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#### To “strengthen” means to make stronger that which already exists.

Hou 19 – Policy Analyst, Gov. of Canada. M.A., International Affairs, Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies in Geneva.

Angela Min Yi Hou, Julia Tops, Cindy Xinying Ou, “2018 Charlevoix G7 Final Compliance Report,” University of Toronto Munk School of Global Affairs and Public Policy, 08-23-2019, https://g7.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2018compliance-final/17-2018-G7-final-compliance-energysec.pdf

The first part of the commitment specifies that energy security must be strengthened collectively through ongoing action. “Strengthen” is defined as “to make or become stronger,” which indicates that the G7 members must act to reinforce and enhance existing energy security-related measures. “Collective” reflects that this commitment binds G7 members to strengthen collective energy security through collaboration with other G7 members or international organizations. Examples of actions that count towards compliance for the first portion of the commitment include contributing to improving the global energy security framework, bilateral or multilateral energy security treaties; addressing energy security issues in the Global South; and increasing international energy transparency. Actions taken domestically or independently of other countries or international organizations do not count towards compliance. Moreover, the word “ongoing” reflects that the G7 member must act in a way that demonstrates consistent, continuous action or long-term consideration.

#### Affs can strengthen CBR by changing the level, flexibility, coordination, or enforcement.

Domash 21 – Economic researcher.

Alex Domash, “Returning Power To American Workers And Raising Wages,” Harvard Kennedy School, Written in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master in Public Administration in International Development, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, March 2021, https://www.hks.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/centers/cid/files/publications/CID\_Wiener\_Inequality%20Award%20Research/Policy%20Report\_Alex%20Domash%20(1-A).pdf

Features of collective bargaining systems

Collective bargaining systems across OECD countries have four principle components, summarized in the box below (modified from OECD (2019): “Negotiating our way up”):

Four main features of collective bargaining systems

1. Level of bargaining – does collective bargaining take place at the firm, sectoral, or national level?

2. Amount of flexibility – how much room is there for firms to derogate from higher-level agreements or opt-out of bargaining agreements in case of economic hardship?

3. Extent of coordination – is there synchronization between different bargaining units (e.g. do sectors coordinate with each other on wage targets in sectoral systems)?

4. Enforcement capacity – how likely is punishment if a party deviates from the terms set in collective agreements?

While broad-based bargaining agreements are common in nearly all continental European countries, there is significant variation in how, and to what extent, firm-level agreements supplement higher-level agreements. In some countries, such as the Scandinavian countries, sectoral agreements only define broad frameworks, but leave significant scope for bargaining at the firm level. In other countries, such as Germany and Austria, sectoral agreements play an important role, but still allow firms to opt-out of certain agreements and renegotiate at the firmlevel. In a third set of countries, such as Italy and Slovenia, sectoral agreements largely set the rules, and don’t allow firms much flexibility (OECD, 2019).

The majority of OECD countries (not including the United States) use some combination of firm-level and higher-level agreements to extend collective bargaining coverage to workers (Figure 10). Two key components that influence how sectoral and firm-level agreements interact are: 1) the favorability principle, and 2) derogations. The favorability principle, which is common in most continental European countries, states that lower-level agreements can only improve higher-level agreements. The second key component, derogations, allow firms to opt-out of higherlevel conditions, either through general opening clauses, or temporary opt-out clauses in the case of an economic hardship. Germany effectively used temporary opt-out clauses to support firms during the 2008-2009 financial crisis (Dustmann et al, 2014).

[Figure 10 Omitted]

Economic theory suggests that there is an important trade-off between flexibility and coordination among these different types of bargaining systems. In an enterprise bargaining system (e.g. the United States system), there is less wage rigidity at the firm-level, which gives firms more flexibility to respond to firm-specific economic shocks and more autonomy to link worker performance/productivity to wages. In a sectoral or centralized bargaining system, theory suggests that there is a weaker link between productivity and wages, but more macroeconomic resiliency, since wage-setters can recognize broader national interests, and entire sectors can have a coordinated response in the aftermath of an economic downturn.

#### The plan violates.

ARAW 08 – American Rights at Work.

ARAW, “THE HAVES AND THE HAVE-NOTS: How American Labor Law Denies a Quarter of the Workforce Collective Bargaining Rights,” American Rights at Work, November 2008, https://www.jwj.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/havesandhavenots\_nlracoverage.pdf

Passed in 1935, the federal National Labor Relations Act (NLRA), also known as the Wagner Act, gave U.S. workers the right to bargain collectively with their employers over wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment. While the NLRA was meant to apply to “employees” in general, it also excluded a number of categories of workers from the provision of these rights. So did amendments to the Act and decisions by the Supreme Court and by the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) on the scope of the NLRA’s coverage.1

Thus, the major groups excluded from NLRA coverage, whether in the Act itself or via amendments and judicial interpretation, are:

1. agricultural workers

2. domestic workers

3. small business employees

4. independent contractors

5. supervisors and managers

6. public employees

#### Vote neg for limits and ground. They open the floodgates to infinite expansion of rights to new categories. That’s a disaster for neg fairness and research.