



Tripartite Validation Workshop of the Philippines Decent Work Country Profile

Workshop Report
Manila, 20–21 March 2012



This document has been produced with the financial assistance of the European Union. The views expressed herein can in no way be taken to reflect the official opinion of the European Union.

ILO COUNTRY OFFICE FOR PHILIPPINES
ILO/EC PROJECT “MONITORING AND ASSESSING PROGRESS ON DECENT WORK” (MAP)

Workshop Report

**Tripartite Validation Workshop of
the Philippines Decent Work Country Profile**

20-21 March 2012

Manila, Philippines

This document has been prepared by the International Labour Office
with funding from the European Union under the ILO/EC Project
“Monitoring and Assessing Progress on Decent Work” (MAP)

International Labour Office
Manila and Geneva

June 2012

Publications of the International Labour Office enjoy copyright under Protocol 2 of the Universal Copyright Convention. Nevertheless, short excerpts from them may be reproduced without authorization, on condition that the source is indicated. For rights of reproduction or translation, application should be made to the Publications Bureau (Rights and Permissions), International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland. The International Labour Office welcomes such applications.

Libraries, institutions and other users registered in the United Kingdom with the Copyright Licensing Agency, 90 Tottenham Court Road, London W1T 4LP [Fax: (+44) (0)20 7631 5500; email: cla@cla.co.uk], in the United States with the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923 [Fax: (+1) (978) 750 4470; email: info@copyright.com] or in other countries with associated Reproduction Rights Organizations, may make photocopies in accordance with the licences issued to them for this purpose.

ILO Cataloguing in Publication Data

Workshop report : tripartite validation workshop of the Philippines decent work country profile : 20-21 March 2012, Manila, Philippines / International Labour Office, ILO Country Office for Philippines, ILO/EC Project "Monitoring and Assessing Progress on Decent Work" (MAP).- Manila: ILO, 2012
1 v.

ISBN: 978-92-2-126457-6; 978-92-2-126458-3 (web pdf)

International Labour Office and ILO Country Office for the Philippines; Tripartite Validation Workshop of the Philippines Decent Work Country Profile (2012, Philippines)

decent work / employment / working conditions / social security / social dialogue / Philippines

13.01.1

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

The responsibility for opinions expressed in signed articles, studies and other contributions rests solely with their authors, and publication does not constitute an endorsement by the International Labour Office of the opinions expressed in them.

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

This document has been produced with the financial assistance of the European Union. The views expressed herein can in no way be taken to reflect the official opinion of the European Union.

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

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

Foreword

Creating decent work for all is one of the Philippines' greatest socio-economic challenges. Between 1990 and 2012, GDP in the country doubled, yet the recent pace of economic growth has been modest when compared to other emerging economies in the region. After two decades of economic expansion—during which time the country embraced globalization and undertook a wide range of economic reforms—decent and productive employment remains the privilege of a relatively few, with the vast majority of working age Filipinos still lacking the basic and essential tenets of decent work.

No single statistic adequately captures the concept of decent work, but a few give a sense of the enormity of the challenge facing the Philippines. In 2010, some 10 million people out of a workforce of 39 million were lacking work, including 3 million openly unemployed and 7 million who were working but wanted more work hours. Wages and earnings in real terms have been falling in the last decade. It is no surprise that, in 2006, 28 per cent of workers were living below the poverty line.

The Philippines was one of the first countries to adopt the Decent Work Agenda after the International Labour Organization (ILO) endorsed the framework in 1999. Some progress has since been made in integrating decent work components into development planning, as well as in the design of national policies and socio-economic programs. Strong commitment by the Philippines' government, working through a tripartite process, is a major advantage for the country as it pursues the ultimate goal of decent work for all.

The *Monitoring and Assessing Progress on Decent Work* ("MAP") project provides supports to national partners to measure and monitor decent work, especially by developing national assessments on progress towards decent work (Decent Work Country Profiles), from statistical indicators and legal framework indicators. The Profile provides comprehensive data on decent work for stakeholders in Philippines, as a tool to monitor and evaluate policies and programs towards decent work. It can be used as an important advocacy tool for policy making.

A *Tripartite Validation Workshop of the Philippines Decent Work Country Profile* was held in Manila from 20 to 21 March 2012, to give the opportunity to tripartite partners, other government agencies, academe, and civil society groups to discuss the main results of the study and advice on final amendments before its publication.

Several government agencies such as the DOLE, the NSO, and other agencies (Corporate Planning, PhilHealth, Social Security System...), as well as representatives from Employers' Confederation of the Philippines (ECOP) and various trade unions (APL, FFWL, DPWH Union, PSLINK) and academes (WAGI, UP-SOLAIR) were involved in the validation workshop. The tripartite consultation gathered views and comments on the adequacy and validity of the draft Profile, and sought guidance in improving the document. The stakeholders discussed the main results of the Profile and the way forward to use the Profile for policy design and advocacy, national development planning, and the monitoring of the country's Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP).

This report summarises the outcome of the workshop discussions and may serve as a valuable source for social dialogue and advocacy for decent work in Philippines. Constituents' comments and ideas are grouped together regardless of chronological order in which they were expressed during the two-day workshop. To the extent possible this report presents the main ideas expressed during the workshop, and reports in an objective manner the recommendations and suggestions made. These inputs have been considered by the profile-drafting team, led by the Bureau of Labor and Employment Statistics (BLES) and the ILO, with support of social partners, other government departments, and individual experts and have been incorporated to the extent possible in the document.



Lawrence Jeff Johnson

Director

ILO Country Office for Philippines

Contents

Foreword	i
Contents.....	iii
List of acronyms and abbreviations.....	v
Introduction	6
1. Welcome remarks and project background opening session	6
2. Measuring Decent Work in the Philippines	8
3. Overview of the Philippines Decent Work Country Profile : key findings and priority decent work challenges	9
4. Discussions: parallel working groups to review and revise chapters of the Philippines Profile.....	12
4.1 General comments	12
4.2. Chapter 1: Economic and Social Context	12
4.3. Chapter 2: Employment Opportunities	13
4.4. Chapter 3: Adequate Earnings and Productive Work	14
4.5. Chapter 4: Decent Hours.....	14
4.6. Chapter 5: Combining Work, Family and Personal Life	14
4.7. Chapter 6: Work That Should Be Abolished	15
4.8. Chapter 7: Stability and Security of Work.....	16
4.9. Chapter 8: Equal Opportunity and Treatment in Employment	16
4.10. Chapter 9: Safe Work Environment.....	17
4.11. Chapter 10: Social Security	18
4.12. Chapter 11: Social Dialogue, Workers’ and Employers’ Representation.....	18
5. Summary and Conclusion	19
Annex 1. Programme.....	22
Annex 2. Opening Address.	24
Annex 3. Message.	27
Annex 4. Closing Remarks.....	30
Annex 5. Workshop Outputs.....	32
Annex 6. List of Participants.....	33

List of acronyms and abbreviations

AFP-RSBS	Armed Forces of the Philippines-Retirement, Separation and Benefits System
APL	Alliance of Progressive Labor
BLES	Bureau of Labor and Employment Statistics
CBA	Collective Bargaining Agreement
CE	Certification Election
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women
CAN	Collective Negotiation Agreement
CRPD	Convention on Rights of Persons with Disabilities
DOLE	Department of Labor and Employment
ECC	Employees' Compensation Commission
ECOP	Employers Confederation of the Philippines
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
FFW	Federation of Free Workers
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GSIS	Government Service Insurance System
HDMF	Home Development Mutual Fund or Pag-ibig Fund
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
ICLS	International Conference of Labour Statisticians
ILO	International Labour Organization
ILS	Institute of Labour Studies
LEP	Philippine Labor and Employment Plan
LGBT	Lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and transsexuals
LSEF	Labor Standards Enforcement Framework
MAP	Monitoring and Assessing Progress on Decent Work
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
NAPC-WIS	National Anti-Poverty Commission-Workers in the Informal Sector
NCR	National Capital Region
NEET	Not in education and not in employment
PCSO	Philippine Charity Sweepstakes Office
PD	Presidential Decree
PDP	Philippine Development Plan
PHIC	Philippine Health Insurance Corporation
PPP	Private Public Partnership
SSS	Social Security System
TME	Tripartite Meeting of Experts
TUCP	Trade Union Congress of the Philippines
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Program

Introduction

The structure of this report is as follows. The first section presents the background to the project, Monitoring and Assessing Progress on Decent Work. Section III describes efforts in the Philippines to integrate the decent work framework into development planning as well as initiatives to develop decent work indicators appropriate to the national setting. Section IV provides a concise overview of the main findings of the Philippines Decent Work Country Profile. Section V summarizes the discussions during the workshop group discussions and plenary sessions, covering the 11 thematic areas corresponding to the chapters in the Profile. Section VI pulls together the main ideas, identifies some cross-cutting themes, and then concludes.

1. Welcome remarks and project background opening session¹

The 2008 ILO *Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization* recommended the establishment of appropriate indicators to track progress made in promoting decent work. In September 2008, the ILO convened an international Tripartite Meeting of Experts (TME) on the Measurement of Decent Work. The meeting gathered experts' views and recommendations on the conceptual framework proposed by the ILO staff in a discussion paper. Later in the year, the ILO Governing Body and the 18th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS) adopted the proposed framework of Decent Work Indicators. The Governing Body endorsed a proposal to test the framework in a number of pilot countries by developing Decent Work Country Profiles. The project *Monitoring and Assessing Progress on Decent Work* was then launched, in nine countries globally. The Philippines was among four countries in Asia—along with Bangladesh, Cambodia, and Indonesia—included in this initial “pilot” stage of the global MAP project.

Measuring progress towards decent work is a daunting task. Decent work is a complex, multidimensional concept combining access to full and productive employment, rights at work, social protection and the promotion of social dialogue. Each of the core dimensions of decent work is difficult to interpret by itself as they are typically heavily interrelated. The challenge, therefore, is to build an adequate framework that accommodates this complexity, as well as reflects the growing urgency of emerging themes like green jobs and sustainable enterprise development. Further complicating the task is that countries vary in circumstances and priorities, as well as capacity for data collection and analysis. Such conditions call for context-specific analysis and interpretation of a common set of indicators, combined with efforts to build national capacities for data collection in various aspects of the decent work agenda.

There is now near-universal recognition that decent and productive work is the key to achieving sustainable, inclusive, greener growth and development which has a lasting impact on reducing vulnerable employment and working poverty. The Decent Work Agenda has also taken root in the international development community, as evidenced in the inclusion in 2005 of MDG Target (1.B): “*achieving full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and young people*”. Systematic and transparent monitoring of progress towards the strategic objectives of the Decent Work Agenda is

¹ This section is based on the presentation of Lawrence Jeff Johnson, Director, ILO Philippines, *Welcome Remarks*, Tripartite Validation Workshop of the Philippines Decent Work Country Profile, Manila and the presentation of David Williams, *Philippines Decent Work Country Profile: Background and Process of Development*. It also refers to the report *Chairperson's Report: Tripartite Meeting of Experts on the Measurement of Decent Work*, Geneva, 8 to 10 September 2008

essential not just for measuring progress toward the MDGs, but also for effective national development planning and policymaking.

The MAP project, with the support of the European Commission, works with government, employers' and workers' organizations, along with research institutions to strengthen national capacities to self-monitor and self-assess progress towards decent work. It assists countries identify nationally relevant decent work indicators and supports the collection and use of data for integrated policy analysis. These indicators, together with information on the legal framework affecting the various aspects of decent work, are assembled into Decent Work Country Profiles.

Decent Work Country Profiles provide a baseline assessment of the state of decent work in a country, the progress that has been made in recent years, and the gaps and deficits that are outstanding. These are intended as a tool for monitoring national policies and programs to help policymakers and development practitioners better evaluate progress towards decent work, and to provide information and possible guidance to policymakers in the design of national policies and programmes. The process intends to facilitate greater engagement of social partners in the design and implementation of policies and programs on decent work and broader national development objectives.

The ILO Governing Body provides a number of basic principles to guide the work of the MAP project. The objective is to assess changes and progress towards decent work to guide policy development. The project avoids –and does not intend to facilitate– ranking countries according to decent work standards, although it encourages the use of standard formats and certain “standard” indicators to be used in all countries (and supplemented, where possible and desirable, with more locally specific ones).

At the same time, the project does aim to facilitate better measurement of progress in all four dimensions of decent work —full and productive employment, rights at work, social protection, and social dialogue.

The ILO's Tripartite Meeting of Experts (TME) identified key features of the current exercise. A proposed list of statistical indicators was agreed upon. The indicators are classified into three categories: (i) main indicators that should be collected for all countries; (ii) additional indicators that have particular relevance in some countries; and (iii) indicators that still need development before they can be included. This classification of indicators helps balance the desire to be comprehensive with what is feasible given the various country differences (and particularly, varying capacities for data collection), while at the same time keeping the list of indicators to a manageable size.

Realizing that progress in decent work cannot be assessed by statistical indicators alone, these are complemented with information on rights at work and the legal framework for decent work. Relevant national legislation in relation to the substantive elements of the Decent Work Agenda are to be provided, including information on the benefit level, evidence of implementation effectiveness and the coverage of workers in law and in practice, and information on the ratification of relevant ILO Conventions.

Furthermore, an analysis of gaps and trends over time in statistical indicators and legal information should be done in the context of a country's overall economic and social situation. In this regard, one chapter of the Decent Work Profile is dedicated to indicators that reflect the so-called “socio-economic context for decent work” –i.e. indicators that are critical to the achievement of decent work goals (health, education, economy, etc.).

2. Measuring Decent Work in the Philippines²

The Philippines was one of the first countries to pilot the decent work program after the ILO endorsed the framework in 1999. A National Plan of Action for Decent Work was adopted in 2002 identifying areas of consensus among tripartite partners, along with steps towards adopting the concept in the national context. The decent work concept was then subsequently introduced into the development planning process so that the pursuit of “full, decent, and productive employment” became part of the Medium Term Philippine Development Plan for 2001-2004. This was followed by the country ratifying three ILO Conventions: Convention 29 on Forced Labour, Convention 143 on Migrant Workers, and Convention 97 on Migration for Employment.

Further steps were taken through expansion of the National Tripartite Advisory Council, a high level committee that provides direction to activities and oversees implementation of the Common Agenda, to include the Alliance of Progressive Labor (APL) and the National Anti-Poverty Commission-Workers in the Informal Sector (NAPC-WIS). They joined the original Committee comprised of the Federation of Free Workers (FFW), Trade Union Congress of the Philippines (TUCP), Employers Confederation of the Philippines (ECOP), and the Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE).

The latest milestone is the completion of the Philippine Labor and Employment Plan (LEP) 2011-2016, the labour sector component of the Philippine Development Plan (PDP) 2011-2016. Formulated through a process of consultation with government agencies, workers’ and employers’ organizations, industry groups, and civil society, the LEP adopts the decent and productive work framework as a means to achieving inclusive growth.

The first attempt to develop decent work indicators in the Philippine context was made under the ILO-UNDP project on Measuring Decent Work through Statistical Indicators, which ran from 2004 to 2007. Workshops and consultation meetings were held. A pilot Labor Force Survey incorporating Decent Work Elements was supported by ILO in 2005. A list of Decent Work Indicators for the Philippines was constructed based on the standard ILO list, while indicators specific to the Philippines, namely, migration and remittances, were added (although not yet included in the profile due to a lack of adequate data). The project identified data gaps and initiatives to improve the measurement of decent work, and suggested mechanisms to strengthen data collection and analysis in this area.

MAP project activities began in the Philippines in 2011, with the initial identification of both the legal framework and statistical indicators (the latter being compiled and tabulated using the standard ILO framework on the measurement of decent work by the Bureau of Labour and Employment Statistics, Department of Labor and Employment). The narrative of the Profile was commissioned to two national consultants, one for the statistical indicators and the other on legal framework indicators. The drafting of the Profile was undertaken by the consultants with BLES providing technical assistance/inputs in the data analysis, and was reviewed by ILO experts in Bangkok and Geneva. Its content was then reviewed and discussed by ILO constituents and other interested parties at the aforementioned validation workshop (to which this report relates).

The current review and validation workshop aims to gather the views, comments and recommendations of Philippine tripartite constituents and partners to improve the draft

² This section is based on the presentation of Rosalinda Dimapilis-Baldoz, Secretary, Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE), *Message*, the presentation of Cynthia R. Cruz, Institute for Labor Studies, DOLE, *Getting the Indicators Right: the Philippine Labor & Employment Plan*, and the presentation of David Williams *Philippines Decent Work Country Profile: Background and Process of Development*.

Profile. The output of the workshop has been incorporated –by the BLES-ILO drafting team- into a revised draft prior to finalization and publication as an official document.

The profile will be updated on a regular basis –albeit not necessarily in the current form- to allow for continuous monitoring and assessment of progress towards decent work.

3. Overview of the Philippines Decent Work Country Profile : key findings and priority decent work challenges³

The Decent Work Philippines Country Profile marks progress made and identifies priority challenges in achieving decent work and improving the collection of data to measure decent work. The main findings can be divided into the ten thematic areas based on the international framework recommended by the 2008 TME on the Measurement of Decent Work, with a first overview of the social and economic context. The Profile covers the period 1995-2010, although for some indicators data is not available for all years.

Chapter 1. Economic and social context

Growth in labour productivity, which closely tracks per capita GDP (in PPP\$), barely grew from 1999 to 2002, and it was only in 2003-2010 that modest growth was sustained (albeit briefly interrupted by the global financial crisis in 2009). Agriculture continues to shed employment (measured by its share of total employment) to the service sector in particular, while the employment share of industry has likewise been falling.

The wage share in GDP fell from 28.3 per cent in 1998 to 24.5 per cent in 2003, before recovering to reach 28.6 per cent in 2009. Gains were made in terms of income inequality, as indicated by the declining ratio of income of top 10 per cent of families to bottom 10 per cent. Price inflation was contained at a still high 10 per cent, with spikes in 1998 and 2008.

Progress was made in the areas of education and health during the last 15 years (1995-2010) There was a rising trend in both the adult secondary graduation rate and the functional literacy rate, accompanied by a steady decline in the proportion of children (5-17 years old) not attending school. HIV incidence in the country remains low, albeit rising since 2008.

Chapter 2. Employment opportunities

The employment-to-population ratio remained virtually stagnant between 1995 and 2010 period at just below 60 per cent. Employment opportunities barely kept up with the growth in working age population. The unemployment rate rose between 1996 and 2004. The change in the official definition of unemployment in 2005 resulted in slightly declining unemployment rate. Youth not in education and not in employment (NEET) stood at close to 25 per cent of the youth population between 2006 and 2010, indicating an acute lack of employment opportunities for young people.

³ This section is based on the presentation of Mrs. Nelia R. Marquez, *Overview of the Philippines Decent Work Country Profile: Key findings and priority decent work challenges* (Powerpoint presentation) and the draft of the *Decent Work Country Profile for Philippines* Bureau of Labor and Employment Statistics-Department of Labor and Employment (BLES-DOLE).

Some gains can be noted in terms of the marked increase in the share of wage and salary workers in total employment, mostly in services where agricultural employment has shifted, and the corresponding reduction in the share of self-employment and unpaid family work. More employment opportunities were opened to women as indicated by the gradual rise in employment-to-population ratio and increasing share in non-agricultural wage employment.

Chapter 3. Adequate earnings and productive work

The lack of progress in this area is a major weakness of the Philippine labour market. The working poverty rate barely moved at 28 per cent between 1997 and 2006 (with only a temporary dip to 25 per cent in 2003). Low paid employees, defined as those earning below 2/3 of the median hourly basic pay, as a proportion of the employed was unchanged in 2001-2010. While the working poverty rate among female workers is lower than among men, the proportion of low-paid women employees is higher than that of low-paid men employees.

Chapter 4. Decent hours

The proportion of men and women with excessive hours of work in all jobs declined slightly over the last six years. The ratio is higher for women than men throughout the period.

Chapter 5. Combining work, family and personal life

The proportion of the working age population that is economically inactive due to household or family duties went down to 17 per cent in 2010 from 18 per cent in 1995. The rise in the proportion for men contrasts with the fall in the same proportion for women.

The proportion of employed workers who are married tended to rise until 2004, after which it began to decline. The overall trend was driven by the proportion for men. The proportion of employed women workers who are married steadily rose during the 16- year period.

Chapter 6. Work that should be abolished

Some progress was made in reducing economic activity rate of children 5-17 years old for both boys and girls. The proportion went down from 12 per cent in 2004 to 9 per cent in 2010 for boys and from 7 per cent to 5 per cent for girls.

Improvement was more tentative when it comes to lowering the proportion of working children not currently attending school, rising from 2006 to 2008 and going down in the next two years. The high proportion of working children not attending school at 55 per cent for both sexes is cause for concern.

Chapter 7. Stability and security of work

Employees in precarious work are those whose nature of employment is short-term or seasonal or casual or those who worked for different employers on day-to-day or week-to-week basis. The ratio of employees in precarious work to total employed fluctuated between 13 per cent and 15 per cent over the period 1995-2010, with no clear trend of increasing over time. A slight increase in the proportion for women can be detected. Precarious work is most widespread in the construction industry at 40 per cent, compared with 15 per cent overall, in 2010. The construction industry is the only industry where the proportion is significantly high.

Chapter 8. Equal opportunity and treatment in employment

The share of women in total employment and in non-agricultural wage employment has been growing, accompanied by considerable improvement in their share in managerial occupations. Segmentation of the labour market on the basis of sex has declined. While the gender wage gap remains low, recent progress in this respect has been erratic.

Chapter 9. Safe work environment

Interventions to promote a safe work environment appear to have made an impact as indicated by the sharp decline in the incidence rate of occupational injuries -both fatal and non-fatal. Average days lost due to temporary incapacity remained low. However, cause for concern remain in the rising incidence of occupational diseases and the low and declining number of labour inspectors (No. of inspectors per 100,000 employees in private establishments).

Chapter 10. Social security

Considerable progress has been achieved in moving towards universal health insurance coverage (coverage reached 74 per cent in 2010). However, this positive development is partly negated by a declining share since 2001 of health care expenditure not financed out of pocket by private households (i.e. the share of total health spending that has come from households—rather than the state—has risen). The share of social security benefits to GDP was 1.7 per cent in 2009, which despite having risen since 1995 remains low by international standards.

Chapter 11. Social dialogue, workers' and employers' representation

There has been a dramatic decline in union membership and CBA coverage in the last decade and a half, a phenomenon that is not confined to the Philippines. Consequently, a sharp drop in the number of strikes and lockouts has been recorded during this period. Social dialogue has taken on new forms with the rise in national and industry tripartite councils, and the institutionalization of industry codes of practice. Nevertheless, trends in this area pose a major challenge to the realization of decent work in the Philippines.

4. Discussions: parallel working groups to review and revise chapters of the Philippines Profile

4.1 General comments

The Profile should provide more details on the legal framework, e.g. full title of laws and key provisions, to give the reader a clear sense of the link to the relevant element of decent work. More importantly, the legal framework and decent work indicators are linked through enforcement and implementation. A discussion of enforcement and implementation of laws could shed light on the link between the legal framework and labour market outcomes.

Another important limitation of the legal framework is that it is primarily intended to cover formal employment. This needs to be noted in the document. The Profile will have to find a way to present the legal framework in concise and meaningful manner.

Decent work must be better defined in the document. Chapters should define the substantive elements of decent work to provide an introductory perspective and context. Cross-references with related chapters should be indicated to enable a consolidated view of trends.

Gender disaggregation is a cross-cutting theme, and focus of analysis is usually on women. There is a need to balance attention on both sexes in order not to miss out on emerging issues/problems that concern men. Insofar as women are concerned, domestic, family, reproductive and care work must be given sufficient attention.

Decent Work indicators can guide policymakers in the development of programs that target specific sectors or problems, e.g. youth unemployment. Indicators can also be used in the mid-term review of the Labor and Employment Plan (LEP). In general, they are critical inputs to evidence-based policy design and program planning.

4.2. Chapter 1: Economic and Social Context

This chapter should begin with the Philippine Development Plan which makes a clear reference to decent and productive employment as a means to achieve inclusive growth. This can be further improved by emphasizing the tripartite process in the creation of decent work.

This chapter can benefit from a more thorough discussion of macroeconomic issues critical to the generation of decent and productive employment. For example, investment has clear implications on job creation and a discussion of related issues—investment policy, cost of doing business, investments generated by foreign trips of the President and government leaders, and so on—provides a useful additional context to the discussion.

Data on enterprises should be provided and correlated with employment/unemployment indicators. Enterprise development is an important component of decent work creation, and is closely related to investment (as noted in the previous paragraph). Critical constraints to enterprise establishment, growth and sustainability are areas that require greater policy attention. In view of their large share of employment, the constraints facing SMEs require separate treatment.

Likewise, government programs that have direct impact on labour demand and supply, including Private-Public Partnerships (PPP), investments in agriculture, asset reform, and reproductive health, should be mentioned as backdrop.

Doubt was raised on the relevance in the local context of the indicator of the proportion of the working age population with HIV. Instead, an indicator of workers infected with tuberculosis might be more appropriate in the Philippine setting. The HIV indicator should be placed under the heading of Safe Work (Chapter 8).

The type of structural transformation witnessed in the Philippines whereby labour is moving from agriculture—and apparently also industry—towards the services sector deserves more in depth treatment. The service sector is bimodal with a large segment (in terms of employment share) marked by low-productivity marginal activities (retail and repair work, household work, informal services) co-existing with modern subsectors (finance, real estate, transportation, business services). The data should be disaggregated to show which subsectors in the services sectors jobs are being generated. What is happening in the industrial sector that is affecting and precipitating this transformation? Are FDIs going to industry or the services sector? Answers to these questions provide a crucial context to understanding major trends and assessing progress (or the lack of it) towards decent work in the Philippines.

A related issue is the relationship between an industrial plan and the necessity of a policy of increasing regular wage employment. These are two key factors in improving many aspects of decent work, including employment opportunities, adequate earnings and decent hours.

It is recommended that indicators on education include: (i) the cohort survival rate to track dropout rates; and, (ii) data on the educational attainment of the labour force. The current indicators on adult education appear to have more bearing on employment opportunities for adults, and therefore should be placed under that heading (Chapter 2).

On the legal framework, the Profile seems to have missed some proposals and programs undertaken by government, including those agreed upon through a tripartite process. Also, there should be a balanced assessment of the positive and negative aspects of the legal framework.

4.3. Chapter 2: Employment Opportunities

The chapter can be complemented with a discussion of policy interventions that have a direct impact on the promotion of full employment.

It was noted that access to employment should be followed by a discussion of the quality of jobs, more so in relation to jobs generated by government programs. Access to employment per se can be misleading considering that people resort to marginal jobs in the absence of sufficient decent and productive jobs.

The issue of job quality is closely related to the fact that in the Philippine setting (as in most middle and low income countries) the lack of employment opportunities is reflected in labour underutilization rather than open unemployment. The profile does include measures of labour underutilization (namely, time related underemployment and visible underemployment) in chapter 4, however it was noted that a cross reference in chapter 2 is made to these indicators, as well as others reflecting employment quality.

4.4. Chapter 3: Adequate Earnings and Productive Work

There is generally less familiarity with the concept of working poverty than the simple poverty rate. Furthermore, a discussion of the methodology to arrive at the working poverty rate indicator is warranted in view of frequent changes in the official methodology for estimating poverty lines. In this respect, it was asked whether the ILO intends to use the international poverty line to identify the working poverty for international comparison.

4.5. Chapter 4: Decent Hours

Given the extent of the labour underutilization problem in the Philippines today, excessive working hours appears to be a lesser –albeit still significant- problem. In certain segments of the workforce, excessive hours are still prevalent, for example among pedicab, tricycle, jeepney and taxi drivers, small shop owners and workers, household and other service workers. In these occupations, long working hours are the norm, and this is often accompanied with various other decent work deficits (poor working conditions and pay, inadequate access to social security, and so on).

Nonetheless, it is important to examine the reasons behind excessive work hours or people holding on to multiple jobs, that is whether this is related to low earnings or poor job quality. It should be noted that since April 2005, the inquiry on reasons for excessive hours is part of the LFS questionnaire. In 2007, it was found that close to 60 per cent of the employed worked excessive hours for more earnings. Excessive hours of work also raise the issue of overtime pay for wage workers.

Excessive work hours affect women more so than men in the Philippines. The Profile should explore the nature of employment that is dominated by women, and how this relates to the issue of long working hours.

4.6. Chapter 5: Combining Work, Family and Personal Life

The rationale behind the two indicators used in this chapter should be clarified. The assumption seems to be that being economically inactive due to household or family duties indicates that the work environment is not conducive to a balanced work and family life. A lower ratio therefore indicates progress towards decent work. Likewise, it appears that an increasing proportion of employed workers who are married signals progress towards decent work on the assumption that being employed and married implies a work environment conducive to balanced work and family life.

The above assumptions need to be examined and validated through disaggregation and analysis of the data. The data on the economically active due to household or family duties may be disaggregated by age, civil status, region, and whether head of family. Of particular interest are: (i) the proportion of single women who are household heads; (ii) the elderly (60 years old and above presumably retired) who work as home/care worker; and (iii) the proportion of single workers and solo parents assuming the role of the head of family and taking care of elderly household members.

An alternative indicator may be generated from time use survey measuring the burden of reproductive/care work. This would provide a better picture of the family and personal life of workers, and the burden on specific household members. Such data may be useful in informing the design of workplace programs promoting a balanced work and family life.

An emerging issue that falls under this element of decent work concerns children left behind by overseas workers who are forced to assume the role of household head. In some cases this follows the death of an elderly household member to whom the family has been entrusted. This raises questions not only about how these young people balance their own education, work, and family life, but also the extent to which the work of overseas Filipinos constitutes decent work (when it lacks an adequate work-family balance). This is one of many issues brought about by the phenomenon of overseas employment that challenge current definitions of “decent work.”

With regard to the legal framework indicators, two shortcomings are identified: (i) the indicators focus on women; and, (ii) most laws provide only leave benefits. There are existing policies that impact on work and family life but are not captured by the legal framework indicators, e.g. allocating a share of the government budget to gender programs. More generally, this raises the question as to whether the legal framework indicators based on laws and ratified ILO conventions adequately capture the relevant government interventions that facilitate or hinder the achievement of decent work goals. (See also Chapter 8)

Statistical and legal indicators on this element of decent work can help policymakers formulate programs to benefit the economically inactive, formulation of better programs to promote gender equality, and mainstream reproductive/domestic work performed by women.

4.7. Chapter 6: Work That Should Be Abolished

The Profile presents the proportion of working children to working population. A disaggregation of the data on working children by sector or industry would be useful and would highlight critical problems, including children engaged in the “sex-work” industry.

Distinction should be made between child labour and working children (i.e. with work permits). This chapter underlines the need for data on child labour as well as statistics on problems associated with child labour. The latter would include “batang hamog” or children exploited by criminal elements, children in conflict with the law, children in areas of conflict, children in the sex industry, and so on.

Statistics on child labour should be disaggregated by age, sex, occupation, industry, urban/rural, and so on. It must capture reasons for child work, work hours, and attendance in school. Regular child labour surveys are essential to monitor and assess this situation.

In this regard, the Profile will benefit from the release this year of the survey on working children. It is hoped that from this point on the survey on working children will be conducted by the NSO on a regular basis. Present law prescribes hours of work, but it is not easy to capture actual working hours of children.

There may be a need to highlight the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child and PD No. 603 (Child and Youth Welfare Code). Deeper understandings of child labour – including its root causes- can result in more effective laws and policies.

4.8. Chapter 7: Stability and Security of Work

The concept of precarious work is premised on the existence of an employer-employee relationship and relates to the absence of security of tenure. Some important segments of the work force may be excluded from this concept. For one, work in the informal economy sector is extremely precarious because of seasonality, the lack of permanent place of business or work, unstable demand, and inherently temporary nature of most micro enterprises. For another, again overseas workers are usually on temporary contracts (less than a year). Public sector workers facing endless “rationalization” of the bureaucracy in a sense lose stability and security of work, notwithstanding payment of separation/termination benefits. These classes of workers—informal, overseas, and public sector workers—whose security of work is arguably “precarious” are not covered by the statistical indicator chosen for this chapter.

Data on termination of employment in the public and private sectors should be collected. The questions in the Labor Force Survey which pertain to the employment contract and worker’s expectation of stay in the present job are currently insufficient. The current LFS is not intended to capture the nature of work and working conditions in so-called non-standard and contingent employment, which is increasingly becoming the norm in many industries that employ a large number of young workers in urban centres (in retail, fast-food, and export manufacturing, for example). However, in the proposed revision of the LFS questionnaire due to be piloted in 2012, there includes an item of inquiry on employment tenure and duration of employment.

Moreover, the emphasis on “tenure” misses out on the fact that possibly the majority of regular rank-and-file and production workers are employed on a no-work-no-pay basis. In other words, while these workers do have security of tenure, actual work and earnings can be highly irregular or unstable subject to fluctuations in product demand, even unavoidable slack time (for example, there is no work when equipment and machinery undergo maintenance repair or in between job orders). On the other end of the spectrum, there are non-regular workers with high incomes. In sum, stability and security of work must be related to tenure as well as to earnings, and thus is clearly related to the element of social protection.

Questions were posed as to whether the increasing incidence of precarious work in the Philippines is correlated to decreasing trade union density and collective bargaining. It is clearly in the interest of trade unions to bargain for security of tenure of members, however this becomes more difficult when union density is thinning. The analysis in this chapter should refer to the indicators in chapter 11 (Social Dialogue).

On the legal framework, there is apparent inconsistency between, on the one hand, stability and security of work as substantive element of decent work and, on the other hand, recognition of casual, seasonal, fixed-period, and project employment in the Philippine Labor Code. The latter has become the basis for the hiring of casual, seasonal and project workers contributing to increasing prevalence of precarious work.

4.9. Chapter 8: Equal Opportunity and Treatment in Employment

It was noted that while the wage gap is an acceptable indicator of decent work, the other statistical indicators in this chapter are somewhat limited. A major limitation is the focus on women. Current indicators are blind to other forms of discrimination such as discrimination at work against the elderly as well as lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and transsexuals (collectively known as the LGBT community).

The increasing number of female overseas workers points to the relevance of this element in overseas employment. From the perspective of promoting decent work, questions were asked as to whether overseas employment is within the purview of the sending country. If it is, then statistical indicators need to cover them –although this is currently a major challenge that will not be overcome in the short run. If it is not, however, questions then arise as to how a country like the Philippines can actually define decent work for its nationals working overseas? (See also Chapters 5 & 7).

Unequal opportunity and treatment may also be evident in the hiring and firing practices (as opposed to coded policies) of companies insofar as such practices take into account, wittingly or unwittingly, the worker's marital status, sexual orientation, and accumulated leave benefits –particularly of women workers. In this respect, the chapter may benefit from the recent ILS (Institute of Labor Studies, DOLE) study on gender discrimination.

An indicator of sexual harassment in the workplace should be included either in this chapter or in the chapter on safe work. Furthermore, data on the public sector should be included. The same comment is made in relation to chapter 11 (Social Dialogue) and chapter 7 (Stability and Security at Work).

On the legal framework, it was observed that the rising number of laws and policy reforms giving more benefits to women may be contradictory to emerging trends, whereby men are taking on increased responsibilities for childcare and raising families.

The legal framework should include other conventions (non-ILO) that promote equal opportunity and treatment at work and elsewhere. Examples include: Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), Convention on Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), Madrid Programme of Action for Senior Citizens, Yogyakarta Principles on the Application of International Human Rights Law in relation to Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity, Convention on the Rights of Migrant Workers, International Covenant on Social, Economic and Cultural Rights.

4.10. Chapter 9: Safe Work Environment

It was noted that the Profile should better indicate and explain data limitations. For example, data on occupational disease incidence may understate the true incidence by not counting those workers who suffer from more than one disease.

Data on accidents, injuries and disease should be correlated with compliance to labour standards across regions in order to identify problem areas and take appropriate action. Further disaggregation by region, injuries/disease categories, industry, and size of establishment would also be useful. Data on work accidents from administrative reports may be presented in future updates of the Profile.

At the same time, the Profile should present data on rates of compliance to labour standards generated through inspection. The case of small establishments, which make up 90 per cent of all establishments, presents a dilemma. Under the Labor Standards Enforcement Framework (LSEF), DOLE undertakes advisory services only. Yet there is generally low compliance rate in regions outside the National Capital Region (NCR), where 75 per cent of small establishments operate.

Another relevant government intervention that is helping develop safe work practices among smaller enterprises is the DOLE Kapatiran program, which brings together large and small enterprises into a *big-brother-little-brother* partnership. The program can serve as vehicle for promoting safe work and encouraging voluntary compliance with labour standards. For example, some big companies tie the continuation of business contracts with their smaller counterparts to the latter's compliance with labour standard.

4.11. Chapter 10: Social Security

An analysis of the benefits offered by the three major social security institutions, SSS, GSIS and PhilHealth, will shed light on the trends observed for the indicators in this chapter. One issue, for instance, is the low value of pension benefits under the SSS, in part due to the proliferation of other benefits.

Data gaps identified for this chapter include: (i) other social protection schemes that are not covered by the Profile, including the Employees' Compensation Commission (ECC), Home Development Mutual Fund or Pag-Ibig Fund, Armed Forces of the Philippines – Retirement, Separation and Benefits System (AFP-RSBS), Philippine Charity Sweepstakes Office (PCSO); (ii) data on membership and contributions to the system as these would be good indicators of the viability of the system; and, (iii) social security of workers in the informal economy, including membership in PhilHealth and SSS.

The social security system was designed with regular employment in mind. Part-time workers should be able to participate in the system and contribute on the basis of total earnings from all jobs. Portability of social security benefits might encourage workers to take advantage of employment opportunities that are not necessarily regular or full-time, but which may allow the worker to earn more than he/she would earn on a regular/full-time basis.

The SSS is currently examining two options to improve the level of benefits. The first is an increase in the contribution rate for those who want to have larger benefits. This requires amending the law which sets contribution levels. The second option is to establish a Provident Fund for workers to be introduced on voluntary basis. This also addresses the issue of portability.

4.12. Chapter 11: Social Dialogue, Workers' and Employers' Representation

There is disagreement on the interpretation of the statistical indicators for this element of decent work. One view regards decreasing union density, CBA coverage and number of strikes/lockouts as a positive development indicative of growing industrial harmony. The other view takes these trends as detrimental to decent work based on the premise that freedom of association and collective bargaining are “threshold rights”. A suggestion was made to remove the indicator on strikes and lockout on the argument that it is difficult to interpret the indicator in relation to decent work.

Nevertheless, it is important to relate the indicators on social dialogue to underlying trends in the economy and labour market. Increasing use of contractual employment arrangements, (comparably) weak economic growth, the large share of small establishments and a growing informal economy are just some of the factors that account for recent negative developments in the area of social dialogue. On the issue of non-regular workers joining unions, while the Labor Code allows this, unions claim that employers are often ambivalent on this issue. Employers often prefer to exclude non-regular workers during the certification election (CE) and tend to exclude them during collective bargaining.

A major gap in the Profile under this chapter is the absence of indicators for public sector and informal sector workers. Public sector workers are covered by collective negotiation agreements (CNA), while informal sector workers are represented by workers' associations. For instance, union density and collective bargaining coverage are low outside the NCR, but membership in workers' associations is rising.

Finally, indicators on labour dispute settlement mechanisms can complement data on strikes and lockouts. It was noted that there is far greater reliance on compulsory rather than voluntary arbitration, on conciliation rather than preventive mediation, and that this skewedness may be related to low and declining union coverage. There are venues for dialogue other than collective bargaining and industrial action, and these should be adequately reflected in the Profile.

5. Summary and Conclusion

1. There was general consensus on the usefulness and feasibility of measuring and assessing progress toward decent work through a Decent Work Country Profile. This was evident in the fact none of the participants questioned either the desirability of this exercise (or the validation workshop itself), or the reliability of the statistical indicators used. That said, questions were raised about the relevance and applicability of certain indicators, and their remains a strong appetite among participants for further improvement and additions to the current set of national indicators. In all, participants agreed that the current choice of indicators had been compiled judiciously, and they expressed confidence in the Philippine statistical system.
2. There was also discussion on the usefulness of the profile for policy decision-making, updating of the Labor and Employment Plan, reporting on the MDGs. It was recognized that decent Work indicators can guide policymakers in the development of programs that target specific sectors or problems, e.g. youth unemployment. Indicators can also be used in the mid-term review of the Labor and Employment Plan (LEP). In general, they are critical inputs to evidence-based policy design and program planning.
3. Each chapter in the Profile should contain a definition of elements and the statistical indicators, the reason why a specific indicator is chosen, and what it means in terms of decent work. Not all readers are/will be familiar with all the indicators, and some indicators (in particular those of social dialogue) are open to conflicting interpretations arising from differing perspectives.
4. Many comments concern the need for deeper analysis, relating the various elements of decent work with one another, and further disaggregation of statistical indicators to reveal the reason behind an observed trend or pattern. At one level, the strong demand for supplementary information and analysis indicates recognition of the value and usefulness of the current exercise. On another level, it reveals familiarity with the concept of decent work.
5. Suggestions for a (future) *composite index* of decent work (cutting across all decent work areas) were raised, but this was countered by those who suggest that even with such an index, there will remain calls for more indicators and further disaggregation of existing ones. Future Profiles will ultimately have to strike a balance between measures of central tendency (single statistic/composite index) and measures of variability (disaggregation). The Profile should have both single indices but also explanatory indicators that will further give the reasons why the directions are favourable or not. A similar tripartite effort was made in 2004 to construct the Philippine Labor Index (PLI) which attempted to measure the 10 elements of decent work. Statistical tests on standard indicators were done to narrow down the list to those that contributed most to variance. The methodology for the Index was

approved by the NSCB Board in 2006. The Index data series has been published/posted in its website by BLES starting with its 2007 edition of the Yearbook of Labor Statistics. However, with the availability of the compiled data on decent work statistical indicators in 2011, the release of the Index was discontinued. Instead, the 2011 issue of the Yearbook contained a special chapter on statistics on the DWI. This was done to avoid confusion as there are some indicators in the Index that are defined differently from the DWI. For example:

Indicator	PLI	DWI
Low-paid employees	Total wage and salary workers with hourly basic pay below 1/2 of the median hourly basic pay as a percentage share of total employees.	Total wage and salary workers with hourly basic pay below 2/3 of the median hourly basic pay as a percentage share of total employed.
Rates of days not worked per 1000 employees in private establishments		Total days not worked by workers involved due to strikes and lockouts divided by employees in private establishments, then multiplied by 1,000
Workdays not worked due to strikes and lockouts per worker	Total days not worked by workers involved due to strikes and lockouts divided by employment in establishments Involved in strikes and lockouts	

But even with a single index one still wants to know what happened. In the case of the PLI the overall trend is unduly influenced by the trend in the number of strikes/lockouts which demonstrates the disadvantage of a single index number. With respect to the Decent Work Country Profile, the international agreement was not to come up with a single index for decent work.

6. Reading the legal framework indicators in its current format is a challenge. More work is needed to make the legal template more user-friendly. In terms of content, one issue is whether it should cover policies and programs, that is, government interventions not necessarily at the level of laws that may have an impact on decent work. This point relates as well to the chapter on economic and social context. Furthermore, while the legal framework indicators include the relevant ILO conventions, there are non-ILO conventions that are equally crucial in advancing decent work, most notably those pertaining to equal opportunity and treatment at work as well as child labour, and should perhaps be reflected in the framework.
7. Data gaps were identified in the discussions. Generation of these statistics will require additional resources and strong demand from data users. In this respect, the proposed reorganization of the Philippine Statistical System (a proposed bill in the House of Representatives was recently approved by the Committee on Appropriations) is a positive development. Some of the current data gaps include:
 - a. Child labour;
 - b. Informal sector (workers' association coverage, benefits to members);
 - c. Public sector (CNA coverage, social security);
 - d. Non-standard, non-regular employment (coverage, actual work hours or work days, length of contract, days not worked, stability of income);
 - e. Work hours;

-
- f. Vulnerable employment;
 - g. Overseas Migration.
8. Finally, the discussions explored the need for capacity building to make better use of the Profile and strengthen its link with policymaking. Capacity building in terms of understanding the Profile was deemed useful to the labour sector. In particular, there is a need to build capacity at the level of company unions. In addition, capacity building should cover basic knowledge of key ILO documents that serve as background to the Profile, in particular the 1998 ILO Convention on Fundamental Principles on Rights at Work and the 2008 ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization.

Annex 1. Programme.

Tripartite Validation Workshop of the Philippines Decent Work Country Profile

March 20-21, 2012

Manila Philippines

Programme

DAY 1	
8:00-9:00 AM	Registration
9:00-9:30 AM	Welcome and opening remarks Mr. Lawrence Jeff Johnson, Director, ILO, Manila Office Secretary Rosalinda Dimapilis-Baldoz, DOLE David Williams, <i>Philippines Decent Work Country Profile: Background and Process of Development</i>
10:00-10:15 AM	<i>Coffee/Tea Break</i>
10:15-10:45 AM	Presentation of the Philippine Labor and Employment Plan, 2011-2016
10:45-11:45 AM	Overview of the Philippines Decent Work Country Profile: Mrs. Nelia Marquez, National Consultant <i>Key findings and priority decent work challenges</i>
11:45-1:00 PM	Lunch
1:00-1:15 PM	Organization of working groups
1:15-2:15 PM	Parallel working groups to review and comment on the assigned chapters of the Philippines Profile Group 1 – Economic and Social Context for Decent Work Group 2 – Combining Work, Family and Personal Life Group 3 – Stability and Security of Work
2:15-3:15 PM	Parallel working groups to review and comment on the assigned chapters of the Philippines Profile Group 1 – Employment Opportunities Group 2 – Work that Should be Abolished Group 3 – Safe Work Environment and Social Security
3:15-3:30 PM	<i>Coffee/Tea Break</i>
3:30-5:00 PM	Parallel working groups to review and comment on the assigned chapters of the Philippines Profile Group 1 – Adequate Earnings and Productive Work and Decent Hours Group 2 – Equal Opportunity and Treatment in Employment Group 3 – Social Dialogue, Workers' and Employers' Representatives

DAY 2	
8:30-9:30 AM	Presentation of outputs by Group 1 Open Discussion
9:30-10:15 AM	Presentation of outputs by Group 2 Open Discussion
10:15-10:30 AM	<i>Coffee/Tea Break</i>
10:30-11:30 AM	Presentation of outputs by Group 3 Open Discussion
11:30-12:30 PM	Next Steps/Way Forward
12:30	Lunch
1:30-2:30 PM	Workshop Summary
2:30-3:00 PM	<i>Closing Remarks</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms Carmelita Ericta, Administrator, National Statistics Office

Mr. Ciriaco Lagunzad III
Executive Director, National Wages and Productivity Council
Moderator and Master of Ceremonies

Annex 2. Opening Address.

Opening Address. Lawrence Jeff Johnson, Director, ILO Country Office for the Philippines

Secretary Baldoz of the Department of Labor and Employment, Ciriaco Lagunzad, Executive Director, NWPC, employers and workers representatives, members of the academe and civil society, the Philippine Statistical Community, my colleagues from the ILO Manila and Bangkok, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, *magandang umaga sa inyong lahat!*

Let me start by welcoming each of you to this tripartite validation workshop on the Philippines Decent Work Country Profile. Decent and productive work is key mechanism for achieving sustainable, inclusive, greener growth which will have a lasting impact on addressing vulnerable employment and reducing the ranks of the working poor.

The global economic crisis has awakened most but not all to the simple fact that growth alone and at any cost is simply not enough nor is it sustainable. The simple truth that has often been overlooked is that it's not about the level of economic growth but rather how we achieve sustainable inclusive growth that service our communities, the Philippines and the world.

Growth that provides opportunities for work that is both productive and decent while ensuring social dialogue an establishing mechanism to share equally in the gains between both capital and labour.

Economic growth that provides security in the workplace and social protection for workers and their families while safeguarding the freedoms that allows individuals and groups to express their concerns and help to find ways to improve productivity and to participate in decisions that affect their lives. Systematic and transparent monitoring of progress towards decent and productive work is essential.

In 2008, the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization recommended:

“the establishment of indicators or statistics, if necessary with the assistance of the ILO, to monitor and evaluate progress made”.

Each of us here today realizes that the Decent Work Agenda which combines access to full and productive employment with rights at work, social protection and the promotion of social dialogue is a complex issue, in turn means that such measurement can be a complex and daunting task.

In September 2008, the ILO convened an international Tripartite Meeting of Experts on the Measurement of Decent Work. At that time, I served as the Chief of the Employment Trends in Geneva and our department was actively involved in the discussions.

Following the Expert Meeting, the 18th International Conference of Labour Statisticians adopted a framework on Decent Work Indicators which was still revolutionary at that time and in some ways controversial.

The Governing Body endorsed the proposal to test the framework in a limited number of countries, by developing Decent Work Country Profiles.

The project, Monitoring and Assessing Progress on Decent Work, with funding from the European Union, works with government, employers' and workers' organizations, along with research institutions to strengthen national capacity to self-monitor and self-assess progress towards decent work. The project covers nine countries globally, including four countries in Asia: Bangladesh, Cambodia, Indonesia and the Philippines. The project has assisted in identifying nationally relevant decent work indicators and supported the collection and use of data for integrated policy analysis.

Decent Work Country Profiles are developed to provide baseline assessment which is relevant to national development policies and planning. The Profile aims to help policymakers and development practitioners better evaluate progress towards decent work, and to provide information for national planning and policymaking. Decent Work Country Profiles are developed with the government, employers and workers in mind. The process intends to facilitate greater engagement of social partners in designing and implementing of policies and programmes on decent work and broad national development objectives.

In the Philippines, the discussion on the Decent Work Indicators trace back to as early as 2004. The ILO in collaboration with the UNDP had a project on Measuring Progress on Decent Work through statistical indicators in partnership with DOLE.

In 2005, the ILO further provided support in pilot-testing the Labor Force Survey to incorporate decent work elements together with the National Statistics Office.

The draft Decent Work Country Profile which will be discussed here today contains decent work indicators from 1995-2010. I've spoken with the team responsible and I remain hopeful we can update the report before its release to reflect the situation on the ground in 2011.

As discussed, decent and productive work is a key mechanism to address vulnerable employment, working poverty, and poverty, which are all part of the MDG set of indicators.

Vulnerable employment comprises those in self-employed and unpaid family workers, those who often lack access to social protection, social dialogue and often fall outside coverage of the legal framework.

Within the Philippines, vulnerable employment has seen downward trend but remains at a high 45 per cent of those that are economically active, slightly below the regional average. While working poverty rate has remained near 28 per cent, below the regional average, but I think we can do much more in this area.

It is now commonly accepted that full and productive employment and decent work for all is the main route for people to escape poverty and which is critical for achieving the MDGs.

Such recognition led to the inclusion in 2005 of a new Millennium Development Goal Target (1.B): "achieving full and productive employment and decent work for all, including young people", for which myself and my team had the chance to lead the Asian Technical Working Group for the MDGs.

Providing employment that can generate both earnings and economic growth is still a challenge in many parts of the world, including here in the Philippines. So how do we create decent work? This is a challenge that we can look up by analyzing the data that we have in front of us. A further challenge that still remains is translating statistical information into policies and programmes to address Decent Work deficits.

Given this challenge, it is my belief, that it is imperative that we work together to further discuss how this Decent Work Country Profile can be useful in policy decision-making.

The two-day workshop aims to facilitate dialogue among our constituents, which includes: the Department of Labor and Employment, the workers, among those present today are the Federation of Free Workers, Alliance of Progressive Labor and PSLINK, the employers, notably the Employers' Confederation of the Philippines, and other stakeholders from civil society. Coming together is critical to understanding how these data and statistics will be used.

It will also give us the opportunity to assess ways of updating the Profile and brainstorming on policy implications based on the findings. We must also keep in mind that the profile is also a valuable teaching tool. It is still amazing to me as an economist to see how many people still don't know the definition of unemployment. This is something we need to deal with policymakers to understand what the real challenges are. In a country like the Philippines where unemployment hovers around 7 per cent

and often is a very serious issue for the young educated but is not as important to those people in poverty. Just a food for thought: if you could transform those individuals with skills and training where they are more productive, what would be the economic impact on GDP in this country, what would be the impact on livelihoods, what would be the impact on the multiplier effect as they earn more money and increase their demand for goods and services. We can have a much broader impact by addressing that number up front.

Let me acknowledge and thank once again the European Union for their support to help strengthen the capacity of countries on data collection and tabulation. But most importantly, the analysis and dissemination of critical decent work indicators for countries such as the Philippines.

Let me also recognize the DOLE Bureau of Labor and Employment Statistics for the strong partnership on this and numerous other endeavours. Again let me also thank you for joining us to share your time and expertise.

I wish you a successful workshop.

Mabuhay!

Annex 3. Message.

Message

Secretary Rosalinda Dimapilis-Baldoz, DOLE

Introduction. It is my pleasure to join you today and I would like to thank you all for travelling from your place of work to attend this two-day tripartite validation workshop of the Philippine Decent Work Country Profile. We are deeply honoured that the Head of Delegation of the European Union Delegation to the Philippines have graciously taken time out of their busy schedule to join us as we discuss and review the progress made by the country in the area of Decent Work.

We take pride as one of the countries to pilot the decent work program when ILO first endorsed the framework in 1999. With support and technical assistance, the tripartite partners developed the first cycle of the National Plan of Action for Decent Work in 2002 or what we now refer to as the Decent Work Common Agenda. It represents the areas of consensus that the tripartite agreed to pursue. These are the initiatives which we as a tripartite body committed to work on together and lend support to one another.

During the first cycle, efforts were directed at introducing the decent work concept in the Philippine Development Plan. Because of the tripartite partner's commitment to the objective, the pursuit of "full, decent, and productive employment" was integrated into the Medium term Philippine Development Plan for 2001-2004.

By the second cycle of the Decent Work Common Agenda focused on aligning and harmonizing goals with the strategic objectives expressed in the Medium Term Philippine Development Plan for 2004-2010. During this cycle, three ILO Conventions were ratified namely: ILO Convention No. 29 on Forced labour, ILO Convention No. 143 for Migrant Workers, and ILO Convention 97 concerning Migration for Employment.

During the 3rd Cycle, membership of the National Tripartite Advisory Council, a high-level committee that provides direction to the activities and oversees the implementation of the Common Agenda, has been expanded to welcome the active participation of the Alliance of Progressive Labor (APL) and the National Anti-Poverty Commission-Workers in the Informal Sector (NAPC-WIS). The Federation of Free Workers (FFW), Trade Union Congress of the Philippines (TUCP), Employers Confederation of the Philippines (ECOP), and the Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE) comprised the rest of the Committee.

Philippine Labor and Employment Plan as the Fourth Cycle of the Decent Work Common Agenda. The Philippine Labor and Employment Plan (LEP) 2011 – 2016, as a complementary sectoral plan of the Philippine Development Plan (PDP) 2011 – 2016, adopts a decent and productive work framework in pursuit of inclusive growth.

The LEP is not a plan of the DOLE but a product of a long process of consultation with and among government agencies, workers' groups, employers' groups, business and industry groups, civil society, migrant organizations as well as the youth. Having been unanimously adopted by the National Tripartite Industrial Peace Council last April, the Plan marks a milestone in policy making for the country as we reflect the collective priorities of various stakeholders toward addressing issues in labour and employment over the medium term.

A year after the adoption of the LEP, significant achievements in the area of employment, rights at work, social protection and social dialogue are now noticeable.

In 2011, actual employment performance exceeded the target. A total of 1.4 million workers were placed for local employment as against the average target of one million local employment per year.

In addition, the DOLE, tasked to monitor the jobs created under the Community Based Employment Program, reported that the 29 national government agencies enrolled in the CBEP generated a total of 1,099,559 jobs in 2011. For 2012, 1.2 million and 1.8 million new jobs are estimated to be generated by the government's Community-Based Employment Program. This has been achieved through promotion of a better business environment to improve productivity and efficiency and through reforms in employment facilitation.

Programs and policies have been and will continuously be pursued to support a policy environment that will increase labour demand, improve labour supply using pro-employment labour market policies and improve employability of the youth. Measures to do this include capacity building of PESO personnel and advocacy for the institutionalization of the Public Employment Services Offices, and Pro-Active Jobs-Skills Matching Process. A memorandum of understanding among DOLE agencies will be finalized this May for the DOLE Human Resource Data Warehouse that will serve as the Labor Market Information portal of the Philippine Government.

In the area of rights at work, the Tripartite Labor Code Reforms Project is on-going and a thorough review of the current Labor Code provisions is being conducted. This endeavour aims to respond to labour market realities through policy reforms and by aligning labour and social legislation with the Constitution, international treaties and ILO Conventions.

I am also proud to announce that since the full implementation of Single Entry Approach in 2011, 19,788 workers have already benefitted and 368,504,140 Php monetary benefits were provided. It is a step in the right direction towards improving labour adjudication in the country.

The Department continues to provide sustainable livelihood and entrepreneurship for vulnerable workers through the DOLE Kabuhayan Program. Livelihood projects include NegoKART, Starter KITS, Workers Income Augmentation Program, Integrated Services for Livelihood Advancement of the Fisherfolks (ISLA), and Youth Entrepreneurship Support (YES). Clients of these projects are the youth particularly the out-of-school and unemployed; workers in the informal economy; persons with disabilities; women; farmers; fisher folk; and, returning OFWs. From January – August this year, 55,798* have benefitted from the DOLE Kabuhayan Program.

A new livelihood project that been created for our returning female OFWs is the Balik Pinay, Balik Hanapbuhay Program. As of September 2011, we have a total of 1,767 beneficiaries.

To further expand access to employment opportunities, active labour market policies and programs to enhance employability of vulnerable groups are promoted. This include investment in regular skills development both thru training and upgrading; expansion of coverage of tech-voc trainings and scholarship thru the training voucher system particularly on skills and occupation required by the key employment industries; and increase subsidies for vulnerable groups to improve their access to skills development. The DOLE has been firm in its belief that the best social protection we can give to our workers is the possession of skills.

Significance of the Philippine Decent Work Country Profile. We recognize the value of the Decent Work Country Profile as it will enhance our capacity to accurately define decent work targets. This will allow us to examine further our commitments in the LEP and ensure that those commitments will ultimately address decent work deficits. We will look into the findings on the ten substantive elements namely: employment opportunities; adequate earning and productive work; decent hours; combining work, family and personal life; work that should be abolished; stability and security of work; equal opportunity and treatment in employment; safe work environment; social security; and social dialogue, and use them as guide as we craft policies and programs.

I would like to congratulate Ms. Nelia Marquez and Atty. Rosa-Maria Juan Bautista, the Bureau of Labor and Employment Statistics and ILO Experts from Bangkok Regional Office, Manila Office and Geneva Headquarters. The hard work that you put in completing the country profile will now serve as an advocacy toll for mainstreaming decent work into policies of the department and of the country.

Concluding Remarks. All these efforts and development highlight the milestones and accomplishments in pursuit of decent work. It is an important concern that was articulated in the Philippine Labour and Employment Plan of the current administration.

I would like to congratulate in advance the organizers and participants for being part of this important event. I look forward to seeing all of you successfully finish this workshop and put to good use the results that will be generated at the end of this activity. May this activity further ignite our enthusiasm and commitment to provide decent work for all Filipino workers.

Thank you and God bless us all.

Annex 4. Closing Remarks.

Closing Remarks

Ms Carmelita Ericta, Administrator, National Statistics Office

Magandang hapon po sa inyong lahat!

I am very pleased to part of the workshop if only for the closing. I would have wanted to join the whole workshop but there were equally pressing commitments. As you know, the NSO is being drawn into many things, including the impeachment, the case of Iggy Arroyo, preparations for the next Census of Agriculture, and other regular functions.

I was listening to the suggestions for capacity building as well as the very brief summaries of the discussions that took place. I hope that the three statisticians that I sent here to participate were actively involved in the discussion. I asked them whether there were any questions as to the quality of the statistics and I am happy to note that there were no questions about quality, because we tend to be sensitive to being compared to the SWS.

But they also told me that there were a number of suggestions about adding indicators to the profile on decent work such as indicators on child labour, and the reasons for excessive work hours. Statistics on child labour will come out in the middle of the year. We will try to process them faster, possibly for inclusion in the profile, but it is scheduled to be released almost at the same time as the profile on decent work.

As for the reasons for excessive work hours as well as other indicators, a bigger part of the exercise that we are now doing together with the BLES which is what we call rethinking the LFS. We are going to do some pre-test later in the year on these indicators that you have suggested. So we try to be as responsive as we can to the growing need for statistics. As statisticians, it is not only the methodology for producing statistics that is important. We also need to study the concept, policies, and frameworks. In other words we want to know the reason why we are producing certain types of statistics. The ILO has been very active in recommending the statistics that we should produce on labour, on working hours, on conditions of employment as well command over goods and services in terms of income and in terms of prices. We also need to study the agreement that Philippine government signed together with other countries because they become part of the policies that we need to monitor. The challenge therefore to statisticians is to be able to translate all these policies, concepts, frameworks and ideas into operational terms. Meaning, into terms that we can measure and quantify and therefore translate into statistics that can be useful for policy making for decision making as well as for monitoring whether the policies that have been promulgated are being implemented and having an impact on the population.

We also have the challenge of deciding on whether we should concentrate on measures of central tendency, meaning, single indicators to describe a profile or to concentrate on measures of variability, meaning disaggregation. Most often we try to strike a balance between the measure of central tendency and the measures of variability. In fact when we do a profile we should have both, the central tendency and the variability. In terms of the profile that we have been discussing we need to have single indices for the 10 elements and four pillars but we also need explanatory indicators that will further give the reasons why the directions are favourable or not favourable. Since most of the participants to this workshop are data users we are not surprised that you are asking for additional indicators. I wish we would also invite those who are in Congress so that they also provide us additional resources so that we can respond to your wishes.

This morning I was in Congress attending the hearing of the Committee on Appropriations. There is a pending bill to reorganize the Philippine Statistical System and the last step before the bill goes to plenary for deliberations is the Committee on Appropriations. I am very pleased to inform you that the Committee has approved that bill. With the reorganization of the PSS we will strive to be more responsive not only to existing but also to emerging data needs. We know that the Philippines is one of the very few countries of the world that has gone into decent work profiling. Some countries would rather not go into this for obvious reasons but in the Philippines it's more fun if we show who we are and what we are and why we are what we are through statistics and other measures.

I am also pleased that we are able to participate in this workshop because one of the fundamental principles of official statistics is to be relevant. This workshop has affirmed our belief that the statistics we produce are relevant to governance. As you know we produce a lot of statistics and if these statistics are used and are commented on as to quality, timeliness, and usefulness, then this gives us the courage to continue producing more and therefore improve the quality further. That is why when we get invitations such as this especially when the invitation comes from the ILO and the DOLE we are always willing to participate.

I understand that the role of the closing is not only to comment on the things that happened during the workshop but also to give thanks. On behalf of the organizers I would like to thank the participants from the labour sectors, from the employers, from the government agencies, from the academe and from our development partners. I understand that there was very active participation during the discussions.

I would also like to thank our consultant, Nelia Marquez whom I consider as my mother professionally. She was my very first boss and if you start under Mrs Marquez you learn a lot of things. And she has been very active even after working for government for so many years. I would also like to thank our consultant Atty Rosa Maria Juan-Bautista, our ILO experts represented today by David Williams from Bangkok, although inputs are also coming from ILO Geneva and ILO Manila. I would also like to thank the EU for funding this exercise of producing the Decent Work Country Profile for the Philippines. On behalf of the NSO I would like to thank our partners, DOLE through my classmate Teresa Peralta. I would like to thank the ILO through our country representative who is too shy to come to the front. Thank you all for enriching the discussion on decent work. We look forward to further discussion and further work to fully describe what we here in the Philippines aspire for in terms of employees' and workers' welfare.

Magandang hapon po muli sa inyong labat.

Annex 5. Workshop Outputs.

Workshop group sessions: evaluation questions (completed for each chapter of the DW Country Profile)

Guide Questions	Comments/Remarks
1. Evaluation of the content of the profile	
a. Are the indicators and analysis outlined in each chapter an accurate representation of the situation in the country; are they relevant to the national context?	
b. Are the indicators and analysis applicable and useful to the work you do?	
c. Should other additional indicators be included in the profile? If so, is the necessary data for these indicators currently available?	
d. How could the indicators and analysis be improved (e.g. in terms of timeliness/regularity; scope and coverage; level of disaggregation?)	
2. Policy Implications	
On the legal framework:	
a. Do the legal framework indicators in the document give an accurate picture of the situation in the country?	
b. Do you think there is a correlation between the statistical trends in the profile and the current legal / policy framework in the country?	
On the use of the document for development policies and plans:	
a. How can the indicators and analysis presented contribute to the improvement of: (a) the Philippine Labour and Employment Plan; and (b) other national development plans / frameworks (MDG reports, Philippine Development Plan)	
Guide Questions	Comments/Remarks
2. Policy Implications	
What would be the main policy recommendations based on the main findings in the Chapter?	
3. Way Forward	
a. How could these recommendations be integrated in the Philippine Labor and Employment Plan and national policies?	
b. What other activities should be undertaken? e.g. data collection of additional indicators, in-depth country studies, dissemination of results, etc.	

Annex 6. List of Participants.

Tripartite Validation Workshop of the Philippines Decent Work Country Profile

March 20-21, 2012

College of Saint Benilde Hotel, Manila.

(Government)

1. Hon. Lourdes Trasmonte
Undersecretary
Department of Labor and Employment
7th Floor, DOLE Building
Intramuros, Manila
Te. 527 3000 loc. 129

2. Ms. Rebecca J. Calzado
Assistant Secretary for
Policy and International Affairs
Department of Labor and Employment
7th Floor, DOLE Building
Intramuros, Manila

3. Ms. Carmelita Ericta
Administrator and Civil Registrar General
Administrator's Office
National Statistics Office (NSO)
Solicarel Building, Ramon Magsaysay Boulevard
Sta. Mesa, Manila

4. Ms. Elizabeth O. Recio
Officer-in-Charge for
Labor Standards & Social Protection Cluster
Department of Labor and Employment
Tel. 527 3000 loc. 201
Mobile: 0949 3323196
Email: eo_recio@hotmail.com

5. Mr. Ciriaco A. Lagunzad
Executive Director IV
National Wages and Productivity Commission (NWPC)
8th Floor, G.E. Antonino Building corner
T.M. Kalaw and J. Bocobo Streets
Ermita, Manila
Tel. 527 5519

6. Ms. Cynthia Cruz
Executive Director
Institute for Labor Studies (ILS)
5th Floor, DOLE Building, General Luna Wing
Intramuros, Manila

-
7. Ms. Brenda Villafuerte
Director IV
Bureau of Workers with Special Concerns (BWSC)
3rd Floor, DOLE Building
Intramuros, Manila
Tel. 536 – 8975

 8. Mr. Antonio Villafuerte
OIC- Director
National Conciliation and Mediation Board (NCMB)
Tel. 332 2233
Mobile No. 09298310026
Email: antonivillafuerte@yahoo.com

(ILO Consultants)

9. Atty. Rosa Maria Bautista
ILO Consultant/ Professional Lecturer
College of Law
University of the Philippines
Diliman, Quezon City
Mobile: 0923 7154529

10. Ms. Nelia Marquez
ILO Consultant
c/o National Statistics Office (NSO)
Solicarel Building, Ramon Magsaysay Boulevard
Sta. Mesa, Manila
Tel. 931 4675

BLES

11. Ms. Teresa Peralta
Officer-in-Charge - Director
Bureau of Labor and Employment Statistics (BLES)
3rd Floor, General Luna Wing, DOLE Building
Intramuros, Manila
Tel. 527 3000 local 310
Email: terevperalta@gmail.com

12. Mr. Manny Laopao
Chief, Employment and Manpower Statistic Division
Bureau of Labor and Employment Statistics (BLES)
3rd Floor, General Luna Wing, DOLE Building
Intramuros, Manila
Tel. 527 3000 loc. 312 and 313

13. Mr. Alvin B. Curada
Labor and Employment Officer III
Bureau of Labor and Employment Statistics (BLES)
3rd Floor, General Luna Wing, DOLE Building
Intramuros, Manila
Tel. 527 3000 loc. 319
Email: alvinbcurada@yahoo.com

-
14. Ms. Asuncion Gavilla
Chief Labor and Employment Officer
Bureau of Labor and Employment Statistics (BLES)
3rd Floor, General Luna Wing, DOLE Building
Intramuros, Manila
Tel. 527 3000 loc. 318
15. Ms. Yolly Navea
Supervising Labor and Employment Officer
Bureau of Labor and Employment Statistics (BLES)
3rd Floor, General Luna Wing, DOLE Building
Intramuros, Manila
Tel. 527 3000 loc. 319
Mobile No. 09289485077
Email: yollyln@yahoo.com
16. Ms. Rosario G. Fajardo
OIC, Chief Labor and Employment Officer
Bureau of Labor and Employment Statistics (BLES)
3rd Floor, General Luna Wing, DOLE Building
Tel 527 3000 local 311
Email: ofajardo1963@yahoo.com
17. Ms. Theresita Pangan
Senior Labor and Employment Officer
Bureau of Labor and Employment Statistics (BLES)
3rd Floor, General Luna Wing, DOLE Building
Intramuros, Manila
Email: cnpangan@yahoo.com.ph

NSO

18. Ms. Estelita Marquez
Statistician
National Statistics Office (NSO)
Tel. 713 – 1234
Email: E.Marquez@census.gov.ph
19. Ms. Rosita Lagunda
Statistician II
National Statistics Office
Tel. 713-1234
Mobile: 0920 5257994
Email: lagundarose@yahoo.com
20. Ms. Rosemarie Bulosan
Statistician II
National Statistics Office
Tel. 716 0298
Mobile: 0915 476 1992
Email: r74_bulosan@yahoo.com

-
21. Ms. Iza Achustegui
Senior Labor and Employment Officer
Institute for Labor Studies (ILS)
5th Floor, DOLE Bldg.
General Luna St., Intramuros, Manila
Tel. 5273452
Mobile: 0922 8258294
Email: iauelustegui@hotmail.com
22. Ms. Stephanie Tabladillo
Senior Labor and Employment Officer
Institute for Labor Studies (ILS)
5th Floor, DOLE Bldg.
General Luna St., Intramuros, Manila
Tel. 527-3447
Mobile No. 0933-4967281
Email: steph0103@yahoo.com
23. Atty. Consuelo Bacay
Mediator/Arbiter
Bureau of Labor Relations
Department of Labor and Employment
6th Floor, General Luna Wing
DOLE, Intramuros, Manila
Tel. 527 3585
Mobile: 09179892213
Email: attylconi@yahoo.com
24. Jose Marx Yumul
Statistician II
Bureau of Labor Relations
Department of Labor and Employment
6th Floor, General Luna Wing
DOLE, Intramuros, Manila
Tel. 527-2537
Email: blr_urwed@yahoo.com
25. Ms. Helen S. Romero
Senior Labor and Employment Officer
Bureau of Workers with Special Concerns (DOLE –BWSC)
9/F G.E. Antonino Building
J. Bocobo St. cor T.M Kalaw Avenue
Ermita, Manila
Tel. 528 3116
Mobile: 0915 4985478
Email: helenromero2001@yahoo.com
26. Mr. Jerome Gacula
Labor and Employment Officer III
Bureau of Local Employment (DOLE – BLE)
6th Floor, First Intramuros BF Condominium Corporation
Solana Street corner Andres Soriano Avenue
Intramuros, Manila
Tel. 527 2539
Email: vrrble@yahoo.com

-
27. Ms. Shirley M. Pascual
Deputy Executive Director
DOLE - National Conciliation and Mediation Board
4th - 6th Floor, Arcadia Building
860 Quezon Avenue, Quezon City
Tel. 332 2233
28. Ms. Charmaine Satumba
Director II
National Wages and Productivity Commission (NWPC)
8th Floor, G.E. Antonino Building corner
T.M. Kalaw and J. Bocobo Streets
Ermita, Manila
Tel. 5275514
29. Ms. Len Ramos
Senior Technical Officer
National Anti-Poverty Commission (NAPC)
3rd Floor, Agricultural Training Institute Building
Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City
Email: lenram2011@gmail.com
30. Ms. Linda Manabat
representing the National Anti-Poverty Commission (NAPC)
3rd Floor, Agricultural Training Institute Building
Elliptical Road, Diliman, Quezon City
31. Ms. Germaine P. Leonin
Programme Officer IV
Policy Department & Planning Bureau
Department of Social Works and Development (DSWD)
Tel. 931 8130
Mobile: 0927 7852892
32. Ms. Desiree Guevarra
Economic Development Specialist II
National Economic Development Authority (NEDA)
12 Saint JosemariaEscriba Drive
OrtigasCenter, Pasig City
Tel. 631-5435
Email: ddguevara@neda.gov.ph
33. Ms. Aurora Quilandrino
Chief, Policy, Programs and System Management
Employees Compensation Commission
ECC Building, 355 Sen. Gil Puyat Avenue Extension
Makati City
Tel. 899 4251 loc. 217
Mobile: 0917 5284528
Email: auquilandrino@yahoo.com

34. Ma. Teresita Cucueco
Executive Director
Occupational Safety and Health Center (OSHC)
Department of Labor and Employment
OSHC Complex, North Avenue corner Science Road
Diliman, Quezon City
Tel. 9286690
Email: oshc.dole@yahoo.com

Employers

35. Mr. Romeo Garcia
Research and Advocacy Manager
Employers Confederation of the Philippines (ECOP)
3rd Floor, ECC Building
355 Senator Gil Puyat Avenue
Makati City
36. Mr. Robert Ela
Communications and Publications Manager
Employers Confederation of the Philippines (ECOP)
3rd Floor, ECC Building
355 Senator Gil Puyat Avenue
Makati City
Tel. 8904847
Email: busmedcenter@yahoo.com
37. Ms. Margarita Amaris Javillonar
Research Assistant
Employers Confederation of the Philippines
3rd Floor, ECC Building
355 Senator Gil Puyat Avenue
Makati City
Tel. 8904847
Email: amaris.javillonar@ecop.org.ph

Workers

38. Mr. Edilberto Pardinias
PSLINK
Napolcom Employees Association
No. 15 Clarion Dili St.,
St. Dominic Subdivision 1
Bahay Toro, Congressional Ave.,
Quezon City
Tel. 890-2143
Email: eppardinias@yahoo.com
39. Mr. Manfred Tesalona
DPWH Union
c/oPSLINK
No. 15 Clarion Dili St.,
St. Dominic Subdivision 1
Bahay Toro, Congressional Ave.,
Quezon City

-
40. Mr. Antonio Asper
Executive Assistant to the President
Federation of Free Workers (FFW)
FFW Building, 1943 Taft Ave.,
Malate, 1004
Tel. 4006656
Email: acasper1951@yahoo.com
41. Ms. Sonia Balgos
President
FFW Womens Network
c/o Federation of Free Workers
FFW Building, 1943 Taft Ave.,
Malate, 1004
Tel. 538 7454
Email: sbalgos25@yahoo.com
42. Ms. Ana Marie Sy
Policy Service Analyst
Country Banker
c/o Federation of Free Workers
FFW Building, 1943 Taft Ave.,
Malate, 1004
Tel. 523 8611 loc. 203
Mobile: 0933 382 1330
Email: sy.anamarie@yahoo.com
43. Mr. Joshua Mata
Secretary General
Alliance for Progressive Labor (APL)
94 Scout Delgado St.,
Barangay LagingHanda
Quezon City 1103
Tel. 332-1378
Mobile No. 0917 7942431
44. Mr. Edwin Bustillos
Deputy Secretary General
Alliance for Progressive Labor (APL)
94 Scout Delgado St.,
Barangay LagingHanda
Quezon City 1103
Tel. 332-1378
Mobile No. 09178017309
Email: edwin.bustillos@gmail.com
45. Mr. Roqueto Arpafo
Vice President
Alliance of Progressive Labor (APL)
94 Scout Delgado St.,
Barangay LagingHanda
Quezon City 1103
Mobile: 09162501881
Email: boyarpafo@yahoo.com

46. Mr. Larry Javier
Organizer
Alliance for Progressive Labor (APL)
94 Scout Delgado St.,
Barangay LagingHanda
Quezon City 1103
Tel. 332 1378
Mobile: 3237775
Email: larry.javier2008@gmail.com

47. Ms. Ann Garcia
Staff
Alliance for Progressive Labor (APL)
94 Scout Delgado St.,
Barangay LagingHanda
Quezon City 1103
Tel. 3321378
Mobile 09178032071
Email: anngarcia27@gmail.com

Govt. Insurance Offices

48. Ms. May Catherice C. Ciriaco
Vice President
Social Security System
SSS Building East Avenue
Diliman, Quezon City
Tel. 4359869
Mobile 09178477242
Email: ciriacomc@sss.gov.ph

49. Ms. Susan Abad- Defensor
Executive Assistant
Office of the President
PhilHealth
CitystateCentre, 709 Shaw Boulevard
Pasig City
Mobile: 0920 7496962
Email: sansudefensor@gmail.com

50. Ms. Marilyn C. Geduspan
Corporate Planning
PhilHealth
CitystateCentre, 709 Shaw Boulevard
Pasig City
Email: marilyn_geduspan@yahoo.com

Academe

51. Prof. Aurora De Dios
Executive Director
Mirriam College
Women and Gender Institute (WAGI)
Katipunan Road, Loyola Heights
Quezon City
52. Atty. Jonathan P. Sale
Dean
University of the Philippines
School of Labor and Industrial Relations (UP-SOLAIR)
UP Campus, Diliman
Quezon City
Tel. 9207717
Mobile: 09228913449
Email: jona_sale@yahoo.com

NGOs and International Organization

53. Mr. Margarito Raynera
Programme Officer – Operations Section (EU)
Delegation of the European Union to the Philippines
30/F Tower 2, RCBC Plaza, Ayala Avenue, Makati City
Tel. 859 5100
Direct Line: 859 5144
Email: margarita.raynera@eeas.europa.eu
54. Atty. Noel Balsicas
People Management Association of the Philippines (PMAP)
670 Lee Street
Addition Hills, Manadaluyong City
Tel. 632 3275
Mobile 0917 7910513
Email: nbalsicas@smg.com.ph
55. Ms. Louisa Echevarria
Director
People Management Association of the Philippines (PMAP)
670 Lee Street
Addition Hills, Manadaluyong City
Mobile: 09296142274
Email: lmue_ph@yahoo.com

(International Labour Organization)

56. Mr. Lawrence Jeff Johnson
Director
International Labour Organization
Country Office for the Philippines - Manila
Tel. 5809900
Email: johnsonl@ilo.org
57. Mr. David Williams
Regional Project Coordinator
Monitoring and Assessing Decent Work Project (MAP)
ILO Regional Office
Bangkok, Thailand
Email: williamsd@ilo.org

-
58. Ms. Lourdes Kathleen Santos
Programming Unit
International Labour Organization
Country Office for the Philippines - Manila
Tel. 5809909
Email: santos@ilo.org
59. Ms. Gwendolyn Fabros
Admin Support Unit
International Labour Organization
Country Office for the Philippines - Manila
Tel. 5809913
Email: fabros@ilo.org
60. Ma. Concepcion Sardaña
Programming Unit
International Labour Organization
Country Office for the Philippines - Manila
Tel. 5809912
Email: sardana@ilo.org
61. Diane Lynn Respall
Programming Unit
International Labour Organization
Country Office for the Philippines - Manila
Tel. 5809915
Email: respall@ilo.org
62. Hilda Tidalgo
Programming Unit
International Labour Organization
Country Office for the Philippines - Manila
Tel. 5809916
Email: tidalgo@ilo.org