establishment of nationally defined social security extension strategies.

QUESTION 18

Further extension of social security on the basis of Convention No. 102 and other ILO social security standards

A majority of respondents (governments: 94 per cent, employers: 40 per cent, workers: 99 per cent) agree that the proposed Recommendation should provide that Members should further extend social security coverage in line with the national context and based on Convention No. 102 and other relevant ILO Conventions and Recommendations. Many comments specifically emphasize the need for these mechanisms to be defined and developed according to the prevailing circumstances in member States, in line with their social needs and fiscal capacities. The importance of establishing these mechanisms through social dialogue is also underlined. Social dialogue is seen as particularly important for ensuring the full involvement of beneficiaries as well as for rights-based outcomes, enhancing commitment and ownership, moving towards better and more efficient social security systems and the formalization of the economy. One government, however, points out the need to define "effective social dialogue" and to identify the participating actors. Another government suggests replacing the term "social dialogue" by "consultations". One government observes that citizens' participation is key to obtaining the support needed to guarantee viability and continuing adherence to strategies.

Support for Convention No. 102 and other relevant ILO Conventions and Recommendations, as references for establishing the mechanisms in question, is unequivocal among governments and workers' organizations. The relevance and importance of Convention No. 102 as a fundamental instrument for building sustainable social security systems is reaffirmed. Some workers' organizations add that all relevant ILO social security standards should be included. One government suggests that the term "up-to-date" should be added in reference to these. A number of employers' organizations mention that Convention No. 102 is a reference among others that can be used for developing such mechanisms, and therefore do not support the proposition.

In light of these comments, the proposed Recommendation in Paragraph 17 spells out in more detail that when building comprehensive social security systems, Members should aim to achieve the range and levels of benefits⁷ set out in Convention No. 102 or in other ILO social security Conventions and Recommendations setting out more advanced standards.

⁷ These refer to the range and levels of benefits set out in the respective branches of Convention No. 102 and in ILO social security Conventions and Recommendations setting out more advanced standards, namely medical care, sickness benefit, unemployment benefit, old-age benefit, employment injury benefit, family benefit, maternity benefit, invalidity benefit and survivors' benefit.

For the purpose of this proposed Recommendation, “ILO social security Conventions and Recommendations setting out more advanced standards” are understood as standards pertaining to social security adopted after Convention No. 102,⁸ as well as Recommendations Nos 67 and 69. The latter are included because of their universal approach to social security, and in view of their continued pertinence, as affirmed by the CEACR, “in particular in terms of the guiding principles they set forward for national law and practice and for ILO action on the extension of social security to all”.⁹

The overall important role of social dialogue during all stages of the extension of social security is reflected in Paragraphs 3 and 13 of the proposed Recommendation.

QUESTION 19

Recommendation to ratify and give effect to Convention No. 102 and other ILO social security Conventions and Recommendations

A majority of respondents (governments: 82 per cent, employers: 28 per cent, workers: 98 per cent) agree that Members should be encouraged to take measures to ensure the ratification and effective implementation of Convention No. 102, and other ILO instruments considered relevant to their national context, as soon as possible in their social and economic development. These instruments are considered to be: universal, flexible and constructive; favourable; essential; key in accelerating development processes; mechanisms for progress; and fundamental long-term goals. One government suggests using the term “up-to-date” in reference to these standards.

The views of employers’ organizations vary. A number of these organizations disagree with the proposition. However, others specify that they are not opposed to the promotion of Convention No. 102, but that they see it as a complex Convention which is difficult to implement and ambiguous on the role of the private sector. It is also acknowledged that the consensual 2011 Conclusions call for wider ratification of Convention No. 102. One government also observes that Convention No. 102 and other existing standards do not always reflect more recent policy developments which have taken place in the field of social security in certain countries. Another suggests updating Convention No. 102 to remove discriminatory and non-gender-sensitive provisions. On this issue, a workers’ organization also indicates that the issue of gender-sensitive language should be addressed, but cautions that this should not put the Convention into question. Some governments and employers’ organizations also recall that it is primarily the State’s responsibility to ratify and implement Conventions and for each country to make such decisions, taking into account its national circumstances.

Taking these comments into account, Paragraph 18 of the proposed Recommendation encourages Members to consider the ratification of Convention No. 102. It also encourages Members to consider ratifying or giving effect to, as applicable, other ILO social security Conventions and Recommendations setting out more advanced standards.

QUESTION 20

Annex listing ILO social security standards

There is significant support for the inclusion of an annex listing all ILO instruments that could be relevant to national social security extension strategies and that could in the future be updated by the ILO Governing Body (governments: 90 per cent, employers: 38 per cent, workers: 98 per cent). Some governments mention that such an annex would be useful, since these instruments serve as reference and guidance for countries when implementing their social security

⁸ These include Conventions Nos 118, 121, 128, 130, 157, 168, 183 and their accompanying Recommendations.

⁹ ILO, 2011: *Social security and the rule of law*, op.cit., para. 53.

extension strategies and developing their social security systems. One government would like to see included in such a list only up-to-date social security instruments of direct relevance; another would like to also include instruments aiming at gender equality and non-discrimination. However, several respondents express reservations with regard to the usefulness of such a list, and voice concerns about the effort that would be necessary to establish it and keep it up to date.

In view of the concerns expressed, and with a view to avoiding an additional burden on the Governing Body, it is suggested that the reference to other ILO social security standards in Paragraph 18 of the proposed Recommendation should not be limited to a pre-defined list.

QUESTION 21

Coherence with social and economic development plans

An overwhelming majority of respondents (governments: 93 per cent, employers: 71 per cent, workers: 97 per cent) agree that national social security extension strategies, including SPFs, should be part of, and conducive to, the implementation of Members' social and economic development plans. Furthermore, some governments state that economic and social development should be closely linked and mutually reinforcing; and, more particularly, that national extension strategies should be coherent with these developments, national policy objectives and financing. One government emphasizes that these are long-term objectives and political commitments. Concerns are raised by some governments and social partners regarding the following: the need for gradual development of social security; the importance of taking into account national circumstances; and the need for the strategy to be "consistent with" rather than "part of" national development plans.

In view of these comments, Paragraph 15 of the proposed Recommendation states that Members' social security extension strategies should be consistent with, and conducive to, the implementation of their social and economic development plans.

QUESTION 22

Importance of formalization and development of the economy

An overwhelming majority of respondents (governments: 95 per cent, employers: 80 per cent, workers: 89 per cent) agree that the proposed Recommendation should provide that the gradual formalization and development of the economy should be conducive to strengthening people's income security and their access to health care. Some respondents further stress the positive contribution of this measure to the strengthening of national social security systems, their financial sustainability and the extension of coverage, as well as the fight against poverty. However, one government notes that the needs of the growing informal economy should be considered when implementing social protection. More particularly, some governments state that health care should be accessible to all, without exclusion or discrimination. Some employers' organizations voice concerns as to the possible negative effect on formal employment of establishing benefits for informal workers which could be a disincentive to the formalization of employment. Most workers' organizations consider the formalization of the employment relationship as equally important.

The above comments have led to a clarification of the concepts in questions 21 and 22 and to a condensed formulation in Paragraph 15 of the proposed Recommendation, which focuses on the active role required of social security extension strategies in supporting the growth of formal employment, which is consistent with, and conducive to, the implementation of wider national development plans.

QUESTION 23

Addressing special social security needs

A majority of respondents (governments: 78 per cent, employers: 36 per cent, workers: 91 per cent) agree that national social security extension strategies should address the needs of specific groups. Comments point to the importance of not restricting the list to specific categories of persons or groups, but of making it inclusive.

In light of these comments, and noting that it is difficult to establish definitive lists, Paragraph 16 of the proposed Recommendation calls for national social security extension strategies to specifically support disadvantaged groups and people with special needs, and is not restricted to specific groups. Disadvantaged groups and people with special social security needs may include, among others, older persons, indigenous people, minorities, migrants, persons with disabilities and chronic illnesses, persons living with or affected by HIV, and orphans and vulnerable children.

QUESTIONS 24–28

Modalities of national social security extension strategies

Question 24. A majority of respondents (governments: 67 per cent, employers: 40 per cent, workers: 96 per cent) agree that the proposed Recommendation should provide that extension strategies should set out how Members plan to improve existing social security coverage within specific time frames. This, according to some governments and workers' organizations, will allow Members to set themselves objectives and to define and take progressive steps for the extension of social security, based on their priorities for the short, medium and long term. Some note that, if realistic and appropriate, planning will facilitate implementation. Some employers' organizations, however, consider that formulating objectives is preferable to fixing time frames. The term "specific time frame" is considered either too vague or too detailed. Others observe that consultations and social dialogue are needed to establish such plans.

Question 25. A majority of respondents (governments: 76 per cent, employers: 24 per cent, workers: 95 per cent) agree with the inclusion in the proposed Recommendation that the national social security extension strategy should specify targets with regard to the progressive achievement of full population coverage and to the range and levels of benefits, as well as the financial means to cover the related expenditure. In this regard, some comments suggest that studies should precede the definition of a strategy. A number of governments and a majority of employers' organizations disagree with the proposition. Among the concerns raised are the following: specifying targets may be too constraining; strategies can change over time; targets should be defined at the national level on the basis of national circumstances and capacities; and there may be constraints regarding financial and other resources available in countries.

Question 26. A vast majority of respondents (governments: 85 per cent, employers: 76 per cent, workers: 82 per cent) agree that the social security extension strategy should seek, as appropriate, to build on existing institutional capacities and social security schemes such as social insurance or social assistance schemes. Many refer to the advantages of making use of existing national procedures, systems and institutions in order to benefit from the experience, capacities and existing infrastructure. However, a number of governments do not rule out that in certain circumstances it may be more efficient and cost-effective to establish new systems or to reform existing systems. Certain respondents note that this depends on national circumstances and priorities. In this regard, a majority of workers' organizations suggest that a thorough assessment of national capacities and schemes should be carried out to evaluate the possibilities.

Question 27. While a majority of respondents (governments: 88 per cent, employers: 28 per cent, workers: 91 per cent) agree that Members should be encouraged to close coverage gaps of persons with contributory capacity through contributory schemes where appropriate, some

governments and workers' organizations point to the need to extend coverage through universal schemes. Others underline the need to formalize the economy and employment, and point to limitations in using contributory schemes given the reality of informal employment in many countries. The majority of employers' organizations do not concur, emphasizing that this issue falls outside the scope of this proposed Recommendation and is addressed in Convention No. 102.

Question 28. An overwhelming majority of respondents (governments: 89 per cent, employers: 83 per cent, workers: 99 per cent) agree that the design of the national social security extension strategy, its time frame and periodicity of updates should be subject to effective social dialogue. Some governments suggest including representatives of beneficiaries, groups outside the labour market and NGOs in a meaningful dialogue. Others note that democratic rules of parliamentary representation need to be respected. Workers' organizations underline that effective freedom of association and collective bargaining rights are key conditions for this process.

Paragraphs 13 and 14 of the proposed Recommendation address the above preferences and concerns in a consolidated way.

QUESTION 29

Guiding principles for the extension of social security

An overwhelming majority of respondents (governments: 96 per cent, employers: 72 per cent, workers: 100 per cent) support that the proposed Recommendation should provide that the extension of social security, including the implementation of SPFs, should be guided by a set of principles identified in the 2011 Conclusions.

A number of comments refer to the specific principles listed in the question. A few governments note that other groups should be included in the consultations under the principle on social dialogue (l). Some respondents, mainly employers' organizations, while supporting the principles, note reservations with regard to universal coverage (a) as a statutory right. Various respondents have reservations regarding the term "universal coverage" and one government suggests combining principles (a) and progressive realization (b). Some respondents note that the principle of solidarity should be included, while one government considers that, while important, it is implicitly included in most of the principles listed. Others point out that the principles need to be determined by each country based on its national situation and priorities. A number of respondents emphasize the need to reformulate the principle of gender responsiveness and gender equality (h). One government suggests placing the guiding principles immediately after the Preamble. A number of comments suggest adding a number of principles (e.g. environmental sustainability, redistribution, social cohesion, transparency, absence of profit-seeking, cost-effective administration, decent work as a means to exit poverty, incentivizing higher labour force participation of people in active age groups, consideration of demographic conditions).

In light of the above, and replies given to other questions, the proposed Recommendation spells out, in Paragraph 3, a set of re-ordered and more precise principles. These seek to identify a common denominator of interests, as expressed by respondents in their replies. In line with the above suggestions, the list of principles now also explicitly mentions "social solidarity",¹⁰ "responsiveness to special needs", "predictability of benefits",¹¹ "overall

¹⁰ The term "social solidarity" is explained by the CEACR as follows: "Strengthening people's security through greater social solidarity means basing social security systems on such organizational principles as risk pooling and collective financing by the members of the community, and guaranteeing a minimum level of protection sufficient to maintain the family of the beneficiary in health and decency" (ILO, 2011, op.cit., para. 34).

¹¹ The predictability of benefits, mentioned in addition to adequacy, refers to the notion that entitlement conditions for access to benefits should be transparent and clearly spelled out, and that levels of benefits should be clearly defined so that potential beneficiaries know what type and amount of benefit they can expect to obtain in case of need, and what are the qualifying conditions they need to fulfil.

and primary responsibility of the State”,¹² and “involvement of representative organizations of employers and workers as well as consultation with representatives of other organizations and persons concerned”.

QUESTIONS 30–34

Monitoring

Question 30. There is large support in the replies (governments: 95 per cent, employers: 50 per cent, workers: 98 per cent) for the inclusion in the proposed Recommendation of a provision concerning the need for Members to monitor the extension of social security including the implementation of SPFs. In this context, many respondents highlight the need for the mechanisms to be developed nationally. Some respondents stress the importance of the monitoring process to ensure effective implementation and realization of the goals and objectives set. Some highlight the need to involve social partners in the monitoring process.

Question 31. An overwhelming majority of respondents (governments: 92 per cent, employers: 67 per cent, workers: 97 per cent) agree that the proposed Recommendation should provide that appropriate monitoring mechanisms should include the regular collection, compilation and publication of social security statistics based on administrative records and household surveys. Many comments stress that statistics are essential to formulate and evaluate policies, monitor social security systems and progress. Various respondents note the need to design these taking into account national circumstances, needs and abilities. Others highlight the need for the information to be transparent, widely disseminated and accompanied by thorough analyses.

In addition, various respondents suggest further mechanisms. An overwhelming majority of workers’ organizations suggest the inclusion of targets and indicators pertaining to: time frame towards universal coverage; impact on poverty; expenditure; and annual progress reports to be discussed in parliament and tripartite advisory bodies. They also call on the ILO to provide technical support to develop such indicators. One government suggests that a global observatory on progress in the extension of social security be created under the auspices of the ILO. However, with regard to information collection, one government voices concern that the privacy of individuals should be protected. Other sources of information are mentioned, e.g.: national population census, ad hoc surveys, national databases, NGOs and academic institutions. Some respondents further note the need to monitor progress through tripartite involvement.

Question 32. A majority of respondents (governments: 89 per cent, employers: 56 per cent, workers: 97 per cent) consider that the proposed Recommendation should provide that social security statistics should include for each category of benefits the number of protected persons and beneficiaries and the amount of benefits, as well as levels and patterns of expenditure and financing. Some governments raise concerns with respect to the feasibility of providing information on financing which, as one government notes, may be difficult to disaggregate in the case of comprehensive public social insurance schemes. Therefore, some of them suggest that the scope of statistics should be determined nationally. Others, while not opposing the provision, note that it could be complicated with respect to the informal economy. Furthermore, it is mentioned that, where possible, social security statistics should be disaggregated for vulnerable groups and that data should be disaggregated by gender. Some respondents mention the need to promote international comparability of data.

¹² For the purpose of the proposed Recommendation, the overall and primary responsibility of the State refers to the formulation and implementation of the national social security extension strategy. This includes the general responsibility of the State for the effective administration or supervision of the social security system, i.e. for the due provision of benefits and the proper administration of the institutions and services concerned, which is one of the general principles laid down in ILO social security standards including Convention No. 102.

Question 33. A large majority of respondents (governments: 89 per cent, employers: 68 per cent, workers: 92 per cent) agree that the proposed Recommendation should provide that, when designing or revising the concepts, definitions and methodology used in the production of social security statistics, Members should take into consideration relevant guidance of the ILO including the International Conference of Labour Statisticians and, as appropriate, of other organizations. A clear majority of workers' organizations call for the ILO to be the lead organization in social security statistics and to provide guidance to constituents. Various respondents note that this would ensure coherence, consistency and international benchmarks. A recurrent concern among some respondents is that statistical concepts, definitions and methodology should be determined nationally and take into account national standards and practice. Other respondents note the need for guidance from, and cooperation with, other organizations such as the World Bank, the IMF, the EU, the OECD and the WHO.

Question 34. An overwhelming majority of respondents (governments: 93 per cent, employers: 83 per cent, workers: 99 per cent) support the need for the proposed Recommendation to provide that Members should contribute to an exchange of information, experiences and expertise on social security policies and practices among themselves and with the ILO. Some respondents indicate that this work should be done by the ILO. Some governments suggest formalizing the exchange of information and that the ILO should make available examples of good practice. An overwhelming majority of workers' organizations suggest that the ILO concept of decent work indicators could be used as a framework to facilitate the exchange of information. Various employers' organizations note that social partners should be encouraged to participate in these exchanges. Some governments further indicate that this should not be mandatory.

Paragraphs 19 to 22 of the proposed Recommendation reflect the formulation of questions 30–34 and take into account the suggestions made by respondents. Furthermore, Paragraph 19 sets out the national responsibility for defining monitoring mechanisms and for the monitoring of the implementation of social protection floors and achieving other objectives of national social security extension strategies. The itemized list of social security statistics included in question 32 is replaced in the proposed Recommendation by reference, in Paragraph 21, to the Resolution concerning the development of social security statistics adopted by the Ninth International Conference of Labour Statisticians, 1957, which specifies statistical requirements for monitoring social security systems.

QUESTION 35

Other possible elements

While the majority of respondents consider the items included in the questionnaire to be sufficiently comprehensive, some propose the inclusion of additional points. Responses address a wide variety of issues, some of which go beyond the scope of the proposed Recommendation or are outside of the mandate given to the ILO by the Conference. Some respondents request definitional clarifications with respect to social security, minimum social protection and social security extension. One government emphasizes the need to mitigate the potential risk of negative employment incentives when designing social security benefits. Another government also suggests that more emphasis should be given to the coordination and integration of social security benefits at the national level in order to enhance effectiveness and efficiency.

The relevant suggestions are addressed in various paragraphs of the proposed Recommendation. Definitional issues are addressed in Paragraph 2 and throughout the text; the issue of proper economic incentives in benefit design is addressed in Paragraph 10(b) which sets out that SPFs should be designed in such a way as to promote productive economic activity; and the need for benefit coordination is addressed in Paragraph 14(c).