

Japan

Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87) (ratification: 1965)

Previous comment

The Committee notes the following observations concerning matters addressed in this comment, as well as the Government's replies thereto: the observations of the Japanese Trade Union Confederation (JTUC-RENGO) and of the Japan Business Federation (Nippon Keidanren), transmitted with the Government's report; the observations of the Rentai Union Suginami, the Rentai Workers' Union, Itabashi-ku Section, the Apaken Kobe (Casual/Temporary/Part-time Non-regular Workers' Union) and the Union Rakuda (Kyoto Municipality Related Workers' Independent Union), received on 1 September 2024. The Committee notes the observations of the International Organisation of Employers (IOE), received on 30 August 2024. Finally, the Committee notes the observations of the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC), received on 17 September 2024, and the reply of the Government thereto.

Follow-up to the conclusions of the Committee on the Application of Standards (International Labour Conference, 112th Session, June 2024)

The Committee notes the discussion that took place in the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards (hereinafter the Conference Committee) in June 2024 concerning the application of the Convention. In its conclusions, the Conference Committee requested the Government to consider, in line with the Convention and in consultation with employers' and workers' organizations: (i) further improvements of the status and labour conditions of firefighters; (ii) what categories of prison officers are considered part of the police, thus exempted from the right to organize, and those categories that are not considered part of the police, and having the right to organize; and (iii) with regard to public service employees: (a) ensure that the National Personnel Authority (NPA) procedures guarantee effective, impartial and speedy conciliation and arbitration procedures; (b) continue to examine carefully the autonomous labour-employer relations system and seek solution to the various obstacles to it, in line with the Convention; and (c) review the Local Public Service Act and any other related legislation to ensure that local public sector workers enjoy the rights and guarantees set out in the Convention.

Article 2 of the Convention. Right to organize of firefighting personnel. The Committee recalls its long-standing comments concerning the need to recognize the right to organize for firefighting personnel. For more than two decades, the Government has been referring to the operation of the Fire Defence Personnel Committee (FDPC) system, which it presented as an alternative to the right to organize. The role of the FDPC was to examine proposals on working conditions of personnel and to submit its conclusions to the chief of the fire department. Surveys directed to fire defence headquarters are regularly conducted to gather information on the deliberations and results of the FDPC. In its report, the Government refers to specific surveys, conducted in 2022 and 2023, aimed at assessing the operation of the FDPC system and seeking improvement. The Government also reports that, in July 2024, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications (MIC) held the twelfth consultation with the workers' representatives to discuss the issues related to the FDPC system, based on the results of the survey on the FDPC's operational status and recent efforts to improve the operation of the system. On this occasion, the MIC explained that it would conduct further analysis of the operational status, hold interviews with some fire departments and conduct a survey with new items. The MIC intends to work to streamline the operation of the system. The Government adds that through the FDPC system, about 40 per cent of the opinions which have been deliberated were decided as "appropriate to be implemented", and about 50 per cent or more of them have been realized. Those opinions are urgent needs of the fire defence personnel such as requests for countermeasures for harassment and

establishment of Epidemic Prevention Work Allowance, which is paid to ambulance team members and others engaged in work to deal with COVID-19. The Government intends to continue to have social dialogue with social partners regularly and to strive for mutual understanding on the FDPC system.

The Committee notes the views of the IOE and of Nippon Keidanren that it can be argued that the firefighting service in Japan, which is responsible for dealing with natural disasters, is of similar importance for the protection of people's lives, health and property as the police in a narrower sense, given the frequent natural disasters in Japan. The organizations argue that the reasons in favour of excluding the police and armed forces from the scope of the Convention apply equally to the fire service in Japan. The IOE encourages the Government to continue to pursue an approach that combines compliance with the requirements of the Convention as well as with its specific national needs and suggests to the Government to seek further guidance and ideas from good practice in other countries with similar systems and needs.

According to the ITUC, the idea that the Government can just categorize firefighters or other public servants as police or having a command or rank structure or as gun-holding personnel to exclude them from the guarantees provided by the Convention is arbitrary and inconsistent with the scope of the Convention. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the basic functions of the Japanese police include, for example, the authority to investigate crimes, the authority to make arrests, and the carrying and use of weapons for these purposes. Firefighters do not have these powers. They are emergency workers and, to that extent, peace officers. This is the same for a majority of prison officers. Therefore, the way the Government is treating these categories of workers for the purposes of the right to organize is discriminatory. The justification for any limitations on this enabling right must find grounds in *Article 9* of the Convention. In the absence of this justification, the default position should be that, in accordance with their legitimate expectation, firefighters and public servants can form or join a trade union of their choice – with any necessary limitations arising from their functions. The ITUC invites the Government to recognize that during the spread of the COVID-19 pandemic, the personnel involved in emergency services showed a high sense of mission and a high level of professionalism to protect the lives of patients without regard for the risk of infection to themselves and their families. The idea that these colleagues will be less patriotic or professional if they exercise their right to organize cannot be further from the truth and the reality. Their professionalism only increased their popularity among the population and created a real leverage for the improvement of their rights. The sanitary crisis during the COVID-19 pandemic led to worsened working conditions for emergency personnel, particularly the ambulance services. Despite clear proposals gathered from the first-responder firefighters, their organization was unable to engage with management on urgent remedial measures in the absence of a system where labour and management could cooperate. The Government has also provided information regarding the use of the FDPC system, even during the COVID crisis which enabled the review of about 5,000 opinions per year – of which 40 per cent are considered appropriate for implementation. The ITUC is of the view that soliciting opinions is not the same as having the right to be consulted or to negotiate.

The JTUC-RENGO is of the view that after the Noto Peninsula Earthquake that occurred in January 2024, the firefighting organizations established a wide-area emergency and support system, such as lifesaving and rescue operations, more rapidly than the police and the Self-Defense Forces. This is due to the high sense of mission of firefighters enabling the immediate nationwide emergency system and is completely unrelated to the approval or disapproval of the right to organize. The FDPC requires the lengthy procedures of “submission of opinions, summarizing of opinions, deliberations, report to the Fire Chief and the Fire Chief’s judgment, budget request to the head of the municipality and relevant departments, and final adjustment”, and the Government has done nothing to respond to this. The FDPC cannot stand as a compensatory measure for the right to organize.

The Committee is bound to recall its regularly expressed view that the implementation policy for the FDPC remains distinct from the recognition of the right to organize under *Article 2* of the Convention.

It notes that views remain divergent between the Government and the workers' organizations on the meaningfulness of the consultations held under the FDPC system and notes with **regret** that no progress was made towards bringing positions closer together on the right to organize of firefighting personnel. **The Committee expresses its firm expectation that continuing consultations with the social partners and other stakeholders concerned will contribute to further progress towards ensuring the right of firefighting personnel to form and join an organization of their own choosing to defend their occupational interests. The Committee requests the Government to provide detailed information on developments in this regard.**

Right to organize of prison staff. The Committee recalls its long-standing comments concerning the need to recognize the right to organize of prison staff. The Committee notes that the Government recalls its position that prison officers are included in the police, that this view was accepted by the Committee on Freedom of Association in its 12th and 54th Reports, and that granting the right to organize to the personnel of penal institutions would pose difficulty for the appropriate performance of their duties and the proper maintenance of discipline and order in the penal institutions, especially in cases of an emergency, when it is required to bring the situation under control, by force if necessary. Following the Government's decision to grant expanded opportunities for the personnel of penal institutions to express their opinions in the eight regional correctional headquarters across the country, sessions took place with the participation of 230 general staff members (from 78 penal institutions) in 2023. The participants exchanged opinions on improving the work environment, on staff training and on the reduction of the workload. Furthermore, the Government introduced "consultation services for staffs", accepting anonymous consultations/complaints, with the Correction Bureau, Regional Correction Headquarters and Training Institution. The Government promoted work-life balance by setting a "Strengthening Consultation Period" not only within the correctional organizations, but also through various services provided by external organizations such as the National Personnel Authority (NPA). Since April 2024, mental health counsellors have been assigned to all penal institutions to enhance mental health measures for correctional staff.

The Committee notes the IOE and Nippon Keidanren's observations supporting the Government's view that prison officers should be considered part of the police. The IOE considers, however, that it is important to improve the working conditions and treatment of prison officers, and therefore encourages the Government to further strengthen its efforts to ensure that the measures function effectively as an alternative to not granting the right to organize.

The Committee notes that according to JTUC-RENGO, the various measures described by the Government to provide opportunities for the personnel of penal institutions to express their opinions on their working conditions is not equivalent to guaranteeing them the right to organize. In addition, JTUC-RENGO deeply regrets that no action was taken by the Government to consult the social partners on the classification of prison officers considered part of the police and the classification of prison officers not considered part of the police, as called for in the 2018 conclusions of the Conference Committee.

While appreciating the information on the Government's latest initiatives to give opportunities to the personnel of penal institutions to provide their opinions on various aspects, including on their working conditions, and on measures taken in the past year to enhance welfare for the correctional personnel following consultation of the staff, the Committee is bound to repeat its view that these initiatives remain distinct from the recognition of the right to organize under *Article 2* of the Convention. The Committee notes with **regret** that the Government has again failed to engage in consultation with the social partners to determine the categories of prison officers that may form and join an organization of their own choosing to defend their occupational interests. In this regard, the Committee again recalls that, in previous reports, the Government referred to the following distinction among staff in penal institutions: (i) prison officers with a duty of total operations in penal institutions, including conducting security services with the use of physical force, who are allowed to use small arms and light weapons;

(ii) penal institution staff other than prison officers who are engaged directly in the management of penal institutions or the treatment of inmates; and (iii) penal institution staff designated, by virtue of the Code of Criminal Procedure, to carry out duties of judicial police officials with regard to crimes which occur in penal institutions and who have the authority to arrest, search and seize. **Therefore, the Committee once again urges the Government to engage without further delay in consultations with the social partners and other stakeholders concerned to determine the necessary measures to ensure that prison officers, other than those with the specific duties of the judicial police, may form and join an organization of their own choosing to defend their occupational interests, and to provide detailed information on the steps taken in this regard.**

Article 3. Denial of basic labour rights to public service employees. The Committee recalls its long-standing comments on the need to ensure basic labour rights for public service employees, in particular that they enjoy the right to industrial action without risk of sanctions, with the only exception being public servants exercising authority in the name of the State and workers employed in essential services in the strict sense of the term. The Committee notes the general information provided once again by the Government on its overall approach, which remains to continue to hear opinions from employee organizations. The Government refers once again to the procedures of the NPA presented as an effective and impartial compensatory guarantee for public service employees whose basic labour rights are restricted. The Government indicates that the NPA held 186 official meetings with employees' organizations in 2023 and 111 meetings in 2024 (as of September), making recommendations enabling working conditions of public service employees to be brought into line with the general conditions of society. In preparation of its 2024 recommendation on the "Improvement of remuneration system in response to the change of society and civil service" (comprehensive revision of various remuneration systems including salaries and allowances), the NPA has heard employee organizations' opinions from the early phases of the process. The recommendations include, inter alia, measures to improve the salary of young employees, especially those working in rural areas and who are new high school graduates, and to raise the maximum amount of the commuter allowance. The Government reiterates that these compensatory measures are appropriate to maintain working conditions of public service employees.

The Committee notes the Nippon Keidanren observations reiterating its support for the Government's intention to continue to carefully review and consider measures for an autonomous labour-employer relations system, taking into account views from employees' organizations.

The Committee notes the observations from the JTUC-RENGO regretting that the Government's position on the autonomous labour-employer relations system has not evolved and the Government's failure to initiate consultation with the organizations concerned. Furthermore, JTUC-RENGO reiterates that the NPA recommendations system is an extremely incomplete mechanism in which the drafting of the relevant legislation is left to political decision, making it obvious that such a mechanism falls short as a compensatory measure. JTUC-RENGO deplores that the reality of the "hearing and exchange of opinions with employee organizations" at meetings is limited to simply taking note of the opinions of the employee organizations. JTUC-RENGO regrets that on all occasions, the Government merely and invariably repeats its statement made in 2013 in the House of Representatives that "an autonomous industrial relations system would have a wide range of issues and as citizens' understanding has not been gained yet, it will be necessary to continue to consider this carefully". JTUC-RENGO once again deplores the evident lack of intention on the part of the Government to reconsider the legal system regarding the basic labour rights of public service employees.

Deploping the fact that the Government again fails to provide any sign of progress on the matter, the Committee urges the Government to engage without further delay in consultations with the social partners and other stakeholders concerned to determine the necessary measures to ensure that public service employees, who are not exercising authority in the name of the State, enjoy fully their basic labour rights, in particular the right to industrial action. Moreover, in the absence of information on

tangible measures in this regard, the Committee again urges the Government to resume consultations with the social partners concerned for the review of the current system with a view to ensuring effective, impartial and speedy conciliation and arbitration procedures, in which the parties have confidence and can participate at all stages, and in which the awards, once made, will be fully and promptly implemented. The Committee expects the Government to provide information on meaningful steps taken in this regard.

Local public service employees. The Committee recalls that, in its previous comments, representative organizations in the local public sector had referred to the adverse impact of the entry into force of the revised Local Public Service Act in April 2020 on their right to organize on the following grounds: (i) non-regular local public service employees and their unions are not covered by the general labour law that provides for basic labour rights and their ability to appeal to the labour relations commission in case of alleged unfair labour practice; (ii) the new system, which aimed at limiting the use of part-time staff on permanent duties (through special service positions appointed by fiscal year just as regular service employees), has the effect of increasing the number of workers stripped of their basic labour rights; (iii) the conditional yearly employment system in place has created job anxiety and weakens union action; and (iv) these situations further call for the urgent restoration of basic labour rights to all public service employees. The Committee observes that, in its latest observations, JTUC-RENGO reiterates its submission made in 2021 that, while the legal amendments are a step to ensure proper appointment of special service personnel and temporary appointment employees, the basic labour rights of local public service employees remain unaddressed and should be addressed as early as possible in the overall framework of the restoration of basic labour rights to all civil servants.

In addition, in their observations, the Rentai Union Sugunami, the Rentai Workers' Union, Itabashi-ku Section, the Apaken Kobe (Casual/Temporary/Part-time Non-regular Workers' Union) and the Union Rakuda (Kyoto Municipality Related Workers' Independent Union) inform of a lawsuit filed in March 2023 by a joint labour union in Tokyo that includes foreign nationals (Tozen Union) against the Tokyo Metropolitan Government, claiming that the deprivation of basic labour rights violates the Constitution. As the MIC has agreed to participate in the case as a party to the lawsuit, the trade unions consider that this case will raise public awareness about the situation in which non-regular local government civil servants have been placed, demonstrating the connection between the protection of fundamental labour rights and the maintenance and improvement of working conditions. More generally, the trade unions call on the Government to disseminate the recommendations made by the ILO supervisory bodies on the Local Public Service Act to national and local government officials and legislators, and to inform the public at large. This dissemination could include posting on the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare website and press release.

The Committee notes with **regret** that the Government merely reiterates that it will carefully examine what the basic labour rights of local public service employees should be in a manner consistent with the measures for the labour-employer relations system of national public service employees, as prescribed by the supplementary provision of the Civil Service Reform Act. To this end, it will continue to exchange views with employees' organizations concerned. The Committee notes Nippon Keidanren's observations supporting the position of the Government for careful examination regarding the basic labour rights of local public service employees. It also notes the IOE's encouragement to continue these consultations.

Noting with **regret** the absence of any concrete action by the Government to address the matter, the Committee is once again bound to observe that the legal amendments to the Local Public Service Act that entered into force in April 2020 for local public service employees had the effect of broadening the category of public sector workers whose rights under the Convention are not fully ensured. ***Therefore, the Committee once again urges the Government to expedite without further delay its consideration of the autonomous labour-employer relations system, in consultation with the social partners concerned to ensure that municipal unions are not deprived of their long-held trade union***

rights through the introduction of these amendments. The Committee expects the Government to provide information on meaningful steps in this regard.

Articles 2 and 3. Consultations on a time-bound action plan of measures for the autonomous labour-employer relations system. The Committee **deeply regrets** that since 2018, the Government has failed to take any concrete step to follow-up on the specific request of the Conference Committee to define with the social partners concerned a time-bound plan of action to give effect to the Conference Committee's recommendations. In its report, the Government once again merely repeats that it continues to carefully examine how to respond to the conclusions and recommendations formulated by the Conference Committee. The Government states its intention to conduct new exchanges of opinion with the employers' and workers' organization based on the June 2024 conclusions of the Conference Committee. ***Observing that JTUC-RENGO calls for setting a two-year limit for the formulation of an action plan to address the matter, the Committee requests the Government to provide information on all developments in this regard.***

Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98) (ratification: 1953)

Previous comment

The Committee notes the observations of the Japanese Trade Union Confederation (JTUC-RENGO) provided with the Government's report, as well as the Government's reply thereto. It also notes the observations of the Japan Business Federation (NIPPON-KEIDANDREN), communicated with the Government's report.

Articles 4 and 6 of the Convention. Collective bargaining rights of public servants not engaged in the administration of the State. In its previous comments, the Committee requested the Government to provide information on the steps taken to engage in consultations with the social partners so as to ensure collective bargaining rights for public servants not engaged in the administration of the State. The Committee notes that the Government once again merely recalls that: (i) the fundamental rights at work of public service employees are, to some degree, restricted, due to the distinctive status and the public nature of their functions, performed in the common interest of citizens; (ii) the measures for an autonomous labour-employer relations system are issues that should be considered carefully while continuing to exchange opinions with workers' organizations, since a wide range of issues remain to be understood by the public, making further in-depth discussion of those issues necessary; and (iii) public servants benefit from the National Personnel Authority (NPA) recommendation system as an effective and impartial compensatory measure for public servants whose fundamental rights at work are restricted. In particular, the Government indicates that the NPA held 186 official meetings with employees' organizations in 2023 and 111 meetings in 2024 (up until September) to develop recommendations to align the working conditions of public service employees with the general conditions in the private sector. For example, in preparing its 2024 recommendation on "Improvement of the pay system in response to changes in society and the public service" (a comprehensive review of the different pay systems, including wages and allowances), the NPA heard the views of employees' organizations from the initial stages of the review and submitted the elements to be considered in the planned review for their opinions. The Government therefore reaffirms that these compensatory measures maintain appropriately the working conditions of public service employees.

The Committee notes the observations of the JTUC-RENGO which complains that the Government has not engaged in any meaningful consultations on the autonomous labour-employer relations system. In these circumstances, the employers simply play a minimal role when required to enter into negotiations under section 108-5 of the Public Service Act (which provides that the competent authorities concerned shall place themselves in the position to respond to any proposal by a registered trade union organization to negotiate on the remuneration of public servants, their hours of work or

other conditions of work, or in connection therewith, on matters pertaining to lawful activities, including social and welfare activities). The Committee also notes the observations of NIPPON KEIDANREN, which reiterates its support for the Government's intention to continue to carefully examine and consider measures for an autonomous labour–employer relations system, taking into account the views of employees' organizations.

The Committee recalls that it drew the Government's attention to the need to ensure the promotion of collective bargaining for public servants not engaged in the administration of the State for the first time in its observation of 1994. The Committee **regrets** to note once again that the Government's report does not contain any information on substantive measures in this respect. **The Committee is bound to reiterate its comments and therefore firmly expects the Government to make every effort to expedite its consultations with the social partners concerned and adopt measures for the establishment of the autonomous labour–employer relations system that will ensure collective bargaining rights for all public servants not engaged in the administration of the State. In the meantime, the Committee requests the Government to continue to provide information on the functioning of the NPA recommendation system as a compensatory measure for the denial of collective bargaining rights to public servants.**

Collective bargaining rights of national forestry project staff. The Committee previously requested the Government to indicate the steps taken to ensure that national forestry project staff are afforded all guarantees under the Convention, including the right to bargain collectively. In this regard, the Committee notes the observations of the JTUC–RENGO, which indicates that no progress has been achieved in this respect and denounces the lack of will on the part of the Government to resolve the issue. The Committee notes the Government's indication that it conducts an annual exchange of opinions with workers' organizations with regard to working conditions in the forestry sector. The views and requests received are communicated promptly to the ministries and agencies responsible for the supervision of the working conditions system, and those that can be adopted are swiftly implemented. Thus in 2021, a centralized consultation system was established to promote measures to prevent harassment; in 2022, maternity and postnatal leave was paid in order to improve the salary of part-time employees; and in 2023, the wage regulations of the Forestry Agency were amended to increase the applicable wages.

While noting the implementation of measures to improve working conditions in national forestry projects, the Committee is bound to recall once again its view that the staff of these national projects are not among the category of workers that may be excluded from the scope of the Convention and should therefore enjoy the right to collective bargaining. **Regretting the lack of progress in this respect, the Committee expects the Government to engage without further delay in substantive consultations with the representative organizations concerned in order to ensure that national forestry project staff are afforded all guarantees under the Convention, including the right to collective bargaining.**

Full guarantee of the Convention for local public servants. The Committee previously noted that legal amendments that entered into force in 2020 for local public servants have the effect of broadening the category of public sector workers whose rights under the Convention are not fully guaranteed. It requested the Government to expedite its consideration of the autonomous labour–employer relations system so as to guarantee that the rights provided by the Convention cover local public servants without distinction, and that the right to collective bargaining of municipal unions is not impaired by the legal amendments introduced. The Committee notes that the Government merely indicates that the fundamental rights of local public servants must be taken into consideration at the same time as measures for the labour–employer relations system for national public service employees, in order to ensure consistency. Recalling that the measures relating to the autonomous labour–employer relations system for the national public service are confronted by a wide range of issues and have not yet been understood by the public, the Government indicates again that it is a matter that must be considered while continuing to exchange opinions with employees' organizations. The Government reiterates that

it will conduct a full review of the fundamental rights of local public servants on the basis of the national public service reform review.

Once again, the Committee is bound to recall that the Convention covers all workers and employers, and their respective organizations, in both the private and public sectors, regardless of whether the service is essential. The only exceptions authorized concern the armed forces and the police, as well as public servants engaged in the administration of the State. It also recalls that the rights and safeguards set out in the Convention apply to all workers irrespective of the type of employment contract, regardless of whether or not their employment relationship is based on a written contract, or on a contract for an indefinite term (see the General Survey of 2012 on the fundamental Conventions, paragraph 168). **The Committee expects the Government to provide information on tangible progress in the consideration of the autonomous labour-employer relation system so as to ensure the full enjoyment by all local public service officials of the rights contained in the Convention, including the right to collective bargaining. Furthermore, the Committee expects this review to ensure that the right to collective bargaining of municipal unions is not undermined by the introduction of legal amendments.**

Jordan

Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98)

(ratification: 1968)

Previous comment

Articles 1 to 6 of the Convention. Scope of application of the Convention. Foreign workers. In its previous comments, the Committee noted that the legal restrictions to the freedom of association of foreign workers, in addition to the existing union monopoly, have strongly contributed to a situation where, in many sectors foreign workers have no access to collective bargaining, while in some others, their bargaining power is significantly constrained in practice. On that basis, the Committee urged the Government to repeal section 98(e)(1) of the Labour Code (pursuant to which foreign workers do not have the right to establish trade unions) and section 7(a) of the Jordanian Teachers' Association Act (hereinafter the JTA Act) (pursuant to which foreign workers cannot join the JTA) and requested it to promote collective bargaining in the sectors where foreign workers are highly represented. The Committee notes that the Government reiterates that pursuant to sections 98(e) and (f) of the Labour Code, while non-Jordanian workers may join trade unions, they do not have the right to establish trade unions, and that amending section 98(e) would lead to a violation of the Constitution, which grants the right to establish trade unions only to Jordanians. Regarding section 7(a) of the JTA Act, the Government reiterates that in accordance with section 19(d) of the JTA Act, amendments may be proposed only by the board of the union to the central authority of the association, which is then forwarded to the Minister to take the necessary legal measures. The Committee also notes the Government's reference to the fact that the collective agreements concluded (46 in 2023 and 16 in the first half of 2024) cover both Jordanian and non-Jordanian citizens). Noting the Government's reiterated arguments concerning the legislative review of the above-mentioned provisions, the Committee once again recalls that States have an obligation to take effective measures in their domestic legislations as well as in practice to comply with the Conventions they have ratified. **In view of the above, the Committee once again urges the Government to take the necessary measures to repeal the legal provisions that exclude foreign workers from the right to directly engage in collective bargaining, in particular section 98(e)(1) of the Labour Code and section 7(a) of the JTA Act. It also requests the Government to promote collective bargaining in all sectors where foreign workers are highly represented and to provide detailed information on collective agreements concluded therein, specifically indicating the number of migrant workers covered by them.**