Monitoring and assessing progress on decent work

Manual

The manual responds to the request of ILO constituents that endorsed the Decent Work Agenda and developed – or are in the process of developing – decent work strategies and programmes, to have a clear methodological framework for the monitoring of decent work at the country level and the preparation of national assessments on progress made. As such, it is an important tool for national stakeholders, particularly ministries in charge of labour, employment, economy and planning, national statistical offices and workers’ and employers’ organisations.

The manual provides a step-by-step guidance on monitoring and assessing progress towards decent work at the national level, on the basis of concrete examples and national experiences gained in the ILO/EC project Monitoring and Assessing Progress on Decent Work and the best practices identified in the project countries. It aims to be a pragmatic and useful tool to help national stakeholders to mainstream employment and decent work in national policies.

The manual is divided in four chapters. After a presentation in Chapter 1 of the rationale for monitoring decent work and the ILO framework on the measurement of decent work, the remaining chapters are practical step-by-step guides that present the experience of individual countries, accompanied by practical indications for each of the step involved. Chapter 2 provides national stakeholders with guidance on the identification of decent work indicators according to national needs and circumstances, drawing particular attention to the key role of tripartite consultations in consensus-building. Chapter 3 discusses the main sources for measuring decent work and data collection issues, and suggests how national data collection instruments can be improved. Chapter 4 provides guidance on how to prepare national assessments on decent work and how the main results of the country studies can be used in policy-making through social dialogue.

This Manual has been prepared with financial assistance from the European Union under the ILO/EC project Monitoring and Assessing Progress on Decent Work (2009-2013).
Preface

The promotion of decent work, defined as “productive work in conditions of freedom, equity, security and human dignity”, as the main objective of the International Labour Organization, has become a widely shared goal of the international development community.

International endorsement of the decent work objective was expressed at the 2005 World Summit, where Heads of State resolved to make the goals of full and productive employment and decent work for all a central objective of relevant national and international policies, as well as of national development strategies, including poverty reduction strategies, as part of efforts to achieve the Millennium Development Goals.

The 2008 ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization reaffirmed the commitment of member States to promote decent work based on the four equally important strategic objectives - promoting employment, developing and enhancing measures of social protection, promoting social dialogue and tripartism - and to respecting, promote and realize the fundamental principles and rights at work. In recent years, the objective of decent work has been consistently highlighted in European Union (EU) policy statements.

The European Consensus on Development indicated that the EU will contribute to strengthening the social dimensions of globalization, and to promoting employment and decent work for all, and that the Community will promote decent work for all in line with the ILO agenda. Various communications have also highlighted that the European Commission support for decent work is a means to promote European values and a European model of development which combines economic competitiveness and social justice. Development and Cooperation - EuropeAid is actively contributing to raising awareness and enhancing understanding of decent work and employment concepts among all European Commission delegations in the world.

Developing and transition countries have endorsed the objective of decent work and have developed (or are in the process of developing) country-owned decent work strategies and programmes. They also called for ILO technical cooperation to support their efforts to monitor and assess progress towards decent work.

With funding from the European Union, the project Monitoring and Assessing Progress on Decent Work (MAP) helps address this need. Over a period of four years (2009 to 2013), the project worked with government agencies (including Ministries of Labour), National Statistical Offices, workers and employers organisations and research institutions.

The project covered several countries in all major regions, including two countries in Africa (Niger and Zambia), four in Asia (Bangladesh, Cambodia, Indonesia and the Philippines), one in Eastern Europe (Ukraine) and two in Latin America (Brazil and Peru). Through the project regional activities, the global methodology has been disseminated beyond the project countries. The project has been implemented by the Policy Integration Department in close collaboration with the Department of Statistics and other relevant technical units at headquarters, regional and country offices and, the ILO International Training Centre in Turin.
The overall objective of the project is the realisation of decent work as a contribution to social justice, poverty reduction and income inequality in developing and transition countries. To achieve this goal, the project supported the development of a global methodology to strengthen the capacity of developing and transition countries to self-monitor and self-assess progress towards decent work.

This global methodology, which has been developed from the experience gained in the MAP project at the country and regional level, encompasses various methodological tools, manuals and guidelines for the measurement, monitoring and assessment of progress made towards decent work.

As part of this global methodology, this manual has been prepared from the lessons learned in the MAP project and best practices. It provides guidance for government agencies, social partners and other national stakeholders on the step-by-step approach developed under the project for monitoring and assessing progress on decent work at the national level. It addresses three different areas: (i) the development of decent work indicators, (ii) the improvement of data collection tools, and (iii) the development of national assessments of decent work, that are needed to strengthen decent work objectives into national policies and programmes.

This manual is an essential component of the capacity-building strategies of ILO and EC on monitoring decent work at the national level, in conjunction with other technical tools produced by the ILO under the EC/ILO MAP project, notably the manual on Decent Work Indicators, the guidelines on Assessing progress on decent work, and the Toolkit Mainstreaming decent work in European Commission development cooperation.
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Introduction

Background

Employment and decent work are central to efforts to reduce poverty and are a means of achieving equitable, inclusive and sustainable development. Decent work refers to opportunities for work that is productive and delivers a fair income, provides security in the workplace and social protection for workers and their families and gives people the freedom to express their concerns, to organize and to participate in decisions that affect their lives.

Since the early 1990s there has been increasing recognition at the international policy level of the importance of employment and the promotion of decent work for sustainable development. The Decent Work Agenda developed by the ILO in 1999 and subsequently adopted by the United Nations system has further refined this goal, highlighting the fact that both the quantity and the quality of employment are essential for human well-being.

The Decent Work Agenda has been adopted by the United Nations agencies as well as by regional organizations as an integral part of a broader global development agenda focusing on a fairer globalization. The 2004 World Commission Report on the Social Dimension of Globalization identified decent work as a crucial element in efforts to assess the social effects of the global open market system.

In 2005 the inclusion of full and productive employment and decent work for all as Target 1.B in Millennium Development Goal 1 – “Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger” – explicitly acknowledged the central importance of employment promotion for the achievement of poverty reduction and sustainable development.

In the new framework of the post-2015 development agenda, the prominence accorded to the promotion of “inclusive and sustainable growth and decent employment”, as part of “transformative and mutually reinforcing actions that apply to all countries”, reflects the central role that decent work has to play in sustainable development. Monitoring employment and the quality of jobs is highlighted in current discussions, including the ILO-UNDP expert meeting (New York, June 2013), in which experts and social partners highlighted the need for an ambitious employment goal in the post-2015 agenda.

Monitoring and assessing progress towards decent work at the country level is thus an important concern for the ILO and its constituents. Against this background, the 2008 ILO Declaration stipulates that member States may consider “the establishment of appropriate indicators or statistics, if necessary with the assistance of the ILO, to monitor and evaluate the progress made” (Paragraph II.B.ii). At its 97th Session in Geneva in June 2008, the International Labour Con-

---


ference adopted a resolution on strengthening the ILO’s capacity to assist its Members’ efforts to reach its objectives in the context of globalization.

In September 2008 the ILO convened an international Tripartite Meeting of Experts (TME) on the Measurement of Decent Work, which adopted a global conceptual framework for developing decent work indicators that was presented to the 18th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS) in December 2008, in which delegates mentioned that a sound measurement of decent work helps to transform the Decent Work Agenda “from a political ambition to something more concrete and quantifiable” and that significant advances had been made in this direction (Report of the 18th ICLS, 2009).

Many governments and employers’ and workers’ organisations countries have repeatedly called on the ILO to support their efforts and strengthen their capacity to monitor and assess progress towards decent work.

The MAP project has accordingly assisted nine countries in collecting data and compiling decent work indicators to provide a basis for the national assessments of progress towards decent work, in the form of Decent Work Country Profiles (an integrated analysis of all the dimensions of decent work, including both quantitative and qualitative information) to inform social partners and policy-makers on decent work. The project has developed a global methodology for monitoring and assessing progress on decent work at the country level, including technical guidelines and manuals.

This manual presents the global methodology on monitoring and assessing progress towards decent work developed from the experience gained in the MAP project and the best practices identified in the project countries.
Box 1. The MAP project: objective and activities

The overall objective of the project is the realisation of decent work as a contribution to social justice, poverty reduction and income inequality in developing and transition countries. To achieve this goal, the project supported the development of a global methodology to strengthen the capacity of developing and transition countries to self-monitor and self-assess progress towards decent work.

The MAP project has supported nine countries (Bangladesh, Brazil, Cambodia, Indonesia, Niger, Peru, Philippines, Ukraine, and Zambia) in collecting and analysing data on decent work. The project has facilitated the identification of decent work indicators that are relevant at the national level, supported data collection (questionnaire design, surveys and database management), and used the collected data for an integrated analysis of decent work in order to make them relevant for policy-making. From the experience gained in the project countries, a global methodology has been developed, that encompasses various methodological tools, manuals and guidelines for the measurement, the monitoring and the analysis of decent work.

The global methodology and the corresponding tools will strengthen the capacity of national stakeholders to monitor and assess progress towards decent work, and will help policy-makers, social partners and international stakeholders, such as the ILO and the EC, to appreciate how countries are performing, how workers in various economic sectors and geographical areas differ in terms of access to decent work, and which policies best ensure progress towards decent work.

Project activities included: the preparation of background country-studies on labour market information systems; tripartite consultation workshops to identify relevant decent work indicators at national level; regional workshops on decent work indicators; support to national statistical offices or other relevant institutions to collect better data on decent work; the preparation of country-studies on decent work; tripartite workshops to discuss and validate the results of the country-studies; media campaigns and launch events to disseminate the main results of the country-studies, and formulate policy recommendations for mainstreaming decent work in national policies; regional training and knowledge-sharing workshops; the production of methodological tools (manuals, guidelines, toolkit); global meetings to discuss the global methodology and best practices in measuring and monitoring of decent work.

The main results of the project have been the following: (i) in the pilot-countries, decent work indicators have been identified on a tripartite basis, through various consultations between government agencies and social partners; statistics on decent work have been produced and analysed, and country-studies have been published disseminated, and used for the design and the monitoring of national decent work strategies and decent work programmes; (ii) in the pilot-countries, government, social partners and other stakeholders are more aware of the dimensions of decent work, of the progress made and of the deficits that remain in the country, and their capacity to collect and analyse data on decent work indicators and to carry out research related to decent work has increased; globally, ownership of the concept of decent work has increased and social dialogue on decent work issues has been boosted; (iii) governments and stakeholders in countries that are not among the pilot countries in the MAP project, have the capacity to initiate their own work on the monitoring and assessment of progress towards decent work, in so far as all interested parties (EC, ILO, international organisations and other stakeholders) have access to the global methodology and to relevant material to support their efforts at the country level (see project documentation, reports and manuals on www.ilo.org/map).
Objectives and audience of the manual

This manual responds to the request of ILO constituents that endorsed the Decent Work Agenda and developed (or are in the process of developing) decent work strategies and programmes, to have a clear methodological framework for the monitoring of decent work at the country level and the preparation of national assessments on progress made. As such, it is an important tool for national stakeholders, particularly ministries in charge of labour, employment, economy and planning, for national statistical offices and for workers’ and employers’ organisations.

The manual provides guidance on monitoring and assessing progress on decent work at the national level, on the basis of concrete examples and national experiences. It aims to be a pragmatic and useful tool to help national stakeholders to mainstream employment and decent work in national policies.

It is designed to build a common understanding among national and international stakeholders on the process of measuring, monitoring and assessing decent work at the country level.

It provides a step-by-step guidance which can be adjusted to national circumstances and suggests a concerted and coordinated process - among national agencies and social partners - that draws and fosters broad-based national ownership.

The global methodology presented here is designed to be both internationally relevant and flexible in its application at the country level. It is based on a step-by-step approach. The first step is the selection by tripartite constituents of indicators judged to be relevant at the national level. The second step is the collection of data on decent work, and the upgrading of existing data collection tools to better measure decent work. The third step comprises the preparation of national assessments on progress made, and their dissemination as a key advocacy tool for mainstreaming decent work into national policies through social dialogue.

Sustained and concerted action is encouraged in this process of monitoring and assessing decent work at the country level, as broad-based participation and social dialogue in the three steps, are essential.

Organization of the manual

The manual is divided in four chapters. After a presentation in Chapter 1 of the rationale for monitoring decent work and the ILO framework on the measurement and the monitoring of decent work, the remaining chapters are practical step-by-step guides that present the experience of individual countries, with an indication of the main challenges encountered and best practices developed, accompanied by practical indications for each of the step involved. Chapter 2 provides national stakeholders with guidance on the identification of decent work indicators according to national needs and circumstances, drawing particular attention to the key role of tripartite consultations in consensus-building. Chapter 3 discusses the main sources for measuring decent work and data collection issues, and suggests how national data collection instruments can be improved. Chapter 4 provides guidance on how to prepare national assessments on decent work and how the main results of the country studies can be used in policy-making through social dialogue.
The global methodology for monitoring and assessing progress on decent work, presented in this manual, is complemented by three technical tools produced by the ILO with the support of the MAP project:

(1) the manual on *Decent Work Indicators* (2012/2013) which focuses on concepts and definitions, method of computation, data sources, metadata and brief interpretation guidelines³;

(2) the guidelines on *Assessing Progress on decent work at the national level* (2013), which provides guidance on analysing decent work indicators together and preparing national assessments on decent work, including tips and suggestions for the analysis of both statistical and legal decent work indicators in an integrated approach covering the ten substantive elements of the Decent Work Agenda;

(3) the *Labour Force Survey Toolkit* (forthcoming), which provides guidance on questionnaire design, sampling, data processing and tabulation, and aims to be a practical tool that can be adapted to national requirements in a modular design⁴.

³ A first version of the manual was published in May 2012, and launched at the MAP global meeting on the measurement and the monitoring of decent work (Geneva, June 2012). An updated version, including further refinements, has been presented at the 19th ICLS (Geneva, October 2013) and will be published by end 2013. Translated versions of the manual into French, Russian and Spanish will be available in 2014.

⁴ First material developed by the ILO to be completed in accordance with resolutions on statistics of work and the labour force at the 19th ICLS (October 2013).
Global methodology for monitoring and assessing progress on decent work at the national level and related technical tools developed by the ILO/MAP project

**Development of decent work indicators:**
identification of a set of qualitative and quantitative indicators at the country level:
- constituents agree on a comprehensive list of decent work indicators relevant to their country (through tripartite consultations)
- concepts/definitions, disaggregation level, and main sources are discussed and identified
- main data collection gaps are identified

**Collection of statistical data and qualitative information** related to selected decent work indicators:
- data collection instruments are developed or improved (surveys, administrative records)
- institutional mechanisms are set up to improve coordination between statistical agencies, ministries and workers’ and employers’ organisations

**Development of national assessments on decent work** (country profiles) to inform policy makers:
- analysis and interpretation of decent work indicators: dynamic picture of progress and gaps with respect to decent work
- review and validation of main results by national stakeholders through social dialogue
- wide dissemination of the country studies and related policy briefs
- links to policy making: priority areas and target indicators for designing and monitoring national policies and programmes

**Manual on Monitoring and assessing progress on decent work. Lessons learned from MAP project**
Chapter 1:
Monitoring decent work: why and how?
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1. The Decent Work Agenda

1.1 What is decent work?

Decent work sums up the aspirations of people in their working lives. It involves opportunities for productive work that delivers a fair income, security in the workplace and social protection for families; better prospects for personal development and social integration; freedom for people to express their concerns, to organize and participate in the decisions that affect their lives; and equality of opportunity and treatment for all women and men.

Box 2. The four pillars of decent work

1. Employment creation and enterprise development
2. Social protection
3. International labour standards and fundamental principles and rights at work
4. Governance and social dialogue

1.2 What is a decent work deficit?

People throughout the world face deficits, gaps and exclusions in the form of unemployment and underemployment, poor quality and unproductive jobs, unsafe work and insecure and low income, rights which are denied, gender inequality, migrant workers who are exploited, lack of representation and voice, and inadequate protection and solidarity in the face of crises, disease, disability and old age. Most jobs do not ensure a decent level of income and a sustainable livelihood. Working conditions are poor, labour legislation is rarely enforced and social dialogue is weak.

1.3 Promoting decent work for all

Work is central to people’s well-being. In addition to providing income, work can pave the way for broader social and economic advancement, strengthening individuals, their families and communities. Such progress, however, hinges on work that is decent. Decent work sums up the aspirations of people in their working lives.

The ILO has developed an agenda for the community of work and provides support through integrated Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCP) developed in coordination with its constituents. The DWCP define the priorities and the targets within national development frameworks and aim at implementing the four strategic objectives of the Decent Work Agenda, with gender equality as a crosscutting objective:

---

Creating jobs – an economy that generates opportunities for investment, entrepreneurship, skills development, job creation and sustainable livelihoods.

Guaranteeing rights at work – to obtain recognition and respect for the rights of workers. All workers, and in particular disadvantaged or poor workers, need representation, participation, and laws that work for their interests.

Extending social protection – to promote both inclusion and productivity by ensuring that men and women enjoy working conditions that are safe, allow adequate free time and rest, take into account family and social values, provide for adequate compensation in case of lost or reduced income and permit access to adequate healthcare.

Promoting social dialogue – Involving strong and independent workers’ and employers’ organizations is central to increasing productivity, avoiding disputes at work, and building cohesive societies.

1.4 How can we achieve the goal of decent work?

Through the engagement and commitment of its tripartite constituents, the ILO plays a major role in facilitating the integration of the Decent Work Agenda into national strategies for poverty reduction and sustainable development and into international discussion by promoting a fair and inclusive globalization.

Decent work calls for the integration of economic and social objectives and for a well-orchestrated combination of measures converging towards four strategic objectives, namely rights at work, employment, social protection and social dialogue. This coherent approach is proving its relevance to a wide-ranging policy agenda, from social dimensions of globalisation to poverty reduction and sustainable development strategies.

Growth, investment and enterprise development are obviously necessary. Promoting a conducive and competitive environment for private initiative, in the wide arc of entrepreneurship that covers helping people organize to move progressively out of the informal economy to the best way of combining national interests with foreign investments, is central to the future of work.

1.5 Decent work within the international development agenda

The decent work concept is based on the understanding that work is a source of personal dignity, family stability, peace in the community, democracies that deliver for people, and economic growth that expands opportunities for productive jobs and enterprise development.

Decent work reflects priorities on the social, economic and political agenda of countries and of the international system. In a relatively short time this concept has forged an international consensus among governments, employers, workers and civil society that productive employment and decent work are key elements in achieving a fair globalization, reducing poverty and achieving equitable, inclusive, and sustainable development.
2. Monitoring decent work: key principles

2.1 The importance of measuring and monitoring decent work

Following the adoption of the Decent Work Agenda by the international development community and the large recognition of the role of decent work in reducing poverty and towards economic development, monitoring decent work has become an important challenge. There has been much debate on how decent work can be measured and monitored in practice, since decent work is a wide-ranging concept with both quantitative and qualitative components.

In order to identify authoritative means of measuring national progress towards decent work, both in relation to poverty, inclusive growth and other developmental objectives and to ensure the methods used allow for international comparability, a global framework has been developed by the ILO.

This conceptual framework identifies a set of decent work indicators that can be adapted to national circumstances and used to monitor decent work into national development frameworks (including Poverty Reduction Strategies), national policies (including National Employment Policies, Social Protection Policies, and sectoral policies), Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCP), and other programmes not directly focused on decent work but that have an impact on it.

2.2 Key principles guiding the measurement and the monitoring of decent work

The ILO has worked on providing guidance on the main principles on which the measurement of decent work should be based since early 2000 and an international Tripartite Meeting of Experts on the Measurement of Decent Work was held in September 2008 to discuss possible ways to measure decent work in all its dimensions. The global conceptual framework presented at this meeting is based on four key principles that guide the measurement of decent work:

- Any framework for the measurement of decent work would be incomplete without adequate consideration of both the quantitative and the qualitative dimensions of decent work. The ILO framework accordingly set out a list of statistical decent work indicators alongside a set of descriptive legal framework indicators to take into account the legal and policy framework.

- Attention is drawn to the need to interpret decent work indicators (legal and statistical) within a broader social and economic context. The ILO framework accordingly includes “context indicators” on the social and economic context.

- The definitions for indicators are to be based as far as possible on agreed international standards. The ILO framework accordingly refers to definitions and concepts of international statistical standards and international labour standards.

- With regard to national applicability, the framework needs to retain enough flexibility to respond to the specific needs and circumstances of individual countries.

---

The ILO framework is accordingly not all-inclusive and should be seen as a launching pad for measuring decent work rather than as straightjacket. The aim of this framework is to propose a “template” of international relevance that can be adapted to national circumstances and evolve over the years as further refinements and new indicators are needed.

Thus, the ILO framework aims to offer comparable information for analysis and policy development based on a common core of indicators and international standards, and to maintain flexibility and adapt to national circumstances and national priorities by including additional indicators and information. All indicators are computed from existing statistics and legal information derived from national sources.

The global framework is based on a layered approach with a set of “main” and “additional” statistical indicators, in which the “main” indicators are common to all countries and the “additional” ones are dependent on data availability and national needs.

Box 3. Key aspects of decent work and implications for statistical indicators

- The comprehensive nature of decent work implies that its measurement needs to cover all aspects of decent work. A compilation of indicators that covers only selected aspects - such as employment - would, thus, be insufficient to map progress towards decent work at the country level.

- Whenever possible, decent work indicators should be based on data that cover all workers (including women and men in the informal economy). However, it is often useful to disaggregate data for different subsets of the employed population (for example by age, by gender or by status in employment).

- Decent work indicators should have conceptual relevance for countries at all stages of development or be developed in a way that makes them relevant for all countries.

- National data and information on decent work should be available for countries at all stages of development, and in every region to facilitate comprehensive reporting on progress towards decent work.

- Concern for the improvement of the conditions of the most vulnerable workers implies that whenever relevant and practical, decent work statistical indicators should measure how many workers work under unacceptable conditions with respect to the aspect of decent work that is measured. This will often mean that it is preferable to collect data on the tail of a distribution (or on the entire distribution), rather than only on the mean or the median.

- The concern for living conditions of workers and their families means that indicators should go beyond statistics on work and the workplace and could include, for example, aspects such as unpaid care work and reproductive work and access to health care and the incidence of working poverty.
In order to shed light on gender aspects of decent work, indicators should be measured separately for women and men whenever possible. Decent work indicators should therefore reflect the different needs and constraints of women and men workers, including taking into account unpaid care work and reproductive work.

Decent work indicators should be placed in the context of the social and economic situation in a country, so that factors that hinder and promote progress towards decent work can be identified.

Two types of information can be used to monitor progress towards decent work: (i) statistical indicators on work and working conditions; and (ii) information on rights at work and the legal framework for decent work, including the effective application of rights. Information on the legal framework for work should include information on laws, jurisprudence, coverage and effectiveness of implementation. Information on the legal framework for work, as well as statistical indicators, should be transparent and verifiable; it needs to be regularly updated and errors systematically eliminated.


3. The ILO framework for the measurement of decent work

Statistical and legal framework indicators

The conceptual framework for measuring decent work covers ten substantive elements which cover the four strategic pillars of the Decent Work Agenda: (i) international labour standards and fundamental principles and rights at work; (ii) employment creation; (iii) social protection; and (iv) social dialogue and tripartism.

These ten elements constitute the groupings under which corresponding statistical and legal framework indicators are organized and classified:

- employment opportunities (11 statistical indicators, 2 legal framework indicators);
- adequate earnings and productive work (7 statistical indicators, 1 legal framework indicator);
- decent working time (5 statistical indicators, 2 legal framework indicators);
- combining work, family and personal life (2 statistical indicators, 2 legal framework indicators);
- work that should be abolished (5 statistical indicators, 2 legal framework indicators);
- stability and security of work (4 statistical indicators, 1 legal framework indicator);
- equal opportunity and treatment in employment (8 statistical indicators, 2 legal framework indicators);
safe work environment (4 statistical indicators, 2 legal framework indicators); social security (8 statistical indicators, 3 legal framework indicators); and social dialogue, employers’ and workers’ representation (5 statistical indicators, 3 legal framework indicators).

An additional substantive element relates to the economic and social context for decent work (12 statistical indicators, 3 legal framework indicators). The context indicators do not measure decent work per se but rather serve to provide data users with information regarding the context of decent work in an economy.

Gender is a cross-cutting concern and as far as possible, many of the indicators of the ten substantive elements are disaggregated by sex (the indicators for which it is recommended to disaggregate the data by sex in addition to providing the total value are followed by the letter “S” in Table 1).

The statistical indicators are organized according to their importance and current availability, in a layered approach. Indicators are thus identified as either “main”, “additional”, “future” or “context” indicators (respectively denoted by “M”, “A”, “F” and “C”). The legal framework indicators are denoted by an “L”.

The 18 main indicators represent a core set of parsimonious indicators that can be compiled by all countries. The 31 additional indicators can be compiled when data are available and if they are considered as relevant indicators at the country level. The future indicators are to be developed by the ILO (see Table 1 presenting the full set of statistical and legal framework indicators).

The 71 statistical indicators are quantitative indicators derived from official national data sources. The 21 legal framework indicators are descriptive and qualitative rather than quantitative and are primarily based on legal texts and related textual information. While statistical indicators make up the vast majority of the indicators in the framework for the measurement of decent work, the legal framework indicators are equally important. The two sets of indicators are mutually reinforcing and both are essential for monitoring progress towards decent work at the country level.

Recent improvements of the ILO framework

The ILO conceptual framework for the measurement of decent work has been tested in a number of pilot countries with ILO assistance, in particular within the ILO/EC MAP project, and it has been improved accordingly. The ILO worked on further refinements of the already defined indicators during the pilot phase from 2009 to 2013. Also in the interests of greater clarity, the Office made some changes in wording. Specifically, eleven indicators have been developed and added in four areas (see Table 1): “work that should be abolished” (3 indicators), “stability and security at work” (4 indicators), “equal opportunity and treatment in employment” (1 indicator), and “socioeconomic context” (3 indicators).

Furthermore, work is ongoing on two future indicators: (i) labour underutilization rate and (ii) indicator for fundamental principles and rights at work. In the case of labour underutilization,

---

a new international statistical standard would be adopted at the 19th ICLS. As for the indicator on fundamental principles and rights at work, preliminary efforts by the Office to develop this indicator have yet to result in an indicator with tripartite support and further assistance and guidance from the ILO’s constituents is required.

With regard to the element “Combining work, family and personal life”, methodological tools for measuring key aspects of the gender dimension of working conditions and decent work have been developed, particularly to compile quantitative indicators on legal and actual coverage of maternity protection at the national, regional and global levels, and to assist National Statistical Offices in measuring key gender dimensions of decent work (household survey module on measuring maternity protection conditions, including guidelines for National Statistical Offices)8.

Remaining developmental work

In some of the pilot-countries, national partners and constituents called for inclusion or improvement of some areas in the ILO framework as follows:

- The classification of the indicators as “main” and “additional” could be revised;
- The development of indicators for combining work, family and personal life, in addition to the indicators on maternity protection, requires further research by referring to the examples developed by the pilot-countries;
- The inclusion of indicators on enterprises, including SMEs and conducive environment for sustainable enterprises should be considered, from the examples of pilot-countries (these indicators could be included in the “Economic and social context for decent work”).
- The development of indicators on migration and skills/training may be considered, as requested by several pilot-countries (that generally requires combining different sources, or specific surveys).
- The inclusion of indicators on green jobs and environmental sustainability of employment may also be considered as an important step in the future.

Two main recommendations for the measurement of decent work

Regarding the application of the ILO conceptual framework, two main recommendations have been formulated at the 18th International Conference of Labour Statisticians in November-December 2008:

- even though it has been recognized that many of the proposed statistical indicators were already common and widely collected indicators of the labour market, it was recommended that they be based on international statistical standards, to guide both their definition and interpretation,
- the need to generate comparable, reliable and consistent data has been emphasized and as such, enhancing data collection to produce decent work indicators is needed.

---

Grouping of indicators under 10 substantive elements of the Decent Work Agenda:

1. Employment opportunities (1 + 2)
2. Adequate earnings and productive work (1 + 3)
3. Decent working time (1 + 3)
4. Combining work, family and personal life (1 + 3)
5. Work that should be abolished (1 + 3)
6. Stability and security of work (1, 2 + 3)
7. Equal opportunity and treatment in employment (1, 2 + 3)
8. Safe work environment (1 + 3)
9. Social security (1 + 3)
10. Social dialogue, workers’ and employers’ representation (1 + 4)
11. Economic and social context for decent work

Note: (1) Rights at work (2) Employment opportunities (3) Social protection (4) Social dialogue
Most of the indicators can be presented separately by sex in addition to the total.

Different types of statistical indicators: A layered approach

Main indicators (M)  Parsimonious core set of indicators to monitor progress towards decent work
Additional indicators (A)  To be used where appropriate, and where data are available
Context indicators (C)  To provide information on the economic and social context for decent work
Future indicators (F)  Currently not feasible, but to be included as data become available
Legal framework indicators (L)  Qualitative information included under the legal framework

Countries are encouraged to select from the full list of indicators and add additional indicators to reflect national circumstances.
Table A. Measurement of decent work based on guidance received at the Tripartite Meeting of Experts on the Measurement of Decent Work (September 2008), including revisions introduced during the pilot phase (2009-13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantive element of the Decent Work Agenda</th>
<th>Statistical Indicators</th>
<th>Legal Framework Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Numbers in parentheses in the first column below refer to ILO strategic objectives: 1. Standards and fundamental principles and rights at work; 2. Employment; 3. Social protection; 4. Social dialogue. | 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. | L – Descriptive indicators providing information on rights at work and the legal framework for decent work.  
Description of relevant national legislation, policies and institutions in relation to the substantive elements of the Decent Work Agenda; where relevant, information on the qualifying conditions, the benefit level and its financing; evidence of implementation effectiveness (as recorded by ILO supervisory bodies); estimates of coverage of workers in law and in practice; information on the ratification of relevant ILO Conventions. |
| Employment opportunities (1 + 2) | **M – Employment-to-population ratio (S)**  
**M – Unemployment rate (S)**  
**M – Youth not in employment, education, or training, 15-24 years (S)**  
**M – Informal employment rate (S)**  
A – Labour force participation rate (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)  
A – Unemployment by level of educational attainment (S)  
A – Employment by status in employment (S)  
A – Proportion of own-account workers and contributing family workers in total employment (S) [to be used especially where statistics on informal employment are not available]  
A – Share of wage employment in non-agricultural employment (S)  
F – Labour underutilization (S)  
**Memo item: Time-related underemployment rate (S) grouped as A under “Decent Working time”** | L – Government commitment to full employment  
L – Unemployment insurance |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantive element of the Decent Work Agenda</th>
<th>Statistical Indicators</th>
<th>Legal Framework Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Adequate earnings and productive work (1 + 3)  | M – Working poverty rate (S)*  
M – Employees with low pay rate (below 2/3 of median hourly earnings) (S)*  
A – Average hourly earnings by occupation group (S)*  
A – Average real wages (S)  
A – Minimum wage as a percentage of median wage  
A – Manufacturing wage index  
A – Employees with recent job training (past year / past 4 weeks) (S) | L – Statutory minimum wage* |
| Decent Working Time (1 + 3)*                  | M – Employment in Excessive Working Time (more than 48 hours per week) (S)*  
A – Employment by weekly hours worked (hours in standardized hour bands) (S)*  
A – Average annual working time per employed person (S)*  
A – Time-related underemployment rate (S)  
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 (including weeks of leave, and rate of benefits)  
L – Parental leave* |
| Work that should be abolished (1 + 3)         | M – Child labour [as defined by ICLS resolution] (S)*  
A – Hazardous child labour rate (S)*  
A – Rate of worst forms of child labour (WFCL) other than hazardous work (S)**  
A – Forced labour rate (S)**  
A – Forced labour rate among returned migrants (S)** | L – Child labour (including public policies to combat it)  
L – Forced labour (including public policies to combat it) |
| Stability and security of work (1, 2 + 3)     | M – Precarious employment rate **  
A – Job tenure**  
A – Subsistence worker rate**  
A – Real earnings of casual workers** (S) | L – Termination of employment* (incl. notice of termination in weeks)  
Memo item: ‘Unemployment insurance’ is grouped under employment opportunities; needs to be interpreted in conjunction for ‘flexicurity’. |
### Chapter 1: Monitoring decent work: why and how?

**Monitoring and assessing progress on decent work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantive element of the Decent Work Agenda</th>
<th>Statistical Indicators</th>
<th>Legal Framework Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Equal opportunity and treatment in employment (1, 2 + 3) | **M** – Occupational segregation by sex  
**M** – Female share of employment in senior and middle management*  
**A** – Gender wage gap  
**A** – Share of women in wage employment in the non-agricultural sector  
**A** – Indicator for Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (Elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation) to be developed by the Office.  
**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 to be developed by the Office.  
**F** – Measure of dispersion for sectoral / occupational distribution of (recent) migrant workers  
**F** – Measure for employment of persons with disabilities.  
Memo item: Indicators under other substantive elements marked (S) indicator should be reported separately for men and women in addition to the total. | **L** – Equal opportunity and treatment*  
**L** – Equal remuneration of men and women for work of equal value* |
| Safe work environment (1 + 3) | **M** – Occupational injury frequency rate, fatal*  
**A** – Occupational injury frequency rate, nonfatal*  
**A** – Time lost due to occupational injuries  
**A** – Labour inspection (inspectors per 10,000 employed persons) | **L** – Employment injury benefits*  
**L** – Occupational safety and health (OSH) labour inspection |
| Social security (1 + 3) | **M** – Share of population above the statutory pensionable age (or aged 65 or above) benefiting from an old-age pension (S) *  
**M** – Public social security expenditure (percentage of GDP)  
**A** – Healthcare expenditure not financed out of pocket by private households  
**A** – Share of economically active population contributing to a pension scheme (S) *  
**F** – Share of population covered by (basic) health care provision (S) (to be developed by the Office; additional indicator)  
**F** – Public expenditure on needs based cash income support (% of GDP)  
**F** – Beneficiaries of cash income support (% of the poor)  
**F** – Sick leave (developmental work to be done by the Office; additional indicator)  
[Interpretation in conjunction with legal framework and labour market statistics.] | **L** – Old-age social security or pension benefits (public/private)*  
**L** – Incapacity for work due to sickness / sick leave  
**L** – Incapacity for work due to invalidity  
Memo item: ‘Unemployment insurance’ is grouped under employment opportunities. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantive element of the Decent Work Agenda</th>
<th>Statistical Indicators</th>
<th>Legal Framework Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Social dialogue, workers’ and employers’ representation (1 + 4) | M – Trade union density rate (S) *  
M – Employers’ organization density rate (ED) (S) *  
M – Collective bargaining coverage rate (S)  
M/F – Indicator for Fundamental principles and rights at work (Freedom of association and collective bargaining) to be developed by the Office; main indicator | L – Freedom of association and the right to organize  
L – Collective bargaining right  
L – Tripartite consultations |
| Economic and social context for decent work | C – Children not in school (percentage by age) (S)  
C – Estimated percentage of working-age population who are HIV-positive  
C – Labour productivity (GDP per employed person, level and growth rate)  
C – Income inequality (90:10 ratio)  
C – Inflation rate (Consumer Price Index, CPI)  
C – Employment by branch of economic activity  
C – Education of adult population (adult literacy rate, adult secondary-school graduation rate) (S)  
C – Labour share of Gross Value Added (GVA) *  
C (additional) – Real GDP per capita (level and growth rate) *  
C (additional) – Female share of employment by economic activity (ISIC tabulation category) *  
C (additional) – Wage / earnings inequality (90:10 ratio) *  
C (additional) – Poverty measures ** | L – Labour administration **  
Developmental work to be done by the Office to reflect environment for Sustainable enterprises, incl. indicators for (i) education, training and lifelong 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 other institutional arrangements, such as scope of labour law and scope of labour ministry and other relevant ministries. |

*Wording modified by ILO in the pilot phase; **Indicator added by ILO in the pilot phase (2009-2013).

4. The main steps for monitoring decent work at the national level

The development of a global methodology to monitor progress towards decent work, in support of the global Decent Work Agenda and national policies and programmes on decent work and related fields, is a process that encompasses at least four distinct aspects (Graph 3):

1. **the identification of a set of qualitative and quantitative indicators** that can be used to measure progress towards decent work at the country level (on the basis of the ILO framework);

2. **the collection of statistical data and qualitative information** related to selected decent work indicators;

3. **the analysis and interpretation of decent work indicators and statistics** in order to obtain a dynamic picture of progress and gaps in the countries’ advance towards decent work, which informs policy makers;

4. **the targeting process**: national studies on progress towards decent work help identify key priority areas (on the basis of the main decent work deficits) for (re)designing priority policies and programmes; they also help identify target indicators (from the baseline information they provide) for monitoring revised or future policies and programmes, that focus directly or indirectly on employment, social protection, rights at work and social dialogue.
Graph 3. The main steps for monitoring decent work at the country level

**Identification of decent work indicators**
National stakeholders and social partners identify
1. a set of quantitative and qualitative indicators for regular country-studies assessing progress made on decent work
2. priority indicators for monitoring priority policies and programmes

**Data collection**
National Statistical Office develops and maintains surveys to collect data on decent work statistics
Ministry of Labour/Employment, social security agencies, key sector ministries, workers’ and employers’ organisations develop/maintain administrative records on decent work

**Policy making**
National stakeholders and social partners define priority policy areas (key decent work deficits) for designing priority policies and programmes through social dialogue

**National assessments of decent work**
Information on the main progress and deficits over a given period, on the basis of quantitative and qualitative indicators identified by national stakeholders and social partners
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1. Selecting the most appropriate indicators at the national level

The process of selection of appropriate decent work indicators at the national level is based on the ILO conceptual framework for the measurement of decent work, which has been tested in a number of pilot countries with the ILO assistance, in particular from the ILO/EC MAP project. The framework has been widely used by national stakeholders in identifying decent work indicators at the country level and extensively implemented in producing national assessments on decent work.

The pilot-countries represent a wide range in terms of income levels and economic development (low-income, middle-income and high-income countries), but also in terms of institutions, statistical infrastructure, legal environment and policy development. In all these countries, the ILO global framework has proved adequate and relevant, by including a common core of indicators (the “main” indicators compiled in all countries to ensure comparability) and allowing each country enough flexibility to add indicators reflecting national circumstances and requirements. Moreover, since the countries selected have had the freedom to add indicators and exclude others from the framework (apart the “main” indicators), the final combination of indicators for any given country tends to be uniquely tailored to its particular requirements for policy monitoring and analysis.

A process of prioritization and selection of the most appropriate decent work indicators is required, reflecting national ownership and feasibility

National partners are encouraged to define their own set of decent work indicators that is relevant at the country level, by selecting from the ILO framework (list of statistical and legal framework indicators) and adding other indicators that reflect their particular national circumstances and decent work policy agenda.

In addition to the main decent work indicators, any new indicators or levels of disaggregation of the decent work indicators that are relevant to the national context, they should be considered for inclusion.

The statistical indicators are supplemented by 21 legal framework indicators (information on rights at work and the legal framework) that can developed from national sources.

In all the pilot-countries, the ILO framework has been discussed by tripartite constituents and other stakeholders, including national statistical offices. It has been applied in a flexible way according to specific needs and national circumstances.

Some countries proposed new indicators to complement the ILO indicators and further disaggregation of existing indicators using age groups, location (urban/rural), race, occupation and industry classifications, as appropriate. The new indicators and the disaggregated decent work indicators have been produced to meet national requirements, as identified in the tripartite consultations.
Country examples:

- Brazil has produced decent work indicators by sex, location (rural/urban) and race (Blacks and Whites) at the national level in 2009 and decided to produce the same indicators at the state and municipal levels so as to reflect regional disparities; decent work indicators were produced for the 27 federal states in 2012 and the compilation of the decent work indicators for the 5,564 municipalities of the country started in 2013.

- Cambodia added an indicator on employment opportunities, “workers in small and medium enterprises in the informal sector, an indicator on earnings, the “average monthly personal expenses of workers” and indicators on equal opportunity and treatment in employment such as “employment for people with disability” and “employment for victims of sexual exploitation”.

- Zambia included further disaggregated several indicators, by economic activity and province and added new indicators such as the “number of children withdrawn from child labour (by age, sex, economic activity and province)”, and the “number of cases of occupation diseases by industry”.

- Niger included disaggregation by age for the indicators on precarious jobs and employment tenure.

- Peru has introduced a new indicator on employment demand in the formal sector (by economic activity, geographic location, and professional category), an indicator on earnings of workers in the informal economy (including earnings of self-employed), and an indicator on the proportion of independent workers who are members of a health system.

- Bangladesh has added additional indicators on safe work environment, such as the share of total enterprise budget spent on safe work environment, the economic/production loss due to occupational injury, the number of workplace accidents with no injuries, the compensation paid due to occupational injury, the exposure to toxic chemicals and hazardous materials in the workplace, the number of occupational diseases/risks by sector, the number of medical personnel employed in factory premises, the number of trained personnel in occupational safety and health, the use of obsolete machinery/age of machinery used, the enrolment in and number of training institutes on safe work, the use of basic safety tool by sector, and the compliance with building safety codes.

- Bangladesh has disaggregated its indicators on social dialogue, such as the union density rate and the collective bargaining rate by sector and ownership.

Some countries have adapted indicators in the light of data availability.

---

Country examples:

- Brazil has developed the indicator “Average hours worked per week per employed person (all jobs)” instead of the suggested indicator in the ILO framework “Average annual working time per employed person” and has not developed the indicator “Average weekly hours worked - hours in standardized hour bands”. Other countries, like Niger or Indonesia, have also preferred the indicator “Average hours worked per week per employed person”.

Many countries have selected indicators that are not yet available but would be produced from future surveys.

Country examples:

- Cambodia included indicators on precarious jobs, employment tenure, and employment for people with disabilities which cannot be computed from the existing data, but considered by constituents as essential, and to be produced from future surveys.
- Zambia included an indicator on the measure of discrimination by disability that cannot be computed from the existing sources but might be considered for inclusion in future surveys.
- Peru included new indicators to be compiled from future surveys, such as “paid sick leave”, and the “proportion of economically active population contributing to a pension fund (wage and non wage employed)”.
- Bangladesh added an indicator on “gender gap in employment benefits (non-salary), including maternity leave, sick leave, casual leave with pay and incentive bonus” (to be produced) in addition to the indicator “gender wage gap”.

Some countries have already developed some of the “future” statistical indicators in the framework, related to various elements, such as combining work, family and personal life, stability and security of work, enterprises and skills development.
Country examples:

- Various indicators have been developed by Brazil, Cambodia, Indonesia, Philippines, Peru, Tanzania, Ukraine and Zambia on “combining work, family and personal life”, such as: home-to-work commuting time (percentage by time band), weekly hours spent on housework and in the main job, access to childcare facilities, the distribution of time devoted to key categories of daily activities, number of workers on parental leave, the share of economically inactive population performing household duties and caring for children, the proportion of employed who are married, the proportion of employed who are household heads (by sex and age bands), rate of factory compliance with maternity leave, and the number of signed collective agreements that include provisions for combining work and family (by industry in a year), the number of female workers receiving maternity subsidies.

- Indicators on stability and security of work have been developed by Brazil, such as the average job tenure in years, the share of employed persons with tenure of less than one year, and the share of employed persons with tenure equal to or greater than five years, by sex, colour (Black/White) and rural/urban location.

- Brazil has developed indicators on enterprises, including the proportion of enterprises by economic activity, size, region, demographic event (birth, death, survival rates) and growth over time. Niger added an indicator on the measurement of favourable conditions for sustainable enterprises, including education, training and training throughout life, enterprise culture, and property rights guaranty.

Identification of national lists of decent work indicators and a core set of priority indicators for monitoring purposes

The objective in establishing appropriate indicators to assess progress made towards decent work should be clearly endorsed by all stakeholders.

National stakeholders and social partners are encouraged to organize tripartite consultations for the identification of a national list of statistical and legal decent work indicators from which they can develop national assessments on progress towards decent work.

They are also encouraged to identify a short-list of priority indicators - that can be selected from the national list of decent work indicators and which can be considered for monitoring the Decent Work Country Programme and included in the national monitoring framework (i.e. into the list of indicators used for monitoring the national development plan or national policies and programmes).

Tripartite consultation workshops were organized and background studies prepared in the pilot-countries to inform constituents on the statistical tools that exist and the data available on labour market and decent work in the country. On the basis of the ILO global conceptual framework for the measurement of decent work, a full set of decent work indicators was discussed. This was followed by a process of indicator selection through a voting system which ensured fair representation of all key decent work dimensions of the framework in the final list of indicators.

---


11 The national lists of decent work indicators and the short-lists of priority indicators identified on a tripartite basis by the MAP countries are available at: www.ilo.org/map
Thus, each pilot-country has identified a national list of decent work indicators, as well as their sources and their availability given current data collection instruments. This comprehensive list of statistical and legal indicators covering the ten elements of decent work and the national context form the basis for the preparation of national assessments on progress made towards decent work.

From the comprehensive list of indicators, constituents have extracted a smaller selection of priority indicators for inclusion in the national monitoring framework (including national development plans, labour and employment policies, and decent work country programmes).12

**Country examples:**

- **In Indonesia,** a core list of 11 priority decent work indicators was selected for monitoring purposes, from the 70 indicators identified (particularly for inclusion in the National Midterm Development Plan), through a voting process, that provided each participant with an opportunity to rate the indicators according to their specific importance in the national context. Among the 11 priority indicators, two of them could not be compiled due to lack of administrative data, one on competency-based training and another on worker certification in occupational safety and health; the priority indicators covered seven elements of decent work: employment opportunities, adequate earnings and productive work, equal opportunity and treatment in employment, safe work environment, social dialogue, workers’ and employers’ representation, work to be abolished and decent working time.

- **The Bangladesh constituents** have selected 14 priority indicators by vote in a tripartite consultation workshop held in Dhaka, in April 2010. The short list of priority indicators includes indicators on safe work environment, stability and security of work, adequate earnings, work that should be abolished, social security, employment opportunities, social dialogue and equal opportunity and treatment in employment. These priority indicators were selected for the monitoring of decent work in the context of the upcoming Sixth Five-year Plan and the Bangladesh DWCP.

- **The constituents of Cambodia** have identified 20 priority indicators covering different dimensions of decent work, from the 63 indicators selected for assessing progress on decent work. The core set of priority indicators has been selected to reflect the priorities of the DWCP (2011-2015), which notably include improving industrial relations and rights at work, promoting an enabling environment for employment, and social protection. The priority indicators were also selected for inclusion in the monitoring framework of the National Strategic Development Plan (2009-2013).

- **In Niger,** 20 priority indicators have been selected within the national list of indicators, on the basis of their relevance for national planning and monitoring. They have been selected to reflect the priorities of the new DWCP (2012-2016), and for inclusion in the monitoring framework of the National Economic and Social Development Plan (2012-2015).

- **In Peru,** at a tripartite consultation meeting held in Lima in April 2010, constituents agreed on 14 priority indicators, including four indicators on social dialogue; 12 indicators were calculated on the basis of available information and two would require additional data collection. Constituent requested that the 14 indicators provide analysis by location (rural-urban) and gender. These priority indicators will contribute to the design of Peru’s future Decent Work Country Programme.

---

Good practice - The identification of decent work indicators in Zambia

The process of identifying decent work indicators was led by the Advisory Committee for the Zambia Decent Work Country Programme (Z-DWCP) which organised tripartite consultations and a Special Session in Siavonga, on January 2010. After selecting about 50 indicators for the preparation of national assessments on decent work, the Advisory Committee narrowed the list of relevant indicators down to 12 for incorporation in the national monitoring framework. The 12 priority indicators can be computed from existing sources except for the employment situations of workers with disabilities (included to enable measurement of discrimination by disability) for which no data is yet available. The priority Z-DWCP indicators for national monitoring purposes cover seven substantive elements of decent work (see Table 2).

Table 5. List of priority decent work indicators for national monitoring purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment-to-population ratio, 15-64 years (S)</td>
<td>LFS; LCMS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working poor (S)</td>
<td>LCMS</td>
<td>(Yes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure of discrimination by disability</td>
<td>LFS</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal employment (S)</td>
<td>LFS (Informal employment module)</td>
<td>(Yes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female share of employment in ISCO-88 groups 11 and 12 [Legislators and senior officials; Corporate managers]</td>
<td>LFS</td>
<td>(Yes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational injury rate, fatal</td>
<td>Administrative data sources (Mine Safety Department, OOHS at MLSS, Workers’ Compensation Fund)</td>
<td>(Yes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union density rate (S)</td>
<td>MLSS, ZCTU, FFTUZ combined with LFS</td>
<td>(Yes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth not in education and not in employment, 15-24 years (S)</td>
<td>LFS; LCMS</td>
<td>(Yes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum wage as per cent of average/median wage</td>
<td>LFS (Wage module); Employment and Earnings Inquiry</td>
<td>– / (Yes, formal sector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour inspection rate</td>
<td>OHSS (MLSS) combined with LFS</td>
<td>(Yes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Labour as defined by ICLS resolution, by age, sex and economic activity (S)</td>
<td>Child Labour Survey; LFS (CL module)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share population aged 55 years and above benefiting from a pension (S)</td>
<td>LFS; Social security institutions (PIA, NAPSA, PSPF, LASF)</td>
<td>(Yes)–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The national lists identified by national stakeholders may be updated and completed according to national needs that evolve over time.

Key: (S) means that an indicator should be disaggregated by sex and (Yes) means that the raw data for an indicator are available, but that some work needs to be done to calculate the indicator.

At the tripartite consultation workshop, the participants proceeded to vote on which indicators they wanted to prioritize to feed into the national monitoring process with each person allowed eight votes. Participants agreed that no more than one vote per participant could go to any single indicator, and no more than two votes within each of the ten substantive elements. The voting resulted in the selection of twelve indicators from seven of the ten substantive elements of the Decent Work Agenda (including indicators that had attracted 13 to six votes).

The Special Session of the Advisory Committee for the Z-DWCP placed great importance on employment opportunities. Equal opportunity and treatment in employment, safe work environment and adequate earnings and productive work also feature prominently, followed by indicators relating to social dialogue, workers’ and employers’ representation, work to be abolished and social security. Three of the substantive elements of the Decent Work Agenda are not represented in the core indicators identified for inclusion in the monitoring framework, namely ‘Decent working time’, ‘Combining work, family, and personal life’ and ‘Stability and security of work’. However, informal employment (grouped under employment opportunities) also relates to ‘Stability and security of work’. ‘Decent working time’ and ‘Combining work, family and personal life’ are covered by the main indicators in the full list of indicators used for national assessments on progress towards decent work (51 indicators covering the ten substantive elements).

The Zambian Government had reached an advanced stage in the development of the Sixth National Development Plan (SNDP 2011-2015) and the special session of the Z-DWCP Advisory Committee and the adoption of a core set of decent work indicators was viewed as a milestone as these priority indicators will form part of the SNDP monitoring and evaluation framework. This demonstrated the commitment of the Government and social partners to achieving decent work, and underscored the importance of reliable statistics to monitor results.

Country examples:

In Brazil, new indicators have been added to the national list of indicators (as identified in the tripartite consultation workshop in August 2009), following technical meetings organized by the ILO with the Ministry of Labour, the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE) and the social partners in 2011 and 2012. The employers’ organisations advocated the inclusion of indicators on productivity at the sectoral or enterprise level and the complementing of indicators on dismissals by information on the capacity of enterprises; they also called for inclusion of indicators linking innovation at work and innovation in technology. The new list of decent work indicators includes further disaggregation (ethnic characteristics of workers, foreign immigrants, disabled people, and traditional communities), and new indicators on combining professional work and family life (such as the percentage of workers whose children go to nurseries), on professional training, and on sustainable enterprises and formed the basis for the preparation of the second edition of the Decent Work Country Profile of Brazil. The full list of indicators selected at the national level, was presented and discussed in 26 workshops held at the federal state level. Additional data on transfer of income, social dialogue, and labour conflicts will be collected through new surveys.

In Peru, the list of the indicators identified at the tripartite consultation workshop (Lima, April 2010) has been completed and discussed with social partners in August and October 2012.

In Indonesia, the national list of decent work indicators (as identified in the tripartite consultation workshop in March 2010) has been discussed and completed at the provincial level, so that adequate indicators can be compiled at the local level for the preparation of provincial decent work profiles13.

---

13 Three decent work profiles at the provincial level have been prepared in 2012-2013 for East Java, Maluku and East Nusa Tenggara; the documents are available at: http://www.ilo.org/integration/themes/mdw/map/countries/WCMS_170054/lang–en/index.htm
2. Using national definitions and international statistical standards

The ILO framework for the measurement of decent work was made possible by promoting a standard list of indicators based to the extent possible on agreed international statistical standards, but also by allowing scope for flexible application at the country level. Country-specific adaptations may be included, particularly concerning thresholds, age bands, classifications, and levels of disaggregation.

In most countries that have identified decent work indicators and developed national assessments of decent work on the basis of selected indicators, national adaptations (classifications, thresholds, specific definitions) have been included according to national legal frameworks and national requirements, along with international definitions, considered for purposes of comparative analysis in particular at the regional level.14

Country examples:

- In Niger, youth is defined as persons between 15–35 years of age and employment indicators disaggregated by age have been produced for the age groups 15–24 years and 15-35 years.
- In Brazil, the working-age population is defined as those aged from 16 to 64 years, while it is commonly defined as persons aged 15 years and older in international statistical standards. In Armenia, the working-age population is defined nationally as persons aged from 16 to 70 years.
- In many countries, such as Zambia, Indonesia, Cambodia and Bangladesh, there is no threshold for the working-age population, and retirement age is not necessarily 65, or workers may remain economically active beyond the age of 64 because of the inadequacy of their pensions and incomes. In the Philippines, the labour force participation rate is measured for three different age bands (15-24, 25-54 and 55+).
- In many countries, the threshold of 48 hours per week used for computing the indicator on “excessive hours” differs from the national threshold as determined by national legislation on overtime work hours. Various countries have computed the indicator on “excessive hours” by taking into account both the international and the national thresholds; in Armenia, Austria, Indonesia and Niger for example, normal legal working hours should not exceed 40 hours per week, and in Brazil they should not exceed 44 hours per week.

Some countries have devised national definitions of specific indicators (such as informal employment, underemployment and precarious employment) that differ from international statistical definitions.

---

Country examples:

- In the Philippines, the international definition of informal employment has not yet been applied and status in employment are used as a proxy to measure informal employment (proportion of self-employed and unpaid family workers), while the national terminology for worker categories (wage and salary workers, employers in own family-operated farm or business, self-employed without any paid employee, unpaid family workers in own family-operated farm or business) differs from the international terminology (employees, employers, own-account workers, contributing family workers). The Philippines has envisaged developing an official definition of informal employment in light of the international definition.

- In Indonesia, the definition of informal employment does not make a difference between informal employment and employment in the informal sector and is based on cross-tabulation of employment status and main occupation as defined in the labour force survey (Sakernas): (i) employers with permanent workers are “formal” in all occupations, (ii) employers assisted by temporary and unpaid workers are “formal” in major occupations but “informal” in agriculture, (iii) own account workers are “formal” if they are professional and technical workers, administrative and managerial, and clerical workers, and they are “informal” in the other occupations, (iv) regular employees are considered to be in the “formal” sector, (v) casual employees are considered to be “informal” workers unless they are professional and technical workers, administrative and managerial, and clerical workers, (vi) unpaid family workers are all in the “informal” sector (Sakernas survey, BPS).

- In Indonesia, regular employees are defined as permanent employees (working for another person or institution permanently for pay in cash or in kind), excluding seasonal, temporary workers and workers in probation are classified as engaged in formal working arrangements (Sakernas survey, BPS).

- In the Philippines, the underemployment rate is defined as the total number of employed who work less than 40 hours in their primary job and want additional work as a percentage of total number of employed, while the international definition of time-related underemployment includes the criteria of availability for additional work and the number of hours actually worked in all jobs.

- In Ukraine, time-related underemployment is measured by an indicator of “involuntary underemployment”, defined as the proportion of all registered employees who are available for full time work but work short hours at the initiative of the employer (the data was obtained from the yearly enterprise survey).

Regarding specific concepts such as the concept of forced labour, different terms and definitions are used at the national level that are based on complex definitions in the national laws. For example, in Brazil, the concept of “work conditions analogous to that of slavery” is preferred and covers various situations that go beyond the scope of the ILO definition, which comprises two basic elements: the work or service is exacted under the menace of penalty and it is undertaken involuntary. The Brazil definition of “slave labour” include the following situations together or separately: (i) submitting a worker to forced labour; (ii) submitting a worker to exhaustive work hours; (iii) subjecting the worker to degrading work conditions; (iv) restricting the worker’s freedom of movement whether by debt bondage, curtailment of any means of transportation by the employer, or by any other means whose purpose is to keep the worker at the workplace; (v) ostensive vigilance at the workplace by employer or representative, with the purpose of retaining the worker there; (vi) keeping worker’s documents or personal objects in possession of employer or representative, with the purpose of retaining him or her at the work place15.

The ILO encourages member States to comply with international statistical standards for producing data that are better harmonized, when possible and relevant at the country level.

15 See the Decent Work Country Profile of Brazil, second edition (ILO, Brasilia, 2013).
The selection of indicators should take into account international statistical standards along with national definitions and classifications

To ensure the greatest possible degree of consistency and international comparability between indicators developed at the country level (see Resolution IV of the 18th International Conference of Labour Statisticians), statistical definitions should be based as far as possible on existing International Conference of Labour Statisticians’ resolutions and guidelines and other relevant international statistical standards.

A manual on decent work indicators has been produced by the ILO, with the MAP project support, to guide national producers and users of data on decent work, as well as international stakeholders. To ensure consistency and international comparability, detailed definitions and methods of computation based on existing ICLS resolutions and guidelines and relevant international statistical standards are presented (see Box 4).

Box 4. The ILO manual on Decent work indicators*

The ILO manual *Decent work indicators* presents guidance on the decent work statistical indicators and legal framework indicators that were identified in the ILO framework on the measurement of decent work and discussed at the 18th International Conference of Labour Statisticians. It is intended for use by national producers and users of data alike and will also be useful for international users.

The manual is divided into eleven chapters corresponding to the ten substantive elements of decent work plus the economic and social context for decent work. Each chapter contains the statistical and legal framework indicators associated with the topic dealt with.

The guidance it provides can be summarized as follows:

- **Guidance on statistical indicators**, focusing on measurement objectives and rationale, method of computation, concepts and definitions, recommended data sources, metadata and disaggregation, and guidelines to the interpretation of these indicators in the national social and economic context and in conjunction with complementary indicators.

- **Guidance on the 21 legal framework indicators**, focusing on the qualitative and descriptive aspects of: (i) laws, policies or institutions that are in place; (ii) benefit levels and thresholds; (iii) evidence of the effectiveness of implementation; (iv) estimated percentage of workers covered in law; (v) estimated percentage of workers covered in practice; and (vi) ratification of relevant ILO Conventions.

- **Guidance regarding the national application of international standards**, including concept and definitions, methods, thresholds and age bands, classification systems, etc.

By providing clear guidance in defining and interpreting the full range of statistical and legal decent work indicators, this manual is designed to serve as a key reference point for a wide range of data users, from ILO constituents and staff to policy-makers and development practitioners, at both the national and the international level. To ensure the greatest possible degree of...
3. Building tripartite consensus on decent work indicators

It is essential that national stakeholders and tripartite constituents are involved from an early stage to agree on a comprehensive list of decent work indicators that is relevant at the national level, as a basis for the preparation of national assessments on decent work.

In the pilot-countries, the whole process benefited at the national level with the ILO guidance. Tripartite dialogue at every step of the process (from the identification of decent work indicators to the validation/dissemination of the country studies) has been a key factor in ensuring ownership.

During the pilot-phase, the process of indicator selection has involved tripartite consultations at the national and regional levels. Several regional meetings on the measurement of decent work and national tripartite consultation workshops on decent work indicators were organized in collaboration with the ILO. They helped to raise awareness, enhance national capacities and build tripartite consensus in the identification of decent work indicators at the country level\(^\text{16}\).

The exercise in prioritizing the indicators was also carried out on a tripartite basis, to ensure that those indicators deemed most important were targeted first in data collection activities and incorporated in the monitoring system of national policies.\(^\text{17}\)

---

16 Several regional and national workshops on the measurement of decent work were organized from 2009 to 2013. The workshop reports are all available at www.i.o.org/map

The selection of indicators at the national level should be the outcome of a tripartite consultation process

A tripartite national consensus needs to be reached in identifying national decent work indicators. The involvement of tripartite representatives from the start of the process to the end is essential. This consensus-building tripartite process is a key factor in the credibility and legitimacy of the data and conclusions of country assessments. It is also an important element for ensuring ownership and the sustainability of the process.18

In the majority of the pilot-countries, tripartite national consensus has been reached on the process of agreeing national decent work indicators. The process may take more or less time according to national circumstances. For instance, in Brazil, the Philippines and Zambia, the process on the measurement and the monitoring of decent work has been very well advanced thanks to strong national tripartite consensus and political commitment. In Peru, despite its considerable statistical capacities, and several tripartite consultations at the national level - in addition to the regional tripartite workshop on decent work indicators organised in Lima in 2010 - the process for identifying indicators has been slowed down by the absence of tripartite consensus, particularly the difficulty in reaching agreement on social dialogue indicators; discussions are still continuing within the National Council on Labour and Employment Promotion.

4. Institutional arrangements and actions for sustainability

In the pilot-countries, the process has generally been led by the ministries in charge of labour and employment in coordination with other key ministries, national statistical agencies and social partners. Strong institutional arrangements and coordinated decision making mechanisms are critically important for ensuring the sustainability of the national monitoring process on decent work.

In all pilot-countries, constituents recommended that ministry in charge of labour should take a strong lead in coordinating the process of measuring and monitoring decent work, particularly for any future revision or update of the national list of decent work indicators. They called for coordinated mechanisms ensuring regular data production and decent work information-sharing system.

Country examples:

- In Zambia, the process of selecting decent work indicators and preparing a national study on progress made towards decent work was led by the Advisory Committee in charge of formulating, monitoring and reviewing the Z-DWCP which includes members of line ministries and workers’ and employers’ organisations.

- In Cambodia, constituents formulated recommendations to strengthen institutional mechanisms for coordination among the national agencies involved in producing decent work statistics and among producers and users of data for monitoring progress on decent work in the country. They recommended that existing initiatives within the Ministry of Labour and Vocation Training (MOLVT) be reinforced and that an inter-ministerial committee on measuring and monitoring decent work be set up involving different ministries and statistical agencies (among them MOLVT, NIS and CARD), employers’ organizations and trade unions as they all collect different information and data on decent work. This tripartite committee would be responsible for defining the data collection protocol (surveys data and administrative data) and ensuring that data on decent work are regularly collected and updated, and for establishing an information sharing system among concerned institutions. Capacity building activities, particularly among the committee core members, should accompany these institutional coordination mechanisms, so as to address specific training needs on data collection and data analysis.

Strong institutional coordination mechanisms are a key element in the sustainable monitoring of decent work at the country level

Governments, and particularly the ministries in charge of labour and employment, should take a strong lead in coordinating the development of decent work indicators and monitoring decent work, in coordination with other line ministries, workers’ and employers’ organisations and national statistical offices.
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1. Main data sources for compiling decent work indicators

There are four main sources of data on decent work: population censuses, household surveys (general, labour force, income and expenditure), establishment surveys and administrative records; complementary sources may also be used (see Box 5).

**Box 5. Types of sources for statistical decent work indicators**

- Population censuses; Labour force surveys; Household income and expenditure surveys; and other household surveys.
- Economic or establishment censuses; Labour-related establishment surveys; and other establishment surveys.
- Official estimates; Insurance records; Employment office records; Population registers; Establishment or business registers; and other administrative records and related sources.
- Collective bargaining agreements; Labour inspectorate records.
- National accounts and consumer price surveys.

Each instrument is developed for specific purposes and target specific population groups:

- **Household surveys** cover persons in employment, unemployment, underemployment, hours of work, income, and other related data, plus information on the personal and family situation of workers. All residents are covered, with sometimes exceptions (like armed forces, child and older workers, persons in institutional dwellings, and migrant workers).

- **Establishment surveys** provide information on the number of filled posts; payments received; hours paid/worked; occupation; industry, etc. These surveys do not always provide information on personal and family situation of workers. They are designed to be useful for internal purposes and cover salaried employees in medium and large establishments. They may exclude managerial and peripheral staff.

- **Administrative records** provide information with regard to persons seeking employment or receiving unemployment benefits, persons registered at the social security agency, registered or declared income, registered hours of work, occupation, industry, and so on. There is usually no data available on workers’ personal or family situation in administrative records, and workers covered by administrative registers are generally full time employees in the formal sector.

Each of these sources has its strengths and limitations:

- **Household surveys** provide a comprehensive coverage of the population, as detailed questioning permits precise measurement of statistical concepts for short reference periods. However, sampling prevents the production of reliable estimates for small groups, and the data quality on income is lower. These surveys cover “sensitive” and employer-related topics, but can-
not provide estimates of vacancies and training needs. Finally, household surveys tend to be quite expensive.

- Establishment surveys have the advantage that they cover larger businesses. Payroll records can provide consistent and reliable data on income and employment by industry. In addition, this is the only source for data on vacancies and training needs. Yet, these surveys require constant updating of registers (births and deaths) and the level of non-responses is generally high. Sampling prevents reliable estimates for small groups, and data items are limited by the available information in establishment’s registers.

- Administrative records are inexpensive but coverage is often poor and it is expensive to keep them up to date. Moreover, the data provided may not be reliable owing to questionable quality of reporting.

Most decent work indicators are compiled from household-based labour force surveys or other household surveys that have an employment module. They are best calculated using estimates derived from a labour force survey, as the latter’s primary objective is to obtain reliable estimates of the labour force of a given population based on a sample of households. This instrument permits the estimation of the number of persons employed as well as the size of the working age population and can be designed to provide both stock and flow estimates. It generally covers all workers, including all self-employed persons and often allows disaggregation of data by demographic variables such as sex, age group and in some cases, ethnic group. Moreover, the data can often be disaggregated by status in employment, occupation group and economic activity group (see Boxes 6 and 7).

---

**Box 6. Labour force survey**

A labour force survey (LFS) is a household-based sample survey focusing on the labour force status of the working-age population and related statistics. Survey respondents are members of sampled households. The LFS seeks to provide reliable, coherent information from a socio-economic perspective about the total working-age population and its components, in particular the labour force. Such surveys often allow disaggregation of the labour force by personal characteristics such as sex, age, educational attainment and, in some cases, migrant status and ethnicity, as well as on the basis of information about the jobs held by employed persons (e.g., occupation and type of contract).

The labour force survey, which is most often conducted at least once a year (though in many cases on a quarterly, monthly or even continual basis), is the main data collection instrument for statistics on employment and unemployment worldwide. The concept of employment in household surveys refers to employed persons, including self-employed workers, rather than to jobs, since a person may have more than one job and work in different establishments. Some labour force surveys allow the breakdown of employed persons according to multiple job-holding characteristics.
Other sources that are used to complement estimates from labour force surveys include other topic-specific household surveys (such as Child labour surveys), other household surveys, employment-related establishment surveys, and administrative records (see Box 7). For instance, some decent work indicators related to safe work environment, social dialogue, or social security are compiled from administrative records, while some of them may be compiled from establishment surveys (such as indicators of stability and security at work, adequate earnings, and safe work environment).

It is important to consider the source (labour force survey, other household survey, population census, establishment survey and administrative records) when analyzing decent work indicators. Each source covers different types of workers. Household surveys and population censuses typically collect information on everyone and labour force surveys on all persons of working age. Establishment surveys and administrative records, on the other hand, collect information on employees only, generally those in large formal sector establishments and national public agencies, a segment of the labour force which tends to have relatively better working conditions, especially in developing countries with an important informal sector and a large number of small farms. A short description of each major source used (e.g., years, sample sizes, coverage of workers and sectors, etc.) is valuable when analysing decent work indicators together19.

19 See the ILO/MAP guidelines on *Assessing Progress on decent work at the national level* (ILO, Geneva, 2013).
Box 7. The preferred sources for compiling the main decent work indicators

Employment opportunities: employment-to-population ratio, unemployment rate, youth not in education and not in employment or training, informal employment rate.

The preferred source is the labour force survey (LFS). Population censuses and other household surveys may be used if they have an appropriate employment module, as well as administrative records related to population and employment (such as unemployment registers). Informal employment is measured from the LFS which includes specific questions to capture information on informal employment; other household surveys may be used if they include a module with similar questions.

Adequate earnings and productive work: working poor, low pay rate.

The preferred source is household surveys that have an employment module and variables on the poverty status and economic activity of household members. Establishment surveys (and sometimes administrative records related to social security) can also provide data on earning and hours.

Decent working time: excessive hours (more than 48 hours per week).

The preferred source is the LFS or other household surveys; establishment surveys with a good coverage may be considered as a second option.

Work that should be abolished: child labour rate.

The main source is household-based child labour surveys.

Stability and security at work: precarious employment rate.

The preferred source is the LFS or other household surveys that provide information on the duration of contracts.

Equal opportunity and treatment in employment: occupational segregation by gender, women’s share of employment in senior and middle management (ISCO groups 11 and 12).

The preferred source is the LFS. Other household surveys and population census may be used if they have an appropriate employment module, as may administrative records related to employment and the ISCO groups.

Safe work environment: occupational injury rate, fatal

The preferred sources are labour inspection records, annual reports, supplemented household surveys and establishment surveys.

Social security: share of the population aged 65 and above benefiting from a pension, public social security expenditure (as a percentage of GDP).

The main sources are administrative records, LFS and household budget surveys.

Social dialogue, workers’ and employers’ representation: union density rate, employers’ organization density rate, collective bargaining coverage rate.

The main sources are administrative records, LFS and household budget surveys with extended modules.

Source: ILO manual on Decent Work Indicators (ILO, 2013)
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Monitoring and assessing progress on decent work

The key statistical instruments to measure decent work indicators

There are four main sources of data on decent work: population censuses, labour force surveys and other household surveys, establishment surveys and administrative records; and complementary sources may be used. The majority of decent work indicators are compiled from household-based labour force surveys or from other household surveys that have an employment module; but this is not possible for all such indicators and other sources (administrative records, censuses, and establishment surveys) may be used. Since there is no single source for computing the decent work indicators, all available information shall be used, by considering quality, coverage and sampling issues.

2. Improving national data collection instruments

2.1 Main challenges in measuring decent work at the country level

Household labour force surveys as a major source

In the pilot-countries it proved feasible to collect statistical data on decent work. On average, data could be found or computed for three-quarters of the main decent work indicators, and in some cases gaps could be filled by using closely related indicators and additional indicators to supplement the main decent work indicators. However, a major challenge in measuring decent work originates from the quality and scope of data available to produce both statistical and legal indicators.

In all the pilot-countries, between 60 and 70 per cent of statistical indicators calculated came from labour force surveys. This underscores the importance of household data in computing most decent work indicators for an effective and comprehensive assessment of progress on decent work. By contrast, relatively few indicators were compiled from establishment surveys, mostly because in the pilot-countries such surveys were rare and often limited in scope (particularly worker and sector coverage)\(^{20}\).

Country examples:

The pilot-countries used generally labour force surveys and other household surveys (living standards, household budget and integrated surveys) to compute most of the identified decent work indicators, since the vast majority of these indicators require individual data from household members. Some countries, such as the Philippines, Indonesia and Ukraine used establishment surveys to compute some indicators, particularly those relating to wages, occupational injuries and stability and security at work. Most of the countries computed the indicators relating to social security, safe work environment and social dialogue from administrative sources (ministries in charge of labour, health and education, social security institutions, workers’ and employers’ organisations).

Since LFS and other household surveys are the major vehicle of data collection on quantitative and qualitative dimensions of decent work, the pilot-countries (including those where such surveys are well designed and conducted on a regular monthly or quarterly basis) have focused attention on the need to increase the scope and quality of such data collection instruments.

In several of the pilot-countries, the majority of nationally identified decent work indicators have been computed using existing survey data, but they have called for additional work, since they were not systematically computed by national statistical offices or were not computed on the basis of international statistical standards. Some indicators, for which data were not available, have requested the extension, improvement and refinement of existing data collection tools, particularly national household surveys (revision of questionnaire design, incorporation of additional questions or modules, revision of existing questions, see country examples below).

Labour force surveys have thus proved to key to the successful measurement of decent work under the ILO global framework. That has not meant overloading the existing sources such as labour force surveys, since most of the main statistical indicators in many countries were already available from regular surveys and other statistical sources and, consequently, their collection has not significantly increased the overall cost of labour force surveys. Countries should not rely exclusively on labour force surveys, however, and an effort can be made to ensure that other sources are used.

Administrative records

Certain indicators are best obtained from administrative sources, such as the records kept by government ministries, as well as other state and non-state bodies. They include indicators on safe work environment (such as labour inspection rate), on adequate earnings (related to minimum wage and average earnings), on decent working time (excessive hours, underemployment), on social dialogue (strike and lockout rate, coverage of collective bargaining agreements), and social protection coverage. In general, experience of the pilot countries has shown that the quality and scope of data available from these sources remains a major concern, in both low and middle income countries. Moreover, the lack of effective coordination of national statistical systems appears to have a direct bearing on the quality and accessibility of administrative records.

Legal framework information

A large proportion of legal framework indicators (descriptive information on the legal framework and the actual application of rights and compliance with international conventions) outlined in the ILO global framework can be compiled from official national sources and complemented by
information compiled by the ILO, for example from reports of the Office's supervisory machinery on the application of ILO conventions (both in law and in practice). Experience from pilot countries has revealed the strong desire of national constituents to develop full and accurate legal framework indicators, which add contextual background to the interpretation and analysis of statistical indicators. In many countries, it has been possible to specify the proportion of workers covered by a legal provisions covering various aspects of decent work.

2.2 National efforts on improving data collection tools

Although in a majority of the pilot-countries most decent work indicators were obtainable from existing surveys or administrative records for the production of initial decent work country profiles, improvements on data quality and compliance to international standards were noticed whenever data regularity and coverage issues were raised by constituents during the pilot-phase. Thus, owing to frequent data gaps and weaknesses in developing decent work indicators and country studies, constituents in many pilot countries have since called for a greater effort by government to strengthen data collection in several decent work areas, so as to enhance the quality, coverage and periodicity of data on decent work. Improving labour force surveys and administrative records of government and non state institutions are key areas in which this is most pertinent.

The project countries, including those with strong statistical capacities, requested ILO assistance in computing decent work indicators where they were not systematically computed by national statistical offices or were not computed on the basis of international statistical standards (even though data were available). On-site technical assistance and training workshops were organised to help statistical offices and ministries compute selected indicators. The issue of standardized definitions and computation methods was raised in various regional and global meetings. Some countries requested assistance to improve and refine the existing data collection tools (questionnaire design, incorporation of additional questions or modules, revision of existing questions). All the pilot-countries called for manuals and guidelines on concepts/definitions, questionnaire design and data processing/ tabulation. The ILO manual on Decent Work Indicators and the forthcoming Labour Force Survey toolkit have been prepared to meet national requirements on the basis of experience gained in the pilot-phase.
In the pilot-phase, governments and social partners expressed concern that the limited frequency of national surveys would undermine future efforts to produce regular and up-to-date follow-up assessments of progress towards decent work.

Indeed, monitoring and assessing progress on decent work depend on the availability of data at the national level as well as on their scope and frequency. In low-income and lower middle-income countries, labour force surveys, other household surveys and population censuses are often available only for certain years.

The countries with strong statistical systems (Austria, Brazil, Indonesia, the Philippines, Peru and Ukraine) have been able to obtain comprehensive data over time on many topics, with a high level of disaggregation at the national, provincial and sectoral level, broken down by population group and covering all areas, including some areas designated in the ILO framework as being suitable for future development. These countries have produced long-time-series data that have made possible a more complete analysis of trends in decent work, since the interpretation of some indicators requires long-time-series rather than year-on-year changes, particularly those which are determined by structural factors instead of cyclical factors.

These countries have produced decent work indicators to assess their progress towards decent work over periods of 10 to 15 years and on a yearly basis. For example, for the first edition of Brazil’s Country Profile the data covered the period 1992-2007, while the updated version includes additional data for 2009 and 2010; Ukraine’s Profile covered the period 1998-2009 and its updated version included additional data for 2010 and 2011; the Country Profile for the Philippines covered 1995-2010, and the Austria’s Profile 1998-2008.

Countries with weak statistical systems, such as Bangladesh, Cambodia, Cameroon, Niger, and Zambia have been able to provide data on only a few data points with a partial coverage of the ten areas of decent work and with limited scope for disaggregation.
In the countries with strong statistical systems, an effort has been made to improve compliance to international statistical standards and broaden the scope of decent work components by including additional questions in household survey questionnaires, mostly relating to safe work environment, social protection and social dialogue.

In the Philippines, a Labour Force Survey (LFS) is conducted every quarter and is the major source of labour market statistics on the country’s economically active population. In recent years, however, as new decent work challenges have risen to prominence, the inadequacy of the current questionnaire has become increasingly evident. In 2011, a reassessment of the LFS by the Department of Labor and Employment and the National Statistics Office (NSO) revealed the following key issues and concerns with the current survey: (i) the need for conformity of concepts and measurements of certain indicators with international standards; (ii) the need for improved measurement of decent work concepts not measured precisely in the current LFS questionnaire (i.e. highest educational grade completed, nature of employment, hours of work, earnings/basic pay, persons with marginal attachment to the labour force); and (iii) the need to increase the availability of data on topics of current analytical importance (i.e. labour underutilization, child labour, overseas employment). The MAP project provided the Bureau of Labor and Employment Statistics and the NSO with support in designing and pre-testing a refined LFS questionnaire to capture various aspects of decent work more effectively and to strengthen the country’s capacity to utilize LFS data for policy diagnosis. New decent work questions were incorporated in a labour force survey questionnaire that was tested in one province in 2012, in order to provide recommendations for the roll-out of an improved LFS questionnaire incorporating points raised at a national consultation seminar attended by major stakeholders. The pre-testing was coordinated by the National Statistical Coordination Board (NSCB), and the refined LFS questionnaire is set to be implemented by 2014.

In Indonesia, the national statistical office (BPS) has decided to broaden the scope of the LFS (Sakernas) to better measure decent work, by including additional questions related to safe work environment, social security and social dialogue. A pilot-survey will be conducted in the August round of the Sakernas in 2014.

In Ukraine, the State Statistical Committee of Ukraine (SSCU) requested assistance to improve national capacities on data processing and analysis, particularly with respect to some dimensions of decent work (informal employment, wages, working time, labour migration). A national training workshop has been organized in September 2012 with the participation of SSCU specialists from the 27 regions of Ukraine, the Ministry of Social protection, social partners and academics, to improve national capacities to measure key aspects of decent work.

In Brazil, an effort has been made to increase the scope of decent work in its revised household-based survey questionnaire (PNAD) and indicators have been produced at both the federal and municipal level in order to mainstream key dimensions of decent work in national and local policies and programmes.
With ILO/MAP guidance, Brazil’s statistical agency (IBGE) has developed a new PNAD continuous survey to replace the previously annual household-based survey (PNAD) and has expanded the revised questionnaire in order to capture more aspects of decent work (safe work environment, social security, and social dialogue, including trade union membership). In addition, a supplementary survey with additional questions on decent work has been included in the integrated household survey system (SIED) in order to fill gaps in the country’s decent work indicators system.

Training workshops on data compilation and analysis were organized with ILO/MAP assistance, in 2011 and 2012 (with the participation of technical officers from government agencies, employers’ and workers’ organisations), in the purpose of developing country and regional studies on decent work and incorporating decent work indicators in the national and regional monitoring system. The capacity building requirements of constituents of Brazil focussed particularly on the development of various indicators such as the working poverty rate (with breakdown by sex, colour/race, and urban/rural areas) at the national level, for the major regions and the 27 states, based on PNAD data.

ILO/MAP also provided the IBGE with technical support in developing decent work indicators at the municipal level (Brazil has 5,656 municipalities) based on the 2010 demographic census. The decent work indicators produced at the municipal and the regional levels are strategic inputs for policy making in the various areas of the decent work agenda (combating child labour and forced labour, extension of social protection, formalization of employment, vocational training, promotion of youth employment, combating gender and racial discrimination) as well as for national and presidential priority strategy of eradicating extreme poverty (Brasil sem Miseria) launched in April 2011. A technical cooperation agreement between IBGE and ILO was signed in October 2012 and IBGE started this activity early 2013.

The Social Studies Department of the Social and Economic Research and Studies Institute (IPEA) decided to conduct a qualitative survey on the population’s perception of the concept of decent work and the evaluation of working conditions – within the Sistema de Indicadores de Percepción Social (SIPS) – with a view to developing qualitative indicators on decent work.

In the countries with weak statistical systems (Bangladesh, Cambodia, Niger and Zambia) new labour force surveys have been conducted with revised questionnaires so as to broaden the scope of decent work components covered including earnings and wages, working time, stability and security at work, safe work environment, social protection and social dialogue, and to improve compliance to international statistical standards (particularly for key statistics such as unemployment, and underemployment, status in employment, informal employment, and child labour). Such improvements helped to raise data quality and ensure accurate measurement of the key dimensions of decent work.

In Zambia, for example, the government has undertaken to produce regular data on labour force and decent work. Labour Force Surveys are to be conducted every three years within the national statistical programme. However, the government faces major challenges, since national capacities on data collection are weak. National partners requested supports from MAP, on data collection (questionnaire design, data processing and tabulation) and on data analysis (training workshops).
Technical assistance was provided to the Country Statistical Office (CSO) and the Ministry of Labour for preparatory activities on the 2012 labour force survey (questionnaire design, pilot-survey, and on the basis of definitions and related questions on employment, unemployment, informal employment, wages and earnings that comply to international statistical standards; specific questions on forced labour and child labour have been added.

Some countries conducted (Bangladesh, Cambodia and Niger) have conducted combined surveys (labour force and child labour survey, labour force and informal sector survey).

The Labour Force and Informal Sector Survey in Niger

In Niger, labour force surveys and other household surveys remain ad-hoc and reliant on donor funds, while there is an urgent need to develop statistical indicators for monitoring progress toward decent work goals over time on a regular basis. To ensure that data serve as a useful diagnostic tool for policy-making, the country needs comprehensive and regular household surveys.

Statistics on labour force, informal employment, working time, working poor, wages and earnings, safe work environment and other dimensions of decent work are limited, and comparability between different surveys is weak due to differences in sampling and methodology used.

The government conducted a combined Labour force and Informal Sector Survey (LFS-ISS) in 2012, in order to improve data availability and produce reliable statistics on decent work in compliance with international statistical standards, with the support of the ILO/MAP, the World Bank and the UNDP. The LFS questionnaire has been revised, including additional questions to better measure decent work, on the basis of the list of priority decent work indicators/topics as identified at the tripartite consultation workshop on measuring decent work (Niamey, August 2011). National capacities on data processing and analysis on decent work were enhanced (NIS, Ministry of Labour and social partners) with ILO/MAP support.

The Employment Observatory and Vocational Training is currently developing a database on decent work statistics, on the basis of the indicators identified by constituents and compiled from national sources.
**Bangladesh: Combined labour force survey and national child labour survey, 2013**

Although Bangladesh has a fairly regular system of censuses and socioeconomic surveys which provide periodic data on employment and unemployment, and conducted a labour force survey in 2009-2010 and an Informal sector survey in 2010, data in some critical areas of decent work (earnings, underemployment, working poor, working time, social security, social dialogue mechanisms) are currently inadequate. The Government wished to boost the information base so as to provide for more robust and detailed analysis and monitoring of labour and decent work trends, which will in turn provide a more credible basis for labour market policy formulation.

A new Labour Force Survey combined to a Child Labour survey (LFS-NCLS 2013) has been prepared in 2012 and implemented in 2013, by the Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics (BBS), and the Ministry of Planning with the assistance of the ILO, MAP project and IPEC/SIMPOC. It is based on the new master sample frame derived from the Population Census, which was conducted in 2011 and from which a new master sample was developed in 2012.

Since child labour data remained inadequate (the last national survey on child labour was conducted in 2003), the new survey allowed to more accurately define child labour and to comply to the standards set at the 2008 International Conference of Labour Statisticians, and to sharpen the focus –through revisions to the survey questionnaire- on specific types of child labour such as child domestic work and unpaid household services by children.

The key objective of the new survey is to address the current lack of timely and authoritative statistics on the labour force, child labour and decent work, by including additional and improved questions on various decent work dimensions.

The BBS requested assistance on data quality analysis (data processing and data quality assessment). Technical assistance and training course have been provided by the MAP project in 2011 to enhance BBS capacities on data processing, data tabulation and data analysis (from the previous LFS and ISS datasets and STATA software). Routine methods have been prepared for the data compilation in the perspective of the development of the Country Profile and a database on decent work indicators. These methods will be used as well for the analysis of the 2013 LFS-NCLS data.

**Cambodia: Combined labour force survey and national child labour survey, 2012**

In Cambodia, labour force surveys and other household surveys remain ad-hoc and reliant on donor funds, while there is an urgent need to develop statistical indicators for monitoring progress toward decent work goals over time. To ensure that data availability keeps pace with the fast-moving economic and social dynamics of Cambodia, and to ensure that that data provides useful diagnostics for policymaking, the country needs comprehensive and regular household surveys.

The Cambodia’s last labour force surveys were conducted in 2000 and 2001, supported by the Asian Development Bank. Both surveys used a nationwide sample of 5,000 households, but employed a rather limited questionnaire that yielded only modest insights in terms of monitoring the progress of decent work. The National Institute of Statistics has also conducted six Socio-Economic Surveys (CSES), the latest one being in 2009, giving broad insights into a number of areas, including health, housing conditions, and labour force. The country’s last child labour survey was conducted in 2001, hence a new survey yielding updated child labour estimates based on the internationally agreed statistical measurement standards was also required.
Available statistics on the labour force, child labour and decent work are limited, out-of-date and subject to several design flaws. For example, comparability between different years in the CSES is weak due to differences in sampling, methodology and questionnaires used. Furthermore, because definitions sometimes differ from year to year, data on issues such as informal employment, underemployment, employment relationships, working time, wages and earnings, and other conditions of work are often unreliable. Cambodia also requires additional statistics on a number of areas critical to efforts to promote inclusive, sustainable and job-rich growth, including labour productivity, skills development, social protection, gender equality, and industrial relations.

To improve data availability and produce reliable and regular statistics on decent work and to strengthen national capacities to use and apply international statistical standards in Cambodia’s household surveys, the MAP project supported the NIS in conducting a combined labour force survey and national child labour survey in 2012 (LFS-NCLS), in collaboration with Statistics department and the ILO IPEC/SIMPOC programme. A technical steering committee has been set up, including the tripartite participation of MOLVT, a workers’ and employers’ representative, the National Sub-committee on Child Labour, Statistics-Sweden, UNICEF, the World Bank and the ILO (as observer). The committee was in charge of the validation of the revised questionnaire, the review of the compiled data and the survey reports.

The LFS questionnaire has been revised including additional questions to better measure decent work, the enumerators’ manual has been revised and translated into Khmer, and training workshops have been conducted. The list of priority decent work indicators/topics for which the LFS-NCLS collected data, was as identified at the ILO Tripartite training consultation workshop on measuring decent work (Phnom Penh, May 2011).

### The need to broaden the scope of decent work into labour force surveys

It is recommended that governments and national statistical offices adjust their statistical instruments to better measure decent work and capture all its aspects.

Countries are encouraged to improve compliance with international statistical standards and broaden the scope of the decent work components covered, in particular in labour force surveys.

For instance, countries are encouraged to use their labour force surveys to collect data on safe work environment and social dialogue, including trade union membership and occupational injuries, as the indicators derived from them are of good quality and coverage.

Also, increasing the coverage of national surveys allow further disaggregation (by population groups, provinces, and economic sectors and so on), which is needed for mainstreaming decent work issues into national and local planning.
3. Setting up institutional mechanisms for sustainable statistical systems on decent work

3.1 Regular labour force surveys

Without regular labour force surveys, national assessments on decent work would not be of much use for policy purposes as they would be based on statistics that were out-dated or limited to permit any sound trend analysis or assessment of progress made.

The pilot countries with advanced statistical systems (Brazil, Indonesia, Peru, the Philippines, and Ukraine) incorporated their decent work indicators into regular statistical activities of the national statistical office, thus facilitating future updates to monitor progress of key indicators.

In the pilot countries with less advanced statistical systems (Bangladesh, Cambodia, Niger and Zambia) where labour force surveys are conducted occasionally, an effort is needed to conduct labour force surveys on regular basis. For instance, LFS are carried out on ad hoc basis in Niger and Cambodia, and only every three to five years in Bangladesh and Zambia. Even though statistical offices in these countries generally face major constraints in terms of technical, financial and human resources, a specific timetable for household surveys does nevertheless exist.

In low-income countries lack of resources was identified as the main constraint on the holding of regular household surveys. That said, middle-income countries have called for continued ILO support beyond the current pilot phase in their efforts to collect data on a systematic basis and improve data quality. Countries also called for greater South-South cooperation efforts and sharing of experience, as was noted at the Asian regional meeting on measuring decent work held in Bangkok in November 2012.21

In less developed countries in particular, governments have sought to build a case for additional resource allocations from the national budget (within the context of their national statistical strategy and programme) in addition to donor assistance, in order to implement regular labour force surveys that will enable more regular compilation of indicators and monitoring of national progress on a sustainable way. Constituents have also pointed out that policy-makers should be more aware of decent work objectives, particularly within the DWCP, in order to increase their political commitment and interest in monitoring decent work and thus in collecting data on decent work.

---

Regular labour force surveys as prerequisite for monitoring decent work

Producing data on decent work on a regular and sustainable basis is of critical importance if future efforts to produce regular and up-to-date assessments are not to be undermined. Given the volume of labour statistics that are typically derived from Labour Force Surveys and other household surveys with an appropriate employment module, conducting regular labour force surveys is considered key to the long term sustainability of decent work indicators and related assessments at the country level.

The regularity of reporting on decent work may vary with the quality of the national statistical systems. Preparing annual or biennial assessments on decent work may well make sense for countries with relatively advanced statistical systems, partly because the precision of estimates for most decent work indicators will more readily be acceptable. Moreover, such countries are more likely to have the necessary staff and expertise to produce national assessments every one or two years. For countries without advanced statistical systems (which would include most developing countries), a national assessment on decent work every 5 to 10 years, or according to the DWCP cycle, would be more appropriate, as real change would be more apparent, there would be fewer unremarked measurement errors, and scarce national expertise and resources would not be placed under excessive pressure.

3.2 Improving the quality of administrative data and institutional coordination mechanisms

In several pilot-countries, both low and middle income countries, the quality and scope of data available from administrative records remains a major concern, as they are generally of very limited quality, coverage and periodicity.

In Bangladesh and in Cambodia, constituents highlighted the need to develop institutional co-ordination mechanisms to produce administrative data in a coherent and regular manner from different government ministries.

In Indonesia, the decentralized structure of the country make the collection of administrative data difficult, in the absence of coordination between central and provincial structures.

In the Philippines, administrative statistics, particularly on social security, are weak, as the social security system is fragmented (different systems are available for public and private sector workers) and undermine a coherent statistical system.

In Niger, administrative records are poor, but efforts are made to improve administrative data and specific units in line ministries have recently been set up to compile information from administrative sources.

Countries should consider integrating the decent work statistics and indicators into their national socio-economic information system through effective institutional coordination mechanisms.
The need to improve administrative data

The collection of administrative data, from labour inspection databases and social security agencies for example, should also be improved.
The quality and scope of administrative data should be improved, in particular through a more effective coordination of national statistical systems.

3.3 Developing integrated information system for decent work data

The development of databases of decent work indicators that can be regularly updated and accessed by all stakeholders, including government agencies, employers’ organisations and trade unions, is an important mean of ensuring the sustainable monitoring of decent work at the country level.

Country example:

⇒ In **Indonesia**, decent work indicators derive from a variety of data sources, most notably labour force surveys (Sakernas) and administrative records (MoMT). The fact that they are stored in disparate and often unconnected locations in multiple agencies and ministries, however, undermines their availability and usability for policymaking. The development of an integrated information system for decent work data, together with a clear management structure and division of responsibilities, would make decent work data both more accessible and more relevant to stakeholders in the world of work – from policymakers designing labour and employment strategies, to unions devising lobbying activities and employers seeking data on employment and working conditions. The national Decent Work Indicators Information System (DWIIS) will offer a regularly updated database of decent work indicators that can be accessed online by all stakeholders in the world of work, including government agencies, employers and trade unions. The DWIIS should provide interactive tools that allow users to create custom reports on indicators related to decent work. The system should also be able to automatically compile data from various data sources (BPS, MoMT, Trade Unions and Employers Associations), in an internationally standardized form. This is currently being discussed by the BPS and MoMT with a view to reaching an agreement on management responsibilities.

⇒ In **Peru**, the National Statistics and Computer Technology Institute (INEI) has produced a first statistical publication on decent work indicators at the national level, selected from an agreed national list, and has committed itself to continuing to collect and publish the indicators that have been agreed upon on an annual basis. This commitment to annual monitoring of the quantitative indicators is an important step in the Peru’s social context.

⇒ In **Zambia**, the Ministry of Labour has decided to develop a database of labour statistics and decent work indicators, in the context of the development of the Labour Market Information System (LMIS) for Zambia, and within the SADC LMIS regional programme. This is the first step in the development of an integrated information system for decent work and a sustainable monitoring process.
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Monitoring and assessing progress on decent work

Development of a national decent work database in the Philippines

The Bureau for Labor and Employment Statistics (BLES) has compiled information on key decent work indicators from the labour force survey and external sources such as the Department of Labor and Employment’s administrative records (for data on social security coverage and industrial relations, for example). In recent years, however, BLES has become increasingly concerned about the need to make these data both more accessible and more relevant to non-specialist audiences, including policymakers and their advisors, and to the general public. Such efforts are critical to the process of raising awareness and understandings of decent work in the country, as well as to the incorporation of decent work objectives in national policies and legal framework.

In order to present decent work data in a more transparent, engaging and relevant way, BLES has developed an interactive, web-based database of key decent work indicators (collected from major national surveys and administrative records), in order to reflect the indicators compiled for the 2012 launched Decent Work Country Profile and allow users to retrieve and save data, and generate their own comparative data tables and charts on key indicators of their choice.

Being maintained online by BLES, the system would also open up the possibility of future “electronic-only” versions of the Decent Work Country Profile, or related national assessments of decent work.

The BLES established this national decent work database with the ILO/MAP support. The database has been publicly launched in December 2012 and serves as an easily accessible online information hub for labour and employment data (see the BLES website).

The ultimate aim of the initiative is to develop a one-stop portal for all decent work data, which should not only broaden awareness of decent work among key stakeholders, but also facilitate more effective monitoring and assessment of progress toward decent work in the Philippines. The system is established and run by BLES, with the support of the National Statistical and Coordination Board (NSCB).

ILO/MAP also supported the organisation of a specific training and capacity building for BLES staff, particularly in the use of statistical and database management software required to run the system, in order to ensure its management, including the cleaning and merging of data files, quality control, and regular updating.

Development of national decent work databases and integrated information systems

Countries are encouraged to develop national decent work databases and integrated information system for decent work, in order to ensure accessibility and sustainability of monitoring decent work.
3.4 Regional initiatives towards the harmonization of data collection tools

Steps have been taken at regional level to harmonize concepts and definitions on decent work, develop common labour force survey questionnaires and build regional databases on decent work. These regional efforts are an important mean of developing sustainable national statistical systems on decent work.

Regional knowledge sharing workshops organised from 2009 to 2012 by the ILO/MAP project helped to identify potential future collaborations among countries belonging to specific regional bodies for developing common data collection instruments (in particular labour force surveys) and regional databases on decent work statistics22.

In Latin America regional and sub-regional initiatives have been undertaken to produce common decent work indicators. At the regional level, the Statistical Conference of the Americas of the Economic Commission of the Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) which brings together 11 countries is developing a common statistical system on decent work. At the sub-regional level the Common Market of the Southern American countries (MERCOSUR) has been working on harmonizing definitions and concepts of key labour statistics and has established a decent work subsystem. The Regional Labour Observatory for Central America is also developing common survey questionnaires.

The African Union Community (AUC) has developed a project aiming to harmonize labour related information systems in Africa, with the purpose to set up a database on decent work. A list of 18 priority indicators has been agreed upon and the African member nations have been asked to provide statistical information for the compilation of the indicators on the basis of harmonized definitions. In addition, a core labour force survey questionnaire has been developed to collect similar data.

---

22 About ten regional workshops and a global meeting were held during the pilot phase under the MAP project, with the aim of sharing countries' experience on developing decent work indicators and decent work country profiles. Regional workshops were organized to raise awareness and national capacities on identifying decent work indicators. Regional training and knowledge sharing workshops were organized for 10 countries of Central and Eastern Europe (September 2012, Kiev, Ukraine) and for 10 countries of Asia and the Pacific (November 2012, Bangkok, Thailand). The participants came from the government institutions (Ministries of Labour and National Statistical Offices), as well as employers’ and workers’ organizations, academics and regional organizations (e.g., ASEAN, SAARC). Similar regional training and promotional activities took place in Africa and Latin America in which the MAP project countries shared their experience (including regional seminars in Santiago in October 2012, Lima in October 2011, Dakar in November 2011, and various regional meetings of SADC and WEAMU Secretariats in 2011, 2012 and 2013).
The Southern African Development Community initiative on developing a sub-regional database on decent work indicators

The need for the creation of a Labour Market Information System (LMIS) for the Southern African Development Community (SADC) was approved by the Integrated Committee of Ministers in June 2007 and reiterated by the SADC Ministers responsible for Employment and Labour and Social Partners in Maseru in April 2008.

SADC organized a Consensus Building Workshop on the Development of the SADC Employment and Labour Market Information Systems in 2011, with the ILO/MAP guidance. A prototype has been developed and the workshop proposed a minimum list of key indicators for the SADC LMIS, an implementation Action Plan, resource requirements and possible sources of funding.

In 2013, with ILO support, SADC approved a Decent Work Programme (2013-2019) in which the development of a LMIS is one of the key priorities. In addition, based on the ILO framework for the measurement of decent work, a manual was drafted to support SADC member states in developing the identified decent work indicators (minimal list of indicators). Countries are requested to collect data for the SADC regional database, which will provide information for the identified decent work indicators, compiled as far as possible in accordance with international statistical standards.

Capacity building activities are also planned, in order to strengthen national capacities on data processing and database management, particularly to national statistical offices, ministries of labour and social partners. A training workshop on the use of specific data processing and database management software required to establish and run the regional databases on decent work has been organised (Pretoria, December 2013) with the ILO/MAP support, so that the SADC Member States have improved their capacities on producing key labour market indicators from the international statistical standards, in order to produce regular reports on employment and decent work in SADC region.

The West African Economic and Monetary Union (WEAMU) decided to develop a sub-regional database on decent work through the creation of a sub-regional Employment and Vocational training Observatory; a minimum list of decent work indicators has been identified and a first database has been developed in 2012, with the ILO/MAP assistance. Supports are provided to the national Employment and Vocational training Observatories by the WEAMU.

A report on decent work indicators in Africa (a first assessment from national sources) was produced by the ILO/MAP in 2011: key decent work indicators have been compiled for 22 countries, and will be a valuable contribution to the establishment of the AUC database and the SADC and WEAMU sub-regional databases.

Decent work assessments for groups of countries may be useful in a regional perspective, particularly for specific regions such as Southern Africa, Western Africa and Central America, for economic and monetary unions such as the AUC, ASEAN, EU, and MERCOSUR or for groups of countries at a similar level of economic development, since countries in a specific region or...
economic grouping or at a similar level of economic development, since such countries may have much in common in terms of working conditions and data availability\textsuperscript{23}.

Regional decent work analysis would increase interaction between countries, enrich their knowledge base and familiarize them with the best practices of comparable countries. It would also be very informative for the tripartite partners as it would offer them an insight into regional progress towards decent work and be a valuable source of information for countries wishing to give added perspective to their national assessment of decent work.

Chapter 4:
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1. Reporting on progress towards decent work: methodology and key principles

1.1 Methodology and design of national reports

In order to assess country-level progress over time towards decent work objectives, it has been agreed to record such progress in “country profiles” using the ILO global methodological framework and a comprehensive list of indicators nationally identified, on which information would be compiled.

The standard structure adopted by the pilot-countries for reporting on main progress on decent work has consisted of 11 thematic chapters corresponding to the 10 “substantive areas” of the decent work agenda, plus one chapter on the social and economic context. Each chapter comprises a set of statistical and legal framework indicators pertaining to that particular area of decent work, together with an analytical narrative which brings the two types of information together and gives a factual and objective assessment of recent progress towards decent work.

The structure of the report has important advantages: it ensures that all ten aspects of decent work are covered and discussed in detail in the Profile, and discussing each aspect separately is easier than discussing several aspects of decent work at the same time (e.g. discussing employment opportunities, hours and earnings all together). Also, the structure ensures that each chapter is focused and reasonably concise and so easier to read. This structure makes it possible to move easily to the aspects of decent work that most interest the reader.

From the experience gained in the pilot-countries, the methodology and design of decent work country profiles have proved to be applicable to national requirements, and both robust and relevant in a wide variety of countries, irrespective of their level of development. The ten thematic areas – ranging from “employment opportunities” to “social dialogue, workers’ and employers’ representation” – are a meaningful way of structuring the national studies on decent work and constituents in the pilot countries could relate to them easily. The combination of statistical indicators and the legal framework indicators proved to be worthwhile undertaking.

The pilot-testing process has shown that the adopted structure is an excellent basis for assessing and monitoring progress toward decent work and communicating it to the public and tripartite partners. However, the proposed structure with separate chapters for each aspect of decent work implicitly encourages treating each aspect in isolation, whereas decent work is an integrated concept. It is therefore recommended to interpret data trends in one chapter be interpreted as far as possible with reference to other chapters.24

Whilst the standard 11-chapter methodology is a universal feature of all pilot profiles, some countries have also added extra chapters to highlight links to the Decent Work Country Programme (for example, Niger and South Africa have included an additional chapter on the priority indicators for monitoring the decent work country programme or strategy adopted at the national level), or to include additional information on specific topics (for example the second edition of the Brazil Profile includes a chapter 12 “Enterprises and decent work”).

24 The Guidelines on Assessing progress on decent work at the national level (2013), provides suggestions for an integrated analysis of the decent work indicators (including check lists of important issues and suggestions for possible figures combining various indicators).
Some countries have also produced additional profiles from further disaggregation by region or province to reflect decentralised governance systems and divergent socio-economic and labour market conditions (see for example the second edition of the Brazil Profile providing a sub-regional perspective and the three Provincial Profiles that Indonesia has produced in 2013).

To date, more than 20 countries have developed or are developing decent work country profiles, and several of them have already integrated key decent work indicators into national monitoring frameworks of national policies and programmes, as well as the decent work country programmes.  

The countries that have developed profiles to assess progress on decent work, have also provided insights into their institutional capabilities in terms of developing national information systems on labour market and decent work. As would be expected, countries with strong and effective state institutions and high statistical capacities have generally been able to provide a continuous, comprehensive and broad range of data on decent work (often above and beyond the standard ILO indicator list), and this has resulted in some very comprehensive decent work country profiles. However, in countries with weaker institutional and statistical capacities, profile datasets have typically contained large time intervals between data points and gaps in the coverage of the ten substantive areas, leading to limited assessments of progress towards decent work (see Chapter 3).

Although in some countries there are certain areas (wages, social security, social dialogue) where data accuracy and coverage have been a challenge, the pilot-countries’ experience has shown that it is still feasible to collect data on a broad range of decent work topics, as envisaged by the ILO conceptual framework.

Finally, even though some countries have been more constrained than others in reporting progress made towards decent work, given data availability issues (including scope, coverage, quality and frequency of data), the fact that having produced such reports has been extremely useful for boosting social dialogue on decent work in the country, and for enhancing national awareness and ownership on decent work objectives. Institutional and statistical weaknesses have been highlighted by tripartite constituent and governments have been requested to improve national information systems on labour market and decent work issues.

All the pilot-countries have planned to produce updated country profiles on decent work on a regular basis, and some of them have already produced updated versions that include recent data points (see the second editions of the Profiles of Brazil and Ukraine) or additional aspects (see the second edition of the Brazil’s Profile, which added regional disaggregation and indicators on enterprises). Updating such studies depends on the data production frequency in the country. In some cases, given the irregularity in data collection, progress towards decent work may be reviewed on specific aspect of decent work as frequently as the data becomes available.

---

25 To date, Decent Work Country Profiles have been developed for Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Brazil (including a second edition), Cambodia, Cameroon, Indonesia, Niger, Philippines, United Republic of Tanzania (mainland), Ukraine (including a second edition) and Zambia. Meanwhile, profiles for Cape Verde, Ethiopia, Jordan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Namibia, Peru, Senegal, South Africa and Pakistan are under development, while a number of other countries have expressed interest in developing them.
Standard structure of national reports on progress made towards decent work

In their Decent Work Country Profiles countries are encouraged to use a standard structure of 11 chapters to report on progress towards decent work: a background chapter describing the socio-economic-demographic context for decent work in the country, is followed by 10 chapters that describe, discuss and analyse one aspect of decent work and how it has evolved in the country in recent years. The standard outline of the profile is the following:

Chapter 1: Socio-economic and demographic context for decent work
Chapter 2: Employment opportunities
Chapter 3: Adequate earnings and productive work
Chapter 4: Decent working time
Chapter 5: Combining work, family and personal life
Chapter 6: Work that should be abolished
Chapter 7: Stability and security of work
Chapter 8: Equal opportunity and treatment in employment
Chapter 9: Safe work environment
Chapter 10: Social security
Chapter 11: Social dialogue, workers’ and employers’ representation

Countries may want to include additional chapters, for example, a chapter on priority areas and indicators for the design and the monitoring of national policies and programmes, such as Decent Work Country Programmes.

In all pilot countries, the profiles identified key aspects of decent work where progress had been made over the past ten or more years (see the example of Brazil).
Global picture of main progress towards decent work in Brazil (2000-2009)

A Decent Work Profile of Brazil was produced in 2009 and a second edition was released in 2012 with data for each one of the 27 federated units, revealing striking regional inequalities, and highlighting improvements made.

Several countercyclical and social protection measures that were implemented to fight 2008 financial crisis, have revived the country’s economy growth trend. In 2010, Brazil became the world’s seventh largest economy with a GDP growth of 7.5 percent that year. Between 2003 and 2009, 27.9 million people were lifted from poverty. In 2010 the share of the population living below the poverty line was 8.5 percent.

**Labour productivity** showed low dynamism and increased by about 1 per cent per annum between 2000 and 2009. In 2009, the services sector share in the national employment structure reached 61 percent. Total labour force participation rate increased to 76 percent in 2009.

**Unemployment rates** show high inequalities related to gender, colour, age and location. In 2009, the unemployment rate for women (11 percent) was much higher than that for men (6 percent). Among youth (ages 15 to 24 years) this rate was 18 percent, and 23 percent among young women. Inequality is even more significant among black female youths, among whom the unemployment rate was as high as 25 percent, 12 percentage points higher than that for white male youths. The proportion of youths neither studying nor working was 18 percent in 2009.

Between 2003 and 2010, 15.4 million **formal jobs** were created in Brazil, an accumulated increase of 54 per cent in eight years. The employment formality rate increased from 47 per cent in 2004 to 53 per cent in 2009.

**Gender wage gap** (29 percent) and **colour wage gap** (42 percent) in 2009 reflect large labour market inequalities. The remuneration gap between the main job of men and women, although still high, decreased during the period being analysed: in 2004, women earned on average, approximately 69 percent of the earnings of men, a proportion that slightly increased to 71 percent in 2009. In terms of the colour of male and female workers, the earnings of Blacks workers as a proportion of those of White workers rose from 53 percent to 58 percent in the same period.

The **proportion of working children** (ages 5 to 17 years) decreased from 11.8 percent in 2004 to 9.8 percent in 2009.

The percentage of **workers with excessive hours** (more than 48 hours per week) has declined from 19 percent in 2004 to 6 percent in 2009. Over the same period, there was a significant reduction (from 36 per cent to 30 per cent) in the share of workers with a working week of more than 44 hours, the maximum allowed by the Brazilian legislation. Among the various economic sectors, there were marked differences in the percentages of people working more than 44 hours per week in 2009: from 11 per cent in the education, health, and social services to 49 per cent in the lodging and food service sector.

In 2009 some 91 per cent of working Brazilian women also performed **domestic tasks**, while among men the number was significantly lower (50 per cent) in 2009. In the same year, women workers - besides the hours spent with regular work in the labour market - also spent on average 22 hours per week performing domestic tasks, while men spent 9.5 hours per week.

The **rate of incidence of occupational injuries** that was equal to 23 for every 1,000 labour contracts in 2008 dropped to 22 in 2009 and then to 19 in 2010. The mortality rate for occupational injuries declined systematically in the 2000s: from 13 deaths per 100,000 working contracts in 2002, to 9 in 2008 and reached 7 in 2010. The number of fatal injuries decreased from 2,817 in 2008 to 2,712 in 2010.

The second half of the first decade of the 2000s was marked by significant growth in the **proportion of the employed who contributed to the social security system**, and for the first time more than half of the employed aged 16 and over were covered by the system. This increase, from 48 per cent in 2004 to 54 per cent in 2009, was predominantly attributable to the growth of formal employment and, on another level, to various incentives to introduce formal labour relations and include more workers in the social security system.
The prevalence of collective bargaining, which resulted in salary increases in excess of the national consumer price index, was 88 per cent in 2010 (the highest ever attained). The union density rate remained relatively stable at around 18 per cent between 2004 and 2009. In 2009 the union density rate for men (19 per cent) was greater than that for women (17 per cent) and that of White workers (20 per cent) was greater than that of Black workers (17 per cent). The rate for rural area workers (24 per cent) was significantly higher than that for urban workers (15 per cent).

In 2009, enterprises were responsible for employing 70 percent of all employees and paid 61% of the entire volume of wages and other forms of remuneration. Micro and Small Enterprises represented 99 per cent of formal establishments and accounted for 52 per cent of formal non-agricultural private jobs in Brazil and approximately 40 per cent of wages in 2010.

Source: Decent Work Country Profile of Brazil Second edition, and the Snapshot Summary of the Profile of Brazil (2012)

1.2 An integrated analysis of decent work indicators

An integrated approach that permits an analysis of all the dimensions of decent work together is essential for any assessment based on facts, derived from the decent work indicators identified by national stakeholders. Moreover, taking the national social and economic context into account and analysing trends among different categories and groups (by gender, age, vulnerable group, etc.) is essential for an accurate measurement of progress on decent work.

Assessing progress on decent work needs to be based on a comprehensive list of qualitative and quantitative indicators in order to cover all dimensions of decent work, and to allow an integrated analysis of decent work, that goes beyond the collection of a disparate set of labour market indicators.

The ILO framework for the measurement of decent work provides a robust framework based on sound measurement principles for analysing qualitative and quantitative data in an integrated approach that ensures that the four decent work strategic objectives (employment, social protection, rights at work, social dialogue) which are all equally important and mutually reinforcing, are addressed together and as effectively as possible. Given that the various aspects of decent work are interrelated, the decent work indicators should be analysed all together rather than individually.

In order to assess progress towards decent work objectives at the national level over time, it is important that the indicators be analysed within a country’s social, economic and institutional context and legal framework. The statistical indicators should therefore be analysed along with complementary legal indicators and context indicators.
The following key principles should guide the analysis of decent work indicators (see country examples):

- National assessments of decent work need to analyze linkages between decent work indicators within and between the ten substantive elements of decent work: employment opportunities; adequate earnings and productive work; decent working time; combining work, family and personal life; work that should be abolished; stability and security of work; equal opportunity and treatment in employment; safe work environment; social security; and social dialogue, employers’ and workers’ representation. Decent work is a comprehensive concept and whose various aspects are interrelated. For example, the unemployment rate and the employment-to-population ratio, the hours of work per month and earnings per month, the frequency of excessive hours of work and the low-pay rate, the frequency of excessive hours of work and the occupational injury rate may all be related, as may occupational segregation by gender, the male-female wage gap and the type of jobs held by women.

- Information on the social and economic context of a given country is essential for analysing the trend in decent work indicators, as well as the legal and policy framework, so that factors that hinder and promote progress towards decent work can be identified. Social, macroeconomic and demographic indicators should be used when interpreting the indicators of each of the ten substantive elements of decent work. For instance economic growth, labour productivity and wages/earnings indicators may be interrelated; and minimum wage laws may have an impact on the wages/earnings indicators. Background information on the country is also very helpful. For instance, it is useful to know whether the country is a low, lower-middle, upper–middle or high-income country, whether it belongs to an economic and monetary un-
ion, the degree of openness of its economy, its demographic situation, the extent to which its economy is dependent on a particular sector such as mining or the garment industry.

- Analysing quantitative indicators and contextual information on the legal and policy framework, including rights at work, is an essential facet of the measurement of decent work. Systematic information on rights at work and the legal framework for decent work needs to be compiled in order to analyze the statistical indicators within the legal framework for decent work, including the effective application of rights at work. In particular, changes in rights at work and in the legal framework for decent work that countries introduce to develop national legislation or its application are important information for interpreting recent trends in statistical decent work indicators.

---

**Box 10: Interpreting decent work indicators together and in the national context**

The interpretation of the level and trend of statistical indicators requires careful analysis, and changes in each statistical indicator should be interpreted by taking into account underlying components and factors. It is recommended that statistical indicators be evaluated along with changes in other related statistical decent work indicators, with economic and social context indicators, and with the corresponding legal framework indicators.

In other words, no single statistical indicator (even a composite indicator) can determine the presence or absence of decent work. It is only by analysing a full set of selected decent work indicators - including context indicators and legal framework indicators - that the complex picture emerges regarding the progress made towards decent work at the country level.

Thus, a decline or an increase in a given indicator may point to progress in the corresponding dimension of decent work in one country but to a deterioration in another country, owing to differences in underlying components or factors. Thus:

(i) **the increase in an indicator that would generally be interpreted positively may not necessarily correspond to an improvement in the situation**

For example, when high or increased the employment-to-population ratios and labour force participation rates (measuring employment in a positive sense) are observed, that does not necessarily indicate an improved situation for workers (especially in rural areas in developing countries). To interpret these two indicators properly, one must analyse complementary indicators, particularly, those on the type and quality of employment (employment by status, informal employment, share of wage employment).

(ii) **a decline in a given indicator that would generally be interpreted positively may point to a deterioration in a given national context**

For example, a declining unemployment rate may generally be viewed positively if there is simultaneously a growing demand for labour as indicated by an increasing employment-to-population ratio; on the other hand, it may be interpreted negatively if it is accompanied by a diminishing employment-to-population ratio outpaced by a declining labour force participation rate (persons leaving the labour force for various reasons such as discouragement over job prospects, educational opportunities, retirement).

In developing countries, a high employment-to-population ratio is not necessarily a positive result, as it may signal limited education options for young people, minimal or non-existent unemployment assistance or other social benefits and/or economic hardship, while a very high ratio
An integrated approach is needed to assess progress made towards decent work

An integrated approach is essential for any fact-based assessment on decent work. It ensures that the four decent work strategic objectives (employment, social protection, rights at work, social dialogue) are addressed together, within the social and economic context and the legal and policy framework.

Source: ILO guidelines on Assessing progress towards decent work at the national level, and ILO manual on Decent Work Indicators, 2013.
Box 11: Key principles for analysing indicators: example from adequate earnings indicators

Seven statistical indicators are selected to help countries to monitor the progress made in promoting adequate earnings and productive work: working poverty rate (MDG indicator), employees with low-pay rate, average hourly earnings by occupation group, average real wages, minimum wage as a percentage of the median wage, manufacturing wage index, and employees with recent job training.

These indicators should be analysed in the light of the socio-economic context and the legal and policy framework in one country. This would include:

(i) Information on national laws, regulations and policies concerned with promoting employment

A statutory minimum wage is an important policy option for influencing wages, especially low wages, and setting a minimum wage is therefore a valuable tool for alleviating poverty as well as for improving gender equity because women are more likely than men to earn low wages. When analysing the indicators on productive earnings, it is important to consider the coverage of minimum wage laws and the types of workers covered. Minimum wage laws often exclude workers in smaller enterprises and they are generally not applied effectively to workers in informal jobs. Collective bargaining agreements that set minimum wages for certain sectors or large numbers of workers should be also considered.

It is worth referring to any national policies or legal commitments for improving wages, especially for lower-wage workers. A statutory minimum wage is not the only way of influencing the level of wages; there are also policies to improve human capital and labour productivity, such as training and job placement, as well as active labour market and infrastructure development policies, and services to increase productivity in small farms. It is also worth discussing the coverage, quality and cost of public health care for workers (indicators on social protection) since it has a major effect on whether wages and income from work are sufficient to meet workers’ basic needs.

(ii) Social and economic context

It is important to analyse the extent to which changes in wages are related to changes in GDP per capita and labour productivity. Do increases in per capita income, labour productivity and economic development translate into higher real wages as one would expect? If not, why not? For countries with a deteriorating economy, have wages and/or labour productivity suffered? Have precarious workers been more affected during periods of economic crisis?

Complementary indicators should be used when interpreting indicators on earnings. The minimum wage as a percentage of the median wage illustrates the extent to which the minimum wage is able to help workers meet their basic needs and may be analysed in the light of the low-pay and working poverty rates. It is important to consider how well the minimum wage has kept its real value over time. Indicators on decent working time (such as time-related under-employment), on stability and security at work (such as precarious jobs), on social security and social dialogue, provide generally additional information to better interpret trends of indicators on earnings.

Source: Guidelines on Assessing progress towards decent work at the national level (Geneva, ILO, 2013).
Finally, it is essential to disaggregate decent work indicators for different groups of the employed population (by age, sex, location, status in employment, sector of activity, etc.). To capture gender differences in access to decent work, the profiles cover themes with a particular gender relevance (e.g., combining work, family and personal life, or equal opportunity and treatment in employment) and provide disaggregation by sex for most indicators. Other demographic variables have been used in some countries for disaggregation purposes (migrant workers, disabled workers, etc.). This led to a number of relevant findings (see the example of Brazil).

Analysing decent work indicators across different population groups is essential

For a sound analysis of decent work, it is recommended that the selected indicators be disaggregated by sex, age, location (urban/rural), status in employment, educational attainment, occupation and economic activity, social groups and vulnerable groups (migrants workers, disabled workers, etc.).

In particular, as the decent work indicators cover all workers, differences in access to decent work for men and women should be measured to ensure that gender issues are properly addressed.

Even if national statistical systems have their own classifications, it is recommended that the international classification systems be used to disaggregate the indicators, in the interest of comparability.
**Box 12: Analysing decent work indicators for different population groups: key examples**

- **Employment indicators** are generally disaggregated by sex, age, location (urban/rural), status in employment, educational attainment, occupation and economic activity. The disaggregation of the employment-to-population ratio by component groups such as sex, age group, urban and rural areas, and educational attainment provides a measure by which to evaluate differences in employment between different population groups. Disaggregation of total employment by key classifications such as status in employment, economic activity, and occupation provides valuable information on the structure of employment whose changing composition will affect the employment-to-population ratio. The quality and type of employment opportunities are measured through four indicators: employment status, informal employment, share of wage employment in non-agricultural employment, and proportion of own-account workers and contributing family workers in total employment (vulnerable employment). As general measures of quality and type of employment, these four indicators serve for interpreting the other dimensions of decent work. The statistical indicators on the other nine elements of decent work rely on these indicators as they help determine the effective coverage of laws and regulations that often do not cover actors in the informal economy effectively. For this reason it is generally useful to indicate the relative level of each indicator by gender, rural-urban area and disadvantaged group when appropriate.

- Many decent work indicators can be disaggregated by age group, and some are more relevant when analyzed this way. In developing countries, for example, the unemployment rate is typically higher among young people (especially better educated youth) and the distribution of unemployed by age and by level of education needs to be reported. In addition, the indicator on youth not in employment, education or training (NEET) provides important complementary information. As a measure of youth who are outside the educational system, not in training and not in employment, it serves as a broad and complementary measure of the youth unemployment rate. A high NEET rate as compared with the youth unemployment rate could mean that a large number of young people are discouraged workers, or do not have access to education or training. This indicator should be analysed in conjunction with the labour force participation rates by age, sex and educational attainment group.

- The importance of capturing **gender differences** in access to decent work has been stressed many times. In order to shed light on the gender aspects of decent work, indicators should be measured separately for women and men whenever possible. The analysis of decent work indicators should not only provide gender disaggregation wherever possible in the decent work indicators but also draw attention to, and analyse, thematic topics that have particular gender implications (reflecting the different needs and constraints of women and men workers and the specific living conditions concerns of workers and their families), such as “combining work, family and personal life”, “decent working time and “equal opportunity and treatment in employment”.

---

The legal framework for gender issues is also an important reference point for analysing decent work indicators - for example, laws, policies and regulations that are intended to improve equal opportunity and treatment in employment by facilitating working life for women with family responsibilities (by means of breastfeeding breaks, maternity leave, family planning, health care, etc., or by combating sexual harassment and sexual violence at work). It is also important to indicate which sectors and industries are subject to the laws and regulations on equal opportunity and treatment in employment, together with an estimate of the proportion of workers covered. Women and men are affected differently by labour laws and have different labour market outcomes. As data by gender exist for many if not most statistical decent work indicators, gender differences and gaps should be discussed and analysed in every dimension, including the extent to which there has been progress toward decent work for women in recent years.

Almost every country has vulnerable groups of workers and groups that suffer from a disadvantage because of the discrimination they face. These groups tend to be affected differently by labour laws and to have worse labour market outcomes than others. To the extent possible, therefore, decent work indicators should be disaggregated by social group, so as to analyse the situation for these disadvantaged groups in every dimension of decent work (employment opportunities, adequate earnings, decent working time, social security, social dialogue, etc.).

Concern for improving the conditions of the most vulnerable workers requires that decent work statistical indicators measure as far as practical and relevant, how many workers work under unacceptable conditions, in terms of the aspect of decent work that is measured. This often means that it is preferable to collect data on the tail of a distribution (or on the entire distribution) rather than only on the mean or the median.

Decent work indicators are generally analysed at the country level, but they may also be disaggregated at provincial and municipal level. Brazil and Indonesia have already produced decent work indicators and prepared assessments by provinces and regional federated states. In very large and diverse countries, a single national value for the decent work indicators is of limited value given the major differences that exist between regions.

Decent work indicators may also be disaggregated at the sectoral level. Indonesia and Uruguay have thus produced an analysis by economic activity, using a national classification and the International Standard Industrial Classification of All Economic Activities

Source: Guidelines on Assessing progress towards decent work at the national level, ILO/MAP, 2013.
2. The importance of tripartite consultation and national ownership

Country profiles have been developed in the pilot-countries in collaboration with tripartite constituents and with national statistical offices and other state and non-state bodies. In order to ensure that profiles are factually accurate and reflect constituents’ concerns, all countries conducted a process of extensive consultation by holding tripartite meetings and validation workshops prior to the finalization and publication of the studies. By engaging constituents from the start and giving them an opportunity to shape the country profile’s development and check the quality and relevance of data and analysis, the global methodology has been successful both in fostering national ownership over the process and in enhancing the relevance of the profiles to national policymaking and development planning.

Tripartite consultation has also helped to overcome disputes and build consensus around difficult decent work issues, thus strengthening the legitimacy of the initiative in the eyes of constituents. Tripartite involvement in the preparation of the country profiles was essential in its own right but also encouraged fact-based social dialogue at the national level. Social dialogue in support of Decent Work Country Profiles was facilitated by tripartite discussions and consensus building on key decent work issues and by the effective design, monitoring and evaluation of Decent Work Country Programmes and national policies (such as employment and social protection policies).

The extensive consultations pursued in reaching agreement on lists of nationally appropriate indicators have ensured strong national ownership of the decent work country profiles.

The close involvement of constituents throughout the process has proved to be a major - and perhaps the defining - factor in the success of the country profiles to date. Cooperation with national statistical offices, ministries in charge of labour and other institutions has been crucial in ensuring that the analysis contained in the profiles is based on reliable and nationally recognized statistics, while the official validation process – conducted by tripartite workshops that discuss the draft reports – has been shown to be an effective forum in which to verify information and analysis and recommend further revisions before publication and dissemination.

To ensure broad consultation, national ownership and legitimacy, a general approach has been pursued in all countries for the development of decent work country profiles:

- Early consultations with constituents regarding the objectives of monitoring and assessing progress on decent work and the identification of nationally relevant indicators; discussions on which indicators should be selected are conducted and national lists of indicators agreed by constituents (see chapter 2).

- A collaborative process for the compilation of indicators: the statistical indicators are compiled in close collaboration with ministries in charge of labour, national statistical offices and other relevant national agencies (the selected indicators are usually obtained from published sources or computed from primary data sets, generally household surveys and administrative data, see chapter 3); the legal indicators with information on rights at work and the legal framework for decent work, are compiled from national legislative sources, from information generated by the ILO supervisory system, and from existing ILO legal databases.
A coordinated process for the preparation of national studies by national consultants, in close collaboration with national statistical offices and ministries in charge of labour and other relevant agencies, with ILO assistance; the process may be led and coordinated by a technical tripartite committee (see country examples).

A national tripartite validation process that allows constituents and other stakeholders to review the draft report and recommend revisions before finalisation, in order to ensure that profiles are accurate and adequately reflect constituents’ concerns.

Official launch events to allow for official endorsement and release of the profile by tripartite constituents; complementary media and publicity campaigns have also been undertaken in a number of countries alongside the launch of new or revised Decent Work Country Programmes; policy briefings have been produced to illustrate the links between decent work country profiles and policymaking.

Tripartite consensus building is essential for the development of decent work country profiles

The development process of decent work country profiles involves the close involvement of tripartite constituents from start to finish (from the identification of indicators to the validation of the report, and its dissemination for discussions with policy makers).

Tripartite consultations are a key factor in fostering national ownership over the process and enhancing the relevance of the studies to national policymaking. They also encourage fact-based social dialogue and consensus building on key decent work issues.

A close collaborative work between statistical offices, national agencies and social partners (on data compilation and analysis), and coordinated processes for the review of the report and the dissemination of its main results are needed.
The Decent Work Country Profile of Niger as a major input for the design and monitoring of the Decent Work Country Programme

Niger’s new Government (following the 2011 presidential elections) adopted a social and economic development plan (SEDP) under which the Niger Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) was reviewed according to the Government’s new vision and finalized through broad tripartite consultation led by the Ministry of Labour. The Decent Work Country Profile that Niger developed in 2012 was a major input for the formulation of the country’s DWCP, as it provided a global picture of progress and shortcoming in decent work and helped to identify target areas and indicators. Tripartite constituents were involved from the start in developing the indicators and Country Profile; a national list of indicators was identified in 2011 and constituents selected a short priority list of indicators for monitoring the Niger DWCP and possible incorporation in the SEDP. The Niger DWCP and Country Profile were reviewed and validated at a validation workshop in July 2012.

The Country Profile also served to bring the data closer to key policy-makers and social partners, by whom it was deemed to be a desirable of boosting national statistical capacities for measuring decent work. A stronger statistical and analytical basis for policy-making on decent work was needed for the Government’s new development strategy and it therefore implemented a labour force survey combined with a survey on the informal sector in 2012 and 2013. The ILO/MAP project provided Niger with financial and technical support to conduct the surveys, in collaboration with other donors (World Bank, UNDP), particularly with respect to the design of the labour force survey questionnaire and data processing and analysis.

The Country Profile was developed under the coordination of a technical committee led by the Ministry of Labour, with close involvement of trade unions and employers’ organizations. At the validation workshop in July 2012 constituents requested that some data be updated and that a supplementary chapter be added on the decent work indicators and the monitoring of Niger’s DWCP. The Country Profile was published after the tripartite validation workshop had incorporated constituents’ comments in the report. The Decent Work Country Profile was launched alongside the DWCP in mid-2013 with a large media campaign.
The preparation of the Country Profile was led by the Advisory Committee of the Zambia Decent Work Country Programme (Z-DWCP), with a strong commitment of the Country Statistical Office (CSO) and the Ministry of Labour, trade unions and employer organisations. The study was published in March 2012 and included the revisions requested by the constituents at the validation workshop organized in December 2011. The study was presented at important meetings, such as the ILO-IMF Conference (Lusaka, March 2012) and widely disseminated at a launch event along with a large media campaign in January 2013. The Profile has been an important tool for designing the new Z-DWCP (2012-2106) and was a reference document used by constituents at tripartite technical meetings on the Z-DWCP in 2012.

The Decent Work Country Profile for Zambia provided a concise analysis of progress made and gaps on decent work: it helped incorporate priority indicators in the new DWCP, served as an advocacy tool for key policy makers and legislators and further enhanced local ownership of the Z-DWCP.

The profile was prepared by local consultants engaged to work in collaboration with the CSO and the Ministry of Labour and a tripartite committee was set up to review the report. Various drafts were produced and reviewed in meetings involving various ministries and social partners, and the final draft report was discussed in a tripartite workshop in December 2011.

The main challenges encountered when developing the Zambia Profile, were related to data quality and frequency issues, as the information was provided from different surveys using different methodologies (labour force surveys, living conditions surveys) and incomplete data from administrative records. National data processing and analysis capacities were limited, and on-site technical assistance and training were provided by the ILO/MAP.

Nevertheless, the Decent Work Country Profile provided concise analysis and very useful insights on the progress made towards decent work, and was considered as extremely relevant for the development of the new Z-DWCP. Furthermore, the Decent Work Country was an important tool for the new government (elected in 2012) and for boosting social dialogue in the country.

The Decent Work Country Profile contained important findings: despite positive macroeconomic indicators (due to structural reforms and an increase of mining activities such as in copper production), the employment level and poverty rate have not improved. Informal employment declined marginally and the unemployment rate stood at around 8 per cent in 2008. The working poverty rate declined over the considered period from 73 per cent in 1998 to 64 per cent in 2008. Gender inequalities were persistent, and there were more women in low status jobs. The number of persons working more than the legal maximum hours of work declined to about 12 per cent; and several legal provisions were adopted in make it possible to balance work and family life. Child labour was a major issue, and laws and policies on the subject have been put in place. Regulations were also introduced concerning stability and security of work since precarious jobs was on the increase. Legal provisions were adopted on equal opportunities and women’s share of the labour force increased. Even though there were legal provisions to protect against occupational disease, capacities to enforce these provisions are inadequate.
The development of Brazil Decent Work Country Profile

With strong national statistical capacities, Brazil benefits from a comparably robust and timely system of national labour statistics. Within this framework, the country is able to produce a wide range of decent work indicators on a regular basis, for use in policymaking. The development of a national decent work country profile in 2009 helped to measure progress and deficits in decent work at the national level, and to promote the wider use of decent work data for policymaking and development planning.

Given the social and institutional characteristics of the country, labour market characteristics vary widely within the country's 26 federated units and the federal district (Brasilia); the success of decent work policies and programmes depends to a large extent on the capacity and effectiveness of federal states, which need to be informed of progress and remaining gaps at their level. In this context, national partners required the development of decent work indicators and assessments on progress made at the federal level.

The second edition of the Decent Work Country Profile has 12 chapters on decent work indicators trends with a series of disaggregated data relative to the Brazil’s 26 federated units and the federal district. The study aims to facilitate the analysis of the country’s heterogeneous nature in all dimensions of decent work. Breaking down data by Federation Unit (UF) is not only important from an analytical point of view, but is also highly relevant for the formulation of national policies. The study has been prepared from updated data, including additional indicators and levels of disaggregation, in order to inform local governments of progress made towards decent work for the design or review of the provincial decent work programmes.

The second edition of the Profile was preceded by a wide consultation process with the Brazil tripartite constituents. In June 2011, in partnership with the IBGE, a technical workshop on decent work indicators and national household surveys was held with representatives federal and state governments which had adopted decent work programmes, employers, workers and academia. Between July and August 2011, this consultation and discussion process was significantly expanded with six regional training workshops focusing on the elaboration and analysis of decent work indicators (involving 155 experts in total, from the government (federal and state-level), employers’ and workers’ organizations, academia and other civil society organizations from 25 of the federated units. These workshops were held under the cooperation agreement signed between the ILO and the FONSTE (National Forum of Labor Secretariats), as part of the ILO technical assistance in preparation for the State Conference of Employment and Decent Work (Brasilia, August 2012). The workshops were an opportunity to present and discuss several new indicators incorporated in the second edition of the Brazil Decent Work Profile. Finally, in May 2012, a tripartite consultation workshop took place, in which the methodology, the indicators and the main findings of the report were discussed, in addition to possible policy recommendations formulated to promote decent work in national planning.
3. Assessing progress on decent work for national policy making and monitoring

A national assessment of progress towards decent work over a given period (generally, the last decade), entails the compilation of all available data on statistical and legal indicators from national sources, on the basis of national lists of indicators identified through a tripartite consensus. In analysing the trend in indicators, the assessment takes into account the social and economic context as well as national policies and institutions. It identifies the main areas where progress has been made over the period considered and the main areas where decent work deficits remain. This allows policy-makers and social partners to obtain a global picture at a given point in time and helps them to identify any adjustments that are needed to national policies and programmes.

Assessments of progress towards decent work are therefore used to inform national planning and policy-making. They help policy-makers identify priority areas (i.e., the principal decent work deficits) and provide baseline indicators that can serve to identify target indicators for the monitoring of key policies and programmes that have a direct or indirect effect on employment and decent work.

In many countries that have developed such national studies on the basis of a list of nationally identified indicators, they have been used by national stakeholders and social partners as a key advocacy tool for mainstreaming priority labour market issues in national development plans and for identifying key performance indicators for inclusion in national monitoring frameworks.

The set of decent work indicators identified nationally by constituents, support the monitoring of decent work at the country level, and can also be reviewed in the light of major changes in the national context (see chapter 2).

Experience in pilot countries has shown that decent work country profiles can be particularly relevant and useful for national stakeholder and tripartite constituents, in particular for developing policies and programmes at the national and local levels, and for designing and revising the Decent Work Country Programmes.

- Thanks to the extensive tripartite consultation in developing the Country Profiles, the data they contain tend to be more readily accepted and less controversial than others. Broad acceptance of the data at the validation stage is a key feature of the profiles, and it has proved to be a key factor in facilitating reasoned and fact-based discussion and to help constituents engage in the discussion of national policies and plans concerning labour and employment issues and wider socio-economic development.

- Country Profiles have also proved useful in mapping the decent work landscape and identifying not only areas of recent progress but, more importantly, areas where components of decent work are lagging behind. The Profiles are thus a key tool for effective policy diagnosis enabling the analysis of progress in national economic, labour and social policies.

- The data and analysis contained in Country Profiles can also assist strategic planning and the design of national development policies and programmes on decent work. Decent work country programmes in particular have been criticised in the past for the absence of reliable data baselines that would inform both design and priority-setting. The ILO’s country offices have highlighted the potential value of integrating Country Profiles into the DWCP development cycle, so as to strengthen the information and evidence base for designing, monitoring and evaluating the documents.
Country examples

Regardless their level of development several pilot countries (Brazil, Indonesia, Niger, Philippines, Ukraine and Zambia) have used their Country Profiles as a basis for developing policies and programmes at the national and provincial levels and for incorporating key decent work indicators into the monitoring framework of national policies and programmes. In Armenia, Niger, and Zambia, the DWCP over the period 2012-25 were formulated on the basis of the information contained in the Decent Work Country Profiles, which provided constituents with a practical tool for prioritizing DWCP outcomes and strategies.28

In Ukraine the decent work country profile helped to integrate decent work in national policy. In 2011 a presidential decree on urgent poverty eradication measures was issued in which decent work was recognized as crucial to any policy aiming to eradicate poverty and many aspects of decent work have been incorporated in the country’s national programmes for 2010-15 on employment promotion, enhancing labour incomes, pension reform, social protection, protection of children rights, etc. The Country Profile has been contributed to the introduction of reforms in the national legislation on labour market issues. In 2012 the revised DWCP (2012-15) was adopted along with an international cooperation memorandum on decent work signed between the ILO and Ukraine, in which the decent work indicators have been included as fundamental data for setting DWCP goals.

In Cambodia, the first decent work country profile has been developed in 2012, when the country faced specific challenges in terms of data availability. The use of data from the three most recent socio-economic surveys was proposed as a first step, meanwhile a Labour Force Survey implemented in 2012, will provide updated data for a future edition of the country profile. The first Profile of Cambodia published in 2012, highlighted areas where decent work was progressing and areas with decent work deficits. It thus helped to identify decent work priorities and challenges for purposes of policy design. This extended to development planning, particularly with respect to mainstreaming decent work issues in the Rectangular Strategy and National Strategic Development Plan. The Country Profile is also expected to be a key resource in monitoring and evaluating Cambodia’s Decent Work Country Programme.

The Philippines benefits from a comparably robust and timely national system of labour statistics, with effective national institutions - the National Statistics Office and Bureau of Labor and Employment Statistics - and a regular and improving system of labour force surveys. The Philippines government has continually sought to strengthen the evidence basis for policymaking across the decent work agenda. Both the current national Labor and Employment Plan (LEP, 2011-2016), and the labour component of the Philippines Development Plan (PDP, 2011-2016) adopt the conceptual framework of decent and productive work as a means to ensure sustainable and inclusive growth in the country. The Philippines can already produce a wide range of decent work indicators on a regular basis, and has earmarked several others which will require future modification to the LFS questionnaire. However, to date, use of such indicators to measure progress on decent work has been limited. The development of a national decent work country profile for the Philippines was a means of addressing this issue and promoted the wider use –and influence- of decent work data for policymaking and development planning in the country. The process of compiling the indicators and preparing the Profile was led by BLES, in close collaboration with the Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE), trade unions and employer organisations.

The Decent Work Country Profile of the Philippines has been used to underscore the importance of integrating the decent work agenda in the national development strategy. National constituents have highlighted the fact that the Profile was a sound basis for tracking and evaluating progress on decent work outcomes, and provided inputs for planning, programming and targeting, and a feedback mechanism for implementing national programmes that promote decent work. The Profile provided also served as a reference point for reviewing existing laws, policies, institutional mechanisms and arrange-

28 See the reports of the tripartite validation workshops for the Country Profiles of Niger and Zambia, available at www.ilo.org/map
ments, and encouraged social dialogue. Visibility of the decent work agenda in the country has also increased as a result of the publication and the large dissemination of the Profile.

**Indonesia** benefits from a reliable and timely national system of labour statistics, with a quarterly labour force survey and a strong national statistical office (Badan Pusat Statistik - BPS). Within this framework, the country produces a wide range of decent work indicators on a regular basis, for use in policymaking. However, use of such indicators to comprehensively measure progress across the different dimensions of decent work was limited. The decent work country profile for Indonesia was developed to address this, and to promote the wider use—and influence—of decent work data for policymaking and development planning in the country.

The national profile was developed the Ministry of Manpower and Transmigration (MoMT), in close collaboration with BPS, researchers from University of Jakarta, trade unions and employer organisations, with the ILO/MAP assistance. It was revised by constituents at a tripartite national validation workshop in 2011, then finalized and published in 2012 (in English and Bahasa). A launch event was organised and media materials disseminated alongside the Indonesia Profile, early 2012. The Profile provided important inputs for designing and implementing the Indonesia DWCP.

In addition, the MoMT in collaboration with the BPS and researchers from the University of Indonesia, and with the assistance of ILO/MAP, developed decent work indicators at the sectoral level, in order to provide additional insights and add a sectoral component to the national Decent Work Country Profile. A separate study was prepared, from a sectoral breakdown of key decent work indicators, providing new information and insights for the mainstreaming decent work in sectoral policies, in particular industrial policies and trade-related policies in Indonesia.
Chapter 4: National assessments of progress towards decent work

Monitoring and assessing progress on decent work

Decent Work Profiles at provincial level: the case of Indonesia

Following the 1997 economic crisis and subsequent political transition to a new democratic system, Indonesia embarked on an ambitious programme of political and administrative decentralization. These changes have had profound implications for labour market governance and administration in Indonesia, as well as for the wider evolution of labour market characteristics in the country’s 33 provinces. Since 1998, responsibilities for policy issues such as employment creation, minimum wage setting, occupational safety and health, social safety nets, and various labour and employment laws have increasingly fallen to local government units. In this context the success of decent work policies and programmes has depended to a large extent on the capacity and effectiveness of local governments.

The Ministry of Manpower and Transmigration (MoMT) worked with the BPS, researchers from University of Jakarta, trade unions and employer organisations, for the production of Decent Work Profiles for East Java, East Nusa Tenggara (NTT) and Maluku.

The Decent Work Profiles for East Java, East Nusa Tenggara (NTT) and Maluku use provincially disaggregated data (primarily from the Labour Force Survey) to present an overview of recent progress made toward decent work in these provinces and to identify remaining gaps and data deficiencies, as well as providing the basis for further analysis and policy recommendations for decent work and broader national development. The objective was that the provincial profiles be used as an advocacy tool to mainstream decent work objectives into provincial development programmes and plans.

The national assessments on decent work developed in the pilot-countries, have equipped constituents with relevant information for evidence-based national dialogue, policy making and development planning. Moreover, the experience has also enabled the ILO to help strengthen national data collection instruments in countries dealing with limited statistical capacities and resources. At the country level, the development of national assessments on decent work has enabled constituents to lever (and in some cases adapt) existing resources and capacities to develop an effective means to measure various decent work dimensions and changes over time.

Owing to the widespread use of international statistical standards and definitions (see Chapter 2), profiles are also broadly comparable between countries, which has proven useful for constituents wishing to conduct comparative analysis, particularly between countries in the same region or with the same level of development29.

Related to the above, the use of a standardised format with internationally comparable data, although not comprehensive (not all indicators and countries can be compared), is broadly supported by constituents. Profiles give examples of successful initiatives by national constituents that could be replicated in other countries in the same region. Also, some countries appreciated that the profiles can facilitate comparisons between countries from on a common system of indicators. Employers and workers in Indonesia and the Philippines, for example, noted that cross-country comparability in the South-East Asian region is useful for their own research and

29 See ILO/MAP Statistical decent work indicators compiled by country groupings. Evidence from 14 pilot countries (2013)
advocacy activities, when it comes to the laws and policies of countries at a similar level of development to their own.\footnote{See the report of the MAP global meeting on measuring and monitoring decent work (Geneva, June 2012), available at: http://www.ilo.org/integration/themes/mdw/map/WCMS_209893/lang--en/index.htm}

National assessments as major inputs for policy making

National assessments on decent work provide relevant information for evidence-based national dialogue among national stakeholders and social partners.

They provide major inputs for national planning, programming and targeting and serve as a reference point for reviewing existing laws, policies, and institutional arrangements.

They also help identify data collection gaps and thus make it easier for national data collection instruments to collect better and regular data on decent work.
4. A sustainable process on assessing progress on decent work

In order to ensure a sustainable process of assessing progress towards decent work, constituents of the pilot-countries have recalled the importance of:

- **strengthening national data collection instruments** to produce better data on decent work and labour statistics in general as well - in particular labour force surveys and administrative records - and enhancing national capacities for data processing and the calculation of decent work indicators, in compliance with international statistical standards.

- **enhancing national capacities in the preparation of national assessments** on decent work, and specifically the analysis of both statistical and legal decent work indicators in an integrated approach, seeking to identify possible interactions between the indicators; the compilation of indicators covering all dimensions of decent work in one document provides the opportunity to examine possible interactions between statistical information, laws and policies and has been much welcomed by constituents in the pilot-countries.

Countries are encouraged to continue efforts in improving data collection instruments and developing sustainable labour market information systems, if necessary with the technical and financial assistance of the ILO, the EC and other donors, and through South-South cooperation mechanisms. This particularly concerns low-income countries whose lack of financial, technical and institutional resources for (continued) data collection and whose lack of political will have been identified as posing a major challenge for producing timely and regular data on decent work. Other countries (particularly middle and upper income countries) have better institutional and financial capacities and the political will to sustain data collection on decent work as part of a regular, state-led process. Such efforts should also be accompanied by periodic assessments of progress towards identified decent work goals and objectives.

### Regular assessments require regular and timely data

Countries are encouraged to produce comprehensive and up-to-date information (statistical data and legal information) to respond to constituents’ demand on assessing progress made towards decent work on a regular basis, for both advocacy and policymaking, and above all to support the design and evaluation of decent work programmes at the country level.

Countries are encouraged to make more financial resources available and develop greater institutional and technical capacities for the regular measurement and assessment of progress towards decent work objectives.
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Manual

The manual responds to the request of ILO constituents that endorsed the Decent Work Agenda and developed – or are in the process of developing – decent work strategies and programmes, to have a clear methodological framework for the monitoring of decent work at the country level and the preparation of national assessments on progress made. As such, it is an important tool for national stakeholders, particularly ministries in charge of labour, employment, economy and planning, national statistical offices and workers' and employers' organisations.

The manual provides a step-by-step guidance on monitoring and assessing progress towards decent work at the national level, on the basis of concrete examples and national experiences gained in the ILO/EC project Monitoring and Assessing Progress on Decent Work and the best practices identified in the project countries. It aims to be a pragmatic and useful tool to help national stakeholders to mainstream employment and decent work in national policies.

The manual is divided in four chapters. After a presentation in Chapter 1 of the rationale for monitoring decent work and the ILO framework on the measurement of decent work, the remaining chapters are practical step-by-step guides that present the experience of individual countries, accompanied by practical indications for each of the step involved.

Chapter 2 provides national stakeholders with guidance on the identification of decent work indicators according to national needs and circumstances, drawing particular attention to the key role of tripartite consultations in consensus-building. Chapter 3 discusses the main sources for measuring decent work and data collection issues, and suggests how national data collection instruments can be improved. Chapter 4 provides guidance on how to prepare national assessments on decent work and how the main results of the country studies can be used in policy-making through social dialogue.

This Manual has been prepared with financial assistance from the European Union under the ILO/EC project Monitoring and Assessing Progress on Decent Work (2009-2013).

Lessons learned from the MAP project