
INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION

Tripartite Meeting of Experts on the Measurement of Decent Work

Geneva, 8 to 10 September 2008

Chairperson's report

Session 1: Opening of the meeting and general debate

Opening remarks and election of the Chairperson

1. In his opening address, the representative of the Director-General explained the nature, mandate and purpose of the Tripartite Meeting of Experts on the Measurement of Decent Work. In particular, he emphasized that monitoring progress towards decent work was a long-standing concern of the ILO's constituents. This was a complex task, given the multi-faceted nature of the Decent Work Agenda that combined access to freely chosen and productive employment with rights at work, social protection and the promotion of social dialogue. On several occasions and in different fora, most notably the Governing Body, constituents had debated the intricacies of finding a measurement framework that takes full account of this. In its March 2008 session, the Governing Body approved the convening of a Tripartite Meeting of Experts and mandated it to provide detailed advice on the viability of the options, and to provide guidance on the various possible ways of measuring the dimensions of decent work in order to prepare comprehensive recommendations for consideration by the Governing Body.
2. Mr Geoff Bowlby (Canada) was elected to chair the meeting. He thanked experts for the responsibility and confidence placed upon him, and urged all those present at the meeting to contribute intensively to the deliberations based on their various experiences. The meeting adopted the provisional agenda that had been proposed by the ILO secretariat.

Introduction by the Office

3. An Office representative provided an overview of the discussion paper before the meeting, in particular of the introductory part I. He recalled that the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, adopted in June 2008, reaffirmed the commitment of the ILO and its Members to the four strategic objectives of the Decent Work Agenda. The Declaration highlighted the importance of national and regional strategies towards decent work, and emphasized that member States might consider the establishment of appropriate indicators or statistics, if necessary with the assistance of the ILO, to monitor and evaluate progress made. The ILO Governing Body was currently debating the Strategic Policy Framework 2010-15, a main focus of which would be the implementation of the above Declaration, and thus the meeting came at a crucial time as it could make a vital contribu-

tion by providing guidance to the ILO's constituents on a global methodology to monitor progress towards decent work at the country level.

4. A key issue was to balance the desirable with the feasible within the perspective of a dynamic framework. The Office had already undertaken a number of initiatives in this respect that are described in greater detail in the discussion paper. These, as well as discussions in the Governing Body, gave rise to five considerations that guided the ILO in developing a system for measuring progress towards decent work:
 - i. It was important to have a clear goal in mind that reflected the needs of constituents as well as country circumstances. In this respect, the main value of measuring the dimensions of decent work would be to assist countries in assessing progress at national level towards the goal of decent work against a set of indicators that are available for other countries.
 - ii. ILO constituents and others appreciate comparative information. Therefore, insofar as possible, country information should be presented in a format and using methodologies that facilitate comparisons.
 - iii. An aggregate composite index that ranks countries had little value for policy analysis and would require restrictive assumptions. Such an index therefore did not seem the best way for the ILO to proceed.
 - iv. Progress towards the achievement of Decent Work cannot be assessed by standard numerical indicators alone. The Office had therefore proposed to combine statistical indicators with information on rights at work and the legal framework for decent work in a single, integrated template.
 - v. Demands for a more comprehensive picture of progress are likely to increase with the recognition of decent work in the international development agenda, including the new Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) Target 1.B, 'Achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and young people'.
5. The development of a methodology to measure progress towards decent work could be conceived of as a process which could involve work on: the identification of a global template of qualitative and quantitative indicators that can be used to measure progress towards decent work at the country level; the collection of statistical data and qualitative information related to selected decent work indicators; and finally the presentation of decent work indicators and information on rights at work and the legal framework for decent work in detailed country profiles.
6. Stemming from the above, the Office representative invited the experts to give guidance to the Office on the framework proposed in the discussion paper before the meeting. The discussions and recommendations of the meeting would be most valuable in directing the Office's future work and would be reported to the November 2008 session of the Governing Body, as well as the 18th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS) held in late 2008. The conceptual framework would then be tested in number of pilot countries in the course of 2009, and the results be reported to the Governing Body in November 2009.

General debate

7. The meeting engaged in a lively debate on the conceptual framework for the measurement of decent work, and the challenges it posed. There was agreement that the Decent Work Agenda was now universally supported and had taken root in the international develop-

ment agenda. As highlighted by the 2008 ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, its four strategic objectives were closely interrelated and inseparable. Experts appreciated that it posed a significant challenge to find a framework that adequately captures decent work in its entirety, covering standards and fundamental principles and rights at work, employment, social protection, and social dialogue. In addition, aspects such as green jobs and sustainable enterprises needed to be reflected.

8. The experts nominated by the Employers' group raised concerns as to how far this objective could be achieved through the development of a global template. They objected to the construction of a globally applied, ILO-driven methodology or template for measuring and monitoring countries' status on and progress towards decent work, and to compulsory reporting on decent work indicators. It was argued that the word 'template' was problematic if it implied something that could be copied exactly and thus be applied to any country without taking into account country-specific circumstances. Support was expressed for a menu of relevant statistical information and indicators that could enable countries, with or without assistance from the ILO, to assess their own situation with respect to decent work. Experts drew attention to the role of statistics and that they were about measuring and providing references, rather than imposing an obligation on policy-makers. Consequently, a suggestion was made to use the word 'plan' instead of 'measure' and 'toolkit' instead of 'template'. One expert underlined that there were a variety of different employers, ranging from government and multinational enterprises to small enterprises, which were increasingly recognized for their important contribution to economic development in Africa. She questioned whether it was possible to account for this diversity. Others argued that decent work was essentially a national matter, and that it was up to national constituents to define the concept according to their specific context. Thus, there could be no common global set of indicators to monitor progress towards decent work.
9. Several Government experts, independent experts and experts nominated by the Workers group argued that the ILO's tripartite structure enabled it to develop a viable template and lent their support to the framework proposed by the Office. It would enable measurement of change over time and allow comparing of experience among nations. The experts also emphasized that decent work was a universal concept and that its meaning was accepted and given. There was a need for policies to move towards decent work. Constituents had agreed in the 2008 ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization that monitoring progress was an important component of this. Decent work was not inaccessible to measurement and a consistent framework was needed for this. Fundamental principles and rights at work had to be a central element of this exercise, a point where the Office paper had been shy to make a sufficiently strong argument. The purpose of the current meeting was to discuss indicators in detail, rather than to revisit the debate on whether decent work should be measured. Using expressions like 'plan' and 'toolkit' instead of 'measure' and 'toolkit' made no substantive difference because they were all part of the same equation. Therefore, the framework proposed by the Office could be supported and would enable the ILO to undertake the crucial task of measuring decent work.
10. This position was shared by other participants. Drawing on the experience made by Ukraine during a Decent Work Survey in 2003, one expert expressed his agreement with the principles and the approach suggested in the Office paper. In his country, a systematic effort to measure decent work had been important to monitor the progress made in recent years. One observer stressed that the main value of measurement was to assist constituents, rather than to rank countries. Decent work indicators needed to reflect country-specifics and take account of existing indicators, rather than to develop new, detailed indicators. This was re-emphasized by another observer who found that the proposed indicators could produce a good picture of decent work in a given country, and supported the Office in proposing not to rank countries.

-
- 11.** A number of experts shared the view that the meeting should help the Organization move forward and approve the conceptual framework proposed together with the core decent work indicators. They underlined that the mandate of the ILO was to improve decent work around the globe and the only way to gauge any success or failure in that process would be to do this against a set of quantitative and qualitative decent work indicators. Experts further argued that the objective of measuring decent work was to illuminate the landscape of work existing in different countries on the basis of a template suggested by the Office, which would also facilitate the process of identifying and analysing departures from or achievements in the Decent Work Agenda.
 - 12.** Responding to these comments, an Office representative explained that the word ‘template’ was used in the sense of a comprehensive framework for a decent work country profile, and that it could be adapted to country circumstance and priorities by including additional indicators and information that are of particular relevance in a given country. Therefore, the template would facilitate both the analysis of national decent work time-series and the cross-country comparisons of decent work dimensions.
 - 13.** Some experts expressed their doubts as to whether it would be feasible to collect data on the major dimensions of decent work in developing countries. Lack of capacity in some countries was mentioned as a serious constraint. This concern was shared by other experts, pointing out that the capability of countries to collect new data varied greatly. However, a number of experts pointed out that substantial progress had been made recently in developing countries in the field of data collection. Hence, even though they still faced a certain lack of technical capacity, this group of countries should not be excluded from the overall process of measuring decent work. Moreover, a number of developing countries had already adopted the Decent Work Country Programmes and, therefore, were in a strong position to contribute to the process. More specifically, participants from Ukraine, South Africa, Zambia and Ghana affirmed that the proposed set of indicators was feasible in their respective countries. One expert argued that a parsimonious but well-targeted set of indicators was needed. Another expert, head of her country’s statistical agency, argued that this would help statistical offices to focus on these indicators and that they would find a way to collect the necessary data.
 - 14.** In the ensuing discussion, experts pointed out that there seemed to be a clear understanding that there was a need to strengthen data collection and analytical capacity of countries in order to adequately measure decent work. At the same time, experts called on the Office to find a way of providing assistance to countries to facilitate the collection and interpretation of decent work indicators. As an example, they argued that unemployment rates in developed countries meant something different from what they meant in developing countries. It was crucial to interpret them in conjunction with information on unemployment insurance. Interpretation problems also existed for several other proposed indicators, such as public social security expenditure, the share of the population aged 65 and above without a pension, and the employment-to-population ratio. Also, several experts stressed that decent work measures should capture the evolving developments in global policies on decent work. Hence, decent work indicators were of a dynamic rather than static nature and should evolve together with changing decent work country profiles. At the same time, experts recalled that decent work was primarily perceived at the level of an individual person and therefore decent work indicators should be able to capture that perception first before proceeding to national and higher levels. As one expert emphasized, decent work also meant that work had to be fruitful and that a measure for labour input was needed.
 - 15.** Experts also emphasized that duplication of effort needed to be avoided. One expert asked how the measurement of decent work would interact with the ILO’s established supervisory mechanisms and the follow-up to the 1998 Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. It was also argued that the measurement of decent work needed to build on existing indicators. In this regard, experts suggested that the ILO should consider

cooperating with the OECD, especially in light of their concept of ‘more and better jobs’, and incorporate the indicators underpinning it. A call was also made to go further and merge the relevant indicators produced by the European Union, the ILO and the OECD into a single set of qualitative and quantitative indicators of work and labour. While recognizing the importance of using experiences gained at the international level in measuring various qualitative aspects of work, many experts felt that the Office should concentrate its efforts on assisting the ILO constituents in measuring decent work, thereby contributing to the ILO global objective of ‘Decent Work for All’. It was recommended that to do this, the Office should be in a position to improve national capacity of labour market data collection and provide countries with a parsimonious set of indicators which would be both comprehensive and targeted at particular country needs. All this should enable countries to learn from each other.

- 16.** In support of the above, there was a call from several experts for the Office to limit its work to a targeted but limited set of decent work indicators. For example, indicators linked with the four major dimensions of decent work; which in turn would be linked with the MDGs; to follow with the qualitative indicators linked with the ‘Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization’. Also, they felt that decent work indicators should focus around the core and priority ILO conventions, such as Convention No. 144 Concerning Tripartite Consultations to Promote the Implementation of the International Labour Standards. Experts held the view that the inclusion of qualitative indicators would make countries better appreciate the legal aspects of work. Finally, experts strongly recommended linking statistics with relevant ILO convention.
- 17.** In the course of the discussion, the meeting’s attention was drawn to the fact that the Working Group on Decent Work Indicators organized during the 17th ICLS had underscored the importance of measuring decent work. The opinion was expressed that the discussion paper prepared for the meeting largely met the requirements set up at the above Working Group. However, a suggestion was made to make the following few semantic changes by re-naming ‘main indicators’, ‘additional indicators’ and ‘future indicators’ to ‘core indicators’, ‘significant indicators’ and ‘developmental indicators’ respectively.
- 18.** Some independent experts argued in favour of a composite index to measure progress towards decent work, as in their view such progress could be gauged only on the basis of indices. The reasons brought forward against such an index in the discussion paper were not fully convincing, given that other organizations had successfully established indices such as the Human Development Index. The different dimensions of the Decent Work Agenda could be represented by sub-indices. Other experts highlighted fundamental problems with an index, such as the need to weigh the different dimensions and thus to make judgements about their relative importance. Several participants and the Office reiterated that constituents appreciated the value of measuring decent work to assist countries to monitor the progress made, as well as to provide comparative information. Therefore, insofar as possible, country information should be presented in a format and using methodologies that facilitate comparisons. This was seen as more appropriate than ranking countries through an index, and the latter issue was thus not pursued further.
- 19.** In answering the numerous queries raised and comments made by the meeting during the discussion of Part I of the discussion paper, a representative of the Office thanked the experts for their open, critical and constructive suggestions, remarks and observations. He stressed that it was quite hard, if not impossible, for the Office to put all suggested elements in one absolutely consistent package. The ultimate objective of the exercise was that countries found the profiles useful. Therefore, the results and recommendations of the meeting would greatly assist the Office in achieving this. Responding to the argument about the limited utility of unemployment statistics in developing countries, the Office informed the meeting that it was planning to organize a special seminar within the context of the 18th ICLS in order to discuss how to measure more efficiently labour underutili-

zation and supplement the standard unemployment rates with alternative indicator(s) in order to better capture labour slack in the developing countries.

20. The Office aimed to present and analyse the multi-faceted nature of decent work to help countries to gauge progress towards decent work against the situation which prevailed some years ago, for example ten years earlier. The Office was aware that not all countries were in a position to produce even a parsimonious list of decent work indicators. Consequently, training and capacity building in data collection should be one of the Office's priorities. In this process, quantitative, qualitative and context indicators should be of equal importance. The envisaged profiles would not replace or amend the ILO's established supervisory mechanisms, but rather incorporate the information gathered by them as well as under the follow-up to the 1998 Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. The Office representative reiterated that the process of measuring progress in decent work would be closely connected with the Office's work on the implementation of the Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, the ILO Strategic Policy Framework 2010-15 and the development of the Programme and Budget proposals for 2010-11.

Session 2: Key aspects of decent work and implications for its measurement

Introduction by the Office

21. An Office representative introduced Part II of the discussion paper, covering key aspects of decent work and implications for its measurement. He stressed the need to reflect on general principles to guide the selection of statistical decent work indicators. He outlined three main implications that arise from the multi-dimensional and comprehensive nature of the Decent Work Agenda, namely that (i) measurement should cover all aspects of decent work; (ii) wherever feasible, indicators should cover all workers, including those in the informal economy, and (iii) that indicators should be conceptually relevant to all regions and to countries at all stages of development. To facilitate comprehensive reporting on progress towards decent work, data and information should be available for a broad range of countries. While it was tempting to include a broad range of indicators, he called for parsimony in the selection of indicators to maintain the list at a manageable length.
22. He pointed out that statistical decent work indicators should not be looked at in isolation, but needed to put into the context of a country's overall economic and social situation. The Office had taken account of this by including a set of indicators for the economic and social context of decent work. Likewise, statistical indicators needed to be complemented with information on rights at work and the legal framework for decent work (to be discussed in greater detail on the third day of the meeting). All information should be transparent and verifiable and needed to be updated regularly. Analyzing change over time posed several additional problems, discussed in greater detail in the paper before the meeting. The Office representative asked the experts for guidance on the proposal to classify statistical indicators into three categories, namely (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. He also asked for direction on the grouping of indicators under thematic headings.

Discussion

23. The subsequent debate took up two issues in particular, namely whether a global template is suitable given the diversity at the country level and how to balance the need for comprehensive information with the aim of parsimony. On the first issue, experts nominated by the Employers' group reiterated their concerns about the universal suitability of any given

template. They argued that decent work could only be measured within the country context. Therefore, the indicator list should not be decided globally and different indicators should be used for different countries. Some participants pointed out that it could be problematic to measure generic indicators where a country's priority was to focus on the specific. For example, in South Africa the priorities agreed by constituents were HIV/AIDS, social security and retirement funds. It was also proposed that county specific lists are established in collaboration between the ILO and constituents to monitor progress over time within a country. That would require that any list remains flexible, without imposing on countries to measure something that was not relevant to them. It was also mentioned that it is essential that countries are convinced that the measurement is useful and relevant.

24. On the other hand, several independent experts, Government experts and experts nominated by the Workers' group, highlighted the importance of measuring decent work in an internationally consistent manner, especially in an increasingly globalizing environment. Therefore, indicators that are globally comparable were needed, and measuring decent work in isolation without looking at the rest of the world was not the right direction. Experts argued that some standards had already been accepted (e.g. the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work), and that it was now time to make sure that there are instruments to assess implementation of these standards. Therefore it is necessary to agree on meaningful set of indicators for measuring trends and progress on the four ILO strategic objectives. It was also suggested to agree on a framework for global comparisons that would transcend differences in development levels.
25. On the number of statistical indicators, it was suggested that there should be a balance between global and local or country-specific indicators. Initially, the list of core indicators for measuring progress towards decent work should be limited to what is feasible and, with time, this core list could be expanded gradually. Additional indicators could be added where these were relevant, useful and available. Some participants cautioned against oversimplifying by reducing the number of indicators too much, while others expressed concern that the list was going beyond decent work into other aspects of workers' lives (as suggested in implications no. 6 of the discussion paper). Some participants acknowledged the importance of reflecting living conditions outside the workplace, but suggested that, given the complexity and difficulties in measuring all aspects of decent work, the list should be restricted to work-related issues (e.g. moving from health in general to health at the workplace). It was argued that unless the list was limited to what is feasible, no progress will be made.
26. On the core set of indicators, difficulties in choosing the selection criteria were pointed out by several participants. Some experts suggested that indicators distorted by country-specific circumstances should not be included, and that one criterion for selecting the core set of indicators should be their invariability. The core list should only include the indicators that are of interest in all settings, whose meaning is not variable across countries, and that are not affected by local circumstances. The additional list could include the indicators that would be interpreted independently from other countries. The importance of measuring all core indicators in all countries, developed and developing alike, was also highlighted. This also applied to the working poor that should not be left out in developed countries. As an alternative to global measurement, a proposal was made to cluster countries based on their level of development and measure their progress relative to their respective comparison countries.
27. In the discussion on the link between statistical indicators and information on the legal framework, the experts exchanged views concerning parsimony. It was pointed out that there should be a way to quantify the legal aspects of the decent work. The view was expressed that rather than measure only ratification of international standards, it was more appropriate to measure their effective implementation by national legislation. Regarding

the indicators on rights at work, some experts cautioned against excessive parsimony and expressed the need to adapt the indicators to specific countries.

28. The merit of making work decent was acknowledged but suggested that the obligations to finance the cost of achieving decent work are taken into account as well. According to one expert, the measurement of decent work is important in order to measure the extent to which the society as a whole benefits from the economic growth. Because there is a false assumption that the economic growth automatically results in improved decent work, it is important to measure how and to what extent this growth is shared in the society. Other participants also expressed the concern that labour productivity should not be used as a synonym for decent work.
29. Experts also went into the discussion of specific indicators. One participant highlighted the need to include indicators on small and medium enterprises, especially in the informal economy. These indicators would also help to monitor the extent to which the informal sector is being formalized and informal workers protected. Other proposed indicators included quality and opportunity of training, access to work, work stability and ability to sustain jobs. Several participants stressed the need to measure illegal migrants' access to decent work, as they are usually employed in conditions that are least decent. This should be monitored in all countries, including developed countries. An indicator for this could be included under equal opportunity and treatment in employment. Some concerns were expressed whether the indicators fully reflect gender differences. Therefore, strong support was expressed for disaggregating the data by sex, as well as by age and other demographic and economic characteristics. The necessity of measuring both the supply and demand side of the labour market was highlighted. Measuring output, labour productivity and employment growth were proposed as possible indicators. However, measurement difficulties were also pointed out.
30. The need to develop standards for statistical analysis (e.g. minimum wage, poverty) was mentioned as some of the areas that need further discussion. As some of the indicators may be presented in many different ways and their interpretation may be difficult and confusing, it was proposed that the presentation of the indicators be standardized. To facilitate comparisons, the indicators should be expressed in relative rather than in absolute terms. It was also suggested that there should be clear guidance not only on how to define the indicators, but also on how to present them.
31. In order to test the suitability of the proposed list of indicators, it was suggested that decent work country briefs be prepared for a number of pilot countries (e.g. high-income, middle-income and low-income country).
32. An Office representative thanked all participants for their constructive and useful comments. He reconfirmed that the ILO was interested in the global picture while addressing individual country needs. This would also include looking at the perspective from the point of view of small enterprises. Testing the measurement framework in pilot countries would be essential.

Session 3: Statistical decent work indicators

Introduction by the Office

33. An Office representative began his introduction by recalling an argument made during the previous day, namely that many indicators were difficult to interpret by themselves unless one had further contextual information. This same insight had guided the Office in preparing the discussion paper and it had sought to match statistical indicators (e.g. unem-

ployment rate) with information on rights at work and the legal framework for decent work (e.g. unemployment insurance). Although the current session would focus on statistical indicators, the representative suggested that experts keep in mind that these would be complemented by further information. He also drew three basic conclusions from the discussions of the previous day: (1) The core list of main decent work indicators should be based on a parsimonious selection of indicators that are relevant across different settings. (2) Beyond this common list, additional indicators could be used to reflect different priorities at the country level. Some of them could already be designated as additional indicators, but such a compilation should not prevent countries going beyond them. (3) Indicators should be based on data for all workers, including migrant workers and workers in the informal economy. He indicated that much of the necessary data and information were available in different units within the Office, but needed to be brought together in a systematic manner.

- 34.** The Office proposed 18 main indicators plus 16 additional indicators, most of them broken down by sex to account for differences in access to decent work between the genders. The list of proposed indicators could be found in Table 2 of the discussion paper. This proposal was founded on a number of compilations of decent work indicators such as those made by different regions, technical sectors at ILO headquarters and the European task force on the measurement of the quality of employment (compiled in Appendix table 1). Amongst all these sets, a broad overlap existed. Certain important indicators were a good example of the complementarity of statistical and legal framework information. Whereas the proportion of workers receiving low pay was included as a statistical indicator, minimum wage legislation was considered contextually important and thus included under the legal framework in Appendix table 4.
- 35.** The Office representative introduced the proposed indicators¹ that were grouped under the thematic headings which had been introduced the previous day. He pointed out that the Office was aware that many of these indicators had shortcomings, which were discussed in greater detail in Appendix table 2 of the discussion paper. Their interpretation was often only feasible in conjunction with other indicators and the legal framework information. Under ‘Employment opportunities’, he recommended five indicators including the unemployment rate. However, he highlighted its well-known limitations as an indicator of labour slack, especially in developing countries. To address this issue, the Bureau of Statistics was developing a new indicator for labour underutilization. This composite rate of unemployed persons, discouraged workers, time-related underemployed and underemployed in relation to wages would be discussed at the forthcoming 18th ICLS and might subsequently be a candidate for inclusion as a decent work indicator. Under ‘Work that should be abolished’, children in wage employment was suggested as a main indicator, and hazardous child labour as an additional indicator. Once reliable statistics on forced labour became available, this indicator should be included as well. Under ‘Adequate earnings and productive work’, the Office representative highlighted that data on the working poor were currently available mainly for developing countries, but that this indicator was relevant to all countries relative to their national standards. Conversely, data on low pay were currently predominantly available for OECD countries but equally relevant for developing countries.
- 36.** Under the heading of ‘Decent hours’, it was important to assess working time in relation to the long-existing internationally agreed consensus of a maximum of 48 hours per week; an additional threshold could be 60 hours. Excessive hours often indicated that work was not

¹ These can be found in Table 2 of the discussion paper. For the sake of brevity, the complete list is not repeated here.

productive (or not fruitful), forcing people to work longer to make ends meet. No statistical indicators were suggested under 'Stability and security of work' and 'Combining work and family life' because none had passed the test of conceptual relevance as well as data availability, or their interpretation was not convincing. The Office reasoned that the informal employment indicator covered the former to some extent. For the latter, often the share of women with children under the age of five who are working was used, but a high rate might indicate 'compatibility' or, on the contrary, the 'necessity' to work due to poverty. Other indicators connected to availability, length, level of maternity benefits and coverage were included in the legal framework information. Under 'Equal opportunities and treatment in employment', it was proposed to use both occupational segregation by sex and the female share of employment in managerial and administrative occupations.

37. Under 'Safe work', the fatal occupational injury rate was suggested, and under 'Social security', the Office suggested that the share of population aged 65 and above benefiting from a pension and public social security expenditure be included. In addition, the Office could draw on statistics produced by the World Health Organization (Health-care expenditure not financed out of pocket by private households). These were useful to show household coverage by health insurance of workers and their families, relating to social security which is an important part of the ILO mandate. Finally, it was particularly important to interpret the three statistical indicators for 'Social dialogue and workers' representation' (union density rate; number of enterprises belonging to an employer organization; collective wage bargaining coverage rate) in conjunction with legal framework information. Here, the Office would draw on information generated by the ILO's supervisory mechanism on coverage, exclusions and the violation of rights. Indicators whose importance had earlier been emphasized, such as labour productivity and the percentage of the working-age population who are HIV positive, could be included under the 'Economic and social context for decent work'.

Discussion

38. Experts began with a general discussion of the Office proposal and later embarked on a systematic examination of the indicators proposed under each thematic heading. Some experts reaffirmed their reservations regarding a global template that would be used indiscriminately for all countries. They also raised doubts about the feasibility of the framework and found that the term used by the Office, namely 'integrated framework to monitor progress towards decent work', was unconvincing. One expert argued that an indicator was a 'statistic with a message', but that it was not always clear what message the proposed statistics would convey. The meeting should therefore address two questions: What is the message behind the proposed statistic? And: What else should be included? He indicated that sustainable enterprises, in particular, were an area where indicators backed by statistics were missing. Others suggested that indicators for the integration of disabled people into the labour market were missing, and that indicators for aspects such as training, sustainable enterprise development, workplace relationships and working time arrangements were lacking. Also, in one expert's opinion an indicator like 'Youth not in education and not in employment' conveyed no clear message. For other indicators, the reference group (e.g. age brackets) was unclear.
39. Other experts argued that the indicators proposed by the Office covered categories that were important to decent work, and that the proposal allowed to reflect the situation in a wide range of countries. One expert drew on the experience of Brazil where a very similar list of decent work indicators had been compiled, and argued that the proposal made by the Office was sound. A few experts proposed that the Office go through various country exercises for dimensions missing from the framework, as well as the international work already being done on the quality of employment and possibly merge the two processes. When comparing the two, indicators listed under employment opportunities did not cover career

opportunity or job development (an indicator of job tenure of less than one year was suggested). The legal-based information should perhaps address the issue of minimum age rather than child labour. Experts needed to consider what government commitment to full employment meant and translate that into indicators.

40. Several experts nominated by the Employers' group emphasized that the framework should not be used for international comparison purposes nor serve as a global monitoring system based on an index, but focus on individual countries' capacity to monitor progress. Others argued that it was not rational to exclude the possibility to make international comparisons, giving as positive examples other well-known and accepted international comparison programmes such as those by the World Economic Forum or the US Bureau of Labor Statistics. To facilitate comparability of data, common definitions and benchmarks (e.g. common age bands) were needed. They raised the question that there was no point in having international consultations if the exercise should be strictly limited to individual country analysis.
41. Several experts considered that indicators should be based on existing international statistical standards to guide not only their definition but also their interpretation. The definition and calculation of indicators raised much discussion, and some experts called on the Office to make more specific information available. Several experts maintained that indicators should always be defined as rates, with baseline definitions for numerators and denominators and the reference population clearly defined. Otherwise, when using the same numerator but different enumerators, different indicators could be computed. Changes over time should be avoided since they resulted in lack of comparability. Various suggestions were made regarding definitional units, such as the age limit for child labour; the use of pay distributions and average or median wages; involuntary part-time employment to define decent hours; limiting excessive hours to those due to economic reasons, etc. These issues required specific definitions to ensure that policy issues were being tackled. By linking all definitions to the existing current international standards (ILO Conventions and Resolutions) as well as ICLS resolutions and guidelines, many such problems might be solved.
42. There were various opinions on the extent to which the criterion of data availability should determine the choice of indicators. Alongside data availability, the expense to develop new sources and indicators was an important concern. If two countries had existing data for different albeit similar indicators, they should be able to each use their own. However, others felt that the proposal was already too pragmatic in its reliance on existing data, which had led to gaps, and was overall not ambitious enough.
43. One expert felt that the labels used for some indicators and their underlying value judgements were possibly inconsistent with a statistician's role. This was, in particular, the case for expressions such as 'work that should be abolished', 'excessive', 'decent' and 'adequate'. He suggested an alternative framework that would be based on a hierarchy, ranging from fundamental aspects such as safety at the workplace to less fundamental issues such as work satisfaction. This proposal was rejected by other participants who argued that it introduced more subjective value judgements. Therefore, the reference yardstick should remain the ILO constitution and freely chosen employment and labour standards. The ILO had clearly codified the content of decent work and, there was no utility in re-visiting a debate that had been concluded.
44. Overall, several experts concluded that the meeting needed to focus on clarify what type of picture should be provided and what kind of information it was needed. Within countries, indicators could change roles from being core or additional, depending on the context and combinations. Expert opinion should provide interpretative guidance regarding the parameters and methodology to take into account. In this manner, the debate might conclude that some indicators fulfilled substitute roles (e.g. possibly the case of the youth

unemployment and youth not in education and not in employment). Experts emphasized that the mandate of the meeting was to provide “guidance on the different options for measuring the various dimensions of decent work in order to prepare comprehensive recommendations for consideration by the Governing Body”² and suggested to systematically examine the proposed indicators.

Employment opportunities

45. Under the thematic heading ‘Employment opportunities’, experts suggested to amend the Office proposal and to use four main indicators: employment-to-population ratio; unemployment rate; youth not in education and not in employment; and informal employment (all disaggregated by sex). While there was broad agreement on this suggestion, some employer experts called for caution in interpreting trends in these indicators with their significance for progress towards decent work. For example, it would be misleading to assume that an employment-to-population ratio of 100% was desirable. Conversely, a fall in the ratio need not signal deterioration. Experts thus pointed out that it would be useful if the Office produced an interpretation guidance that highlighted potential problems of the indicators. Also, one needed to look at all indicators together, and take into account information supplied under the legal framework.
46. The indicator ‘proportion of own-account and contributing family workers in total employment’ could be re-classified from main to additional. It was often referred to as ‘vulnerable’ employment, but experts argued that it invited the misleading interpretation that any move from rural self-employment into urban wage employment signified progress towards decent work. Also, it erroneously suggested that no employee was vulnerable. Others supported the argument that informal employment was much better suited to monitor the vulnerability of workers. Whereas the ICLS definition for informal employment was meaningful worldwide,³ data on the proportion of own-account and contributing family workers had little relevance in developed countries such as Italy. This was also stressed by another expert who highlighted that own-account workers in Japan often worked under good conditions, whereas informal employment signified a lack of rights and social security coverage. However, participants from Africa and Asia highlighted that in their regions data availability was much better for the proportion of own-account and contributing family workers than for informal employment. Therefore, the indicator should be used where no data on informal employment were available at the national level. Thus, its inclusion on the list of additional indicators was warranted. This was underscored by an observer who encouraged the Office to rely on available statistics, and asked how much the collection of additional statistics on informal employment would cost countries. Drawing on discussions in Latin America, one possible remedy for the shortcomings of the indicator was to exclude professional and technical workers from its scope. One participant asked in how far the meeting was constrained by the existing list of MDG indicators⁴, but others argued that the meeting should not feel bound by it and strive to recommend the most suitable indicators.

² See GB.301/PFA/8.

³ See *Guidelines concerning a statistical definition of informal employment*, adopted by the 17th ICLS in 2003.

⁴ The proportion of own-account and contributing family workers in total employment is listed as MDG indicator 1.7 under Target 1.B.

-
47. The proposal to use ‘youth not in education and not in employment’ was generally endorsed, but experts argued that youth unemployment should be retained as an additional indicator. Drawing on the experience of Japan, one expert highlighted that youth unemployment was very costly to society. Others said that the youth unemployment rate could be used where statistics on the main indicator were not available. The role of the employment-to-population ratio and the unemployment rate as benchmark indicators was underscored. However, in the Caribbean the labour force participation rate was the only widely available indicator so that it should be included as an additional indicator that could be used where no other data were available. The meeting also took note of the work carried out by the Office to develop an indicator of labour underutilization to complement the unemployment rate. Experts strongly encouraged the Office to advance this work, and recommended that the labour underutilization rate be designated a candidate for future inclusion once data become available.

Response by the Office

48. In view of the many opinions discussed, the Office representatives summarized that it was important to seek a balance between desirability of measuring a certain aspect of decent work and its current feasibility. The primary aim was to provide indicators that were useful to constituents and all those interested in decent work. Testing the indicators in countries and exploring their usefulness in an iterative process seemed to be necessary for all categories of indicators. Going from information to indicators was not an easy process, as was reflected in the debate. As suggested by experts, the indicators under discussion were based on various sources and international standard definitions and measurement methodologies. Therefore, for most indicators a clear international agreement on their measurement and meaning existed. It would be a useful next step for the Office to draw these definitions together and to expand on the explanations provided in the appendix of the discussion paper and to compile information on data sources, definitions, calculations and interpretations. With respect to informal employment, the Office emphasized that the data can be collected through labour force surveys without generating significant additional costs.

Session 4: Statistical decent work indicators (cont.)

Work that should be abolished

49. Experts supported the inclusion of child labour as a main indicator under ‘Work that should be abolished’. However, they suggested to simplify the indicator name from children in wage employment or self-employment to child labour, and to reference it to the draft international statistical definition to be adopted by the 18th ICLS at the end of 2008. The scope of this definition included both children in self-employment (including unpaid family workers) and those in paid employment. They also suggested that public policies to combat child labour should be included in the legal framework information. Experts supported the inclusion of hazardous child labour as an additional indicator, but questioned why other worst forms of child labour were designated for future (rather than present) inclusion. In particular, they emphasized that the separation between the two should in no way create the impression that the other worst forms of child labour were non-hazardous or less serious than those that are measured. An Office representative clarified that the separation was simply due to the present difficulty of measuring the other worst forms of child labour, such as child prostitution.
50. Some experts questioned the classification of forced labour as an indicator for future inclusion, when it is such an essential indicator. Indeed, it was considered that forced labour issues were very connected with child labour, trafficking, migrant workers and that

it affected all countries, including developed ones. An Office representative explained that statistics on forced labour were not yet reliable in many countries. The idea was to develop measurement methodologies and launch projects in countries to measure it, and in due course include an indicator when sound statistics existed for a sufficient amount of countries. This had been the process for child labour statistics, a programme which started some 10 years ago and for which there are now statistics for around 60 countries. Regarding legal framework information on forced labour, it was recommended to add an indicator to measure progress on the implementation of laws.

Adequate earnings and productive work

- 51.** There were a number of comments on the two main indicators suggested by the Office, namely the working poor and the low pay rate. Some experts suggested using only the low pay rate, and debate about the difference between the two indicators emerged. It was explained that the first is a household concept while the second is an individual concept. As a result, the working poor can include people who may not be in the 'low pay' category, depending on the number of income earners and dependents. One expert highlighted that having a second employed person within a household often determined whether a household was poor or non-poor. This could lead to a situation where low-paid workers were not captured as poor since the household has a second source of income. By contrast, the concept of a low pay rate was not influenced by household characteristics. One expert suggested the use of the "working poor" as an absolute concept and to re-define the low pay rate as a purely relative concept to achieve greater conceptual clarity. This would mean changing the current definition of 'percentage of employed below one half of median hourly earnings, or absolute minimum, whichever is greater' by excluding the reference to the absolute minimum. Other experts suggested using two-thirds of the median hourly earnings, a common standard, rather than half of median hourly earnings as a threshold. The meeting reached agreement to follow these suggestions and to recommend the working poor and the (re-defined) low pay rate as main indicators.
- 52.** There was also lively debate on possible additional indicators, including those suggested by the Office (average earnings in selected occupations; number and wages of casual/daily workers; and manufacturing wage index). One proposal was to complement the indicator 'average hourly earnings in selected occupations' with information on the hours worked, as earnings per hour varied depending on full time and part time schedules. Other points of debate were whether median earnings would be more appropriate than average (i.e. mean) earnings; whether average earnings and minimum wages should be presented in purchasing power parities (PPPs); and whether scope of information on minimum wages should be restricted to the manufacturing sector for which data are available for many countries. An indicator of the 'percentage of workers who earn less than the minimum wage' is used in Latin America. The Office clarified that data on minimum wages (included under the legal framework information) would cover workers beyond the manufacturing sector, and that they are currently collected by the ILO's Conditions of Work and Employment Programme (TRAVAIL).⁵ Data on average earnings referred to hourly earnings and could be converted to PPPs; the same was true of the indicator of average earnings in selected occupations. For these, data by different working time arrangements were currently not available from the ILO October Inquiry.

⁵ See ILO, *Working Conditions Laws 2006-2007. A global review*. Geneva: International Labour Office.

-
53. Substantial debate also arose on how lifelong learning could be captured by a statistical indicator, and the meeting agreed to recommend ‘employees with recent job training’ as an additional indicator (rather than as a candidate for future inclusion, as in the Office proposal). Experts also debated whether a short reference period (such as the past four weeks) or a long longer reference period (such as the past year) should be used. Whereas the latter made data more comparable across countries with different training systems, experience had shown that a longer reference period can entail recall errors. It was agreed to allow both reference periods.
 54. Experts nominated by the Employers’ group proposed to develop indicators relating to the sustainability of enterprises, which were perhaps difficult to quantify but were important to achieve decent work. These indicators could cover: (i) education, training and lifelong learning, (ii) entrepreneurial culture, (iii) enabling legal and regulatory environment, (iv) fair competition, and (v) rule of law and secure property rights. An Office representative highlighted that developmental work on indicators relating to sustainable enterprises was already under way at headquarters and in Latin America, and suggested that appropriate indicators could be included in the future under the economic and social context for decent work.
 55. The general comment was made of the importance of evaluating these indicators in relation to indicators in other boxes, as they are all interrelated. In particular, it was suggested that ‘Employment opportunities’ and ‘Adequate earnings and productive work’ needed to be interpreted jointly, and that the order of headings be amended so that the latter directly follows the former.

Decent hours

56. Experts supported the inclusion of excessive hours as a main indicator, but questioned the suggested use of a 60 hour benchmark in addition to the threshold of 48 hours. It was argued that only the 48 hour threshold is codified in ILO Convention No. 1 (C.1), and should therefore be the only relevant one for the ILO. One expert suggested qualifying the indicator by adding ‘due to economic reasons’ to exclude those who work voluntarily work longer than 48 hours. Experts also drew attention to the fact that, for instance in Norway, it was common for workers to work in excess of these thresholds in one week, but that this was then followed by long periods of rest. This could distort measurement. An Office representative clarified that excessive hours related to hours usually worked, therefore eliminating the effect of special working time arrangements. The Office would follow experts’ advice and use 48 hours, as stipulated by C.1, as the sole threshold for excessive hours. He agreed that ‘excessive hours due to economic reasons’ was the better indicator, but that data were currently not widely available.
57. It was also debated whether time-related underemployment (a component of which is known as involuntary part-time work) should be used as a main indicator, and not as an additional indicator as proposed by the Office. This indicator could also be used as a gender indicator, insofar as it could be seen as a proxy for workers’ preferences to work more, given their family responsibility or constraints for women. Involuntary part-time work, mentioned by a number of participants, implied the measurement of part-time, which is very problematic in many countries and therefore the more general measure of time-related underemployment was preferred for an international indicator. One participant mentioned an indicator of ‘over-employment’ to show the counterpart of time-related underemployment. An Office representative explained that statistics on time-related underemployment were currently lacking for many countries, and that this was the rationale for grouping it as an additional indicator to be used in countries where data are available.
58. Experts also suggested that an indicator related to annual leave was needed under decent hours. This was taken up by others who argued that paid leave was an important aspect,

and should thus be adequately reflected. One expert suggested including annual leave entitlements under the legal framework. An Office representative said that information on the duration of annual leave, the entitlement to payment during leave and related aspects was collected by the ILO's Conditions of Work and Employment Programme (TRAVAIL). It was thus feasible to include paid annual leave under the legal framework.

- 59.** Participants also debated the applicability of decent hours concepts to the self-employed, given that they do not have working contracts stipulating hours of work. One participant mentioned that, if feasible, an indicator of the distribution of annual hours worked per person should be considered, rather than using the average.

Stability and security of work

- 60.** No statistical indicators were proposed for this dimension of decent work in the discussion paper since none of those suggested in the past had met the criteria laid out earlier. Experts sought to fill this gap by suggesting to re-consider some of the indicators listed in the discussion paper. They also proposed to use the number and wages of casual workers, currently grouped under employment opportunities, as well as an indicator on the notice period for the termination of an employment relationship, measured in weeks.
- 61.** The indicators considered by participants included tenure less than one year, temporary work, the job turnover rate, the existence of a written contract, social security coverage and subcontracting. Some delegates disagreed with the proposal to include the job turnover rate as it was not necessarily related to job instability. On tenure less than one year, it would be important to specify whether it related to written contracts or whether a de facto tenure was also considered. Experts further highlighted that interpretation of these indicators was problematic. For example, short job tenure did not necessarily mean that work was not decent, especially for highly qualified workers. Job mobility could not be seen as necessarily negative, and in countries like Austria, high job turnover reflected flexible labour markets. Mobility and security were not incompatible, as shown by the example of Denmark. Also mentioned was the experience in Australia that sought to distinguish between voluntary job-leavers and involuntary job-losers, and that the aim should be to capture the latter. On subcontracting, it was noted that at previous international meetings on the employment relationship, no consensus had been reached. It was also mentioned that in terms of measuring decent work what is important was not so much the type of employment relationship, but whether it was a voluntary or involuntary situation for the worker.
- 62.** It was suggested that the experience in European countries in measuring 'job security', using household-based surveys and self-assessment as part of the Eurobarometer programme, could be utilized for the measurement of decent work. Some participants mentioned the importance of including indicators that reflected the legal framework in the countries. Under legal indicators they proposed an indicator on the 'protection in case of termination'. In response, an Office representative suggested that the legal framework information should provide a profile of a country's employment protection legislation, including the notice period in case of termination and the effective coverage of workers by the legislation. Also, he noted that the meeting had demanded a statistical indicator for stability and security of work and understood that the Office would have to develop such an indicator in accordance with the guidance provided.

Combining work, family and personal life

- 63.** Again, no statistical indicators had been proposed by the Office for this substantive element of decent work. Experts considered whether the employment rate for women with children under compulsory school age could be used as a main indicator to fill this gap. Whereas there was initially some support for this proposal, it was later argued that statistics on this did not convey much meaning and that indicators needed to be reliable. The

limits of conventional statistics were highlighted, and one expert encouraged the Office to draw on the experience of Japan where an index for the work life balance had been developed.

- 64.** Participants debated a number of aspects that could be measured, including maternity leave (as a main indicator); the existence of support to the family, such as childcare; paternal leave; paternity leave; employment of mothers and fathers with young children (or by the age of the youngest child); employment of those who look after the elderly members of the family; and asocial / unusual hours and working time arrangements more generally. However, it was mentioned that extending the indicators too much would make this dimension blurred. Thus, it was perhaps more useful to concentrate on maternity leave. One independent expert suggested constructing a composite indicator for maternity leave by multiplying the length of maternity leave in weeks, the replacement rate and the coverage of workers. This proposal received the support of other experts, notably those nominated by the Workers' group, who argued that the Office should develop a quantitative indicator along these lines and include it as a main indicator. Further, all these indicators should cover all workers, not only those in paid employment.
- 65.** It was noted that it was difficult to define what a family is, and that there had, for example, been substantial debate on this issue in the United States. One suggestion was to make reference to 'personal life'. A general comment was that the need is to understand decent work as a local concept which needed to accommodate different cultures and national circumstances.
- 66.** An Office representative suggested including paternity and parental leave as an additional indicator under the legal framework, and to utilize information collected by ILO's Conditions of Work and Employment Programme (TRAVAIL) that, however, so far covered only a small number of countries. He highlighted the difficulties in calculating a composite indicator for maternity leave, given that data on coverage were only a rough approximation, and suggested to provide full information under the legal framework. He took note that developing a suitable indicator for asocial or unusual hours that conflicted with family responsibilities was a task to be addressed by the Office.

Safe work environment

- 67.** Experts agreed with the Office proposal to use the fatal occupational injury rate as a main indicator. It was also debated whether the non-fatal occupational injury rate should be used as a main indicator, rather than as an additional indicator, and that it should also include occupational diseases. Others highlighted that non-fatal injuries were an important aspect as they accounted for as much as 90% of all occupational injuries and the bulk of workers' compensation in countries such as Norway. This could be reflected by including an indicator for the work time lost due to occupational injuries that could be included as an additional indicator. It was explained that while some diseases are included in the current statistic (those that lead to an injury), diseases are in general excluded given the significant difficulties of determining cases of occupational diseases, in addition to the fact that they are not necessarily linked to the work environment. Also, data reliability and availability problems should be considered.
- 68.** Experts also proposed an additional indicator relating to labour inspection, whether to be placed under this dimension or elsewhere. Others experts said that the sheer number of labour inspectors need not be very meaningful unless one had information about their effectiveness. One expert suggested that the number of prosecutions that resulted from labour inspections might be a more informative indicator. An Office representative indicated that the Office would work on this aspect, and look into labour inspection as an additional statistical indicator to complement the information on this issue that is currently included under the legal framework.

-
69. One expert suggested an indicator relating to disabled workers and the reintegration of injured workers. However, it was argued by others that this was an issue related to employment opportunities and non-discrimination, rather than a question of a safe work environment.

Session 5: Rights at work and legal framework for decent work / statistical indicators (cont.)

Introduction by the Office

70. An Office representative introduced the proposals on the inclusion of rights at work and the legal framework for decent work. She emphasized that rights at work were relevant across the entire Decent Work Agenda, and that ILO labour standards covered a range of topics that had already been discussed during the meeting. It would be inadequate to base the measurement of decent work solely on statistical indicators, and that the Office proposal had recognized that the rights at work and the legal framework for decent work need to be prominently reflected. To this end, the Office had made two complementary proposals: (i) to provide a textual description of the legal framework and data on the actual application of rights, as well as on benefit levels and coverage and other relevant aspects; and (ii) to develop indicators for countries' compliance with the four Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (FPRWs).
71. With reference to the first proposal, a systematic effort would be made to compile information on the legal framework and the effective application of rights in a standard template. This information could be read in conjunction with statistical indicators and help to interpret them and complement them in areas that are of a complex legal nature such as maternity leave entitlements. It would build on existing ILO databases and information generated through the ILO supervisory system. The template in Appendix table 4 sought to organize this information as follows: Laws, policies or institutions that are in place (column 2); benefit levels and thresholds (column 3); evidence of implementation effectiveness (column 4); rough percentage of workers covered, both in law (column 5) and in practice (column 6), based on estimation routine; and the ratification of relevant ILO Conventions, including of all eight core conventions and all four priority conventions (column 7). She briefly introduced the different subjects covered by the proposal, that range from unemployment insurance and statutory minimum wages to anti-discrimination laws and freedom of association and right to organize.
72. With respect to the second proposal, the Office representative said that it would be warranted to construct indicators for compliance with the four FPRWs freedom of association and collective bargaining, elimination of forced and compulsory labour, elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation, and the abolition of child labour. The primary objective of these indicators would be to measure the situation in a base year and then to record progress made towards their full application. This necessitated a transparent and objective rating according to standard evaluation criteria, based on the extent to which a country's laws complied with FPRWs and the actual application of FPRW in a country. For each of the four FPRWs, the Office needed to develop clear and sufficiently detailed evaluation criteria to define compliance.

General debate

73. Experts generally underscored the importance of rights within the Decent Work Agenda. As one expert said, the fundamental principles and rights at work represented an oath of allegiance to the ILO. Another expert contemplated whether compliance was the end or the beginning of decent work, and whether the legal component was 100% of the Decent Work

Agenda. The aspirational component of the four fundamental principles and rights at work also received attention, and their key role for the ILO was highlighted.

74. Experts argued that it was clear that the legal content of decent work was essential for an integrated measurement of decent work, and that the proposed legal framework information added richness and context for the interpretation of statistical indicators. As one expert highlighted, it was possible to go beyond the suggested data on the rough percentage of workers covered by a legal arrangement to provide exact figures on coverage in countries such as Canada.
75. Several experts strongly endorsed the proposal to develop indicators for the compliance with the FPRWs. The required indicators were a manageable set, and their absence would lead to an incomplete picture and present a major shortcoming. Some debate resulted about how the FPRWs could be measured, and experts agreed that measurement needs to be reproducible and should be based on a standard coding framework. It was highlighted that the Office had already undertaken substantial developmental work, and could build on an impressive framework to measure trade union rights on the basis of 37 evaluation criteria.⁶ Thus, the feasibility of such indicators had been demonstrated. This was underscored by a participant who cited the experience gained in a pilot project on the effective application of fundamental standards in Latin America. Another point of debate was whether compliance indicators would lead to a duplication of work with the Committee of Experts, and possibly to inconsistencies, and experts emphasized that these aspects should be carefully reviewed so as to ensure that the ILO supervisory machinery was not undermined. Further, some experts raised resource implications of the proposal, and experts encouraged the Office to tap into the already existing expertise within the Office. Several participants encouraged the Office to work in a more integrated way.

Response by the Office

76. Office representatives affirmed that the FPRWs had an aspirational nature, but that at the same time the eight core conventions, given their high rate of ratification, also represented the baseline from which to measure the achievement of the legal commitments made by a majority of governments. They emphasized that compliance indicators would be consistent with the work of the Committee of Experts and the ILO's other supervisory organs, and utilize the information generated by them. The Committee of Experts had developed objective criteria to measure progress, and the Office would draw on these as well as on the previous work highlighted in the debate. It was thus possible for the Office to generate reliable and reproducible indicators, and the experts' request to develop them was acknowledged. While a substantial amount of information was available from the ILO supervisory system, this was not generally easily accessible. This implied, as suggested by experts, that a important effort would be needed to produce compliance indicators.

Social dialogue, workers' and employers' representation

77. The chairperson proposed to continue the debate along the substantive elements of decent work, and to begin with social dialogue and workers' representation. Experts supported the three main indicators proposed by the Office (union density rate, enterprises belonging to employer organization, and the collective wage bargaining coverage rate) and further suggested some amendments. Support was also expressed for the Office proposal to

⁶ See David Kucera (ed.), *Qualitative Indicators of Labour Standards. Comparative Methods and Applications*. Dordrecht and Geneva: Springer and ILO.

develop a compliance indicator for freedom of association and collective bargaining, and to list it as a main indicator. The additional indicator strikes and lockouts/rates of days not worked was also endorsed, albeit with reservations regarding its interpretation. Further, it was suggested to amend the heading of the category by making reference to both workers' and employers' representation.

- 78.** Regarding trade union density, one expert suggested drawing on previous work done by the Office to improve the measurement of workers' representation. Other participants noted that this indicator needed to be seen together with institutional and statistical framework. It was also cautioned that union density can be an ambiguous indicator, given that a country like France had a low trade union density but nonetheless powerful trade unions. This point was supported by another expert who suggested interpreting trade union density in conjunction with indicators for collective bargaining coverage.
- 79.** As far as employers' representation was concerned, one expert stated that the number of enterprises belonging to an employers' organisation should be expressed as a ratio, rather than as an absolute number. Experts also highlighted several issues that had to be taken into account: First, some enterprises could be double counted as affiliation occurred through sectors and regions as in France. Second, indicators of the representation of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) and enterprises in the informal economy should be included. Countries such as Gabon now had informal economy associations. Third, the representation of women entrepreneurs was an important aspect.
- 80.** With respect to collective wage bargaining coverage, experts recommended removing 'wage' from the name of the indicator since collective bargaining covered many non-wage issues. A participant from Latin America suggested using wage and salaried workers as the denominator, as done in her region. Also, the indicator could be disaggregated by economic activity where these data are available. One expert cautioned that this was difficult to measure, and that one needed to consider changes over a long period to detect changes in countries such as Norway.
- 81.** It had become clear during the morning session that there was strong support for the construction of an indicator for compliance with the fundamental principles and rights at work in the area of freedom of association and collective bargaining. As one expert argued, this indicator was essential for the interpretation of the remaining indicators. In response to a question raised by an observer on the possibility to measure freedom of association, an Office representative affirmed that it was feasible by building on previous work and the information gathered by the ILO's supervisory system.
- 82.** Substantial debate arose on the meaningfulness of the additional indicator strikes and lockouts/rates of days not worked. Experts agreed that this indicator could give rise to ambiguous interpretation. In the Nordic countries, legal strikes were not an indication of the breakdown of social dialogue, which distinguished them from illegal strikes; lock-outs were a seldom used mechanism. However, experts said that it still could be useful as an additional indicator if contextual indications were provided.
- 83.** Experts also considered that tripartism should be one indicator of social dialogue. As one expert emphasized, tripartism was not synonymous with negotiations between workers and employers, and another participant highlighted the role of national tripartite bodies. In response, an Office representative said that this information could be included under the legal framework where one aspect was tripartism.
- 84.** During the discussions, one expert contemplated whether the current substantive element should be broken down into three different areas, namely social dialogue, workers' representation, and employers' representation. This was opposed by others who argued that all elements should stay under a single heading since social dialogue was an encompassing

notion that included workers' and employers' representation, and essential to the Decent Work Agenda. Some participants raised concerns about the appropriate ways of measuring social dialogue without ambiguity, while reflecting the diversity of institutional arrangements and their implementation. To illustrate that social dialogue was a collective effort, an expert presented the workers' development agenda in Brazil. The importance of contextual information was also underscored by another expert who argued that, while no single indicator provided a complete picture, their sum was greater than the worth of its parts.

Equal opportunity and treatment in employment

- 85.** Under the heading 'Equal opportunity and treatment in employment', the discussion paper had proposed to use occupational segregation by sex and the female share of employment in managerial and administrative occupations as main indicators. While experts supported the first indicators, some debate arose on the utility of the second indicator. Some experts felt that it did not add much information to what was already contained in the former. However, others argued that it was necessary to record information on both vertical and horizontal segregation, as done in much of the literature on gender inequality. The latter was a proxy for the 'glass ceiling' faced by women that denied them access to leadership positions. However, experts argued that administrative occupations included both managerial and service position, and that the indicator should be refined. Experts supported the suggestion to use the female share of employment in ISCO-88 groups 11 and 12 as a main indicator.⁷ Further, experts asked the Office to list the gender wage gap as an additional indicator.
- 86.** A number of comments and proposals were put forward to better reflect the situation of minorities, including disabled and migrant workers, and disadvantaged ethnic and racial groups. Regarding migrant workers, an independent observer proposed to include the employment rate of migrant workers, disaggregated by gender and age, and instead of the proposed measure of dispersion for the sectoral distribution of migrant workers. Independent experts and observers argued that migrant origin, employment status, access to training, and number of years spent in the country were needed to give an accurate picture of migrant workers. However, the difficulty of gathering these data was highlighted by several experts and the Office representative. The meeting concluded that further developmental work was needed and agreed to designate a measure of dispersion for sectoral / occupational distribution of (recent) migrant workers as a candidate for future inclusion. Experts also encouraged the Office to build on existing work and to develop a measure for the employment situation of persons with disabilities so that an appropriate indicator could be included in the near future.⁸
- 87.** Several experts highlighted that discrimination along the lines of ethnicity and race was a common challenge and that indigenous people and rural workers often faced severe disadvantages. In South Africa, the legacy of apartheid meant that race was still an important determinant of opportunity, and that initiatives were under way to improve the situation of black workers. Therefore, the template should provide for sufficient flexibility to reflect

⁷ ISCO-88 group 11 includes chief executives, senior officials and legislators, and group 12 corporate managers. The indicator will have to be adapted to ISCO-08 once countries adopt the new classification.

⁸ See ILO Bureau of Statistics in collaboration with the In Focus Programme on Skills, Knowledge and Employability, *Statistics on the employment situation of people with disabilities: A compendium of national methodologies*. Integration Working Paper No. 40. Geneva: ILO, 2004.

different national circumstances and include this dimension where it was relevant. In a similar vein, another participant expert stressed that indigenous people and rural workers often faced discrimination in Latin America, and that statistics could shed some light on this providing appropriate disaggregation. In response to these suggestions, the Office suggested to list as an additional indicator a measure for discrimination by race / ethnicity / of indigenous people / of (recent) migrant workers / of rural workers where relevant and available at the national level. Under the legal framework, information on anti-discrimination laws based on race, ethnicity, religion or national origin would be provided.

- 88.** Experts also asked the Office to develop an additional indicator for Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (Elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation), following the principles discussed earlier.

Social security

- 89.** Several experts supported the inclusion of two of the suggested main indicators, namely (i) share of population aged 65 and above benefiting from a pension and (ii) public social security expenditure (% of GDP). There were, however, some notes of caution regarding the interpretation of these indicators. With respect to pension coverage, one expert pointed out that several countries had succeeded in keeping older workers in employment beyond the age of 65 years. If this led to a decrease in the proportion of people aged 65 and above receiving a pension, this should not be seen as negative, and differences in retirement ages needed to be taken into account. Another concern was that pension coverage in itself was not a sufficient indicator unless other information, such as pension levels, were known. With respect to public social security expenditure, experts pointed out that a fall induced by declining unemployment or a reduction in occupational injuries actually pointed towards progress. Also, in regions such as Latin America it was possible to disaggregate expenditure, and data could thus be presented at a greater level of detail. In response, it was pointed out that the Office appreciated this difficulty of interpretation and would take it into account. As for pensions, the intention was to provide further contextual information (e.g. on replacement rate and the retirement age at full pension) under the legal framework. Where available, additional disaggregations could add further depth.
- 90.** Some debate arose around the proposed statistics on health-care expenditure not financed out of pocket by private households. Experts questioned whether it was suitable, given differences in national health care systems. Specifically, experts asked how payments financed through private health insurance systems would be treated. An Office representative replied that the indicator would be based on data from the WHO's national health accounts, and that out-of-pocket spending by private households did not include expenditure reimbursed through public or private health insurance systems. Regarding health expenditure, a complementary indicator was suggested by one participant: the share of population covered by (basic) health care provision. Agreement was reached to use the two as additional indicators. This also addressed the suggestion to differentiate the social security coverage (pension and/or health) into two separate indicators.
- 91.** Experts also proposed to mark three indicators for future inclusion: (i) the share of economically active population contributing to a pension scheme; (ii) public expenditure on needs-based cash income support (% of GDP); and (iii) beneficiaries of cash income support (% of the poor). With regard to the first, experts pointed out that some countries had obligatory private pension systems. Therefore, any contributions to pension schemes, where public or private, needed to be taken into account. With regard to the other two indicators, an expert observed that cash income support for vulnerable groups of the population were increasingly common in developing countries and should be captured.
- 92.** One expert raised the point that statistical decent work indicators generally referred to the economically active population, while some of the social security indicators did not. In

response, an Office representative agreed with this observation and pointed out that the Decent Work Agenda was also concerned with the living standard of workers and their families as well as their welfare after their active working lives.

Session 6: Statistical indicators (cont.) and closing of the meeting

Economic and social context for decent work

- 93.** Experts endorsed the eight main and two additional indicators listed in the discussion paper under ‘Economic and social context for decent work’, and proposed several refinements. Experts felt that they were relevant and pointed out that very similar indicators were already used in a country like Ukraine. The importance of contextual indicators such as the estimated percentage of working-age population who are HIV positive and labour productivity (GDP per employed person, level and growth rate) had already been stressed during the previous debate. Similarly, the importance of education and training had also previously been highlighted. Two context indicators sought to proxy this, namely education of adult population (adult literacy rate, adult secondary-school graduation rate) and children not in school (% by age).
- 94.** Several experts sought clarifications, and suggested alternative statistics and additional indicators. With respect to labour productivity, one expert suggested that labour time inputs (i.e. days or hours worked), rather than number of employed, should be used as the denominator. Others agreed that time worked would be ideal, but pointed out that these data are currently not available in many countries. One expert pointed out that the labour share in GDP, listed as a main indicator in the Office proposal, was sensitive to economic growth, rising during slow economic growth and declining in rapid economic growth. In response, an Office representative said that such effects needed to be taken into account, and led further support to the assessment that interpretation of indicators is not always straightforward and needs to be done in conjunction with other indicators, such as GDP growth.
- 95.** Two experts asked if the ratio to measure income inequality used average incomes of the top and bottom deciles. In response, an Office representative clarified that the ratio used the upper limit of lowest decile and lower limit of the top decile and suggested to remove ambiguity by re-naming the indicator into ‘Income inequality (percentile ratio P90/P10, income or consumption)’. Several experts argued in favour of a further indicator to measure wage and earnings inequality, equally expressed as a percentile ratio (P90/P10). The Chairperson informed the group that the European Taskforce on the Measurement of the Quality of Employment was also measuring earnings inequality.
- 96.** With respect to the additional context indicator on per capita incomes, experts made a number of suggestions: first, to use GDP per capita rather than GNI; second, to express it in purchasing power parities (PPP); and third, to report level and growth rate to establish symmetry with the labour productivity indicator. The indicator was thus changed into ‘Real GDP per capita in PPP\$ (level and growth rate)’. Uncontroversial were the two main context indicators inflation rate and employment by branch of economic activity and the additional context indicator female share of employment by industry (ISIC tabulation category).
- 97.** An Office representative also highlighted that developmental work needed to be done by the Office to reflect environment for sustainable enterprises. As suggested by the meeting, possible indicators that could be included in the future under the context information could refer to (i) education, training and life-long learning, (ii) entrepreneurial culture, (iii) enabling legal and regulatory framework, (iv) fair competition, and (v) rule of law and secure

property rights. Further indicators could reflect other institutional arrangements, such as scope of labour law and the labour ministry and other relevant ministries.

Revised set of indicators

- 98.** An Office representative introduced a revised set of indicators, and asked experts whether the list presented an accurate record of their suggestions and comments made up to the end of session 5. In particular, he emphasized that all indicators marked (S) would be disaggregated by sex to shed light on gender differences in access to decent work, and invited participants to look at statistical indicators and legal framework information in conjunction. One expert clarified that the revised proposal was a record of what had been discussed, not yet an agreement. He also pointed out that the discussion focused on which indicators to include, rather than on which should be main, additional or future indicators; this designation would need further examination. The Office replied that the designations ‘main indicator’ or ‘additional indicator’ were meant to guide testing at country level; the designation could change based on results.
- 99.** The expert further pointed out that the statistical indicators by themselves will not offer a ‘commentary on decent work’ in a country, but that they would need to be interpreted. In this regard, a set of guidelines on how to use and interpret the proposed indicators, and what to ‘watch out for’, should be prepared by the Office. The Office representative replied that the Office would look into this suggestion, and that it would be a useful next step for the Office to prepare a guidebook that provides standard definitions for indicators, highlights the link between the categories of indicators, and discuss possible pitfalls in their interpretation. This could build on the guidebook produced by the ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific and similar efforts.⁹
- 100.** Many experts lend their support to the revisions carried out by the Office. One expert found that the revision was excellent and agreed with the revised proposal. It reflected the systematic work undertaken by the experts, and was a concrete achievement of the meeting. Another expert agreed that the revised proposal was a ‘very good starting point’ for the Office to test in countries. Such a test might also show the links between the various indicators. He added that the proposed set of decent work indicators would bring together the various databases available in the ILO into a searchable ‘template’ or ‘integrated framework’ that is linked to decent work; this would be helpful to countries. It was also pointed out that, while the development of decent work indicators was work in progress, many statistics were already available. One expert underscored the importance of including indicators that capture all workers, i.e. including informal and domestic workers.
- 101.** An observer commented that the legal framework was comprehensive overall, but still required refinement, i.e. it could make use of other available information. Another participant reiterated that certain dimensions of quality of employment were not adequately taken into account, such as training and job satisfaction. An Office representative appreciated these comments and said that training and career development were partially represented under productive work, but indeed were still an area for further work by the Office. Job satisfaction was recognized as valid element, but that data was scarce.

⁹ ILO, *Decent Work Indicators for Asia and the Pacific. A guidebook for Policy-makers and Researchers*. Bangkok: ILO, 2008.

Employment opportunities

- 102.** Experts proceeded by re-visiting the indicator list, starting with employment opportunities. One expert pointed out that informal employment may include domestic workers and unregistered workers of establishments. This differentiated it from the proportion of own-account and contributing family workers, that was suggested as proxy indicator. An Office representative agreed with this observation, and said that the latter was still useful in countries where no data on informal employment exist.

Adequate earnings and productive work

- 103.** One expert suggested including an additional indicator under ‘Adequate earnings and productive work’, namely the minimum wage as a percentage of the median wage, and the Office followed this proposal.

Decent hours

- 104.** One expert clarified that hours worked should cover all employed persons, i.e. workers and employers alike. The Office replied that this was the case. One expert suggested that paid annual leave should be quantified and be used as a main statistical indicator, rather than under legal framework information. The Office clarified that annual leave entitlements under the legal framework will be quantified, based on data already collected by the Office. Rather than to provide a single summary figure, it would be useful to report the available information in detail. Another expert suggested the inclusion of sick leave under decent hours. The Office pointed out that incapacity for work due to sickness was included under the legal framework information, but that it was arguably better placed under the heading of social security. One expert contemplated whether data on ‘unusual hours’, such as work on weekends and night shifts, should be included. The Office representative highlighted that this proposal had been taken into account under ‘Combining work, family and personal life’ where an indicator on asocial / unusual hours of work was marked for future inclusion, following developmental work to be done by the Office.

Combining work, family and personal life

- 105.** Experts revisited their earlier debate on the appropriate title of this substantive element. The revised indicator list had amended it to ‘Combining work and personal life’, and experts emphasized that the family was an important social unit, and the reference to it should not be omitted. Work and family was a well-established terminology and rooted in Convention on Workers with Family Responsibilities, 1981 (No. 156). The Office representative apologized for the misunderstanding that had led to this amendment, and the meeting followed the Chairperson’s proposal to use ‘Combining work, family and personal life’ as a heading.
- 106.** One participant suggested using Convention 156 to elaborate the legal framework information. In a similar direction, another participant proposed quantifying parental leave entitlements as well as paternity leave entitlements. It was also suggested that the legal framework information on maternity leave should specify entitlement in terms of length, maternity leave benefits and approximate coverage of women workers. Another expert pointed out that that these are rights and do not necessarily reflect reality, thus stressing the importance of information on coverage in practice. An independent expert re-emphasized the proposal to construct a quantitative indicator for maternity leave, and suggested to mark it for future inclusion as a main statistical indicator. Others supported this proposal, arguing that it was desirable and entirely feasible to produce a numerical indicator on maternity leave. The Office representative took note of this request and said that the Office would also report the available detailed information on maternity leave entitlement in

terms of length, benefits and approximate coverage of women workers under the legal framework.

- 107.** One expert expressed disappointment that the indication of ‘Developmental work to be done by the Office’ under statistical indicators was still too vague, leading to the explicit reference to ‘Asocial / unusual hours (Developmental work to be done by the Office)’. Another expert highlighted that paid annual leave and excessive hours of work, included under ‘Decent hours’, also provided relevant information. Further, it was suggested that measures taken by countries to help workers accommodate family responsibilities, such as flexible working time arrangements, could be taken into account. In response, it was highlighted that the Office could draw on the work done by the European Taskforce.

Work that should be abolished

- 108.** Experts asked for clarification about the difference between ‘hazardous’ and ‘other worst forms’ of child labour. They expressed their unease about this subdivision, since this element of decent work should include all forms of child labour, and pointed out that this classification should only aid measurement. The Office representative clarified that measurement difficulties were the reason for this sub-division. Hazardous forms of child labour were generally more visible and thus easier to measure than the other worst forms, such as child prostitution. One expert suggested the inclusion of statutory minimum age under legal framework, and the Office said that this was intended.

Stability and security of work

- 109.** One expert emphasized the importance of this dimension of decent work. He expressed his understanding of the need for the Office to develop indicators, and his expectation that indicators would be incorporated into the framework once the developmental work is completed. Another participant suggested that one indicator to be considered as part of this developmental work could be the incidence of temporary work, which may be captured through questions in Labour Force Surveys.

Equal opportunity and treatment in employment

- 110.** The Office representative clarified that, in addition to gender-based discrimination, country specificities may require indicators covering race, ethnic and other grounds of discrimination. The revised proposal therefore followed experts’ advice and mentioned this explicitly. There was a brief discussion on lines along which discrimination and unequal treatment can occur: sectoral segregation which reflects underutilization of labour; occupational segregation rather than (or in addition to) sectoral segregation, particularly for migrant workers; disability; and rural/urban division. Inclusion of indicators on unequal treatment of migrants was supported by other experts. It was suggested to use indicators such as pay gaps and employment gaps. Another participant said that different ways of measuring discrimination would allow for flexibility across countries. The Office took these comments and included the following as an additional indicator: Measure for discrimination by race / ethnicity / of indigenous people / of (recent) migrant workers / of rural workers where relevant and available at the national level.

Safe work environment

- 111.** An expert suggested that the ratio of labour inspectors to 100,000 employees should be a main indicator. Several experts pointed out that the denominator should refer to all employed persons, rather than employees. An Office representative highlighted quality issues with respect to national data because of non-uniform coverage, and suggested to include the measure as an additional indicator, as well as to provide more detailed information on national labour inspection systems under the legal framework.

-
- 112.** One expert noted that the occupational injury rate was a measure for incidences, but that time lost due to accidents may be more important. He added that the existence of reporting requirements should be cited under legal context. The Office representative replied that using 'time lost' had been considered as an additional indicator, but that obtaining this data was not feasible for many countries.

Social security

- 113.** Part of the discussion focused on the inclusion of private insurance in the measurement of social security. Experts pointed out that pensions and insurances are under private systems, and that workers may contribute to a private or public pension scheme. The Office clarified that pension schemes referred to both private and public schemes.
- 114.** Further clarification centred on the meaning of the indicator on health care expenditure not financed out of pocket by private households. The Office representative stated that available WHO data would be used for this indicator, and that relevant WHO definitions would thus be followed. Total health care expenditures included public, private and other (e.g. NGOs) sources, and that the proposed indicator only looked at share that is not paid for directly by private households. Experts lent support to this indicator and argued that it measures the extent of private burden for health care, and that out of pocket expenditure captured cash outlays by households that were not covered by any public or private insurance scheme.

Social dialogue, workers' and employers' representation

- 115.** One expert emphasized that tripartism is fundamental to social dialogue, and that the lack of a statistical indicator of tripartism was a major gap. Other experts expressed their support for the selected indicators. The Office pointed out that information on tripartite consultations would be included under the legal framework.

Conclusions and closing of the meeting

- 116.** The Chairperson thanked all participants for their constructive engagement and the many good suggestions that were made. Likewise, the representative of the Director-General complimented the group for a rich discussion and very collegiate exchange of views on a topic that is clearly delicate and complex. The inputs received during the meeting would be essential to guide the Office in its future work. He reiterated the potential use of the indicators for constituents and others in assessing changes and progress in decent work over time and in policy discussions. He outlined the next steps to be taken by the Office, namely: (i) to submit reports on the meeting to the Governing Body and the International Conference of Labour Statisticians; (ii) to develop clear indicator definitions and guidance on the interpretation of these indicators; and (iii) to test the revised set of indicators in a number of pilot countries before reporting back to the Governing Body in November 2009.
- 117.** Experts nominated by different groups thanked the Office and the staff, and appreciated that the meeting had been successful and useful. In line with the previous discussion, one expert added a note of caution and stressed that, while important progress had been made, the measurement of decent work was still partial. He underscored that all pillars of decent work should be measured. Another expert agreed that the meeting was useful and interesting, and had given him many new ideas which he will share enthusiastically with Government and the national statistical office. While one participant suggested that the group might consider preparing a resolution for the forthcoming ICLS, another cautioned that a resolution to the ICLS might be premature.

**Appendix 1: Revised Office proposal for the measurement of decent work based on guidance received at the TME on the Measurement of Decent Work
(to be read in conjunction with the Discussion paper* and the detailed comments made by experts as reflected in the Chairperson’s report)**

<p>Substantive element of the Decent Work Agenda Numbers in brackets refer to ILO strategic objectives: 1. Standards and fundamental principles and rights at work; 2. Employment; 3. Social protection; 4. Social dialogue.</p>	<p>Statistical indicators Selection of relevant statistical indicators that allow monitoring progress made with regard to the substantive elements. M – Main decent work indicators A – Additional decent work indicators F – Candidate for future inclusion / developmental work to be done by the Office C – Economic and social context for decent work (S) indicates that an indicator should be reported separately for men and women in addition to the total. See Appendix table 2 of the discussion paper for full discussion of statistical indicators (reference number in brackets; n.a. where no reference number is available).</p>	<p>Information on rights at work and the legal framework for decent work Description of relevant national legislation in relation to the substantive elements of the Decent Work Agenda; where relevant, information on the benefit level; evidence of implementation effectiveness and the coverage of workers in law and in practice; complaints and representations received by the ILO; observations by the ILO supervisory system and cases of progress; information on the ratification of relevant ILO Conventions (1, 2, 3 + 4) L – Subject covered by information on rights at work and the legal framework for decent work See Appendix table 4 of the discussion paper for full discussion of information on rights at work and the legal framework for decent work.</p>
<p>Employment opportunities (1 + 2)</p>	<p>M – Employment-to-population ratio, 15-64 years (S) (2) M – Unemployment rate (S) (3) M – Youth not in education and not in employment, 15-24 years (S) (4b) M – Informal employment (S) (6) A – Labour force participation rate, 15-64 years (1) [to be used especially where statistics on Employment-to-population ratio and/or Unemployment rate (total) are not available] A – Youth unemployment rate, 15-24 years (S) (4) A – Unemployment by level of education (S) (3a) A – Employment by status in employment (S) (5) A – Proportion of own-account and contr. family workers in total employment (S) (5b) [to be used especially where statistics on informal employment are not available] A – Share of wage employment in non-agricultural employment (S) (5a) F – Labour underutilization (S) <u>Memo item:</u> Time-related underemployment rate (S) (15) grouped as A under “Decent hours”</p>	<p>L – Government commitment to full employment L – Unemployment insurance</p>

* See ILO, *Measurement of decent work, Discussion paper for the Tripartite Meeting of Experts on the Measurement of Decent Work*. Geneva: ILO, 2008.

Substantive element of the DWA	Statistical indicators	Information on rights at work and the legal framework for decent work
Adequate earnings and productive work (1 + 3)	M – Working poor (S) (9) M – Low pay rate (below 2/3 of median hourly earnings) (S) (10) A – Average hourly earnings in selected occupations (S) (12a) A – Average real wages (S) (12) A – Minimum wage as % of median wage (n.a.) A – Manufacturing wage index (12c) A – Employees with recent job training (past year / past 4 weeks) (S) (13)	L – Statutory minimum wage
Decent hours (1 + 3)	M – Excessive hours (more than 48 hours per week; ‘usual’ hours) (S) (14) A – Usual hours worked (standardized hour bands) (S) (14a) A – Annual hours worked per employed person (S) (14b) A – Time-related underemployment rate (S) (15) F – Paid annual leave (developmental work to be done by the Office; additional indicator)	L – Maximum hours of work L – Paid annual leave
Combining work, family and personal life (1 + 3)	F – Asocial / unusual hours (Developmental work to be done by the Office) F – Maternity protection (developmental work to be done by the Office; main indicator)	L – Maternity leave (incl. weeks of leave, replacement rate and coverage) L (additional) – Paternity and parental leave
Work that should be abolished (1 + 3)	M – Child labour [as defined by draft ICLS resolution] (S) (8) A – Hazardous child labour (S) (n.a.) F – Other worst forms of child labour (S) (n.a.) F – Forced labour (S) (n.a.)	L – Child labour (incl. public policies to combat it) L – Forced labour (incl. public policies to combat it)
Stability and security of work (1, 2 + 3)	M – Stability and security of work (developmental work to be done by the Office). A – Number and wages of casual/daily workers (S) (12b) <u>Memo item:</u> Informal employment grouped under employment opportunities.	L – Employment protection legislation (incl. notice of termination in weeks) <u>Memo item:</u> Unemployment insurance grouped under employment opportunities; needs to be interpreted in conjunction for ‘flexicurity’.
Equal opportunity and treatment in employment (1, 2 + 3)	M – Occupational segregation by sex (19) M – Female share of employment in ISCO-88 groups 11 and 12 (19a) A – Gender wage gap (n.a.) A – Indicator for Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (Elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation) to be developed by the Office (n.a.) A – Measure for discrimination by race / ethnicity / of indigenous people / of (recent) migrant workers / of rural workers where relevant and available at the national level. F – Measure of dispersion for sectoral / occupational distribution of (recent) migrant workers (20) F – Measure for employment of persons with disabilities (n.a.) <u>Memo item:</u> Indicators under other substantive elements marked (S) indicator should be reported separately for men and women in addition to the total.	L – Anti-discrimination law based on sex of worker L – Anti-discrimination law based on race, ethnicity, religion or national origin

Substantive element of the DWA	Statistical indicators	Information on rights at work and the legal framework for decent work
Safe work environment (1 + 3)	M – Occupational injury rate, fatal (21) A – Occupational injury rate, non-fatal (21a) A – Time lost due to occupational injuries (n.a.) A – Labour inspection (inspectors per 10,000 employed persons) (22)	L – Occupational safety and health insurance L – Labour inspection
Social security (1 + 3)	M – Share of population aged 65 and above benefiting from a pension (S) (25) M – Public social security expenditure (% of GDP) (24) A – Health-care exp. not financed out of pocket by private households (n.a.) A – Share of population covered by (basic) health care provision (S) (25a) F – Share of econ. active population contributing to a pension scheme (S) (25b) F – Public expenditure on needs-based cash income support (% of GDP) (24a) F – Beneficiaries of cash income support (% of the poor) (24b) F – Sick leave (developmental work to be done by the Office; additional indicator) [Interpretation in conjunction with legal framework and labour market statistics.]	L – Pension (public / private) L – Incapacity for work due to sickness / sick leave L – Incapacity for work due to invalidity <u>Memo item:</u> Unemployment insurance grouped under employment opportunities.
Social dialogue, workers' and employers' representation (1 + 4)	M – Union density rate (S) (26) M – Enterprises belonging to employer organization [rate] (27) M – Collective bargaining coverage rate (S) (28) M – Indicator for Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining) to be developed by the Office (30) A – Strikes and lockouts/rates of days not worked [interpretation issues] (29)	L – Freedom of association and right to organize L – Collective bargaining right L – Tripartite consultations
Economic and social context for decent work	C – Children not in school (% by age) (S) (7) C – Estimated % of working-age population who are HIV positive (31) C – Labour productivity (GDP per employed person, level and growth rate) (E1) C – Income inequality (percentile ratio P90/P10, income or consumption) (E3) C – Inflation rate (CPI) (E4) C – Employment by branch of economic activity (E5) C – Education of adult population (adult literacy rate, adult secondary-school graduation rate) (S) (E6) C – Labour share in GDP (E7) C (additional) – Real GDP per capita in PPP\$ (level and growth rate) (E2) C (additional) – Female share of employment by industry (ISIC tabulation category) (E5a) C (additional) – Wage / earnings inequality (percentile ratio P90/P10) (n.a.)	Developmental work to be done by the Office to reflect environment for <i>sustainable enterprises</i> , incl. indicators for (i) education, training and life-long learning, (ii) entrepreneurial culture, (iii) enabling legal and regulatory framework, (iv) fair competition, and (v) rule of law and secure property rights. Developmental work to be done by the Office to reflect to reflect other institutional arrangements, such as scope of labour law and scope of labour ministry and other relevant ministries.

Source: ILO compilation on the basis of the Discussion paper for the Tripartite Meeting of Experts on the Measurement of Decent Work (Geneva, 8 -10 September 2008).

Appendix 2: Final List of Participants

EXPERTS NOMINATED BY GOVERNMENTS

BRAZIL

Ms. Adriana Giuberti
Coordinadora-General de Aparcerías Empresariales
Ministerio de Trabajo y Empleo
Esplanada dos Ministérios
Bloco F, 5º Andar - Gabinete
BR-70059-900 BRASILIA DF
Brazil

CANADA

Mr. Geoff Bowlby
Director, Labour Statistics
Statistics Canada
100 Tunney's Pasture Driveway
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada

GHANA

Ms. Grace Bediako
Government Statistician, Ghana Statistical Service
P. O. Box GP 1098
Accra
Ghana

INDIA

Mr. Shiri Virender Singh
Deputy Director, Ministry of Labour and Employment
Shram Shakti Bhawan
Rafi Marg
New Delhi 11001
India

UKRAINE

Mr. Igor G. Mantsurov
Professor, Head of the Statistical Department
Kiev National Economic University
Peremohy Prospect 54/1
Kyiv, 252057
Ukraine

EXPERTS NOMINATED BY THE EMPLOYERS' GROUP

Mr. Paul Mackay
Manager Employment Relations Policy
Business New Zealand
P.O. Box 1925
Wellington
New Zealand

Mr. Olav Magnussen
Special Advisor
Confederation of Norwegian Enterprise
P.b. 5250 Majorstuen
Oslo
Norway

Mr. Stefan Jan Marculewicz
Principal
Miles & Stockbridge
10 Light Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202-1487
USA

Mr. Toshio A. Suzuki
Executive Advisor
Nippon-Keidanren International Cooperation Center
1-23 Kanda-Nishikicho
Chiyodaku
Tokyo 101-0054
Japan

Mr. Victor van Vuuren
Chief Operations Officer
Business Unity South Africa
P.O. Box 652807
Benmore 2010
South Africa

ADVISERS - EMPLOYERS' GROUP

Ms. Félicité Awassi Atsimadja
Chef d'Entreprise – Secrétaire Général SIMPEX
Confédération Patronale Gabonaise (CPG)
Address BP 2101
Libreville
Gabon

Mr George G. Chabwera
President
Zambia Federation of Employers
PO Box 31941
Electra House, Cairo road
Lusaka, Zambia

Mr. André Miguel N'Zau
Directeur
Câmara de Comércio e Indústria de Angola (CCIA)
Largo do Kinaxixi N° 14-1 Andar
Caixa postal 92
Luanda
Angola

Mr. Eric Oechslin
Adviser
International Organisation of Employers (IOE)
26 ch. de Joinville
1216 Cointrin
Switzerland

EXPERTS NOMINATED BY THE WORKERS' GROUP

Mr. Grant Belchamber
Economist
Australian Council of Trade Unions
365 Queen Street
Melbourne 3000
Australia

Ms. Ana Yara Dania Paulino Lopes
Instituto Observatório Social (IOS)
/ Central Única dos Trabalhadores (CUT)
Rua São Bento, 365 - 18º andar
Centro - São Paulo SP
CEP: 01011 100
Brazil

Mr. Austin Muneku
Director, Research and Economics
Zambia Congress of Trade Unions
P.O. Box 20652
Kitwe
Zambia

Mr. Sylvain Schetagne
Senior Economist/Researcher
Canadian Labour Congress-Congrès du Travail du Canada (CLC-CTC)
2841 Riverside Drive
Ottawa
Canada

Ms. Anja Scholz
Project manager DGB-Index Gute Arbeit
Kooperationsstelle Hochschulen und Gewerkschaften Osnabrück
August-Bebel-Platz 1
49074 Osnabrück
Germany

ADVISERS - WORKERS' GROUP

Ms Anna Biondi
Director
International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC)
Avenue Blanc 46
1202 Genève
Switzerland

Ms Raquel Gonzalez
Assistant Director
International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC)
Avenue Blanc 46
1202 Genève
Switzerland

INDEPENDENT EXPERTS

Ms. Armida Alisjahbana
Professor, Padjadjaran University
Department of Economics
Jl. Dipati Ukur no. 35
40132 Bandung
Indonesia

Mr. Ernesto Kritz
Partner - CEO
Sociedad de Estudios Laborales Consultores
Viamonte 524, 3 ° Piso
Buenos Aires
Argentina

Ms. Angelika Nußberger
Professor of Law
Director, Institut für Ostrecht der Universität zu Köln
Klosterstr. 79 d
50931 Köln
Germany

Mr. David Peetz
Professor of Industrial Relations
Department of Employment Relations
Nathan Campus
Griffith University
170 Kessels Road
Nathan, QLD 4111
Australia

Mr. Anthony Rafferty
Research Associate, School of Social Sciences
Kantorovich Building
Humanities Bridgeford Street
University of Manchester
Manchester
M13 9PL
United Kingdom

OBSERVERS

International organizations

Mr. David Boko
UNECE Statistical Division
Palais des Nations, r. C-436
1211 Geneva 10
Switzerland

Ms. Vitalija Gaucaite Wittich
UNECE Statistical Division
Palais des Nations, r. C-436
1211 Geneva 10
Switzerland

Ms. Sarah Mongourdin-Denoix
UNECE Statistical Division
Palais des Nations, r. C-436
1211 Geneva 10
Switzerland

Ms. Margareta Vermeulen
Research Manager – Monitoring and Surveys Unit
European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound)
Wyattville Road
Loughlinstown
Dublin 18
Ireland

OBSERVERS

Governments

Mr. Manfred Zauner
Labour market analysis and prognosis
Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Labour
1011 Wien
Stubenring 1
Austria

Mme Marie Christine Coënt
Chef de Bureau des affaires multilatérales
Ministère du travail, des relations sociales,
de la famille et de la solidarité
8, Avenue de Ségur
75007 Paris
France

Mr. Olivier Marchand
Chargé de mission auprès du Directeur des statistiques démographiques et sociales - Timbre F001,
INSEE (Institut national de la statistique et des études économiques)
18 boulevard Adolphe Pinard
75675 Paris
France

Ms. Federica Pintaldi
Researcher, Labour Force Survey
Istituto nazionale di statistica (ISTAT)
Via Cesare Balbo 16 00184
Rome
Italy

Mr. Matheus Machado de Carvalho
Señor Representante Permanente de Brasil ante la Oficina de las
Naciones Unidas y demás Organizaciones Internacionales en Ginebra
Case postale 165
71, avenue Louis Casai
1216 Cointrin
Switzerland

Mr. Rong Sica
First Secretary, The Permanent Representative
of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations
Office in Geneva and other International
Organizations in Switzerland
11, chemin de Surville
1213 Petit-Lancy 2
Switzerland

Mr. Hubert Martin
Conseiller pour les affaires sociales
Mission permanente de la France auprès des Nations Unies à Genève
Villa «Les Ormeaux»
36, route de Pregny
1292 Chambesy
Switzerland

Ms. Franziska Fitting
Counsellor, Labour and social affairs
Permanent Mission of Germany to the United Nations Office and
other International Organizations in Geneva
P.O. Box 171
1211 Geneva 19
Switzerland

H.E. Mr. Kwabena Baah-Duodu
Ambassador and the Permanent Representative of the
Republic of Ghana to the United Nations
Office in Geneva and
Specialized Agencies in Switzerland
56, rue de Moillebeau
1209 Geneva
Switzerland

Ms. Doris Richter
Counsellor
The Permanent Representative of the
Republic of Ghana to the United Nations
Office in Geneva and
Specialized Agencies in Switzerland
56, rue de Moillebeau
1209 Geneva
Switzerland

Mr. Juvenal Dengo
1st Secretary
Permanent Mission of Mozambique
Rue Gautier 13
1201 Geneva
Switzerland

Mr. Siphon Ndebele
Labour Counsellor
The Permanent Representative of the Republic of South Africa
to the United Nations Office in Geneva and other
International Organizations in Switzerland
65, rue du Rhône
1204 Genève
Switzerland

Mr. Nobunao Tagaya
Permanent Mission of Japan to the United Nations Office and
other International Organizations in Geneva
3, chemin des Fins
Case postale 337
1211 Geneva 19
Switzerland

Mr. Nathaniel Wapshere
The Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom
to the United Nations Office and other International
Organizations in Geneva
Avenue Louis Casai 58
Case postale 6
1216 Cointrin
Switzerland

Ms. Anne Louise Chick
The Permanent Mission of the United States of America to the United
Nations Office and other International Organizations in Geneva
11, route de Pregny
CH-1292 Chambesey
Switzerland

ILO SECRETARIAT

Mr. Stephen Pursey
Director, Policy Integration & Statistics Department
ILO Geneva

Mr. Sylvester Young
Director, Bureau of Statistics
Policy Integration & Statistics Department
ILO Geneva

Mr. Malte Luebker
Research Officer, Policy Coherence Group
Policy Integration & Statistics Department
ILO Geneva

Mr. George Okutho
Director
ILO Subregional Office for Eastern Africa
P.O. Box 2532
Addis Ababa
Ethiopia

Ms. Monica Castillo
Labour Market Analyst
ILO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
Las Flores 275 San Isidro
Apartado postal 14-124
Lima
Perú

Mr. Lawrence Egulu
Senior Economist
ILO Regional Office for Africa, Addis Ababa
Africa Hall, 5th Floor,
Menelik II Avenue
P.O. Box 2788
Addis Ababa
Ethiopia

Mr. Steve Kapsos
Labour Economist
ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
11th Floor, United Nations Building
Rajdamnern Nok Avenue
P.O. Box 2-349
Bangkok 10200
Thailand.

Mr. Rafael Gijon von Kileist
Senior Adviser
Employers' Activities
ILO Geneva

Mr Frank Hoffer
Senior Research Officer
Workers' Activities Department
ILO Geneva

Ms. Clare Schenker
Conference Relations Assistant,
Policy Integration & Statistics Department
ILO Geneva

Ms. Niamh Hogan
Secretary, Policy Coherence Group
Policy Integration & Statistics Department
ILO Geneva

ILO STAFF ATTENDING THE MEETING

Ms. Karen Curtis
Deputy Director
International Labour Standards Department
ILO Geneva

Ms. Cleopatra Doumbia-Henry
Director, International Labour Standards Department
ILO Geneva

Mr. Philippe Egger
Deputy Director
Cabinet of the Director-General
ILO Geneva

Mr. Tayo Fashoyin
Director, Social Dialogue, Labour Law, Labour Administration and Sectoral Activities
ILO Geneva

Mr. Zafar Shaheed
Director, Programme on Promoting the Declaration
ILO Geneva

Mr. Patrick Belser
Labour Economist (wages and income)
The Conditions of Work and Employment Programme
ILO Geneva

Mr. David Bescond
Statistical assistant, Bureau of Statistics
Policy Integration and Statistics Department
ILO Geneva

Ms. Sandrine Cazes-Chaigne
Senior Employment Specialist, Economic and Labour Markets Analysis Department
Employment Sector
ILO Geneva

Mr. Igor Chernyshev
Senior Statistician, Methodology and Analysis Unit, Bureau of Statistics
Policy Integration and Statistics Department
ILO Geneva

Mr. Harvey Clavien
Statistical assistant, Bureau of Statistics
Policy Integration and Statistics Department
ILO Geneva

Mr. Kamran Fannizadeh
Coordinator, Sector on International Labour Standards and Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work
ILO Geneva

Ms. Brigitte Feiring
International Labour Standards Department
ILO Geneva

Ms. Andrea Fromm
Policy Integration and Statistics Department
ILO Geneva

Mr. Frank Hagemann
Chief, Research and Policy, International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
ILO Geneva

Mr. Christopher Hearle
Policy Integration and Statistics Department
ILO Geneva

Ms. Lê Anh Hua
Statistical assistant, Bureau of Statistics
Policy Integration and Statistics Department
ILO Geneva

Mr. Azfar Khan
International Migration Programme
ILO Geneva

Mr. Amelita King-Dejardin
Policy Integration and Statistics Department
ILO Geneva

Ms. Sophia Lawrence
Statistician, Bureau of Statistics
Policy Integration and Statistics Department
ILO Geneva

Mr. Sangheon Lee
Senior Research Officer
The Conditions of Work and Employment Programme
ILO Geneva

Ms. Adriana Mata-Greenwood
Senior Statistician, Bureau of Statistics
Policy Integration and Statistics Department
ILO Geneva

Ms. Deirdre McCann
Conditions of Work and Employment Programme
ILO Geneva

Ms. Susan McCrory
Legal Services
ILO Geneva

Ms. Alice Ouedraogo
Director (Policy Coherence Group)
Policy Integration & Statistics Department
ILO Geneva

Mr. Hakki Ozel
Senior Statistician, International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
ILO Geneva

Mr. Godfrey Phetla
Policy Integration and Statistics Department
ILO Geneva

Ms. Pallavi Rai
HIV/AIDS
ILO Geneva

Mr. Alvaro Ramirez
Job Creation and Enterprise Development
ILO Geneva

Ms. Annie Rice
Programme on Safety and Health at Work and the Environment (SafeWork)
ILO Geneva

Ms. Angelina Robinson
Policy Integration and Statistics Department
ILO Geneva

Ms. Catherine Saget
Policy Integration and Statistics Department
ILO Geneva

Ms. Mogau Lucky Selepe
Associate Expert, Bureau of Statistics
Policy Integration and Statistics Department
ILO Geneva

Ms. Charmell Smith
Associate Expert, Bureau of Statistics
Policy Integration and Statistics Department
ILO Geneva

Mr. Theodoor Sparreboom
Labour Economist
Economic and Labour Market Analysis Department
ILO Geneva

Ms. Valentina Stoevska
Head of Data Production Unit, Bureau of Statistics
Policy Integration and Statistics Department
ILO Geneva

Ms. Manuela Tomei
Conditions of Work and Employment Programme
ILO Geneva

Ms. Katerina Tsotroudi
International Labour Standards Department
ILO Geneva

Mr. Thobile Yanta
Associate Expert, Bureau of Statistics
Policy Integration and Statistics Department
ILO Geneva

Ms. Monique Zarka
International Labour Standards Department
ILO Geneva

Appendix 3: Meeting agenda

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION

TMEMDW/2008

**Tripartite Meeting of Experts on the
Measurement of Decent Work**

Geneva
8–10 September 2008
ILO Building, room VII, R2, south

Provisional agenda

Monday, 8 September 2008

08.00–10.30	Registration	R2, south
08.30–10.30	Meeting of Employer experts	Room III
09.00–10.30	Meeting of Worker experts	Room IV
10.30–13.00	Session 1 Opening of the Meeting General discussion of report, especially Part I on the conceptualization of decent work, rationale for measurement, approach to measurement	
14.00–15.00	Group meetings (Employers' and Workers' groups)	
15.00–18.00	Session 2 Key aspects and implications of measurement, change analysis, classification of indicators and information on rights at work and legal framework (Part II and Part III: section 6)	
	<i>(15 minutes' coffee break during morning and afternoon sessions)</i>	
18.15	Cocktail	"Le Gobelin"

Tuesday, 9 September 2008

09.00–10.00	Group meetings (Employers' and Workers' groups)	
10.00–13.00	Session 3 Statistical indicators (Part III: section 7, and appendix table 2)	
14.00–15.00	Group meetings (Employers' and Workers' groups)	
15.00–18.00	Session 4 Statistical indicators <i>(cont.)</i>	
	<i>(15 minutes' coffee break during morning and afternoon sessions)</i>	

Wednesday, 10 September 2008

09.00–10.00

Group meetings (Employers' and Workers' groups)

10.00–13.00

Session 5

Rights at work and legal framework (Part III: section 8, and appendix table 4)

14.00–15.00

Group meetings (Employers' and Workers' groups)

15.00–17.00

Session 6

Rights at work and legal framework (*cont. if necessary*)

Overview of discussion from a gender perspective

Closure of meeting

(15 minutes' coffee break during morning and afternoon sessions)

* * *