

166. *Question 25(b).* Some respondents indicated that the dispute procedure as outlined did not raise any difficulties.⁷⁸² Only two respondents indicated that the dispute procedure had raised difficulties.⁷⁸³ Those two respondents identified serious difficulties in their views, including its time-consuming nature, its character as a consensus document in “sharp contrast to the firmness of legal decisions”, and its “minuscule outcome”.⁷⁸⁴ Three respondents offered suggestions for improvement of the implementation procedures of the MNE Declaration. A workers’ organization recommended that the requirement of unanimity in determining receivability should be abolished.⁷⁸⁵ A government suggested that the process be reformed, taking account of the deliberations initiated on the OECD Guidelines on MNEs and calling for an “observatory of multinationals” with rapid observation and warning capabilities (not an “academic assembly producing studies long after the event”).⁷⁸⁶ Without identifying any specific difficulties with the procedure, an employers’ organization took the view that the procedure should not cause major difficulties within MNEs even though the introduction of new things often takes time and money, and that cooperation would be made easier if MNEs gave a higher priority to participating in employers’ organizations.⁷⁸⁷

III. Conclusions and recommendations

167. As demonstrated by the previous sections, the replies to the Seventh Survey provide extensive information and insights which will encourage those interested and concerned to work together in addressing the problems and opportunities identified. In addition, the wealth of information thus made available should prove useful to the work of the Office in a number of major technical areas. Replying to such a survey has meant considerable work for respondents. The Working Group would like to express its sincere appreciation to all governments and employers’ and workers’ organizations for their contributions to the Survey.

168. Having studied the reports and on the basis of the analysis carried out, the Working Group has agreed on the following conclusions, and has formulated a number of recommendations concerning action to be taken at national and/or international levels. The Working Group submits these to the Subcommittee for consideration, endorsement and transmittal to the Governing Body. The Subcommittee may also wish to formulate additional conclusions and recommendations which it may consider necessary.

⁷⁸² 47 respondents: 17 governments, 7 employers’ organizations, 8 workers’ organizations, 15 respondents in tripartite replies. For a list of those respondents, see endnote 104.

⁷⁸³ Belgium (G) and Ireland (W).

⁷⁸⁴ Belgium (G) (quoted remarks), Ireland (W) (procedure is totally ineffective because it cannot respond to the speed of decision-making in the global economy).

⁷⁸⁵ Ireland (W).

⁷⁸⁶ Belgium (G).

⁷⁸⁷ Hungary (TP – employers’ view)

General conclusions

- 169.** The information provided by governments and by employers' and workers' organizations that responded to the Survey can contribute significantly to achieving the objectives of the MNE Declaration in and across regional, country and sectoral contexts. It can strengthen the understanding of how to put into practice the aims and principles of the MNE Declaration with respect to employment promotion and security, representation and fundamental rights at work, and how to measure progress along the way. ***The Working Group therefore recommends that the Governing Body call on the Director-General to ensure that the International Labour Office – at headquarters and in the field – make use of the information from the Survey, taking into account the issues raised and recommendations made, when discussing and designing programmes to assist governments and employers' and workers' organizations in member States to implement the objectives of the MNE Declaration.***
- 170.** Global FDI has grown steadily over the reporting period, with a new record level of inward investment reported at the end of the period. Globalization and the emergence of the knowledge-based economy (including e-commerce) are having profound effects both on the rationale behind and the types of FDI. MNEs play an increasingly important role in the knowledge-creating process, and as a source of management, technology and external funding for developing and transition economies. The consequences of these processes on development, and in particular on ILO objectives, have been reported in this Survey as both positive and negative. The MNE Declaration addresses key aspects of that process in its guidelines on the strategies, roles, and responsibilities of governments, the social partners and MNEs. FDI is constantly shifting in its search for international investment opportunities, and the continuously changing situations and impacts of such shifts should be carefully evaluated. ***Consequently, the Working Group recommends that a further survey be carried out covering the years 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003.***
- 171.** This Survey has attracted the largest number of responses since the introduction of periodic surveys. The increase in the number of respondents from a greater number of countries, combined with higher levels of participation among governments and employers' and workers' organizations, reflects a growing interest among constituents generally in the social impact of multinational enterprise activities contributing to both inward and outward FDI in the global economy. However, the current sample includes 24 countries from which only employers' and workers' organizations replied and there were no responses from a small number of countries with significant FDI activity.⁷⁸⁸ ***In order to further improve response rates, the Working Group recommends that the Governing Body call for the views of constituents on the survey process to be fully taken into account, including on how the Office might improve its assistance, both at headquarters and in the field, to governments and the most representative employers' and workers' organizations in replying to the questionnaire.***
- 172.** The Working Group notes that a number of respondents indicated that they had difficulties in replying or had views on improvements to the questionnaire.⁷⁸⁹ In addition, in cases in which responses were likely influenced by specific contexts, the Working Group notes that requests for information based on sectoral, economic, or other relevant categories could enhance the usefulness of information gathered. Moreover, requests for examples of good

⁷⁸⁸ See discussion *supra* "FDI flows and the survey sample".

⁷⁸⁹ See *supra* Part I, "Observations", and GB.280/MNE/1/2, Appendix 1.

practices of MNEs could perhaps help to bridge the gap between law and practice in several significant areas. The Working Group further notes that in situations where government replies are not notified to employers' or workers' organizations, the Office should undertake to communicate these replies to the social partners for comment in line with the current practice of notifying governments of responses received from employers' and/or workers' organizations which are not transmitted directly to governments. ***Accordingly, the Working Group recommends that the questionnaire to be sent out in connection with the Eighth Survey should cover the main issues dealt with in the Declaration. The draft text of the questionnaire should be examined by the Subcommittee in November 2003 and dispatched early in 2004, and the replies thereto should be examined by the Subcommittee and the Governing Body in November 2005. The next questionnaire should seek to clarify terms where appropriate, achieve as great a comparability of data as possible, and request information that will enable the Working Group to draw conclusions by and across specifically relevant categories. In addition, the replies of each respondent should be made available to the other(s) in the same country, preferably directly but, if not, by the Office.***

- 173.** As observed by a number of respondents, the Working Group notes that a further questionnaire could focus on changes in MNE operations in the current context of globalization, and relate to home country issues as well as operations of inward FDI and foreign MNEs.⁷⁹⁰ In addition, as reflected in the survey replies,⁷⁹¹ subnational regions, particularly within some of the larger countries, are becoming increasingly important influencing factors on MNE activity and related policy-making. As further highlighted in the replies, licensing, export and franchise agreements with MNEs are becoming increasingly visible effects of globalization as much as increasing FDI; these were reflected, for example, in responses relating to linkages.⁷⁹² As further noted, mergers and acquisitions are becoming increasingly common entry points for MNEs⁷⁹³ and the impact modalities are perceived as distinct from that of greenfield ventures. Finally, some of the responses reflect that, in law and policy-making or data collection, no distinctions are made between MNEs and other enterprises.⁷⁹⁴ ***Accordingly, the Working Group recommends that the next survey questionnaire include themes within the ambit of the MNE Declaration relevant to current experiences with MNEs, including MNE operations in home as well as host countries, subnational level relationships, and distinctions among mergers and acquisitions, greenfield investments, and linkages with other enterprises. The questionnaire should seek to examine policies and measures relating to leading MNE practices in areas critical to the aims of the MNE Declaration for which typically no legal distinctions are made between MNEs and national enterprises.***

⁷⁹⁰ This survey sample, for example, contained many home countries of MNEs. See *supra* Part I (FDI flows and the survey sample) and table I.2.1.

⁷⁹¹ See, e.g., discussion of replies to questions 1, 2, 5-7, 24 *supra*.

⁷⁹² See, e.g., discussion of replies to question 6 *supra*.

⁷⁹³ See, e.g., discussion of replies to questions 1-2 *supra*.

⁷⁹⁴ See, e.g., Brazil (G), Burkina Faso (E), Cameroon (W), Canada (E), Turkey (G), United Kingdom (G).

**Background, aim and general policies:
Paragraphs 1-12 of the Declaration**

174. The perception of many respondents was that MNEs made an important contribution within the framework of development policies established by governments in specific areas, but this view was affirmed with significant qualifications by a number of respondents. Greatest emphasis was given to MNE contributions to the creation of employment opportunities, although a significant number of respondents stated that such opportunities were temporary and precarious in nature. Although the activities of MNEs were seen by many respondents to promote economic welfare at national, local, and workplace levels, a combination of positive and negative experiences was evident when it came to improvement of living standards and social welfare. Responses regarding the satisfaction of basic needs and enjoyment of human rights revealed a number of instances in which MNEs were reported to have caused difficulties.
175. Reports illustrated the importance of market and FDI diversification and the role of regulatory mechanisms in preventing the concentration of economic power by MNEs, while many respondents perceived that market concentration, M&As and privatization led to a concentration of economic power by MNEs. A significant number of respondents reported there were instances in which the concentration of economic power had led to abuses or to conflicts with national policy objectives and/or with the interests of workers in the country. The effects of M&As, including employment losses and market excesses, were noted in a number of cases. However, many respondents, and in particular governments, reported that regulatory or other means were successful in resolving conflicts and abuses, even in situations where there was a concentration of economic power.
176. Many respondents reported that steps were taken during the reporting period to further the aim of the MNE Declaration. Adoption of new laws was the most frequently reported activity followed by policies, measures and other actions. The new laws and regulations addressed a range of matters relevant to the Declaration, including non-discrimination, equality and security in employment, wages and benefits, occupational safety and health, EPZs, privatization and deregulation, and incentives to attract FDI. Respondents in approximately one-half of the countries in which activities were reported also indicated that employers' and workers' organizations had been consulted in the adoption of the new laws, policies, measures or other actions. In several cases, consultations resulted in tripartite agreements addressing MNE operations.
177. The perception of many respondents was that MNEs took fully into account established general policy objectives and development priorities of the countries in which they operated, although some – particularly a number of workers' organizations – expressed the opposite view, and others considered that MNEs' conduct in this regard depended on the sector of operation or individual company. A significant number reported that consultations on general policy objectives and development priorities between the government and MNEs and/or with the national employers' and workers' organizations, as appropriate, had not taken place. More respondents reported that no consultations were held between home and host countries than reported the opposite.
178. *The Working Group reiterates the importance of consultation and cooperation among governments, MNEs, and employers' and workers' organizations, through laws, policies, measures and other actions, with a view to enhancing the positive contributions which MNEs can make to economic and social progress and minimizing the difficulties to which their operations can give rise. Good*

social practice, based on respect for international labour standards⁷⁹⁵ and for the fundamental principles and rights at work, reflected in particular in the Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work adopted during the reporting period, and in accordance with the MNE Declaration and its listed Conventions and Recommendations, is of particular importance. To assist the parties concerned in advancing such practice, the Working Group recommends further study of the contributions by MNEs within specific areas of development policy and in particular, exploration of the conditions influencing consultations between MNEs, the government and employers' and workers' organizations. Further research on the relationship between concentration of economic power and multinational enterprise strategies in particular sectors of operation may prove helpful to understanding the conduct of MNEs bearing on national policy objectives.

Employment promotion: Paragraphs 13-20 of the Declaration

- 179.** Many respondents experienced qualitative benefits from technology used by MNEs during the reporting period, including better job opportunities, increased skills, and heightened productivity. However, a number of respondents across regions and levels of development considered that technology used by MNEs had reduced the quantity of jobs. Negative quantitative effects and benefits to local enterprises and to prevailing levels of technology were noted by some respondents. Some such effects were also seen to be mitigated by government policies encouraging training or reskilling. A limited number of studies on the subject revealed diverse results and ongoing research activities in countries across regions and levels of development, some focusing at sectoral or regional level.
- 180.** In general, backward and forward linkages between MNEs and national/indigenous enterprises varied depending on sector of operation, and were reported across levels of development. The perception of many respondents was that linkages with MNEs brought benefits, both to national economies and local enterprises, and programmes to encourage linkages by strengthening local enterprise networks were reported. However, a number of respondents considered that linkages with MNEs did not represent long-term commitments or stable employment opportunities. Adverse effects were also reported in cases in which MNEs were seen to compete with local enterprises and/or to import materials for production or distribute imported goods locally rather than relying on existing local resources.
- 181.** The impact of MNE activities on employment opportunities and standards was perceived by many to be positive, particularly in situations in which backward or forward linkages were well developed. However, some observations on MNE operations, in particular those which were perceived to bring precarious or casual employment or involve relocation and closure, reflected a sense that such practices did not necessarily bring sustainable employment or improvements. A positive impact of MNE activities on employment standards was observed by a number of respondents, including enhanced terms and conditions of work, and improved social and economic conditions in the country. Nonetheless, the quality of the employment opportunities varied by sector of activity and country of operation, and was perceived by some respondents to be influenced by local or expatriate nationality.

⁷⁹⁵ In particular, Conventions Nos. 29, 87, 98, 100, 105, 111, 122, 138 and 182.

182. *The Working Group notes the pressing need to further promote the positive contributions of MNEs to employment opportunities and standards, including from technology and linkages with national/indigenous enterprises, while preventing or mitigating the adverse effects of MNE operations. The Working Group accordingly recommends that the Governing Body urge MNEs and governments, when discussing and implementing investment arrangements, to take into consideration the importance of creating jobs consistent with the aims of the MNE Declaration, e.g., employment promotion, equality of opportunity and treatment, security of employment, and training. Further research should be pursued to understand better how trends in MNE contributions to FDI, particularly mergers and acquisitions and sectoral strategies, affect employment and linkages with national enterprises in order to inform strategies and activities to further realize the aims of the MNE Declaration within and across specific sectors, countries, and regions. The Working Group also recommends that the Governing Body call for action, on the part of governments, MNEs, and the social partners, separately and collectively, to develop strategies and programmes that will improve the capacity and quality of local networks to benefit from MNE activities. The active assistance of the ILO, alone or in conjunction with other intergovernmental organizations, should be considered. Paragraphs 18-20 of the Declaration are particularly relevant to these concerns.*

Equality of opportunity and treatment: Paragraphs 21-23 of the Declaration

183. In many countries represented in the survey sample, governments were reported to have pursued policies designed to promote equality of opportunity and treatment during the reporting period. Activity focused on enactment of legal measures, adoption of policies, and ratification of ILO Conventions (notably, Conventions Nos. 97, 98, 100, 111 and 175), but a number of respondents pointed out gaps between law and practice. Gender-based discrimination was emphasized as a priority for elimination, followed by other grounds of discrimination, including race and ethnic origin, disability, age, and sexual orientation, among others. Particular concern was expressed about discriminatory effects of family responsibilities on employment. Consultation with employers and workers in pursuing laws and policies was reported in approximately one-third of the countries with relevant activity during the reporting period. However, only a small number reported government consultations with MNEs on policies designed to promote equality.

184. *The Working Group recognizes that, while governments have the responsibility of pursuing policies designed to promote equality of opportunity and treatment in employment, MNEs should be guided by this general principle throughout their operations, and notes with disappointment the lack of response regarding consultations with MNEs on equality-related policies. The Working Group therefore recommends that further research be undertaken, in cooperation as appropriate among governments, MNEs and employers' and workers' organizations, with a view to identifying contributions of MNEs on the issue of employment equality, taking into account sector, country and region of operation, and in particular the role played by governments and the social partners.*

Security of employment: Paragraphs 24-28 of the Declaration

185. The perception that MNEs take measures to provide secure and stable employment, or ensure stable employment through favourable employment conditions, was balanced with reports of the opposite view. On the positive side, contract duration, higher wages and benefits, including social security plans, and advance notice of change of operations were pointed out; negative observations featured job precariousness through practices like subcontracting, temporary or daily wages employment, and lack of notice of change of operations. The role of collective bargaining agreements incorporating protective measures was noted, and regulations protecting workers from job instability or mitigating effects of unemployment, particularly in situations of redundancy, were reported in line with paragraph 24 of the Declaration.
186. *The Working Group notes that, although some respondents report that steps have been taken by MNEs to promote stability and security of employment, experiences of negative effects persist, and MNEs should strive, in line with the MNE Declaration, to assume a leading role in promoting security of employment, particularly where closure of operations is likely to accentuate long-term unemployment. The Working Group recommends that follow-up research be conducted with a view to identifying distinctions relevant to decision-making and programme design, and based on determinative factors which might include source of FDI, skilled/unskilled labour, age of MNE operation in the host country, product type, outsourcing practice, and host government strategies, including legal and policy frameworks.*

Training: Paragraphs 29-32 of the Declaration

187. MNEs were credited with playing an important role in HRD and training in the host country, but there was no unanimous agreement on this point. While the view was expressed that such contributions were intended largely to meet their own requirements and many examples of delivery of training in-house or by sending employees to local or foreign facilities were given, MNEs were also said to be involved at national, sectoral and enterprise levels in programmes and funds to modernize HRD systems and upgrade workers' skills, many with the participation of the government and social partners. Legal and policy frameworks within which MNEs made contributions in this area included specific laws on HRD and training, some directing compulsory contributions to be made to training funds, obligations under ILO Convention concerning vocational guidance and vocational training in the development of human resources (No. 142), collective agreements, investment agreements, and various institutional mechanisms, funds and programmes, some supported by multilateral donors. Training policies and goals were elaborated on a tripartite basis in some cases, particularly through government-established councils or other such mechanisms, but the lack of tripartite cooperation was reported in a number of cases. Bipartite agreements and collaboration at enterprise level between management and workers' representatives were also noted.
188. *The Working Group notes with satisfaction that the contributions to development that MNEs can make through training as elaborated in the MNE Declaration are recalled in the conclusions concerning human resources training and development adopted by the 88th Session of the International Labour Conference in June 2000. In particular, the Working Group reiterates that MNEs should be encouraged to enter into fair technology transfer agreements, to develop local*

high-level skills in developing countries, and to help create the infrastructure for the new knowledge economy. Recognizing that these measures, taken together, can contribute to development and realization of the aims of the MNE Declaration in even the poorest countries, the Working Group recommends further examination of such contextual factors as regions, sectors and size of MNEs, and general level of consultations between MNEs and host governments. The information thus collected could enhance the database and benchmarks on investment in training, differentiated by region, enterprise size and sector, which is under development by the Office in connection with the implementation of the ILC conclusions referred to above.

Wages, benefits and conditions of work: Paragraphs 33-35 of the Declaration

189. Wages, benefits and/or conditions of work were generally perceived to be equal to or more favourable than those of comparable employers in the country, but some qualified their perceptions, particularly workers' organizations. Some reported that wages are determined through collective agreements in general, and recognized the partial coverage of collective bargaining agreements in the country. Collective agreements did not exist where unions were restricted. In some countries, MNEs were also subject to collective agreements negotiated at sectoral, branch, and interoccupational level. In several instances, individual contracts were said to be used as well as collective agreements. Factors influencing the conclusion of collective agreements on wages, benefits and/or conditions of work were noted to include size or resource base of enterprise, sector of operation, and host country, including its labour market conditions or foreign exchange rates. Higher productivity and more qualified staff were said to bring higher wages in several cases noted. Laws on minimum wage or conditions of work were considered by some as a helpful floor in setting minimum standards, but as a disincentive for collective agreements in others. A range of fiscal and other measures were said to have been taken by the government to enable lower income groups and less developed areas to benefit from MNE activities, while others reported that no such measures were taken or questioned their efficacy.
190. *The Working Group recommends that the Governing Body call on governments and employers' (including MNEs) and workers' organizations to work jointly in setting wage policies, ensuring respect for the principle of equal pay for work of equal value, effectively recognizing the right to have recourse to collective bargaining for determining wages, benefits and working conditions, and in governments drawing up relevant legislation. Further study is recommended to explore the extent to which foreign MNE affiliates conform with principles of the MNE Declaration on consultation in the context of MNE strategy and legal and other incentives. The Working Group further notes that specific focus in future research or survey work on the impact of measures to enable lower income groups and less developed areas to benefit from MNE activities, may assist related efforts at local and national levels.*

Safety and health: Paragraphs 36-39 of the Declaration

191. In the views of many respondents, the activities of MNEs did not cause occupational safety and health problems. Specific OSH problems were identified by a number of respondents, particularly workers' organizations, including OSH concerns at subcontractors or

outsourced enterprises used by MNEs. In cases where problems were identified they tended to be sector and/or occupation specific. Fewer reports indicated that, once problems were caused, MNEs were seen to undertake remedial measures. MNEs' standards on occupational safety and health were perceived to be equal to or higher than national standards by many respondents; a small number reported that MNE standards were lower than national standards or that MNEs tended to apply the OSH standards of their home countries. In a comparison of MNEs with comparable employers in the country, OSH practice in MNEs was viewed by many respondents as more or equally favourable to that of comparable employers. Views on all three issues reflected the inter-play of OSH problems, standards and/or practice with such factors as size and resources of the enterprise (regardless of country of origin), sector of operation, level of development and/or enforcement of national OSH standards, standards of the home country of the MNE, and availability of information on OSH standards practised in local and foreign operations. Reports of some respondents confirmed that safety and health matters had been incorporated, where appropriate, in agreements with the representatives of workers and their organizations in the country, or at least in MNEs where unions existed. Commitments were reflected in a variety of agreements encompassing general, and sectoral or enterprise-level understandings. The views of some of those who reported limitations on, or lack of, agreements reflected concerns particularly in EPZs where the need to further develop the awareness of workers as well as enterprises relating to the need for, and right to, occupational safety and health was expressed.

- 192.** *The Working Group reiterates that, in view of their experience and resources, MNEs' cooperation with governments and the social partners, as well as local institutions, on health and safety matters, is most desirable. MNEs should also make available to workers' representatives in the enterprise, and upon request to the authorities, information on the OSH standards relevant to their local operations which they observe in other countries. It recommends that questions on specific safety and health practices and management systems at enterprise and sectoral levels, as well as queries on national standards relating to health and safety committees, be propounded in the Eighth Survey, in line with the guidelines of the Declaration and based on the principles underlying Convention Nos. 155 and 161 and other relevant standards. The Working Group further notes, in view of the range of comments on this issue, the advisability of considering the treatment of health and safety matters in a broader context, including practices at sectoral and regional levels. It could also be useful to specifically consider how health and safety standards are upgraded over time and transferred from one country to another in the context of MNE operations.*

Industrial relations: Paragraphs 40-58 of the Declaration

- 193.** Many respondents considered industrial relations standards (that is, policies and/or practices) in MNEs to be the same or comparable to those observed by comparable employers in the country, while a number perceived MNE standards as more favourable than comparable local employers. However, some respondents, particularly workers' organizations, reported less favourable practices, some providing specific examples. Various factors were perceived to play a role in shaping industrial relations practices, including size of enterprise, sector of operation, nature of the regulatory environment in both the host and home country, type of employment contracts, framework agreements, and MNE membership in employers' organizations. Some responses reflected the value of international benchmarks found in ILO Conventions and the MNE Declaration. Notably, a

number of respondents emphasized the state of legal standards applicable to MNEs rather than the application in practice within MNE operations.

194. Many respondents considered that incentives to attract FDI had not limited workers' freedom of association or right to organize and bargain collectively; some of these viewed incentives and concessions as strictly economic or fiscal in nature. However, limitations on freedom of association or the right to organize and bargain collectively were perceived by approximately half as many workers' organizations as those which reported no limitations. Several respondents that did not consider incentives to lead to violations of workers' rights in principle nevertheless pointed out that, in practice, certain MNEs wielded control over workers that resulted in restrictions on freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining. Others suggested the need for incentives that sought to improve industrial relations.

195. Many respondents considered that MNEs responded positively to requests for information required for meaningful negotiations by workers' representatives, either generally or some of the time. Some workers' organizations found MNE responses to be totally insufficient. Difficulties described by some respondents indicated that MNEs provided information selectively or superficially, cited commercial secrecy as the reason for refusal to provide information, or delayed release of information by seeking authorization from a parent company. As to government requests for information from MNEs in the context of collective bargaining, many perceived that MNEs responded constructively; only a few reported difficulties in receiving full information from MNEs when it was requested. In addressing steps or measures taken to implement the Governing Body's recommendations to promote collective bargaining, many respondents described ratification of ILO instruments, revisions to labour legislation, strengthening of labour dispute mediation, conciliation and prevention services, creation of tripartite institutions and initiatives, launching of training activities and information campaigns, and implementing multilateral technical assistance programmes.

196. Many respondents reported that there had been no threats by MNEs to relocate by way of unfairly influencing negotiations or hindering exercise of the right to organize. However, a significant number of reports, particularly, but not only, from workers' organizations, confirmed that MNEs had made such threats. With regard to particular industrial relations problems specific to MNEs operating in the country, common themes among those who described such problems related to decision-making critical to labour relations occurring within the parent company far from the place of operation, and the lack of authority at local operations level which was seen to lead to a number of industrial relations problems. Interference with freedom of association and exercise of the right to organize and bargain collectively was mentioned by a number of respondents in relation to various regions and sectors of operation, and diverse occupations. Other problems were reported to arise in the context of the adaptation of MNEs to local standards of industrial relations, including local laws, practices and languages. Direct dialogue, the role of national employers' organizations and concerted government and trade union action were among responses reported to help resolve industrial relations problems specific to MNEs.

197. *In light of the above, the Working Group recommends further research, at national level, of MNE standards and operations of industrial relations in the context of laws and regulations giving effect to the principles contained in the MNE Declaration. It is noted that sectoral variations in industrial relations practices were reported in some cases, though not requested, and further follow-up study of industrial relations of MNEs at sectoral level of operation, including as a function of type of FDI (labour-intensive and/or export-seeking), could inform policy and programme options. The Working Group observes with*

satisfaction that, in many countries, incentives to attract FDI had not limited workers' freedom of association or right to organize and bargain collectively. The Working Group observes with regret some instances where the contrary is the case. It further commends the efforts being taken to promote collective bargaining but finds that many such reports did not specifically address the role of MNEs in the promotion of collective bargaining. The Working Group expresses concern that reports of refusal by MNEs to provide information required by workers' representatives for meaningful negotiation, and threats by MNEs to transfer operations, made in the context of collective bargaining or organizing, still persist. Given the critical importance of national law and practice and tripartite cooperation to the climate of industrial relations, the Working Group recommends that the Governing Body call on governments which have not yet done so to ratify and to fully implement Convention Nos. 87 and 98 in line with the MNE Declaration. The Working Group further recommends the Governing Body to call on the Director-General to ensure that the information contained in the present Survey on the application of freedom of association and the right to organize and bargain collectively be included in the action plan implemented under the Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, as well as the strategic plan of MNE Declaration activities.

Promotion of the observance of the Declaration

198. Many respondents reported that promotional activities had been undertaken during the reporting period to increase awareness of the aims and principles of the MNE Declaration. At the same time, many others indicated that no such activities had taken place. The activities were designed to accomplish various purposes, including enhancing the principle of tripartism underlying the MNE Declaration, improving consultative or conciliation institutions or methods, and strengthening social and economic legislation to better promote the aims of the Declaration. Other activities included increasing awareness of the MNE Declaration, directly discussing social policy with MNEs, addressing relationships between host and home governments, and agreeing on commitments through a Memorandum of Social Understanding (MSU) patterned after the MNE Declaration, and promoting basic labour rights. A variety of modalities were recounted, including seminars, workshops, round tables, use of the media, and translation and/or dissemination of copies of the MNE Declaration, in some cases with the assistance of the ILO, and the suggestion was made to involve MNEs in round tables, through the ILO, on the MNE Declaration.
199. *The Working Group recommends that the Governing Body request the Director-General to intensify knowledge and advocacy activities relating to implementation of the MNE Declaration at regional, national, sectoral and enterprise levels and, in this respect, to convene a tripartite forum on promotion of the Declaration in the context of current FDI trends with a view to enhancing its effectiveness. The Working Group further recommends that the revised MNE Declaration be translated and reproduced as widely as possible, for use in promoting and advocating the aims of the Declaration.*

The Tripartite Declaration and various economic zones and industrial sectors

200. Among the countries that reported laws establishing export processing/special economic zones (EPZs/SEZs), many reported that labour laws applicable in such areas were the same

as those applied elsewhere in the country. Among the number of others which reported that different laws applied in EPZs, many of the differences applicable to terms and conditions of employment appeared to affect wages and benefits, working time, employment security, training, and occupational safety and health. Some differences were perceived as more favourable to workers in special zones; others as less favourable. In general, among the countries in which EPZs were operating, many respondents considered that workers in EPZs have the right to form associations of their own choosing and bargain collectively. A number of others indicated that workers did not have such rights by law, and still others observed that, while the law granted workers in EPZs such rights, in practice they were not always able to exercise them. Several reports reflected a position of power of MNEs investing in EPZs with regard to influencing government policy and action in ways that could have adverse impact on the exercise of freedom of association, and the right to bargain collectively.

- 201.** Overall, special incentives offered to investors in zones were perceived, in most cases, *not* to limit fundamental human rights or basic trade union rights, employment security, equality of treatment, safety and health standards or other rights of workers. However, some respondents, mainly workers' organizations, indicated that special incentives offered to investors in EPZs limited various rights of workers, particularly freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining.
- 202.** A number of respondents reported that the participation of MNEs in what were previously state and now privatized industries or deregulated sectors had given rise to particular labour problems. Many of the respondents referred to workforce reductions, some of which were carried out in compliance with relevant agreements or legislation and others occurring without social support measures. Reasons given for job reductions included the introduction by MNEs of new technologies and production methods, restructuring and the difficulties of employees in meeting new demands of efficiency and enhanced productivity. Particular attention was given to the effects of privatization and/or deregulation on freedom of association and collective bargaining; most such reports indicated that unions were closed down or diminished in influence as a result of privatization. One respondent called for the ILO to monitor the transformation process involved to explore whether the social protection and "co-determination" developed in public sector services could be retained in the "new multis".
- 203.** *The Working Group notes that the response to this question overall leads it to query the effectiveness of the application of the MNE Declaration in EPZs/SEZs and recommends exploration of further means for promotion of its principles in such settings. The Working Group thus recommends that further study and consultations, combined with ongoing programmes in the Office, be conducted to promote the application of the Declaration by MNEs in EPZs. It further recommends that the issue of the labour and employment effects of MNE operations in the context of privatized and deregulated industries be addressed as a separate question in the Eighth Survey.*

Disputes concerning interpretation of the provisions of the Declaration

- 204.** No one reported any dispute arising in their country as a result of different interpretations of the paragraphs of the Tripartite Declaration; those who responded to the question said that no disputes had arisen. Other comments demonstrated the lack of cooperation or discussion, either collectively or individually, by governments, employers' or workers' organizations, on the issue of monitoring or implementing the MNE Declaration. Some

respondents indicated that the dispute procedure as outlined did not raise any difficulties. Two respondents articulated difficulties with the dispute procedure which, in their view, was unnecessarily time-consuming, lacked firmness due to its consensus nature, and had little impact. Suggestions to improve implementation of the Declaration, and the interpretation procedure in particular, encompassed country-based studies to determine areas of compliance and non-compliance, eliminating the requirement of unanimity in determining receivability of requests for interpretation, reforming the process in view of the deliberations initiated on the OECD Guidelines on MNEs, establishing an “observatory of multinationals” with rapid observation and warning capabilities, and enhancing the participation of MNEs in employers’ organizations.

205. *The Working Group notes the low response rate to the questions relating to the interpretation procedure and the difficulties perceived in monitoring and implementing the MNE Declaration and appreciates the suggestions made for advancing the aims of the Declaration and, in particular, its interpretation procedure. The Working Group, accordingly, recommends that the Subcommittee give consideration to means of promoting knowledge of, and application of, the procedure to promote effective follow-up on the MNE Declaration.*

Geneva, 31 January 2001.

(Signed) Debra Robinson,
Chairperson.

Points for decision: Paragraph 109;
Paragraph 170;
Paragraph 171;
Paragraph 172;
Paragraph 173;
Paragraph 178;
Paragraph 182;
Paragraph 184;
Paragraph 186;
Paragraph 188;
Paragraph 190;
Paragraph 192;
Paragraph 197;
Paragraph 199;
Paragraph 203;
Paragraph 205.

Endnotes

¹ 91 respondents: 38 governments, 22 employers' organizations, 17 workers' organizations, 14 respondents in tripartite replies. Angola (G), Antigua and Barbuda (G), Australia (G), Austria (G), Bangladesh (G), Barbados (G), Belarus (G), Brazil (G), Colombia (G), Costa Rica (G), Côte d'Ivoire (G), Ecuador (G), Egypt (G), El Salvador (G), Guatemala (G), India (G), Italy (G), Jordan (G), Kenya (G), Republic of Korea (G), Lebanon (G), Mauritius (G), Mexico (G), New Zealand (G), Nicaragua (G), Pakistan (G), Panama (G), Peru (G), Poland (G), Portugal (G), Romania (G), Senegal (G), Singapore (G), Sri Lanka (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G), Zimbabwe (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Bangladesh (E), Barbados (E), Belgium (E), Burkina Faso (E), Canada (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Egypt (E), Gabon (E), Germany (E), Greece (E), Jordan (E), Malta (E), New Zealand (E), Oman (E), Switzerland (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E), Viet Nam (E), Zambia (E); Australia (W), Barbados (W), Belgium (W), Colombia (W), Cyprus (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), Ghana (W), Ireland (W), Italy (W), Republic of Korea (W), Madagascar (W), Mexico (W), Nepal (W), Portugal (W), Sri Lanka (W – LJEWU), Togo (W – CSTT), Turkey (W); Estonia (TP), Hungary (TP – government and employers' view), Malaysia (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP), Slovakia (TP).

² 71 respondents: 32 governments, 19 employers' organizations, 11 workers' organizations, 9 respondents in tripartite replies. Antigua and Barbuda (G), Australia (G), Austria (G), Bahamas (G), Bangladesh (G), Brazil (G), Colombia (G), Costa Rica (G), Côte d'Ivoire (G), Cyprus (G), Egypt (G), El Salvador (G), Guatemala (G), Guyana (G), India (G), Italy (G), Kenya (G), Republic of Korea (G), Lebanon (G), Mauritius (G), New Zealand (G), Nicaragua (G), Pakistan (G), Panama (G), Peru (G), Romania (G), Senegal (G), Singapore (G), Slovenia (G), Sri Lanka (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Bangladesh (E), Belgium (E), Brazil (E), Burkina Faso (E), Canada (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Egypt (E), Gabon (E), Germany (E), Greece (E), Oman (E), South Africa (E), Spain (E), Sri Lanka (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E), Viet Nam (E); Australia (W), Bangladesh (W), Barbados (W), Belgium (W), Ghana (W), Ireland (W), Italy (W), Republic of Korea (W), Mozambique (W), Portugal (W), Spain (W); Estonia (TP), Finland (TP), Malaysia (TP).

³ 56 respondents: 22 governments, 17 employers' organizations, 11 workers' organizations, 6 respondents in tripartite replies. Antigua and Barbuda (G), Bahamas (G), Bangladesh (G), Brazil (G), Bulgaria (G), Colombia (G), Côte d'Ivoire (G), Ecuador (G), El Salvador (G), Guatemala (G), Guyana (G), India (G), Italy (G), Kenya (G), Lebanon (G), Mauritius (G), Nicaragua (G), Pakistan (G), Panama (G), Sri Lanka (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Bangladesh (E), Barbados (W), Burkina Faso (E), Canada (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Gabon (E), Germany (E), Greece (E), Oman (E), South Africa (E), Spain (E), Sri Lanka (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E), Viet Nam (E); Bangladesh (W), Barbados (W), Ghana (W), Ireland (W), Italy (W), Morocco (W), Mozambique (W), Portugal (W), Spain (W), Togo (W – CSTT); Finland (TP), Malaysia (TP).

⁴ 48 respondents: 22 governments, 14 employers' organizations, 7 workers' organizations, 5 respondents in tripartite replies. Antigua and Barbuda (G), Bahamas (G), Bangladesh (G), Barbados (G), Colombia (G), Côte d'Ivoire (G), El Salvador (G), Guatemala (G), Guyana (G), Jordan (G), Kenya (G), Mauritius (G), Mexico (G), Pakistan (G), Panama (G), Peru (G), Singapore (G), Sri Lanka (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G), Zimbabwe (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Bangladesh (E), Burkina Faso (E), Gabon (E), Germany (E), Greece (E), Jordan (E), Oman (E), Spain (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E), Viet Nam (E), Zambia (E); Bangladesh (W), Barbados (W), Ghana (W), Ireland (W), Nepal (W), Togo (W – CSTT), Turkey (W); Hungary (TP – government and employers' view), Malaysia (TP).

⁵ 22 respondents: 10 governments, 8 employers' organizations, 4 workers' organizations. Côte d'Ivoire (G), El Salvador (G), Guatemala (G), Italy (G), Mauritius (G), Mexico (G), Sri Lanka (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G); Gabon (E), Germany (E), Greece (E), Spain (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E), Zambia (E); Bangladesh (W), Ghana (W), Ireland (W), Togo (W – CSTT).

⁶ 19 respondents: 7 governments, 7 employers' organizations, 2 workers' organizations, 3 respondents in tripartite replies. Colombia (G), El Salvador (G), Guatemala (G), Mauritius (G), Sri

Lanka (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G); Gabon (E), Germany (E), Greece (E), Spain (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E); Bangladesh (W), Ghana (W); Uganda (TP).

⁷ 37 respondents: 19 governments, 7 employers' organizations, 3 workers' organizations, 8 respondents in tripartite replies. Barbados (G), Bulgaria (G), Costa Rica (G), Cyprus (G), El Salvador (G), Guatemala (G), Indonesia (G), Italy (G), Kenya (G), Mauritius (G), Mexico (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Myanmar (G), New Zealand (G), Pakistan (G), Panama (G), Singapore (G), Slovenia (G), Turkey (G); Barbados (E), Burkina Faso (E), Gabon (E), Greece (E), Guatemala (E), Spain (E), Venezuela (E); Croatia (W), Italy (W), Latvia (W); Estonia (TP), Malaysia (TP – government and employers' view), Uganda (TP).

⁸ 66 respondents: 17 governments, 11 employers' organizations, 29 workers' organizations, 9 respondents in tripartite replies. Argentina (G), Australia (G), Austria (G), Bahamas (G), Bangladesh (G), Brazil (G), Bulgaria (G), Colombia (G), Ecuador (G), Egypt (G), Guyana (G), Republic of Korea (G), Lithuania (G), Romania (G), Spain (G), Togo (G), Zimbabwe (G); Bangladesh (E), Belgium (E), Brazil (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E) Lithuania (E), South Africa (E), Switzerland (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Ukraine (E), Viet Nam (E); Zambia (E); Austria (W), Bangladesh (W), Barbados (W), Belgium (W), Cameroon (W), Colombia (W), Cyprus (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), Dominican Republic (W), France (W x 2), Ghana (W), Republic of Korea (W), Lithuania (W – LTUC), Madagascar (W), Malta (W), Morocco (W), Nepal (W), New Zealand (W), Pakistan (W), Panama (W), Peru (W), Portugal (W), Rwanda (W), South Africa (W x 2), Spain (W), Sri Lanka (W – CWC), United Republic of Tanzania (W), Togo (W – CSTT), Turkey (W); Finland (TP), Hungary (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP).

⁹ 33 respondents: 8 governments, 5 employers' organizations, 20 workers' organizations. Antigua and Barbuda (G), Barbados (G), Brazil (G), Ecuador (G), India (G), Lithuania (G), Togo (G), Zimbabwe (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Burkina Faso (E), Togo (E), Ukraine (E), Viet Nam (E); Austria (W), Cameroon (W), Colombia (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), Dominican Republic (W), France (W x 2), Republic of Korea (W), Lithuania (W – LTUC), Malta (W), Mozambique (W), Nepal (W), New Zealand (W), Panama (W), Peru (W), Portugal (W), Rwanda (W), South Africa (W – FEDUSA), Spain (W), Sri Lanka (W – CWC), Turkey (W).

¹⁰ 15 respondents: 4 governments, 3 employers' organizations, 4 workers' organizations, 4 respondents in tripartite replies. Australia (G), Bahamas (G), Bangladesh (G), Colombia (G); Bangladesh (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Zambia (E), Bangladesh (W), Cyprus (W), Ghana (W), Togo (W – CSTT); Malaysia (TP – workers' view), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP).

¹¹ 68 respondents: 32 governments, 9 employers' organizations, 12 workers' organizations, 15 respondents in tripartite replies. Australia (G), Austria (G), Bahrain (G), Belarus (G), Belgium (G), Brazil (G), Bulgaria (G), Cyprus (G), Ecuador (G), Egypt (G), El Salvador (G), Germany (G), Guatemala (G), Guyana (G), Jordan (G), Kenya (G), Republic of Korea (G), Lithuania (G), Mauritius (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Nicaragua (G), Norway (G), Panama (G), Portugal (G), Romania (G), Senegal (G), Singapore (G), Slovenia (G), Spain (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G); Barbados (E), Jordan (E), Lithuania (E), Switzerland (E), Togo (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E), Zambia (E); Cameroon (W), Cyprus (W), France (W – CFE-CGC); Ireland (W), Lithuania (W – LTUC), Madagascar (W), Nepal (W), Panama (W), Peru (W), Poland (W – OPZZ), South Africa (W – FEDUSA), Spain (W); Denmark (TP), Finland (TP), Hungary (TP), Slovakia (TP), Sweden (TP).

¹² 21 respondents: 12 governments, 3 employers' organization, 3 workers' organizations, 3 respondents in tripartite replies. Australia (G), Belgium (G), Bulgaria (G), Cyprus (G), Kenya (G), Republic of Korea (G), Mauritius (G), Panama (G) Romania (G), Singapore (G), Slovenia (G); Gabon (E), South Africa (E), Togo (E), Cameroon (W); Cyprus (W), Togo (W); Hungary (TP).

¹³ 35 respondents: 15 governments, 3 employers' organization, 8 workers' organizations, 9 respondents in tripartite replies. Australia (G), Bahrain (G), Barbados (G), Belgium (G), Bulgaria (G), Guatemala (G), Japan (G), Lebanon (G), Lithuania (G), Nicaragua (G), Norway (G), Peru (G), Romania (G), Slovenia (G), Singapore (G); Belgium (E), Canada (E), South Africa (E); Barbados

(W), Cameroon (W), Dominican Republic (W), France (W – CFE-CGC), Ireland (W), Mozambique (W), South Africa (W x 2); Finland (TP), Hungary (TP), Slovakia (TP).

¹⁴ 7 respondents: 5 governments, 1 employers' organization, 1 workers' organization. Japan (G), Republic of Korea (G), Philippines (G), Togo (G); Viet Nam (E); South Africa (W – FEDUSA).

¹⁵ 41 respondents: 12 governments, 15 employers' organizations, 8 workers' organizations, 6 respondents in tripartite replies. Antigua and Barbuda (G), Bahamas (G), Bangladesh (G), Barbados (G), Belarus (G), Colombia (G), Mexico (G), New Zealand (G), Pakistan (G), Sri Lanka (G), Togo (G), Ukraine (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Bangladesh (E), Brazil (E), Burkina Faso (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Egypt (E), Gabon (E), Latvia (E), Malta (E), Morocco (E), New Zealand (E), Sri Lanka (E), Switzerland (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E); Australia (W), Barbados (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), Madagascar (W), Pakistan (W x 2), Poland (W), Rwanda (W), Sri Lanka (W); Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP), Uganda (TP).

¹⁶ For example, consultation on legal reforms was reported in the following replies: 33 respondents: 17 governments, 3 employers' organizations, 4 workers' organizations, 9 respondents in tripartite replies. Australia (G), Austria (G), Brazil (G), Bulgaria (G), Cyprus (G), Guyana (G), Jordan (G), Kenya (G), Republic of Korea (G), Lithuania (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Nicaragua (G), Portugal (G), Romania (G), Senegal (G), Singapore (G) (wage reforms), Ukraine (G); Barbados (E) (in process), Ukraine (E), Zambia (E); Cyprus (W), Ireland (W), Mozambique (W), South Africa (W – FEDUSA); Finland (TP), Kuwait (TP), Slovakia (TP).

¹⁷ For example, new laws were reported to have been adopted without consultation with employers' and workers' organizations in the following cases: 8 respondents: 2 employers' organizations, 6 workers' organizations. Lithuania (E), Togo (E); Cameroon (W), France (W), Lithuania (W – LTUC), Nepal (W), Peru (W), United Republic of Tanzania (W).

¹⁸ 63 respondents: 32 governments, 17 employers' organizations, 8 workers' organizations, 6 respondents in tripartite replies. Antigua and Barbuda (G), Argentina (G), Australia (G), Austria (G), Bahamas (G), Bahrain (G), Bangladesh (G), Bulgaria (G), Cape Verde (G), Colombia (G), Costa Rica (G), Cyprus (G), El Salvador (G), Guatemala (G), Guyana (G), India (G), Lithuania (G), Mauritius (G), Mexico (G), Myanmar (G), Netherlands (G), New Zealand (G), Nicaragua (G), Norway (G), Pakistan (G), Peru (G), Poland (G), Slovenia (G), Sri Lanka (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Bangladesh (E), Barbados (E), Burkina Faso (E), Canada (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Greece (E), Jordan (E), New Zealand (E), South Africa (E), Spain (E), Sri Lanka (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E), Zambia (E); Australia (W), Austria (W), Cyprus (W), Ghana (W), Ireland (W), Pakistan (W – NLP), Switzerland (W), Togo (W – CSTT); Denmark (TP), Estonia (TP).

¹⁹ 23 respondents: 3 governments, 2 employers' organizations, 15 workers' organizations, 3 respondents in tripartite replies. Netherlands (G), Panama (G), Zimbabwe (G); Guatemala (E), Viet Nam (E); Angola (W), Bangladesh (W), Barbados (W), Colombia (W), Dominican Republic (W), France (W – CFE), Malta (W), Morocco (W), Nepal (W), Pakistan (W – PLF), Panama (W), Peru (W), Poland (W – OPZZ), Portugal (W), Spain (W); Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP).

²⁰ 39 respondents: 19 governments, 9 employers' organizations, 3 workers' organizations, 8 respondents in tripartite replies. Antigua and Barbuda (G), Argentina (G), Australia (G), Bahamas (G), Bangladesh (G), Cyprus (G), Ecuador (G), El Salvador (G), Guyana (G), Kenya (G), Mauritius (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Netherlands (G), Pakistan (G), Philippines (G), Romania (G), Singapore (G), Togo (G), Ukraine (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Bangladesh (E), Barbados (E), Canada (E), Egypt (E), Guatemala (E), Jordan (E), Spain (E), Ukraine (E); Ghana (W), Italy (W), Togo (W – CSTT); Hungary (TP – government and employers' views), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP), Slovakia (TP).

²¹ 22 respondents: 5 governments, 2 employers' organizations, 11 workers' organizations, 4 respondents in tripartite replies. Colombia (G), Panama (G), Peru (G), Poland (G), Sri Lanka (G); Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Sri Lanka (E); Australia (W), Barbados (W), Colombia (W), Dominican Republic (W), France (W – CFE), Madagascar (W), Panama (W), Peru (W), Poland (W)

– NSZZ Solidarność), Rwanda (W), Switzerland (W); Denmark (TP), Hungary (TP – workers' view).

²² 40 respondents: 3 governments, 4 employers' organizations, 23 workers' organizations, 10 respondents in tripartite replies. Antigua and Barbuda (G), Jordan (G), Sri Lanka (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Guatemala (E), Sri Lanka (E), Togo (E); Angola (W), Australia (W), Bangladesh (W), Barbados (W), Croatia (W), Cyprus (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), Dominican Republic (W), France (W – CFE), Germany (W), Latvia (W), Lithuania (W – LPSS), Madagascar (W), Morocco (W), Mozambique (W), Nepal (W), New Zealand (W), Pakistan (W x 2), Poland (W x 2), Rwanda (W), Spain (W), Sri Lanka (W – CWC), United Republic of Tanzania (W); Denmark (TP), Hungary (TP – workers' view) (no knowledge of consultations), Kuwait (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP).

²³ 25 respondents: 9 governments, 7 employers' organizations, 3 workers' organizations, 6 respondents in tripartite replies. Bulgaria (G), Cape Verde (G), Cyprus (G), Guyana (G), Jordan (G), Norway (G), Pakistan (G), Sri Lanka (G), Turkey (G); Egypt (E), Guatemala (E), Jordan (E), South Africa (E), Sri Lanka (E), Turkey (E), Zambia (E); Ghana (W), South Africa (W – FEDUSA), Togo (W – CSTT); Hungary (TP), Uganda (TP).

²⁴ 35 respondents: 11 governments, 6 employers' organizations, 12 workers' organizations, 6 respondents in tripartite replies. Antigua and Barbuda (G), El Salvador (G), Guatemala (G), Mauritius (G), New Zealand (G), Panama (G), Peru (G), Senegal (G), Slovenia (G), Ukraine (G), Zimbabwe (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), New Zealand (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E), Viet Nam (E); Australia (W), Barbados (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), Dominican Republic (W), France (W – CFE), Malta (W), Nepal (W), Pakistan (W – PLF), Panama (W), Poland (W – OPZZ), Rwanda (W), Switzerland (W); Denmark (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP).

²⁵ 95 respondents: 40 governments, 15 employers' organizations, 25 workers' organizations, 15 survey respondents in tripartite replies. Angola (G), Argentina (G), Australia (G), Austria (G), Bahrain (G), Bangladesh (G), Belarus (G), Belgium (G), China (G), Colombia (G), Costa Rica (G), Côte d'Ivoire (G), Croatia (G), Ecuador (G), Egypt (G), Eritrea (G), Germany (G), Greece (G), India (G), Indonesia (G), Italy (G), Japan (G), Kenya (G), Republic of Korea (G), Lebanon (G), Lithuania (G), Malta (G), Mexico (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Myanmar (G), Netherlands (G), Nicaragua (G), Philippines (G), Portugal (G), Romania (G), Singapore (G), Spain (G), Thailand (G), Togo (G), United Kingdom (G); Bangladesh (E), Barbados (E), Belgium (E), Brazil (E), Burkina Faso (E), Canada (E), Gabon (E), Germany (E), Greece (E), Japan (E), Lithuania (E), Oman (E), Spain (E), Togo (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E); Angola (W), Belgium (W), Brazil (W), Cameroon (W), Colombia (W), Ethiopia (W), France (W – CGT), Germany (W), Israel (W), Italy (W), Japan (W), Republic of Korea (W), Latvia (W), Lithuania (W x 2), Mexico (W), New Zealand (W), Pakistan (W – NLP), Peru (W), Poland (W – NSZZ Solidarność), South Africa (W – COSATU), Sri Lanka (W x 2), United Republic of Tanzania (W), Togo (W – GSA), Turkey (W), United States (W); Estonia (TP), Finland (TP), Kuwait (TP), Slovakia (TP), Sweden (TP).

²⁶ 61 respondents: 26 governments, 15 employers' organizations, 11 workers' organizations, 9 respondents in tripartite replies. Antigua and Barbuda (G), Australia (G), Bahamas (G), Bangladesh (G), Barbados (G), Cape Verde (G), China (G), Cyprus (G), Ecuador (G), El Salvador (G), Indonesia (G), Jordan (G), Republic of Korea (G), Lithuania (G), Mauritius (G), Mexico (G), Myanmar (G), New Zealand (G), Panama (G), Romania (G), Senegal (G), Singapore (G), Slovenia (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Bangladesh (E), Canada (E), Egypt (E), Germany (E), Greece (E), Jordan (E), Oman (E), South Africa (E), Spain (E), Sri Lanka (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E), Zambia (E); Cyprus (W), France (W – CFE-CGC), Ghana (W), Ireland (W), Latvia (W), Lithuania (W – LPSS), Mozambique (W), Poland (W – OPZZ), Sri Lanka (W – CWC), Togo (W – CSTT), Turkey (W); Estonia (TP), Kuwait (TP), Uganda (TP).

²⁷ 21 respondents: 13 governments, 6 employers' organizations, 2 workers' organizations. Bahamas (G), Bangladesh (G), China (G), Cyprus (G), El Salvador (G), Republic of Korea (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Myanmar (G), Nicaragua (G), Pakistan (G), Panama (G), Singapore (G), Slovenia (G); Bangladesh (E), Germany (E), Greece (E), Oman (E), Venezuela (E), Viet Nam (E); Cyprus (W), Ghana (W).

²⁸ 34 respondents: 11 governments, 4 employers' organizations, 16 workers' organizations, 3 respondents in tripartite replies. Argentina (G), Barbados (G), Belgium (G), Ecuador (G), Guyana (G), Indonesia (G), Italy (G), Lithuania (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Zimbabwe (G); Lithuania (E), Sri Lanka (E), Turkey (E), Zambia (E); Bangladesh (W), Brazil (W), Dominican Republic (W), France (W – CFE-CGC), Italy (W), Latvia (W), Lithuania (W x 2), Mozambique (W), Nepal (W), New Zealand (W), Pakistan (W – PLF), Poland (W – OPZZ), South Africa (W – FEDUSA), Sri Lanka (W – CWC), Togo (W – CSTT), Turkey (W); Sweden (TP).

²⁹ 14 respondents: 4 governments, 3 employers' organizations, 4 workers' organizations, 3 respondents in tripartite replies. Costa Rica (G), Mexico (G), Nicaragua (G), Pakistan (G); Barbados (E), Brazil (E), Germany (E); Cyprus (W), France (W – CFE-CGC), Madagascar (W), Nepal (W); Hungary (TP). See also Finland (TP).

³⁰ 73 respondents: 31 governments, 10 employers' organizations, 17 workers' organizations, 15 respondents in tripartite replies. Australia (G), Bahamas (G), Bahrain (G), Bangladesh (G), Barbados (G), Belgium (G), Brazil (G), Cape Verde (G), China (G), Colombia (G), Cyprus (G), Ecuador (G), Guatemala (G), Guyana (G), India (G), Italy (G), Republic of Korea (G), Lebanon (G), Lithuania (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Myanmar (G), New Zealand (G), Norway (G), Peru (G), Philippines (G), Portugal (G), Romania (G), Sri Lanka (G), Togo (G), Ukraine (G), Zimbabwe (G); Bangladesh (E), Burkina Faso (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Egypt (E), Greece (E), South Africa (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E), Zambia (E); Cameroon (W), Croatia (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), Dominican Republic (W), Ghana (W), Ireland (W), Italy (W), Latvia (W), Malta (W), Morocco (W), Pakistan (W – PLF), Poland (W x 2), Rwanda (W), South Africa (W – FEDUSA), Switzerland (W), United Republic of Tanzania (W), Togo (W – CSTT); Denmark (TP), Estonia (TP), Kuwait (TP), Malaysia (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP), Slovakia (TP).

³¹ 90 respondents: 31 governments, 19 employers' organizations, 16 workers' organizations, 24 respondents in tripartite replies. Angola (G), Argentina (G), Austria (G), Bahamas (G), Bangladesh (G), Belgium (G), Colombia (G), Costa Rica (G), Ecuador (G), Egypt (G), India (G), Indonesia (G), Italy (G), Jordan (G), Kenya (G), Republic of Korea (G), Mauritius (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Myanmar (G), New Zealand (G), Pakistan (G), Philippines (G), Romania (G), Senegal (G), Singapore (G), Sri Lanka (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G), United Kingdom (G), Zimbabwe (G); Bangladesh (E), Burkina Faso (E), Canada (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Egypt (E), Gabon (E), Greece (E), Guatemala (E), Jordan (E), Oman (E), South Africa (E), Sri Lanka (E), Switzerland (E), Togo (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E), Viet Nam (E), Zambia (E); Australia (W), Bangladesh (W), Cameroon (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), Ghana (W), Ireland (W), Latvia (W), Morocco (W), Mozambique (W), Nepal (W), Pakistan (W – PLF), South Africa (W – FEDUSA), Spain (W), Sri Lanka (W – CWC), United Republic of Tanzania (W), Togo (W – CSTT); Denmark (TP), Estonia (TP), Finland (TP), Hungary (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP), Slovakia (TP), Sweden (TP), Uganda (TP).

³² 8 respondents: 1 government, 7 workers' organizations. Slovenia (G); Brazil (W), France (W – CFE-CGC), Republic of Korea (W), Lithuania (W – LPSS), Madagascar (W), Malta (W), Poland (W – OPZZ).

³³ 63 respondents: 28 governments, 14 employers' organizations, 10 workers' organizations, 11 respondents in tripartite replies. Angola (G), Antigua and Barbuda (G), Bahamas (G), Bahrain (G), Bangladesh (G), Barbados (G), Cape Verde (G), China (G), Colombia (G), Costa Rica (G), Côte d'Ivoire (G), Cyprus (G), El Salvador (G), India (G), Indonesia (G), Italy (G), Kenya (G), Republic of Korea (G), Mexico (G), Myanmar (G), New Zealand (G), Nicaragua (G), Peru (G), Philippines (G), Portugal (G), Slovenia (G), Spain (G), Sri Lanka (G), Ukraine (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Bangladesh (E), Canada (E), Egypt (E), Germany (E), Guatemala (E), Jordan (E), New Zealand (E), South Africa (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E), Viet Nam (E), Zambia (E); Australia (W), Cyprus (W), Ireland (W), Madagascar (W), Malta (W), Mozambique (W), Nepal (W), Pakistan (W – NLFP), South Africa (W – FEDUSA), Switzerland (W); Hungary (TP – government and employers' view), Malaysia (TP), Sweden (TP), Uganda (TP).

³⁴ 15 respondents: 3 governments, 11 workers' organizations, 1 respondent in tripartite replies. Argentina (G), Belgium (G), Zimbabwe (G); Bangladesh (W), Colombia (W), France (W x 2), Germany (W), Israel (W), Italy (W), Republic of Korea (W), New Zealand (W), Pakistan (W –

PLF), Poland (W – NSZZ Solidarność), South Africa (W – COSATU); Hungary (TP – workers' view); others gave examples of sectoral differences.

³⁵ 23 respondents: 6 governments, 7 employers' organizations, 1 workers' organization, 9 respondents in tripartite replies. Bahamas (G), Bangladesh (G), Bulgaria (G), Costa Rica (G), Ecuador (G), Sri Lanka (G); Bangladesh (E), Guatemala (E), Jordan (E), South Africa (E), Turkey (E), Venezuela (E), Viet Nam (E); Ireland (W); Malaysia (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP), Uganda (TP).

³⁶ 13 respondents: 3 governments, 1 employers' organization, 9 workers' organizations. Cyprus (G), Philippines (G), Portugal (G); Trinidad and Tobago (E); Dominican Republic (W), Republic of Korea (W), Madagascar (W), Nepal (W), Pakistan (W – PLF), Portugal (W), South Africa (W – COSATU), Sri Lanka (W – LJEWU), Togo (W – CSTT).

³⁷ 71 countries: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Republic of Korea, Kuwait, Lithuania, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mexico, Republic of Moldova, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

³⁸ 82 respondents: 33 governments, 12 employers' organizations, 19 workers' organizations, 18 respondents in tripartite replies. Antigua and Barbuda (G), Argentina (G), Austria (G), Bahrain (G), Bangladesh (G), Belarus (G), Belgium (G), Brazil (G), Bulgaria (G), China (G), Colombia (G), Costa Rica (G), El Salvador (G), Germany (G), Guyana (G), Indonesia (G), Italy (G), Japan (G), Jordan (G), Republic of Korea (G), Lithuania (G), Mexico (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Norway (G), Peru (G), Philippines (G), Portugal (G), Romania (G), Spain (G), Switzerland (G), Thailand (G), Togo (G), Ukraine (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Bangladesh (E), Barbados (E), Belgium (E), Brazil (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), South Africa (E), Switzerland (E), Togo (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Ukraine (E), Viet Nam (E); Australia (W), Belgium (W), Croatia (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), France (W – CFE-CGC), Ireland (W), Italy (W), Latvia (W), Lithuania (W – LPSS), Madagascar (W), Mozambique (W), Pakistan (W – PLF), Poland (W – NSZZ Solidarność), Portugal (W), Rwanda (W), South Africa (W x 2), Spain (W), Switzerland (W), Togo (W x 2); Denmark (TP), Estonia (TP), Finland (TP), Kuwait (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP), Slovakia (TP).

³⁹ 46 respondents: 23 governments, 10 employers' organizations, 7 workers' organizations, 6 respondents in tripartite replies. Austria (G), Bahamas (G), Bangladesh (G), Barbados (G), Belgium (G), Brazil (G), Bulgaria (G), China (G), Costa Rica (G), Cyprus (G), Ecuador (G), Greece (G), Guatemala (G), Nicaragua (G), Panama (G), Peru (G), Philippines (G), Romania (G), Senegal (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G), United Kingdom (G); Bangladesh (E), Brazil (E), Guatemala (E), Jordan (E), Spain (E), Sri Lanka (E), Togo (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E), Zambia (E); Brazil (W), Ghana (W), Republic of Korea (W), Nepal (W), Poland (W – NSZZ Solidarność), Portugal (W), Togo (W – CSTT); Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP), Uganda (TP).

⁴⁰ 36 respondents: 21 governments, 4 employers' organizations, 5 workers' organizations, 6 respondents in tripartite replies. Australia (G), Austria (G), Bangladesh (G), Belgium (G), Brazil (G), Greece (G), Japan (G), Kenya (G), Mauritius (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Norway (G), Panama (G), Philippines (G), Portugal (G), Rwanda (G), Singapore (G), Slovenia (G), Spain (G), Switzerland (G), Turkey (G), United Kingdom (G); Bangladesh (E), Brazil (E), Spain (E), Switzerland (E); Cyprus (W), Ireland (W), Latvia (W), Mexico (W), Switzerland (W); Finland (TP), Hungary (TP).

⁴¹ 9 respondents: 6 governments, 2 employers' organizations, 1 workers' organization. Bahrain (G), Cyprus (G), Indonesia (G), Republic of Korea (G), Sri Lanka (G), Zimbabwe (G); Trinidad and Tobago (E), Zambia (E); Switzerland (W).

⁴² 60 respondents: 29 governments, 9 employers' organizations, 13 workers' organizations, 9 respondents in tripartite replies. Antigua and Barbuda (G), Austria (G), Bahrain (G), Bangladesh (G), Belgium (G), China (G), Cyprus (G), Germany (G), Guyana (G), Italy (G), Japan (G), Jordan (G), Republic of Korea (G), Mauritius (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Norway (G), Philippines (G), Portugal (G), Senegal (G), Singapore (G), Spain (G), Sri Lanka (G), Switzerland (G), Thailand (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G), United Kingdom (G), Zimbabwe (G); Bangladesh (E), South Africa (E), Spain (E), Switzerland (E), Togo (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E), Viet Nam (E), Zambia (E); Australia (W), Austria (W), Cyprus (W), France (W – CFE-CGC), Ghana (W), Ireland (W), Italy (W), Latvia (W), Morocco (W), Portugal (W), South Africa (W x 2), Switzerland (W), Togo (W – CSTT); Estonia (TP), Hungary (TP), Uganda (TP).

⁴³ 11 respondents: 3 governments, 2 employers' organizations, 6 respondents in tripartite replies. Australia (G), Cyprus (G), Spain (G); Canada (E), Zambia (E); Hungary (TP), Uganda (TP).

⁴⁴ 44 respondents: 17 governments, 15 employers' organizations, 4 workers' organizations, 8 respondents in tripartite replies. Angola (G), Antigua and Barbuda (G), Bahrain (G), Bangladesh (G), Belgium (G), Bulgaria (G), China (G), Guatemala (G), India (G), Indonesia (G), Jordan (G), Kenya (G), Republic of Korea (G), Lebanon (G), Myanmar (G), Singapore (G), Togo (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Bangladesh (E), Brazil (E), Burkina Faso (E), Canada (E), Egypt (E), Gabon (E), Greece (E), Jordan (E), South Africa (E), Sri Lanka (E), Togo (E), Turkey (E), Venezuela (E), Zambia (E); Cameroon (W), Pakistan (W – NLF), Sri Lanka (W – CWC), Togo (W – CSTT); Kuwait (TP), Malaysia (TP – government and employers' view), Slovakia (TP).

⁴⁵ 15 respondents: 7 governments, 4 employers' organizations, 1 workers' organization, 3 respondents in tripartite replies. Antigua and Barbuda (G), Indonesia (G), Kenya (G), Republic of Korea (G), Lebanon (G), Singapore (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Canada (E), Togo (E), Venezuela (E); Cameroon (W), Togo (W – CSTT); Kuwait (TP).

⁴⁶ 42 respondents: 8 governments, 2 employers' organizations, 22 workers' organizations, 10 respondents in tripartite replies. Guyana (G), Lithuania (G), Mauritius (G), New Zealand (G), Philippines (G), Portugal (G), Sri Lanka (G), Zimbabwe (G); Trinidad and Tobago (E), Viet Nam (E); Angola (W), Bangladesh (W), Barbados (W), Brazil (W), Croatia (W), Cyprus (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), Dominican Republic (W), Republic of Korea (W), Latvia (W), Lithuania (W – LPSS), Malta (W), Morocco (W), Mozambique (W), Nepal (W), New Zealand (W), Peru (W), Portugal (W), Rwanda (W), South Africa (W – COSATU), Spain (W), Switzerland (W); Demark (TP), Malaysia (TP – workers' view), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP), Uganda (TP).

⁴⁷ 26 respondents: 18 governments, 6 employers' organizations, 2 workers' organizations. Belarus (G) (retraining and unemployment), Brazil (G), Bulgaria (G), China (G), Colombia (G), Ecuador (G), El Salvador (G), Kenya (G), Republic of Korea (G), Lebanon (G), Mexico (G), Myanmar (G), Nicaragua (G), Panama (G), Peru (G), Portugal (G), Singapore (G), Spain (G), Ukraine (G); Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Guatemala (E), South Africa (E), Switzerland (E), Togo (E), Zambia (E); Mexico (W), Togo (W – CSTT).

⁴⁸ 115 respondents: 48 governments, 21 employers' organizations, 25 workers' organizations, 21 respondents in tripartite replies. Angola (G), Antigua and Barbuda (G), Argentina (G), Australia (G), Austria (G), Bahamas (G), Bahrain (G), Bangladesh (G), Barbados (G), Belgium (G), Brazil (G), Bulgaria (G), Cape Verde (G), China (G), Colombia (G), Costa Rica (G), Côte d'Ivoire (G), Ecuador (G), Egypt (G), El Salvador (G), Guatemala (G), Guyana (G), India (G), Indonesia (G), Italy (G), Jordan (G), Kenya (G), Republic of Korea (G), Lebanon (G), Lithuania (G), Mauritius (G), Mexico (G), Myanmar (G), Nicaragua (G), Pakistan (G), Panama (G), Peru (G), Philippines (G), Senegal (G), Singapore (G), Slovenia (G), Spain (G), Sri Lanka (G), Thailand (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), United Kingdom (G), Zimbabwe (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Bangladesh (E), Barbados (E), Burkina Faso (E), Canada (E), Guatemala (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Egypt (E), Gabon (E), Germany (E), Greece (E), Guatemala (E), Jordan (E), Oman (E), South Africa (E), Spain (E), Sri Lanka (E), Switzerland (E), Togo (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Venezuela (E), Viet Nam (E); Australia (W), Austria (W), Bangladesh (W), Brazil (W), Cameroon (W), Croatia (W), Cyprus (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), France (W – CFE-CGC), Ireland (W), Italy (W), Latvia (W), Madagascar (W), Malta (W), Mexico (W), Mozambique (W), Nepal (W), Pakistan (W – NLFP), Poland (W – OPZZ), Portugal (W), South Africa (W x 2), Spain (W), Sri Lanka (W –

CWC), United Republic of Tanzania (W), Togo (W – CSTT); Estonia (TP), Finland (TP), Hungary (TP), Kuwait (TP), Malaysia (TP), Slovakia (TP), Uganda (TP).

⁴⁹ 87 respondents: 35 governments, 16 employers' organizations, 18 workers' organizations, 18 respondents in tripartite replies. Angola (G), Australia (G), Austria (G), Bahrain (G), Bangladesh (G), Barbados (G), Bulgaria (G), Cape Verde (G), China (G), Ecuador (G), Guatemala (G), Guyana (G), India (G), Indonesia (G), Italy (G), Jordan (G), Kenya (G), Lebanon (G), Lithuania (G), Mauritius (G), Mexico (G), Nicaragua (G), Panama (G), Peru (G), Philippines (G), Senegal (G), Singapore (G), Slovenia (G), Spain (G), Sri Lanka (G), Thailand (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), United Kingdom (G), Zimbabwe (G); Bangladesh (E), Barbados (E), Burkina Faso (E), Canada (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Egypt (E), Guatemala (E), Jordan (E), Oman (E), South Africa (E), Sri Lanka (E), Switzerland (E), Togo (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Venezuela (E), Viet Nam (E); Australia (W), Austria (W), Bangladesh (W), Barbados (W), Cameroon (W), Croatia (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), France (W – CFE-CGC), Ireland (W), Italy (W), Latvia (W), Malta (W), Mexico (W), Nepal (W), Portugal (W), South Africa (W x 2), Sri Lanka (W – CWC), Togo (W – CSTT); Estonia (TP), Finland (TP), Hungary (TP), Malaysia (TP), Slovakia (TP), Uganda (TP).

⁵⁰ 83 respondents: 31 governments, 16 employers' organizations, 18 workers' organizations, 18 respondents in tripartite replies. Australia (G), Austria (G), Bahrain (G), Bangladesh (G), Barbados (G), Bulgaria (G), Cape Verde (G), China (G), Ecuador (G), Guatemala (G), Guyana (G), India (G), Indonesia (G), Italy (G), Jordan (G), Kenya (G), Lebanon (G), Lithuania (G), Mauritius (G), Mexico (G), Panama (G), Peru (G), Philippines (G), Senegal (G), Singapore (G), Slovenia (G), Sri Lanka (G), Thailand (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Zimbabwe (G); Bangladesh (E), Barbados (E), Burkina Faso (E), Canada (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Egypt (E), Guatemala (E), Jordan (E), Oman (E), South Africa (E), Sri Lanka (E), Switzerland (E), Togo (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Venezuela (E), Viet Nam (E); Australia (W), Austria (W), Bangladesh (W), Barbados (W), Cameroon (W), Croatia (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), France (W – CFE-CGC), Ireland (W), Italy (W), Latvia (W), Malta (W), Mexico (W), Nepal (W), Portugal (W), South Africa (W x 2), Sri Lanka (W – CWC), Togo (W – CSTT); Estonia (TP), Finland (TP), Hungary (TP), Malaysia (TP), Slovakia (TP), Uganda (TP).

⁵¹ 48 respondents: 24 governments, 9 employers' organizations, 9 workers' organizations, 6 respondents in tripartite replies. Australia (G), Bangladesh (G), Barbados (G), Brazil (G), Bulgaria (G), Côte d'Ivoire (G), Ecuador (G), El Salvador (G), India (G), Indonesia (G), Italy (G), Jordan (G), Republic of Korea (G), Lithuania (G), Mexico (G), Netherlands (G), Nicaragua (G), Pakistan (G), Panama (G), Philippines (G), Romania (G), Singapore (G), Spain (G), Switzerland (G); Bangladesh (E), Barbados (E), Brazil (E), Gabon (E), Germany (E), Greece (E), Lithuania (E), South Africa (E), Viet Nam (E); Australia (W), Cyprus (W), Ghana (W), Ireland (W), Italy (W), Latvia (W), Lithuania (W – LTUC), Spain (W), United Republic of Tanzania (W); Denmark (TP), Kuwait (TP).

⁵² 46 respondents: 11 governments, 5 employers' organizations, 18 workers' organizations, 12 respondents in tripartite replies. Antigua and Barbuda (G), Bahamas (G), Belgium (G), Guatemala (G), Guyana (G), New Zealand (G), Peru (G), Senegal (G), Sri Lanka (G), Togo (G), Zimbabwe (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), New Zealand (E), Togo (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E); Austria (W), Bangladesh (W), Barbados (W), Brazil (W), Cameroon (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), Madagascar (W), Malta (W), Mozambique (W), Nepal (W), New Zealand (W), Pakistan (W x 2), Poland (W – OPZZ), Portugal (W), Rwanda (W), South Africa (W – FEDUSA), Togo (W – GSA); Hungary (TP), Malaysia (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP), Uganda. Of these, there were several cases in which different respondents in the same country disagreed as to whether tripartite consultation occurred in the context of HRD and/or training. Compare, e.g., Bangladesh (E) with (W), Barbados (G) and (E) with (W), Brazil (G) and (E) with (W), Pakistan (G) with (W x 2), South Africa (E) with (W – FEDUSA).

⁵³ 115 respondents: 44 governments, 20 employers' organizations, 24 workers' organizations, 27 respondents in tripartite replies. Angola (G), Antigua and Barbuda (G), Argentina (G), Australia (G), Austria (G), Bahamas (G), Bahrain (G), Barbados (G), Belarus (G), Belgium (G), China (G), Colombia (G), Costa Rica (G), Côte d'Ivoire (G), Croatia (G), Cyprus (G), Egypt (G), Greece (G), Guyana (G), India (G), Indonesia (G), Jordan (G), Kenya (G), Lebanon (G), Lithuania (G), Mauritius (G), Mexico (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Myanmar (G), Nicaragua (G), Pakistan (G),

Panama (G), Peru (G), Romania (G), Rwanda (G), Senegal (G), Singapore (G), Slovenia (G), Sri Lanka (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G), United Kingdom (G), Zimbabwe(G); Bangladesh (E), Canada (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Egypt (E), Gabon (E), Germany (E), Greece (E), Guatemala (E), Jordan (E), Lithuania (E), New Zealand (E), Oman (E), South Africa (E), Spain (E), Sri Lanka (E), Switzerland (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E), Viet Nam (E); Australia (W), Austria (W), Bangladesh (W), Colombia (W), Croatia (W), Cyprus (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), France (W – CFE-CGC), Ghana (W), Ireland (W), Japan (W), Republic of Korea (W), Latvia (W), Lithuania (W x 2), Madagascar (W), Morocco (W), Mozambique (W), Nepal (W), Pakistan (W x 2), Rwanda (W), South Africa (W – FEDUSA), Spain (W), Sri Lanka (W – CWC), Togo (W x 2); Denmark (TP), Estonia (TP), Finland (TP), Kuwait (TP), Malaysia (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP), Slovakia (TP), Sweden (TP), Uganda (TP).

⁵⁴ 104 respondents: 41 governments, 18 employers' organizations, 24 workers' organizations, 21 respondents in tripartite replies. Angola (G), Antigua and Barbuda (G), Argentina (G), Australia (G), Bahamas (G), Bahrain (G), Barbados (G), Belgium (G), China (G), Colombia (G), Costa Rica (G), Côte d'Ivoire (G), Croatia (G), Cyprus (G), Egypt (G), Greece (G), Guyana (G), India (G), Indonesia (G), Jordan (G), Kenya (G), Lithuania (G), Mauritius (G), Mexico (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Myanmar (G), Netherlands (G), Nicaragua (G), Norway (G), Pakistan (G), Panama (G), Peru (G), Portugal (G), Romania (G), Rwanda (G), Senegal (G), Singapore (G), Sri Lanka (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G); Bangladesh (E), Canada (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Egypt (E), Gabon (E), Germany (E), Greece (E), Guatemala (E), Jordan (E), Lithuania (E), South Africa (E), Spain (E), Sri Lanka (E), Switzerland (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E), Viet Nam (E); Australia (W), Austria (W), Bangladesh (W), Colombia (W), Croatia (W), Cyprus (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), France (W – CFE-CGC), Ghana (W), Ireland (W), Republic of Korea (W), Latvia (W), Lithuania (W x 2), Madagascar (W), Malta (W), Morocco (W), Mozambique (W), Nepal (W), Pakistan (W x 2), Rwanda (W), South Africa (W – FEDUSA), Spain (W), Sri Lanka (W – CWC), Togo (W – CSTT); Denmark (TP), Finland (TP), Malaysia (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP), Slovakia (TP), Sweden (TP), Uganda (TP).

⁵⁵ 5 respondents: 1 employers' organization, 4 workers' organizations. Zambia (E); Dominican Republic (W), Madagascar (W), Poland (W – OPZZ), South Africa (W – COSATU).

⁵⁶ 5 respondents: 1 government, 1 employers' organization, 3 workers' organizations. Bulgaria (G); Burkina Faso (E); Brazil (W), Madagascar (W), Poland (W – OPZZ).

⁵⁷ 105 respondents: 41 governments, 18 employers' organizations, 25 workers' organizations, 21 respondents in tripartite replies. Antigua and Barbuda (G), Australia (G), Austria (G), Bahamas (G), Barbados (G), Belgium (G), Brazil (G), Bulgaria (G), China (G) (where unions exist), Colombia (G), Côte d'Ivoire (G), Croatia (G), Cyprus (G) (where unions exist), Egypt (G), Germany (G), Guatemala (G), India (G), Indonesia (G) (where unions exist), Kenya (G), Republic of Korea (G) (where unions exist), Lebanon (G), Lithuania (G), Mauritius (G), Mexico (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Nicaragua (G), Norway (G), Pakistan (G), Portugal (G), Romania (G), Senegal (G), Singapore (G) (where unions exist), Slovenia (G), Sri Lanka (G), Switzerland (G), Thailand (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G), Zimbabwe(G); Barbados (E), Brazil (E), Canada (E) (where unions exist), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Gabon (E), Germany (E), Greece (E), Guatemala (E), Jordan (E), Lithuania (E) (where unions exist), South Africa (E), Spain (E), Sri Lanka (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E), Viet Nam (E) (where unions exist); Australia (W), Austria (W), Bangladesh (W), Barbados (W), (where unions exist), Colombia (W), Croatia (W), Cyprus (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), Dominican Republic (W), France (W – CFE-CGC), Ghana (W), Ireland (W), Republic of Korea (W), Latvia (W) (where unions exist), Malta (W), Mozambique (W), Nepal (W), Pakistan (W x 2), South Africa (W x 2) (where unions exist – FEDUSA), Spain (W), Sri Lanka (W – CWC) (where unions exist), United Republic of Tanzania (W), Togo (W – CSTT); Denmark (TP), Estonia (TP), Finland (TP), Malaysia (TP) (where unions exist), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP), Slovakia (TP) (where unions exist), Uganda (TP).

⁵⁸ 12 respondents: 4 governments, 1 employers' organization, 4 workers' organizations, 3 respondents in tripartite replies. Angola (G), Cape Verde (G), Jordan (G), Rwanda (G); Egypt (E); Madagascar (W), Morocco (W), Portugal (W), Rwanda (W); Kuwait (TP).

⁵⁹ 97 respondents: 35 governments, 18 employers' organizations, 23 workers' organizations, 21 respondents in tripartite replies. Antigua and Barbuda (G), Australia (G), Austria (G), Bahamas (G), Barbados (G), Belgium (G), Brazil (G), Bulgaria (G), China (G) (where unions exist), Colombia (G), Côte d'Ivoire (G), Cyprus (G) (where unions exist), Egypt (G), Germany (G), Guatemala (G), India (G), Indonesia (G) (where unions exist), Italy (G), Jordan (G), Republic of Korea (G) (where unions exist), Lebanon (G), Lithuania (G), Mexico (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Nicaragua (G), Pakistan (G), Romania (G), Singapore (G) (where unions exist), Slovenia (G), Sri Lanka (G), Thailand (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G), Zimbabwe(G); Barbados (E), Brazil (E), Canada (E) (where unions exist), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Gabon (E), Germany (E), Greece (E), Guatemala (E), Jordan (E), Lithuania (E) (where unions exist), Oman (E), South Africa (E), Spain (E), Sri Lanka (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E), Viet Nam (E) (where unions exist); Australia (W), Austria (W), Bangladesh (W), Barbados (W) (where unions exist), Croatia (W), Cyprus (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), Dominican Republic (W), France (W – CFE-CGC), Ghana (W), Ireland (W), Italy (W), Republic of Korea (W), Latvia (W), Malta (W), Mozambique (W), Nepal (W), Pakistan (W x 2), Poland (W – OPZZ), South Africa (W x 2) (where unions exist – FEDUSA), Spain (W), Sri Lanka (W – CWC) (where unions exist), Togo (W – CSTT); Denmark (TP), Estonia (TP), Finland (TP), Malaysia (TP) (where unions exist), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP), Slovakia (TP) (where unions exist), Uganda (TP).

⁶⁰ 13 respondents: 6 governments, 1 employers' organization, 3 workers' organizations, 3 respondents in tripartite replies. Angola (G), Croatia (G), Greece (G), Kenya (G), Lebanon (G), Rwanda (G); Egypt (E); Madagascar (W), Morocco (W), Rwanda (W); Kuwait (TP).

⁶¹ 16 respondents: 13 governments, 3 respondents in tripartite replies. Bahrain (G), Barbados (G), Bulgaria (G), El Salvador (G), India (G), Lithuania (G), Netherlands (G), Norway (G), Panama (G), Peru (G), Slovenia (G), Spain (G), Thailand (G); Finland (TP).

⁶² 19 respondents: 15 governments, 1 employers' organization, 3 respondents in tripartite replies. Bahrain (G), Barbados (G), Bulgaria (G), El Salvador (G), India (G), Lithuania (G), Panama (G), Peru (G), Philippines (G), Portugal (G), Senegal (G), Slovenia (G), Spain (G), Switzerland (G), Thailand (G); Trinidad and Tobago (E); Finland (TP). See also Australia (G), Hungary (TP), Lithuania (G) but see (W – LTUC) (government tolerates wage free zones).

⁶³ 55 respondents: 27 governments, 9 employers' organizations, 10 workers' organizations, 9 respondents in tripartite replies. Argentina (G), Australia (G), Bahamas (G), Bahrain (G), Barbados (G), Belarus (G), Brazil (G), Bulgaria (G), Cape Verde (G), Costa Rica (G), Guyana (G), Italy (G), Jordan (G), Kenya (G), Republic of Korea (G), Mexico (G), Republic of Moldova (G), New Zealand (G), Nicaragua (G), Pakistan (G), Poland (G), Romania (G), Singapore (G), Slovenia (G), Sri Lanka (G), United Kingdom (G), Zimbabwe(G); Bangladesh (E), Barbados (E), Canada (E), Jordan (E), New Zealand (E), South Africa (E), Sri Lanka (E), Switzerland (E), Venezuela (E); Cyprus (W), France (W – CFE-CGC), Ghana (W), Ireland (W), Italy (W), Madagascar (W), Morocco (W), Poland (W – OPZZ), South Africa (W – FEDUSA), Sri Lanka (W – CWC); Estonia (TP), Kuwait (TP), Slovakia (TP).

⁶⁴ 32 respondents: 5 governments, 5 employers' organizations, 13 workers' organizations, 9 respondents in tripartite replies. Antigua and Barbuda (G), Peru (G), Rwanda (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G); Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Greece (E), Turkey (E), Viet Nam (E), Zambia (E), Bangladesh (W), Barbados (W), Croatia (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), Republic of Korea (W), Latvia (W), Malta (W), Nepal (W), Pakistan (W x 2), Peru (W), Spain (W), Togo (W – CSTT); Denmark (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP), Uganda (TP).

⁶⁵ 66 respondents: 26 governments, 16 employers' organizations, 15 workers' organizations, 9 respondents in tripartite replies. Angola (G), Antigua and Barbuda (G), Australia (G), Bahamas (G), Belgium (G), Bulgaria (G), Colombia (G), Costa Rica (G), Croatia (G), Ecuador (G), Egypt (G), El Salvador (G), Italy (G), Jordan (G), Republic of Korea (G), Mauritius (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Myanmar (G), Nicaragua (G), Norway (G), Pakistan (G), Peru (G), Romania (G), Rwanda (G), Singapore (G), Ukraine (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Barbados (E), Brazil (E), Burkina Faso (E), Egypt (E), Germany (E), Jordan (E), Oman (E), South Africa (E), Spain (E), Sri Lanka (E), Togo (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E), Viet Nam (E); Austria (W), Bangladesh (W), Croatia (W), Cyprus (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), Dominican Republic (W), Italy (W), Republic of Korea (W), Latvia (W), Lithuania (W – LPSS), Malta (W), Nepal (W), Pakistan (W –

PLF), Poland (W x 2), Togo (W – CSTT); Kuwait (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP), Slovakia (TP).

⁶⁶ 18 respondents: 8 governments, 1 employers' organization, 9 workers' organizations. Barbados (G), Guyana (G), Kenya (G), Lithuania (G), Philippines (G), Portugal (G), Sri Lanka (G), Zimbabwe (G); Zambia (E); Barbados (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), Dominican Republic (W), Ghana (W), Madagascar (W), Mozambique (W), South Africa (W – FEDUSA), United Republic of Tanzania (W); Togo (W – GSA).

⁶⁷ 14 respondents: 6 governments, 5 workers' organizations, 3 respondents in tripartite replies. Brazil (G), Guatemala (G), Guyana (G), Indonesia (G), Panama (G), Zimbabwe (G); Dominican Republic (W), Ghana (W), Peru (G), Sri Lanka (W – CWC), Turkey (W); Malaysia (TP).

⁶⁸ 13 respondents: 7 governments, 2 employers' organizations, 4 workers' organizations. Remedial measures for OSH problems: Barbados (G), Guyana (G); Ghana (W). Preventive measures for OSH problems: Bangladesh (G), Barbados (G), Bulgaria (G), Philippines (G); Bangladesh (E), Canada (E); Ghana (W), South Africa (W – FEDUSA). Remedial measures for environmental problems: Guyana (G); Ghana (W).

⁶⁹ 100 respondents: 44 governments, 19 employers' organizations, 17 workers' organizations, 20 respondents in tripartite replies. Angola (G), Argentina (G), Bahamas (G), Bangladesh (G), Barbados (G), Belarus (G), Brazil (G), Bulgaria (G), Cape Verde (G), Colombia (G), Costa Rica (G), Croatia (G), Ecuador (G), Egypt (G), El Salvador (G), Germany (G), Greece (G), Guatemala (G), Guyana (G), India (G), Indonesia (G), Jordan (G), Republic of Korea (G), Lebanon (G), Lithuania (G), Mauritius (G), Mexico (G), Myanmar (G), Netherlands (G), New Zealand (G), Nicaragua (G), Norway (G), Pakistan (G), Panama (G), Romania (G), Rwanda (G), Senegal (G), Singapore (G), Sri Lanka (G), Switzerland (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G), United Kingdom (G); Bangladesh (E), Barbados (E), Brazil (E), Canada (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Greece (E), Guatemala (E), Jordan (E), Lithuania (E), New Zealand (E), Oman (E), Spain (E), Switzerland (E), Togo (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E), Viet Nam (E); Australia (W), Austria (W), Bangladesh (W), Barbados (W), Colombia (W), Croatia (W), Cyprus (W), France (W – CFE-CGC), Ghana (W), Ireland (W), Lithuania (W – Unification), Mozambique (W), Pakistan (W x 2), Poland (W – NSZZ), Switzerland (W), United Republic of Tanzania (W), Togo (W – CSTT); Finland (TP), Hungary (TP), Kuwait (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP), Slovakia (TP – government and employers' view), Sweden (TP), Uganda (TP).

⁷⁰ 46 respondents: 15 governments, 8 employers' organizations, 11 workers' organizations, 12 respondents in tripartite replies. Costa Rica (G), Croatia (G), Ecuador (G), Guatemala (G), Guyana (G), Lebanon (G), Lithuania (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Myanmar (G), Pakistan (G), Philippines (G), Romania (G), Senegal (G), Togo (G), Zimbabwe (G); Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Egypt (E), Oman (E), Sri Lanka (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Ukraine (E), Viet Nam (E), Zambia (E); Austria (W), Bangladesh (W), Croatia (W), Ghana (W), Lithuania (W – LPSS), Malta (W), Morocco (W), Mozambique (W), Pakistan (W x 2), Sri Lanka (W – CWC), Togo (W – CSTT); Estonia (TP), Hungary (TP), Malaysia (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP).

⁷¹ 31 respondents: 15 governments, 7 employers' organizations, 3 workers' organizations, 6 respondents in tripartite replies. Angola (G), Bulgaria (G), Colombia (G), Côte d'Ivoire (G), Egypt (G), El Salvador (G), Greece (G), Italy (G), Jordan (G), Republic of Korea (G), Netherlands (G), Panama (G), Thailand (G), Turkey (G), United Kingdom (G); Germany (E), Guatemala (E), Jordan (E), Lithuania (E), South Africa (E), Togo (E), Turkey (E); Cyprus (W), Italy (W), Nepal (W); Denmark (TP), Kuwait (TP).

⁷² 39 respondents: 23 governments, 11 employers' organizations, 13 workers' organizations, 18 respondents in tripartite replies. Bangladesh (G), Barbados (G), Brazil (G), Colombia (G), Costa Rica (G), Ecuador (G), Guatemala (G), Guyana (G) (where unions exist), Jordan (G), Republic of Korea (G), Mexico (G), Netherlands (G), New Zealand (G), Nicaragua (G), Norway (G), Pakistan (G), Peru (G) (where unions exist), Philippines (G) (where unions exist), Singapore (G) (where unions exist), Spain (G), Thailand (G), Ukraine (G), Zimbabwe (G); Bangladesh (E), Barbados (E), Brazil (E), Guatemala (E), Jordan (E), New Zealand (E), Spain (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E),

Viet Nam (E) (where unions exist), Zambia (E); Australia (W), Bangladesh (W), Barbados (W), Colombia (W), Croatia (W), Ghana (W), Latvia (W), Mozambique (W), Pakistan (W – NLFP), Peru (W), Poland (W – OPZZ), Spain (W), Sri Lanka (W – CWC); Denmark (TP), Estonia (TP), Hungary (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP), Slovakia (TP) (where unions exist), Uganda (TP).

⁷³ 60 respondents: 27 governments, 13 employers' organizations, 14 workers' organizations, 6 respondents in tripartite replies. Angola (G), Antigua and Barbuda (G), Argentina (G), Australia (G), Bahrain (G), Barbados (G), China (G), Colombia (G), Costa Rica (G), Cyprus (G), Egypt (G), Guyana (G), Japan (G), Kenya (G), Republic of Korea (G), Lithuania (G), Mexico (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Netherlands (G), New Zealand (G), Norway (G), Pakistan (G), Senegal (G), Sri Lanka (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Zimbabwe (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Barbados (E), Belgium (E), Canada (E), Gabon (E), Germany (E), Jordan (E), Spain (E), Switzerland (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E), Viet Nam (E); Australia (W), Belgium (W), Cyprus (W), France (W – CFE-CGC), Ghana (W), Israel (W), Italy (W), Latvia (W), Malta (W), Peru (G), Poland (W – NSZZ), South Africa (W – COSATU), Spain (W), Togo (W – CSTT); Malaysia (TP), Sweden (TP).

⁷⁴ 33 respondents: 6 governments, 7 employers' organizations, 8 workers' organizations, 12 respondents in tripartite replies. Austria (G), Bangladesh (G), Costa Rica (G), Indonesia (G), Singapore (G) (in some instances), Switzerland (G); Bangladesh (E), Egypt (E), Greece (E), South Africa (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E) (in some cases), Venezuela (E), Zambia (E); Bangladesh (W), Croatia (W), Dominican Republic (W), Morocco (W), Nepal (W), Pakistan (W – NLFP), Poland (W – OPZZ), South Africa (W – FEDUSA); Estonia (TP), Hungary (TP) (better or same), Kuwait (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP).

⁷⁵ 104 respondents: 46 governments, 20 employers' organizations, 14 workers' organizations, 24 respondents in tripartite replies. Argentina (G), Australia (G), Austria (G), Bahamas (G), Bangladesh (G), Barbados (G), Brazil (G), Bulgaria (G), Cape Verde (G), China (G), Costa Rica (G), Cyprus (G), Egypt (G), El Salvador (G), Germany (G), Guatemala (G), Guyana (G), Indonesia (G), Japan (G), Jordan (G), Kenya (G), Republic of Korea (G), Mauritius (G), Mexico (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Myanmar (G), Netherlands (G), New Zealand (G), Nicaragua (G), Pakistan (G), Panama (G), Peru (G), Philippines (G), Portugal (G), Romania (G), Rwanda (G), Senegal (G), Singapore (G), Slovenia (G), Sri Lanka (G), Switzerland (G), Thailand (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G), Zimbabwe (G); Bangladesh (E), Barbados (E), Brazil (E), Burkina Faso (E), Canada (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Egypt (E), Gabon (E), Germany (E), Greece (E), Guatemala (E), Jordan (E), South Africa (E), Spain (E), Sri Lanka (E), Switzerland (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Turkey (E), Venezuela (E), Zambia (E); Australia (W), Austria (W), Barbados (W), Croatia (W), Cyprus (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), France (W – CGC), Lithuania (W – Unification), Malta (W), Morocco (W), Poland (W – NSZZ), Rwanda (W), South Africa (W x 2), Switzerland (W); Denmark (TP), Estonia (TP), Finland (TP), Kuwait (TP), Malaysia (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP), Slovakia (TP), Uganda (TP).

⁷⁶ 104 respondents: 47 governments, 21 employers' organizations, 15 workers' organizations, 21 respondents in tripartite replies. Angola (G), Antigua and Barbuda (G), Argentina (G), Australia (G), Austria (G), Bahamas (G), Bangladesh (G), Barbados (G), Brazil (G), Bulgaria (G), Cape Verde (G), China (G), Costa Rica (G), Cyprus (G), Egypt (G), El Salvador (G), Germany (G), Guatemala (G), Guyana (G), Indonesia (G), Japan (G), Jordan (G), Kenya (G), Republic of Korea (G), Mauritius (G), Mexico (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Myanmar (G), Netherlands (G), New Zealand (G), Nicaragua (G), Pakistan (G), Panama (G), Peru (G), Philippines (G), Portugal (G), Romania (G), Senegal (G), Singapore (G), Slovenia (G), Sri Lanka (G), Switzerland (G), Thailand (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G), Zimbabwe (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Bangladesh (E), Barbados (E), Brazil (E), Burkina Faso (E), Canada (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Egypt (E), Gabon (E), Germany (E), Greece (E), Guatemala (E), Jordan (E), South Africa (E), Spain (E), Sri Lanka (E), Switzerland (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Turkey (E), Venezuela (E), Zambia (E); Angola (W), Australia (W), Austria (W), Barbados (W), Croatia (W), Cyprus (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), France (W – CFE-CGC), Republic of Korea (W), Lithuania (W – Unification), Malta (W), Morocco (W), Poland (W – NSZZ), Rwanda (W), South Africa (W x 2), Switzerland (W); Denmark (TP), Finland (TP), Kuwait (TP), Malaysia (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP), Slovakia (TP), Uganda (TP).

⁷⁷ 7 respondents: 7 workers' organizations. Dominican Republic (W), Ghana (W), Pakistan (W – NLFP), Panama (W), Peru (W), Sri Lanka (W – CWC), United Republic of Tanzania (W).

⁷⁸ 5 respondents: 5 workers' organizations. Ghana (W), Pakistan (W – NLFP), Panama (W), Peru (W), Sri Lanka (W – CWC).

⁷⁹ 60 respondents: 21 governments, 12 employers' organizations, 9 workers' organizations, 18 respondents in tripartite replies. Angola (G), Antigua and Barbuda (G), Bangladesh (G), China (G), Colombia (G), Cyprus (G), El Salvador (G), Guatemala (G), Indonesia (G), Jordan (G), Republic of Korea (G), Lithuania (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Netherlands (G), Pakistan (G), Panama (G), Singapore (G), Sri Lanka (G), Thailand (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Barbados (E), Brazil (E), Egypt (E), Gabon (E), Greece (E), Guatemala (E), Jordan (E), Lithuania (E), South Africa (E), Sri Lanka (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Turkey (E); Bangladesh (W), Barbados (W), Croatia (W), France (W – CGC), Ghana (W), Ireland (W), South Africa (W – FEDUSA), Sri Lanka (W – CWC), Togo (W – CSTT); Denmark (TP), Estonia (TP), Kuwait (TP), Malaysia (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP), Slovakia (TP).

⁸⁰ 19 respondents: 3 governments, 2 employers' organizations, 10 workers' organizations, 4 respondents in tripartite replies. Ecuador (G), Guyana (G), Zimbabwe (G); Belgium (E), Zambia (E); Belgium (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), Dominican Republic (W), Republic of Korea (W), Latvia (W), Lithuania (W – Unification), Morocco (W), Pakistan (W x 2), Poland (W x 2), United Republic of Tanzania (W); Sweden (TP – workers' view), Uganda (TP).

⁸¹ 21 respondents: 7 governments, 1 employers' organization, 7 workers' organizations, 6 respondents in tripartite replies. Austria (G), Bahamas (G), Barbados (G), Bulgaria (G), Costa Rica (G), Nicaragua (G), Philippines (G); Venezuela (E); Austria (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), Mozambique (W), Nepal (W), Panama (W), Poland (W x 2), Spain (W); Finland (TP), Hungary (TP). Austria (G), Barbados (G), Costa Rica (G), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), Finland (TP), Hungary (TP – workers' view), Nepal (W), Philippines (G) (“incredulous financial statements” indicating a deteriorating financial position), Poland (W x 2), Bulgaria (G), certain sectors negative: Australia (W), Austria (W), Costa Rica (G). See also France (W – CFE-CGC) (generally MNEs respond positively but only a start of operations in the country).

⁸² 57 respondents: 25 governments, 9 employers' organizations, 5 workers' organizations, 18 respondents in tripartite replies. Bahamas (G), Bahrain (G), Bangladesh (G), Barbados (G), Colombia (G), Costa Rica (G), Cyprus (G), Ecuador (G), El Salvador (G), Guatemala (G), Indonesia (G), Jordan (G), Kenya (G), Lithuania (G), Mexico (G), Netherlands (G), Pakistan (G), Panama (G), Peru (G), Senegal (G), Singapore (G), Sri Lanka (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Zimbabwe(G); Bangladesh (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Gabon (E), Jordan (E), South Africa (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Turkey (E), Venezuela (E), Viet Nam (E); Bangladesh (W), Barbados (W), Pakistan (W – PLF), South Africa (W . FEDUSA), Spain (W); Denmark (TP), Estonia (TP), Finland (TP), Hungary (TP), Malaysia (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP).

⁸³ 78 respondents: 38 governments, 15 employers' organizations, 10 workers' organizations, 15 respondents in tripartite replies. Antigua and Barbuda (G), Australia (G), Bahrain (G), Bangladesh (G), Barbados (G), Brazil (G), China (G), Colombia (G), Costa Rica (G), Ecuador (G), Egypt (G), Guatemala (G), Guyana (G), Indonesia (G), Jordan (G), Kenya (G), Republic of Korea (G), Lithuania (G), Mauritius (G), Mexico (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Netherlands (G), New Zealand (G), Nicaragua (G), Pakistan (G), Panama (G), Philippines (G), Romania (G), Senegal (G), Singapore (G), Slovenia (G), Spain (G), Sri Lanka (G), Thailand (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G), Zimbabwe(G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Bangladesh (E), Barbados (E), Brazil (E), Jordan (E), Lithuania (E), South Africa (E), Spain (E), Sri Lanka (E), Togo (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E), Viet Nam (E), Zambia (E); Belgium (W), Croatia (W), Cyprus (W), Latvia (W), Morocco (W), Peru (W), Poland (W x 2), South Africa (W – FEDUSA), United Republic of Tanzania (W), Togo (W – GSA); Estonia (TP), Malaysia (TP), Slovakia (TP), Sweden (TP), Uganda (TP).

⁸⁴ 18 respondents: 5 governments, 7 workers' organizations, 6 respondents in tripartite replies. Bulgaria (G), Peru (G), Portugal (G), Rwanda (G), Switzerland (G); Australia (W), Barbados (W),

Dominican Republic (W), Lithuania (W – Centre), Malta (W), Pakistan (W x 2), Rwanda (W); Denmark (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP).

⁸⁵ 69 respondents: 26 governments, 16 employers' organizations, 12 workers' organizations, 15 respondents in tripartite replies. Angola (G), Bahamas (G), Bahrain (G), Brazil (G), Bulgaria (G), China (G), Colombia (G), Costa Rica (G), Cyprus (G), Guyana (G), Italy (G), Jordan (G), Kenya (G), Republic of Korea (G), Mauritius (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Netherlands (G), New Zealand (G), Pakistan (G), Peru (G), Romania (G), Rwanda (G), Singapore (G), Sri Lanka (G), Togo (G), Zimbabwe (G); Bangladesh (E), Brazil (E), Burkina Faso (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Egypt (E), Gabon (E), Germany (E), Greece (E), Guatemala (E), Japan (E), Jordan (E), Switzerland (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Turkey (E), Venezuela (E), Zambia (E); Bangladesh (W), Croatia (W), Cyprus (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), Ghana (W), Italy (W), Latvia (W), Morocco (W), Nepal (W), Sri Lanka (W – CWC), United Republic of Tanzania (W), Togo (W – CSTT); Denmark (TP), Hungary (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP), Slovakia (TP), Uganda (TP).

⁸⁶ 39 respondents: 11 governments, 5 employers' organizations, 20 workers' organizations, 3 respondents in tripartite replies. Antigua and Barbuda (G), Belgium (G), Bulgaria (G), Guyana (G), Lithuania (G), Philippines (G – reporting workers' view), Senegal (G), Sri Lanka (G), Switzerland (G), Thailand (G), United Kingdom (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Barbados (E), Guatemala (E), Lithuania (E), Viet Nam (E); Australia (W), Bangladesh (W), Cameroon (W), Colombia (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), Dominican Republic (W), France (W – CGT), Ireland (W), Japan (W), Republic of Korea (W), Lithuania (W – Centre), Madagascar (W), Mozambique (W), Panama (W), Portugal (W), Rwanda (W), Spain (W), United Republic of Tanzania (W), Togo (W – GSA), United States (W); Finland (TP).

⁸⁷ 77 respondents: 28 governments, 14 employers' organizations, 11 workers' organizations, 24 respondents in tripartite replies. Angola (G), Australia (G), Bahamas (G), Bahrain (G), Cape Verde (G), China (G), Colombia (G), Costa Rica (G), Côte d'Ivoire (G), Cyprus (G), Egypt (G), Indonesia (G), Jordan (G), Kenya (G), Republic of Korea (G), Mauritius (G), Myanmar (G), Netherlands (G), New Zealand (G), Pakistan (G), Panama (G), Peru (G), Rwanda (G), Singapore (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G), Zimbabwe (G); Belgium (E), Brazil (E), Burkina Faso (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Egypt (E), Gabon (E), Germany (E), Greece (E), Jordan (E), Switzerland (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E), Zambia (E); Belgium (W), Cyprus (W), Ghana (W), Latvia (W), Malta (W), Morocco (W), Nepal (W), Poland (W x 2), South Africa (W – FEDUSA), Sri Lanka (W – CWC), Togo (W – CSTT); Denmark (TP), Estonia (TP), Hungary (TP), Kuwait (TP), Malaysia (TP), Saint Vincent and Grenadines (TP), Slovakia (TP), Uganda (TP),

⁸⁸ 54 respondents: 22 governments, 14 employers' organizations, 3 workers' organizations, 15 respondents in tripartite replies. Antigua and Barbuda (G), Bahamas (G), Bangladesh (G), Colombia (G), Guatemala (G), Guyana (G), Indonesia (G), Italy (G), Jordan (G), Kenya (G), Lebanon (G), Mexico (G), Nicaragua (G), Peru (G), Philippines (G), Portugal (G), Romania (G), Senegal (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G), Zimbabwe (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Bangladesh (E), Egypt (E), Germany (E), Japan (E), South Africa (E), Sri Lanka (E), Jordan (E), Togo (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E), Viet Nam (E); Brazil (W), Cameroon (W), Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), Italy (W), Lithuania (W x 2), Mexico (W), Nepal (W), Pakistan (W – PLF), Poland (W x 2), South Africa (W – FEDUSA), Spain (W), Sri Lanka (W – CWC), United Republic of Tanzania (W), Togo (W – CSTT); Denmark (TP), Finland (TP), Hungary (TP), Malaysia (TP), Slovakia (TP).

⁸⁹ 40 respondents: 12 governments, 6 employers' organizations, 13 workers' organizations, 9 respondents in tripartite replies. Bahrain (G), Barbados (G), Ecuador (G), India (G), Republic of Korea (G), Lithuania (G), Mauritius (G), New Zealand (G), Panama (G), Rwanda (G), Slovenia (G), Sri Lanka (G); Barbados (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Greece (E), Guatemala (E), Lithuania (E), Zambia (E); Australia (W), Bangladesh (W), Croatia (W), Cyprus (W), Dominican Republic (W), Ireland (W), Republic of Korea (W), Latvia (W), Malta (W), Morocco (W), Mozambique (W), Rwanda (W), Switzerland (W); Kuwait (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP), Uganda (TP).

⁹⁰ Tripartite activities: 32 respondents: 10 governments, 4 employers' organizations, 3 workers' organizations, 15 respondents in tripartite replies. Antigua and Barbuda (G), Bahamas (G),

Colombia (G), Indonesia (G), Italy (G), Jordan (G), Mexico (G), Philippines (G), Romania (G), Senegal (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Jordan (E), Togo (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E); Italy (W), Mexico (W), Pakistan (W – PLF); Denmark (TP), Finland (TP), Hungary (TP), Malaysia (TP), Slovakia (TP). Government activities: 19 respondents: 10 governments, 1 employers' organization, 5 workers' organizations, 3 respondents in tripartite replies. Kenya (G), Lebanon (G), Nicaragua (G), Peru (G), Portugal (G), Romania (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G), Zimbabwe (G); Turkey (E); Brazil (W), Cameroon (W), Nepal (W), Pakistan (W – NLF), Togo (W – CSTT); Estonia (TP). Employer activities: 10 respondents: 1 government, 9 employers' organizations: Bangladesh (G); Bangladesh (E), Egypt (E), Germany (E), Japan (E), South Africa (E), Sri Lanka (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E), Viet Nam (E). Worker activities: 9 respondents: 2 governments, 7 workers' organizations: Guatemala (G), Guyana (G); Democratic Republic of the Congo (W), Lithuania (W x 2), Poland (W x 2), South Africa (W – FEDUSA), Spain (W), Sri Lanka (W – CWC), United Republic of Tanzania (W).

⁹¹ 85 respondents: 41 governments, 14 employers' organizations, 15 workers' organizations, 15 respondents in tripartite replies. Antigua and Barbuda (G), Argentina (G), Austria (G), Bahamas (G), Bangladesh (G), Belarus (G), Brazil (G), Bulgaria (G), Cape Verde (G), Costa Rica (G), Cyprus (G), Ecuador (G), Egypt (G), El Salvador (G), Germany (G), Guatemala (G), Indonesia (G), Jordan (G), Kenya (G), Republic of Korea (G), Lithuania (G), Mauritius (G), Mexico (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Myanmar (G), Nicaragua (G), Norway (G), Pakistan (G), Panama (G), Philippines (G), Poland (G), Portugal (G), Romania (G), Senegal (G), Slovenia (G), Sri Lanka (G), Thailand (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G), Zimbabwe (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Bangladesh (E), Barbados (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Greece (E), Guatemala (E), Lithuania (E), Sri Lanka (E), Togo (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E), Viet Nam (E); Bangladesh (W), Cameroon (W), Dominican Republic (W), Ghana (W), Ireland (W), Latvia (W), Madagascar (W), Mexico (W), Mozambique (W), Pakistan (W – NLFP), Poland (W – OPZZ), Sri Lanka (W x 2), United Republic of Tanzania (W), Togo (W – CSTT), Turkey (W); Estonia (TP), Hungary (TP), Kuwait (TP), Malaysia (TP), Slovakia (TP). Five of these indicated that the law provided for the operation of EPZs but no such zones were currently operating: Antigua and Barbuda (G) and (E), Lithuania (G) and (E), Sri Lanka (G).

⁹² 57 respondents: 27 governments, 10 employers' organizations, 8 workers' organizations, 12 respondents in tripartite replies. Antigua and Barbuda (G), Argentina (G), Austria (G), Bahamas (G), Belarus (G), Brazil (G), Bulgaria (G), Cape Verde (G), El Salvador (G), Germany (G), Guatemala (G), Indonesia (G), Jordan (G), Lithuania (G), Mexico (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Myanmar (G), Nicaragua (G), Pakistan (G), Philippines (G), Poland (G), Portugal (G), Romania (G), Slovenia (G), Sri Lanka (G), Thailand (G), Togo (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Bangladesh (E), Barbados (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Greece (E), Guatemala (E), Lithuania (E), Sri Lanka (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Viet Nam (E); Barbados (W), Cyprus (W), Ghana (W), Ireland (W), Latvia (W), Madagascar (W), Poland (W – OPZZ), Sri Lanka (W x 2); Hungary (TP), Kuwait (TP), Malaysia (TP), Slovakia (TP).

⁹³ 24 respondents: 13 governments, 3 employers' organizations, 8 workers' organizations. Costa Rica (G), Ecuador (G), Egypt (G), Jordan (G), Kenya (G), Mauritius (G), Norway (G), Panama (G), Peru (G), Senegal (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G), Zimbabwe (G); Togo (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E); Bangladesh (W), Dominican Republic (W), Mozambique (W), Pakistan (W – NLFP), Panama (W), United Republic of Tanzania (W), Togo (W – CSTT), Turkey (W).

⁹⁴ 46 respondents: 20 governments, 9 employers' organizations, 8 workers' organizations, 9 respondents in tripartite replies. Argentina (G), Austria (G), Brazil (G), Cape Verde (G), Colombia (G), Costa Rica (G), Ecuador (G), El Salvador (G), Guatemala (G), Republic of Korea (G), Lithuania (G), Mauritius (G), Republic of Moldova (G), Nicaragua (G), Pakistan (G), Romania (G), Senegal (G), Slovenia (G), Thailand (G), Ukraine (G); Bangladesh (E), Barbados (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Lithuania (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E), Viet Nam (E); Barbados (W), Cyprus (W), Ghana (W), Ireland (W), Madagascar (W), Mexico (W), Poland (W – OPZZ), Turkey (W); Hungary (TP), Kuwait (TP), Malaysia (TP).

⁹⁵ 45 respondents: 18 governments, 9 employers' organizations, 6 workers' organizations, 12 respondents in tripartite replies. Argentina (G), Austria (G), Brazil (G), Costa Rica (G), Ecuador (G), El Salvador (G), Guatemala (G), Lithuania (G), Mauritius (G), Nicaragua (G), Pakistan (G), Philippines (G), Romania (G), Slovenia (G), Thailand (G), Togo (G), Ukraine (G); Barbados (E),

Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Lithuania (E), Togo (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E), Viet Nam (E); Cyprus (W), Dominican Republic (W), Ghana (W), Ireland (W), Madagascar (W), Mexico (W); Hungary (TP), Kuwait (TP), Malaysia (TP), Slovakia (TP).

⁹⁶ 15 respondents: 6 governments, 1 employers' organization, 8 workers' organizations. Egypt (G), India (G), Jordan (G) (no unions in EPZs but workers may join existing unions elsewhere), Kenya (G), Panama (G), Zimbabwe (G) (under review); Jordan (E) (concurring with (G)); Bangladesh (W), Colombia (W) (not public employees), Mozambique (W), Pakistan (W x 2), Panama (W), United Republic of Tanzania (W), Togo (W – GSA), Turkey (W).

⁹⁷ 10 respondents: 4 governments, 6 workers' organizations. Egypt (G), India (G), Panama (G), Zimbabwe (G); Bangladesh (W), Colombia (W) (not public employees), Mozambique (W), Pakistan (W x 2), Panama (W), United Republic of Tanzania (W).

⁹⁸ 50 respondents: 26 governments, 8 employers' organizations, 4 workers' organizations, 12 respondents in tripartite replies. Argentina (G), Bahamas (G), Brazil (G), Bulgaria (G), Cape Verde (G), Colombia (G), Costa Rica (G), Côte d'Ivoire (G), Ecuador (G), Egypt (G), El Salvador (G), Guatemala (G), Kenya (G), Republic of Korea (G), Lithuania (G), Myanmar (G), Nicaragua (G), Pakistan (G), Poland (G), Portugal (G), Romania (G), Senegal (G), Slovenia (G), Sri Lanka (G), Thailand (G), Zimbabwe (G); Bangladesh (E), Barbados (E), Brazil (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Lithuania (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Venezuela (E), Viet Nam (E); Barbados (W), Cyprus (W), Ireland (W), Poland (W – OPZZ); Hungary (TP), Kuwait (TP), Malaysia (TP), Slovakia (TP).

⁹⁹ 10 respondents: 1 government, 9 workers' organizations. India (G – reporting workers' view), Bangladesh (W) (no right to organize and bargain collectively on terms and conditions of employment; violation of constitution; lack of fundamental human rights and employment security; lack of social security measures and inadequate OSH facilities), Cameroon (W), Dominican Republic (W), Ghana (W), Madagascar (W) (limit workers' rights), Pakistan (W – NLF) (obviously limit basic trade union rights) (W – PLF) (limit the rights of worker), Panama (W), Sri Lanka (W – CWC) (“curb” the rights of workers), Togo (W – CSTT) (“seriously limit” fundamental human rights, basic trade union rights, employment security, equality of treatment and other rights of workers).

¹⁰⁰ 3 respondents: 3 governments. Costa Rica (G): with reference to para. 20 (there are various programmes which seek to expand the links between national enterprises and MNEs); para. 26 (enterprises which plan changes in their operations for any reason which may affect their employees must fulfil certain obligations such as give notice in the country's press and PROCOMER (the government agency administering EPZs)); para. 30 (some MNEs play an active role, along with other enterprises, government representatives and academic bodies, in programmes designed to improve the quality of training), Ecuador (G) (as CONAZOFRA, a council created to implement any necessary modifications to the law of free zones, is in its formative stage, questions on the paragraphs cannot be answered precisely), Nicaragua (G): para. 52 (Government does not a registry of cases relevant to this paragraph). A few respondents noted paragraphs of the Declaration but not in the context of EPZs. E.g., Peru (G).

¹⁰¹ *Privatization*: 20 respondents: 6 governments, 11 workers' organizations, 3 respondents in tripartite replies. Colombia (G), Guatemala (G), Pakistan (G), Panama (G), Togo (G), Zimbabwe (G); Australia (W), Croatia (W), Dominican Republic (W), Madagascar (W), Nepal (W), Poland (W – OPZZ), Rwanda (W), South Africa (W – FEDUSA), Sri Lanka (W – CWC), United Republic of Tanzania (W), Togo (W – CSTT); Uganda (TP). *Deregulation*: 10 respondents: 3 governments, 1 employers' organization, 3 workers' organizations, 3 respondents in tripartite replies. Cyprus (G), Mexico (G), Zimbabwe (G); Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Dominican Republic (W), Germany (W), Madagascar (W); Uganda (TP).

¹⁰² 17 respondents: 6 governments, 4 employers' organization, 4 workers' organizations, 3 respondents in tripartite replies. Guatemala (G), Republic of Korea (G), Mauritius (G), Senegal (G), Togo (G), Ukraine (G); Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Guatemala (E), Jordan (E), Ukraine

(E); Panama (W), Poland (W – OPZZ), United Republic of Tanzania (W), Togo (W – CSTT); Malaysia (TP).

¹⁰³ 94 respondents: 38 governments, 17 employers' organizations, 18 workers' organizations, 21 respondents in tripartite replies. Angola (G), Antigua and Barbuda (G), Australia (G), Austria (G), Bahamas (G), Bahrain (G), Colombia (G), Côte d'Ivoire (G), Ecuador (G), El Salvador (G), Guatemala (G), Guyana (G), India (G), Jordan (G), Kenya (G), Republic of Korea (G), Lithuania (G), Mauritius (G), Mexico (G), Myanmar (G), New Zealand (G), Nicaragua (G), Pakistan (G), Panama (G), Peru (G), Philippines (G), Portugal (G), Romania (G), Rwanda (G), Senegal (G), Singapore (G), Slovenia (G), Sri Lanka (G), Switzerland (G), Togo (G), Turkey (G), Ukraine (G), Zimbabwe (G); Antigua and Barbuda (E), Barbados (E), Burkina Faso (E), Democratic Republic of the Congo (E), Egypt (E), Gabon (E), Germany (E), Greece (E), Guatemala (E), Jordan (E), South Africa (E), Togo (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E), Turkey (E), Ukraine (E), Venezuela (E), Viet Nam (E); Australia (W), Barbados (W), Cyprus (W), Dominican Republic (W), Ghana (W), Ireland (W), Latvia (W), Lithuania (W – LPSS), Malta (W), Nepal (W), Pakistan W – PLF), Poland (W x 2), Portugal (W), South Africa (W – FEDUSA), Spain (W), Switzerland (W), United Republic of Tanzania (W), Togo (W x 2); Denmark (TP), Estonia (TP), Hungary (TP), Kuwait (TP), Malaysia (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP), Uganda (TP).

¹⁰⁴ 47 respondents: 17 governments, 7 employers' organizations, 8 workers' organizations, 15 respondents in tripartite replies. Bahamas (G), Bahrain (G), Guyana (G), India (G), Jordan (G), Kenya (G), Republic of Korea (G), Lithuania (G), Mauritius (G), Pakistan (G), Philippines (G), Romania (G), Senegal (G), Singapore (G), Slovenia (G), Sri Lanka (G), Zimbabwe (G); Barbados (E), Egypt (E), Gabon (E), Germany (E), Greece (E), Jordan (E), Trinidad and Tobago (E); Barbados (W), Cyprus (W), Ghana (W), Malta (W), Nepal (W), Poland (W – OPZZ), South Africa (W – FEDUSA), United Republic of Tanzania (W); Estonia (TP), Hungary (TP), Kuwait (TP), Malaysia (TP), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (TP).