

**ILO INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR ON  
THE USE OF NATIONAL LABOUR FORCE SURVEYS FOR  
COLLECTING ADDITIONAL LABOUR-RELATED STATISTICS  
(GENEVA, 24-26 OCTOBER 2005)**

**Report**

The ILO International Seminar on the Use of National Labour Force Surveys for Collecting Additional Labour Related Statistics was held on 24-26 October 2005 in Geneva. It was attended by representatives of the national statistical offices of Australia, Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, Finland, Italy, Mali, Moldova, The Philippines, South Africa, Uganda, Ukraine, and the United States of America as well as delegates representing workers' and employers' organisations.<sup>1</sup> The Seminar was also attended by representatives from the Statistical Office of the European Commission (EUROSTAT), the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the Statistical Programme of Women in Informal Employment: Globalizing and Organizing (WIEGO), and ILO officials from headquarters and regional offices. (Annex 1 List of participants).

In line with the agenda of the seminar (Annex 2), after an introduction describing the purpose and background of the seminar (Annex 3) by Mr. Peter Peek, Manager, ILO Statistical Development and Analysis Unit, and Mr. Sylvester Young, Director, ILO Bureau of Statistics, national experiences in collecting additional data from labour force surveys were presented for twelve countries and discussed during the first two days of the seminar (Annex 4 Summary of discussions).<sup>2</sup>

The key conclusions that emerge are listed below:

- There was a general agreement that the extension of national labour force surveys to collect additional data on labour-related issues beyond the measurement of employment and unemployment and their main demographic and economic characteristics presents a number of advantages but has also limitations.

The key advantages are:

- Insight. The inclusion of additional topics in national labour force surveys provides an opportunity to improve the understanding of the employment and unemployment situation

---

<sup>1</sup> The government representative from Bangladesh, Dr. A.K.M. Musa, Director-General, Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics was unfortunately unable to attend the seminar due to unexpected administrative difficulties for transit travel to Geneva.

<sup>2</sup> The papers and presentations prepared for the seminar may be found at <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/integration/index.htm>. The attention of the seminar was also drawn to the website on labour force surveys recently established by the ILO Bureau of Library and Documentation Services and the Statistical Development and Analysis Unit, with links with national labour force survey results and documentation <http://www.ilo.org/dyn/lfsurvey/lfsurvey.home>.

in different countries within a wider framework. As the broad employment and unemployment aggregates cannot adequately reflect all aspects of labour market conditions, such complementary data may prove to be highly informative.

- Flexibility. Extension of labour force survey programmes, implemented cautiously, provides flexibility for collecting data on new and emerging issues in the labour market, such as working time arrangements, child care, earnings, job-search experience, trade union membership, informal sector employment, and travel-to-work and commuting time. It also provides flexibility on the tempo and scope of data collection on the added topics.
- Coherence. Collecting additional labour-related data as part of national labour force survey programmes imposes a desired coherence on concepts and definitions, and permits the study of relationships for identical target populations.
- Carry-over. In an adequately designed labour force survey programme, the labour force information obtained in the core survey may be carried over in the added parts of the survey thus simplifying data collection and enriching the analysis of the results.
- Efficiency. The use of the same statistical infrastructure for collecting additional labour-related data as that of the national labour force survey results in efficiency in the use of scarce resources and possibly in lower cost per unit of information.
- Exploring ground. Under appropriate conditions, a labour force survey instrument with a supplementary data collection programme can provide the opportunity to explore the topics or methods that might then be used or incorporated into the core survey as new items or as refinements of existing ones.

The main limitations are:

- Cost. Extension of labour force surveys implies an increase in the total cost of the survey both in terms of the variable cost of survey operations and the fixed cost of survey planning and organisation, although the marginal cost of the added items may be relatively insignificant.
- Selectivity. Because of sample size limitations, not all labour-related items may be subject to additional data collection through labour force surveys. For example, phenomena that concern a restricted population group or concentrated on particular geographic areas may need special survey designs or substantial increases in sample size.
- Interview burden. Collecting additional data imposes a higher response burden on the survey respondents with possibly negative impact on the quality of the data and future participation in the survey programme. It also entails an added burden on interviewers' work load with its own effect on the accuracy of the data obtained during interviewing.
- Potential impact on core topics. The incorporation of additional topics in a regular labour force survey programme may introduce adverse effects on the core topics of the survey that may not become immediately visible.

- Complexity of survey operations. The introduction of additional topics in a labour force survey programme raises the complexity of the survey operations, not only in terms of questionnaire design and data collection, but also in terms of training of the interviewers and orderly processing and dissemination of the survey results.
- Given these considerations, it was generally agreed that topics designated for inclusion in extended national labour force surveys should satisfy strict conditions:
  - Relevance. The choice of additional labour-related topics for data collection should be formulated within a conceptual framework of national concern. The ILO *decent work* agenda based on the four pillars of productive employment, social protection, rights at work and social dialogue was given as an example a conceptual framework for the collection of labour-related data through extended labour force surveys.
  - Appropriateness. The appropriateness of each new item for labour force survey measurement should be established, and weighted against alternative sources of data collection. A related issue is whether the supplementary inquiry covering the additional items should be an integral part of the labour force survey or designed as a follow-up survey.
  - Feasibility. Supplementary topics to be considered for inclusion in a labour force survey programme should of a feasible nature, i.e., they should elucidate accurate responses from the respondent, particularly, if the survey design allows for proxy responses. It is crucially important to field test each potential supplementary topic within a labour force survey data collection environment before introducing the topic in the programme.
  - Precision. The precision required in the measurement of supplementary topics should be within the order of the magnitude that is achievable by the sample size of the core survey or lower. In this respect, particular care should be taken in introducing supplementary topics that concern a narrow population group or need to be analysed in conjunction with a large number of other variables.
  - Timeliness. The analytical plan of the supplementary survey should be designed before hand and the dissemination of the results should be scheduled within an acceptable time frame, not necessarily at the same time of the release of the core survey results.
- Extension of labour force surveys should be examined within the framework of a labour force survey programme with appropriate periodicity and survey design:
  - Periodicity. Supplementary topics attached to a labour force survey programme may be collected with a periodicity that differs from the periodicity of the core labour force survey. The appropriate periodicity for supplementary surveys may vary from topic to topic depending on users' requirement and the nature of the evolution of the measured phenomena, as well as on the availability of resources. In general, while some topics may

be covered on a regular basis with fixed periodicities, others may be covered once or at irregular intervals to meet specific need for information.

- Survey pattern. The design of the supplementary surveys should take advantage of the sampling scheme of the core survey. For example, if the sample design of the core survey involves a rotation scheme, data collection on supplementary topics of sensitive nature may be limited to the outgoing rotation group, in order to avoid or limit any potential impact of the supplementary questions on responses to the core survey items in subsequent interviews.
- Sub-sampling. In certain survey environments, for example where the labour force survey programme is punctual or where the precision requirements for some of the supplementary topics are not as stringent as that of the core survey or where the supplementary data may be rolled over a number of survey rounds, the data collection on the supplementary topics may be carried out on a sub-sample basis. Sample selection at the sub-sample level for the supplementary survey may not necessarily correspond to a specific part of the sampling pattern of the core survey.
- Main topics that were discussed for coverage by extended labour force surveys included:
  - Earnings of the employed population or particular sub-groups.
  - Hours of work of the employed, including time-related underemployment of short-hour workers and excessive hours of work of long-hour workers.
  - Stability of employment measured in terms of continuity or discontinuity of employment over a given period of time (e.g., the distinction between regular, seasonal and casual workers).
  - Informal sector and informal employment and their components, measured in terms of the characteristics of the production unit in which the worker is engaged and the employment conditions of the worker, respectively. Care should be taken to limit data collection on production units to items that the worker tends to know about, especially, where the worker is not the owner-manager of the unit.
  - Social protection. Where appropriate, coverage and non-coverage by private and public social security schemes concerning old-age pension, health hazards, occupation injuries and unemployment insurance, and also on current recipients of benefits.
  - Other topics of particular interest were: social dialogue, in particular trade union membership and collective bargaining coverage, labour-related migration and its implications, child labour and gender aspects of the labour market.

\* \*  
\*

It was suggested that the ILO should examine these conclusions further in light of the existing international standards on labour statistics, and with a view of developing guidelines on labour force survey programmes with appropriate flexibility in the survey periodicity and survey contents to suit concerns of countries with different levels of development.

In particular, it was suggested that the ILO should undertake a systematic inventory of additional items included in recent national labour force survey programmes, identifying where possible those items that are legislated and form part of national statistical obligations. The exercise should include an evaluation of the performance of each item in terms of ease and accuracy of the survey responses and analytical uses of the statistical results.

It was further suggested that the ILO should prepare a report describing best practices in the design and execution of extended national labour force survey programmes, recognizing differences between countries with well-established national labour force survey programmes, and countries with limited experience in conducting regular labour force surveys. The report should also address the concerns of countries with no experience in such survey programmes.

---

**Annex 1**  
**International seminar on the Use of National Labour Force Surveys for Collecting**  
**Additional Labour-related Information**  
(Geneva, 24-26 October, 2005)

**List of participants**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Place of work</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>email</b>
BHUYAN, A. R.	Bangladesh Employers' Federation	Economic Adviser	+ 880 2 861 9549	<a href="mailto:arbhuyan@bangla.net">arbhuyan@bangla.net</a>
BOWLBY, Geoff	Statistics Canada	Chief, Analysis and Special Projects	+01 613 951 3325	<a href="mailto:Geoff.bowlby@statcan.ca">Geoff.bowlby@statcan.ca</a>
BUWEMBO, Peter	Statistics, South Africa	Manager, Development and Output	+ 27 82 888 22 51	<a href="mailto:peterb@statssa.gov.za">peterb@statssa.gov.za</a>
CASTILLO, Monica	ILO Lima	Regional Specialist in Decent Work, Labour Information and Analysis	+ 911 615 0343	<a href="mailto:castillo@oit.org.pe">castillo@oit.org.pe</a>
DJERMA, Honoré	ILO Abidjan	Spécialiste des statistiques du travail	+0221 889 2989	<a href="mailto:Djerma_dak@ilo.org">Djerma_dak@ilo.org</a>
DOUMBIA, Saliha	Observatoire de L'emploi et de la formation du Mali	Director	+ 223 223 59 50	<a href="mailto:doumbiasaliha@yahoo.fr">doumbiasaliha@yahoo.fr</a>
FABIAN, Emma A.	National Statistical Office, Philippines	Chief, Income and Employment Statistics Division	+ 716 9369	<a href="mailto:e.fabian@census.gov.ph">e.fabian@census.gov.ph</a>
FILGUEIRAS JORGE, Angela	IBGE, Brazil	Coordinator of Labour and Income Statistics	+ 55 21 2142 4521	<a href="mailto:angel@ibge.gov.br">angel@ibge.gov.br</a>
HARDARSON, Omar	EUROSTAT	National Expert	+ 352 4301 35166	<a href="mailto:Omar.hardarson@cec.eu.int">Omar.hardarson@cec.eu.int</a>
HENDEN, Merilyn	Australian Bureau of Statistics	Director, Labour Household Surveys	+ 0400 309 413	<a href="mailto:Merilyn.henden@abs.gov.au">Merilyn.henden@abs.gov.au</a>

KEINANEN, Paivi	Statistics Finland	Senior Adviser	+ 3589 1734	<a href="mailto:paivikeinanen@stat.fi">paivikeinanen@stat.fi</a>
KUMAR, Arun	Worker representative	Education and Training Coordinator	+ 91 11 2341 3519	<a href="mailto:arundaur@yahoo.com">arundaur@yahoo.com</a>
KYEWALYANGA, Simon	Bureau of Statistics, Uganda	Statistician	+ 256 041 322 101	<a href="mailto:skyewalyanga@yahoo.com">skyewalyanga@yahoo.com</a>
LALIBERTE, Pierre	Canadian Labour Congress	Senior Economist	+ 613 526 5409	<a href="mailto:plaliberte@clc-ctc.ca">plaliberte@clc-ctc.ca</a>
MARIANNA, Pascal	OECD	Labour Statistician	+ 33 14 52 49 223	<a href="mailto:Pascal.marianna@oecd.org">Pascal.marianna@oecd.org</a>
MASSARELLI, Nicola	ISTAT, Italy	Researcher	+39 06 4673 4735	<a href="mailto:Nicola.massarelli@istat.it">Nicola.massarelli@istat.it</a>
MOSIANE, Malerato	Statistics South Africa	Professional: Development and Output	+ 27 12 310 8688	<a href="mailto:maleratom@statssa.gov.za">maleratom@statssa.gov.za</a>
NARDONE, Thomas	US Bureau of Labour Statistics	Assistant Commissioner Current Employment	+ 202 691 6378	<a href="mailto:Nardone_T@bls.gov">Nardone_T@bls.gov</a>
OKUTHO, George	ILO Addis Ababa	Senior Specialist in Labour Statistics and Economics	+ 2511 544 43 44	<a href="mailto:okutho@ilo.org">okutho@ilo.org</a>
RUBLOVA, Nataliya	State Statistics Committee of Ukraine	Deputy Director of Labour Statistics Department	+ 380 44 458 5024	<a href="mailto:n.rublova@ukrstat.gov.ua">n.rublova@ukrstat.gov.ua</a>
VANEK, Joann	WIEGO	Director of the Statistics Programme Women in informal Employment	+ 212 490 3838	<a href="mailto:Joann_vanek@hotmail.com">Joann_vanek@hotmail.com</a>
VUTCARIOV, Elena	National Bureau of Statistics, Moldova	Head of Division	+ 37322 403090	<a href="mailto:Elena.vutcariov@statistica.md">Elena.vutcariov@statistica.md</a>

ILO Headquarters participants

Bescond, David (STAT)  
Bonnet, Florence (IFP/SES)  
Châtaignier, Anne (INTEGRATION/SDA)  
Chernyshev, Igor (INTEGRATION/SDA)  
Giles, Rachael (INTEGRATION/SDA)  
Grange, Thierry (STAT)  
Guillet, Isabelle (KILM)  
Hagemejer, Krzysztof (SOC/FAS)  
Husmanns, Ralf (STAT)  
Kapsos, Steve (KILM)  
Martins-Oliverira, Angela (IPEC)  
Mehran, Farhad (INTEGRATION/SDA)  
Ozel, Hakki (IPEC)  
Peek, Peter (INTEGRATION/SDA)  
Pember, Bob (STAT)  
Schachter, Jason (STAT)  
Young, Sylvester (STAT)

## Annex 2

### International seminar on the Use of National Labour Force Surveys for Collecting Additional Labour-related Information (Geneva, 24-26 October, 2005)

#### Agenda

*Monday, 24 October 2005*

**9.00 - 10.00 Registration of the participants**

**10.00 - 10.30 Opening of the meeting**

Peter Peek, Manager, Statistical Development and Analysis, Policy Integration Department, ILO.  
Sylvester Young, Director, Bureau of Statistics, ILO.

**10.30 - 12.45 Session 1: Can the success of labour force surveys to count employment and unemployment be extended to measure qualitative aspects of the labour market?**

Farhad Mehran, and Igor Chernyshev, Statistical Development and Analysis Group, Policy Integration Department, ILO – “Can the success of labour force surveys to count the employed and the unemployed be extended to measure other aspects of the labour market?”

Anne Châtaignier, Statistical Development and Analysis Group, Policy Integration Department, ILO – “Which additional questions on Labour-related Statistics have been included in National Labour Force Surveys?”

Discussants: Mr. Ralf Hussmanns, ILO Bureau of Statistics  
Mr. Geoff Bowlby, Statistics Canada

**12.45 - 14.30** Lunch break

**14.30 - 17.30 Session 2: Country experiences in collecting qualitative employment data from labour force surveys**

Mr. M. Bhuyan, Employer Representative: Bangladesh Employers’ Federation -  
“Bangladesh Experience in Labour Force Survey”

Mr. Farhad Mehran presenting on behalf of Mr. AKM Musa, Director General, Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics - “Bangladesh Experience in Collecting Qualitative Employment Data From Labour Force Surveys”

Ms. Emma Fabian, National Statistical Office, The Philippines - “Experiences in Collecting Qualitative Employment Data from Labor Force Surveys”

Discussants: Mr. Ajit Ghose, Employment Strategy, ILO  
Mr. Bijoy Raychaudhuri, IPEC, ILO

Coffee break

Mr. Saliha Doumbia, Director, Observatoire de l'emploi et de la formation, Mali – "Activité, emploi et chômage au Mali en 2004"

Ms. Malerato Mosiane & Mr. Peter Buwembo, Statistics South Africa - "Additional data collected through the Labour Force Survey"

Discussant: Mr. G. Okutho, ILO Sub-Regional Office in Addis Ababa

## Tuesday, 25 October 2005

### **9.30 – 12.45 Session 2: Country experiences in collecting qualitative employment data from labour force surveys (Cont.)**

Ms. Elena Vutcariov, National Bureau of Statistics, Moldova - "The use of labour force survey for collecting additional labour-related statistics in the Republic of Moldova."

Ms. Natalia Rublyova, State Statistics Committee, Ukraine

Discussant: Mr. K. Hagemeyer, Social Security Financial, Actuarial and Statistical Branch, ILO

Coffee break

Ms. Angela Filgueiras Jorge, IBGE, Brazil - "Use of the labour force surveys to collect additional labour-related statistics in Brazil"

Mr. Simon Kyewalyanga, Bureau of Statistics, Uganda - "National Labour Force Surveys as a Source of Additional Labour Statistics"

Discussants: Ms. Monica D. Castillo, ILO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean  
Mr. H. Djerma, ILO Sub-Regional Office in Abidjan

**12.45 - 14.30** Lunch break

### **14.30 - 17.30 Session 2: Country experiences in collecting qualitative employment data from labour force surveys (Cont.)**

Ms. Paivi Keinanen, Statistics Finland, "Finnish experiences in collecting qualitative employment data from the Labour Force Survey"

Mr. Nicola Massarelli, ISTAT, Italy - “Enlarged Labour Force Survey, The Italian experience”

Discussant: Mr. Omar S. Hardarson, EUROSTAT

Mr. Tom Nardone, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics

Coffee break

Mr. Geoff Bowlby, Statistics Canada - “Use of the Canadian Labour Force Survey for Collecting Additional Labour-related Information”

Ms. Merilyn Henden, Australian Bureau of Statistics - “Australia's experiences in collecting additional data from the national Labour Force Survey”

Discussant: Mr. Pascal Marianna, OECD, Paris

### **Wednesday, 26 October 2005**

#### **09.30 - 11.30 Seminar Report (Secretariat)**

Experience gained from national practices and approaches.

Implications on ILO future activities: international data reporting and statistical standard setting.

**11.30 - 11.50** Coffee break

**11.50 - 13.00** Adoption of the report and closing of the Seminar

## **Annex 3**

### **International seminar on the Use of National Labour Force Surveys for Collecting Additional Labour-related Information (Geneva, 24-26 October, 2005)**

#### Background

The seminar on the use of national labour force surveys for collecting additional labour-related statistics is organized jointly by the Statistical Development and Analysis Unit and the Bureau of Statistics of the ILO. Its main objectives are (a) to review the ILO experience in expanding the use of labour force surveys and collect information not only of employment/unemployment but also of other aspects of the labour market (formal/informal employment, social security, etc.) and (b) to draw on the experience in other countries with multiple-task labour force surveys.

For many years, labour force surveys have been an important instrument for collecting current data on employment and unemployment in both developed and developing countries. These surveys are now an integral part of the national statistical programme of many countries. The ILO has counted more than 70 countries with regular labour force surveys conducted annually, or more frequently, semi-annually, quarterly or monthly.

Although traditionally, the main objective of these surveys has been the measurement of employment and unemployment, in recent years a growing number of countries are using labour force surveys to collect additional data on other aspects of the labour market, such as working time arrangements, earnings, trade union membership, informal sector employment, occupational accidents and injuries, and travel-to-work and commuting time.

Many countries have established wider labour force survey programmes on their own initiative while some others have requested ILO assistance. ILO technical assistance is based on the international statistical standards adopted by the International Conferences of Labour Statisticians. In the case of labour force surveys, the relevant standards concern “statistics of the economically active population, employment, unemployment and underemployment” (ICLS 1982), and “the measurement of underemployment and inadequate employment situations” (ICLS 1998).

To face the increasing number of countries requesting technical assistance to launch a new or amend their existing labour force survey programme for collecting additional labour data, appropriate international statistical standards may be required. Experience has shown that multi-task labour force surveys are not without problems. Careful consideration has to be given to any proposed addition or change in order not to undermine the original purpose of these surveys.

The proposed international seminar is envisaged to get together some 20 to 25 experts from different countries, each having experience in conducting or analysing such multi-task labour force surveys. The experts will be mainly statisticians working for national statistical

institutes or specialists involved in the analysis and interpretation of expanded labour force surveys. Each participant is requested to prepare a paper reviewing work in their country. Specialists from international organisations and ILO regional offices are also be invited.

The outcome of the seminar will be a report of examples of “good practice” on the design and the use of labour force surveys to collect a wider range of labour-related statistics while ensuring reliability of the results for which the survey was originally intended. This “good practice” evaluation is intended to be of use to countries envisaging the broadening of their labour force survey programme, and also to the ILO in strengthening its capacity to deliver technical assistance in this area of statistics.

## Annex 4

### International seminar on the Use of National Labour Force Surveys for Collecting Additional Labour-related Information (Geneva, 24-26 October, 2005)

#### Summary of discussions – Session 2: Country experiences in collecting qualitative employment data from labour force surveys

**Discussant : Mr. Agit Ghose, Employment Strategy, ILO**

Countries: Bangladesh and the Philippines

Proposals for modifying the design of LFS

Identify the following sub-categories of “wage employment”:

- a) Regular wage employment
- b) Irregular/casual wage employment

Then design three blocks of questionnaires:

#### 1. Self-employment

- a) Nature of engagement: employers, own account workers, unpaid family workers.
- b) For each of these categories, sector (formal or informal) of engagement; the objective is to distinguish between large employers in the modern sector and small employers in the informal sector (e.g., owners of large industrial/commercial/agricultural establishments vs. owners of small farms/businesses); well-off self-employed in the modern sector and poorer self-employed in the informal sector (doctors/lawyers/freelance consultants vs. peasant farmers/petty traders/shoeshine boys); and corresponding classification of unpaid family workers.
- c) Annual earnings.

#### 2. Regular employees

- a) Sector of engagement (formal/informal).
- b) Type of contract, trade union membership, training, non-wage benefits, hours of work, etc.
- c) Monthly or weekly earnings.

#### 3. Irregular/casual employees

- a) Sector of engagement (formal/informal).
- b) Nature of engagement (part-time, fixed-term, seasonal, daily).

- c) Type of contract and non-wage benefits.
- d) Hours of work earnings in the reference week for those with written contract.
- e) Days of employment and earnings per day in the reference week for daily workers.

#### 4. Unemployed

- a) Type of job (regular/irregular) that was being sought.
- b) Sector (formal/informal) in which job was being sought.

#### 5. Child labour

- a) The important point to remember is that many children are not attending school and only some of those not attending school actually work. We should get away from the idea that parents choose between schooling and employment for their children. The real choice is between idleness and work in a context of poverty.

**Discussant: Mr. Bijoy Raychaudhuri, IPEC, ILO**

Countries: Bangladesh and the Philippines

1. Comments by Ajit Ghosh:

- a) Concept of “unemployment” applied in LFS not very appropriate for application in low income developing countries, where everyone seeks some work to survive only: but that is not adequate employment for the person who is technically classified as employed even if working for only 1 hour in the reference week. As at present, comparison of unemployment rates across countries has little meaning.
- b) Labour force statistics should collect data on “regular” employment and “irregular” employment in respect of wage-earners. Distinction between these two classes of wage-earners will add to the value of the data on wage-earners for analytical purposes.
- c) Concept of “school attendance” as a proxy for child labour is not very correct for the 5-14 years old children, as children may not attend school for several reasons other than due to work. That is, children may not attend school due to lack of schools, facilities to attend school, and extreme poverty of parents who cannot pay the basic expenses of even free schooling, or even may be due to disability.

2. Comments by Bijoy Raychaudhuri

- a) The pilot LFS findings of Bangladesh are mainly in Sections 3 and 4 of the paper. Section 3 is a presentation of data only, and relates to variables traditionally collected by the Bangladesh LFS. No analysis or reasons underlying the observed trends (as data is provided for LFS of 1995-96, 1999-2000 and 2002-03). Section 4, perhaps due to structure of the questionnaire, is for the additional questions included in the pilot LFS, beyond the traditional data collected. So reasonings are provided, and this is very useful for analysis.
- b) On the data provided by the Bangladesh pilot LFS findings, two points were noted:
  - In Table 1, the data on rural male Labour Force Participation Rate for 1999-2000 and for 2002-03 needs to be re-checked as it is significantly lower than for 1995-96. What the reasons are for this change should be given.
  - In Table 4 relating to Youth Unemployment, the reference age group for who falls into the “Youth” category should be given. (Mr Bhuyan’s paper notes 15-19 years as the “youth” category for LFS 2002-03, but internationally 15-24 years is “youth”).
- c) The Bangladesh pilot LFS findings do not reflect tabulations on “Unemployment” characteristics and characteristics of the “Self-employed” which should have been collected in terms of the questionnaire. Moreover, “Schooling” characteristics of 5-14 years olds, though presented in Section 3 for the 3 regular LFS findings, is not provided

for the pilot LFS. These tabulations should be made when the Report on the pilot LFS of Bangladesh is revised.

- d) Philippines pilot – LFS findings though tentative, indicate that some useful information on limited aspects of social dialogue and social protection are indeed obtained.
- e) In the Asia Pacific region, there is great heterogeneity between countries, and most countries do not have the financial and personnel resources to collect official statistics beyond the minimum required for policy purposes, such as, employment/unemployment, inflation, national accounts, and demography. So to collect additional Decent Work-related Labour Force statistics may be too much of a problem.
- f) Since informal sector is important for developing countries in respect of the Labour Force, classification of Labour Force characteristics (including Decent Work aspects) by “Formal Sector” and “Informal Sector” should be very useful. Thus, for some Decent Work-related questions, Formal Sector may show high percentages and Informal Sector may show almost nil.
- g) Given budgetary constraints on Labour Force data collection, supplementary Decent Work statistics obtained through administrative records should be explored.
- h) In Asia – Pacific region “migration” is important, and as it reflects mainly the search for better jobs, it could be considered for inclusion in the list of “Decent Work” statistics.

#### Comments from floor:

- a) India Trade Union: Has administrative sources Decent Work data been compared with results of pilot Labour Force Survey findings?

**Discussant: Mr. George Okutho, ILO Sub-Regional Office in Addis Ababa**

Countries: Mali and South Africa

1. From the discussions that transpired on Monday morning and afternoon, it was possible to identify three scenarios in the quest for identifying additional information that can be generated through LFS. These scenarios are.
  - a) Collect more detailed and in-depth information on the same phenomenon (unemployment, underemployment, working time, earnings, self-employment, paid employment, etc...) to obtain a better understanding of the situation.
  - b) Collect more information on new “areas” that hereto have not been captured by the LFS provides a reasonably appropriate platform and tool. The new “areas” should be to meet specific needs for users.
  - c) “Strategize” and collect information that are relevant for understanding the particular labour market limitations in a particular country – and yet leaving room for international comparison.
  
2. In deciding what additional information should/can be collected through LFS, some strategic choices have to be made and these include the following:
  - a) How will the additional information/data influence the timeliness of data availability in general and in respect to the new variables?
  - b) To what extent do they (new information) meet the data user needs and what are the necessary “trade-offs” to avoid overloading the LFS with serious resulting non -sampling errors?
  - c) From the perspective of cost and sustainability, what adjustments and necessary in the design and implementation of LFS, especially in developing countries, to be ensured they are sustainable.
  - d) Conceptual and operational definitions continue to hamper data collection, analysis and policy formulation in the labour market (e.g. informal sector and informal employment, self-employment, unemployed persons, etc...).

**Discussant: Mr. Krzysztof Hagemeyer, Social Security Financial, Actuarial and Statistical Branch, ILO**

Countries: Moldova and Ukraine

1. These two, very interesting presentations, confirmed how powerful tool the LFS is and how much one can learn on the changing patterns in the labour markets from such surveys. One has to bear in mind that in both countries in questions, although a regular LFS is a relatively new statistical tool, it proved to be nearly the only such a tool to show a full statistical picture of the dramatic changes which since more than a decade are transforming labour market in these two countries. Moldova and Ukraine, similarly to many other countries this part of Europe, are passing through not only a massive decrease and restructuring of employment and increasing unemployment, but also thorough equally dramatic changes in the quality of employment: with respect to wages, access to employment protection and social security, job security etc.
2. For the purpose of economic and policy analysis we need more qualitative information on employment. A good example is broadly defined social security/social protection. Policy analysts need to know who is covered by what parts of social protection systems (like affordable access to health care services, employment injury insurance, unemployment insurance/assistance, disability and old-age income security), and even more importantly who is not covered and why.
3. One can learn about social protection coverage from a number of sources: administrative records of the social protection institutions (if kept in order can tell us who is covered by different programmes), establishment surveys (for bigger establishments allow knowledge about employer provided benefits and social insurance contributions paid), household budget/living standards survey (can tell about who are actual beneficiaries and how much they get) and – last but not least – labour force survey. Coverage by social protection is usually – through respective legislations – closely linked to specific statuses in the labour market and employment, to sectors of employment etc., and thus LFS is potentially a very important source of information on this.
4. As we can see from the Moldavian survey, definition of the informal employment among employees is closely linked to the fact of being covered or not by social security (right to paid sick leave and the fact that employer is paying social security contribution defines that a person belongs to the formal employment category). In many countries also self-employed are supposed to contribute – on the mandatory basis – to social security (health, pensions, etc.) and this also can be used as a criterion to assess informality of employment (especially in cases when “registration” of the company criterion is not clear). However, self-employed often are asked to contribute mandatory only basing on some minimum amount and voluntarily above it, and this – ideally -should also be possible to capture through the survey as it has major consequence in terms of the quality of employment – its security.
5. The general issue that should be discussed is to what extent one and how one can standardise thee way in which questions about social protection are asked. Social protection systems

differ substantially among countries, which makes any difficult. However, there is a need to develop clear methodological guidelines on the ways questions about social protection/social security should be dealt with in LFS.