



19th International Conference of Labour Statisticians
Geneva, 2-11 October 2013

Room Document: **4**

**Report on Progress and Outcomes on the
Monitoring and Measurement of Decent
Work**

Report on Progress and Outcomes on the Monitoring and Measurement of Decent Work¹

Contents

List of Abbreviations	4
1. Background: measuring decent work, why and how?.....	5
2. Work accomplished since the 18th ICLS	8
3. Piloting the measurement of decent work: main results	10
3.3. Defining and interpreting decent work indicators.....	12
3.4. Data sources for measuring decent work	13
3.5. Improving data collection	14
3.6. Decent Work Country Profiles: experience and lessons learned	15
3.7 Capacity building activities.....	18
4. Looking ahead	19
Annexes	21

¹ Prepared by Nikholai Rogovsky, Senior Economist and Naima Pagès, Economist, with the final editing of David Williams, Economist, MULTILATERALS Department.

List of Abbreviations

ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
AfDB	African Development bank
AFRISTAT	Economic and Statistical Observatory of Sub-Saharan Africa
DWI	Decent Work Indicator
GB	ILO Governing Body
ICLS	International Conference of Labour Statisticians
ILC	International Labour Conference
ILO	International Labour Organization
LFI	Legal Framework Indicator
LFS	Labour Force Survey
MAP	Monitoring and Assessing Progress on Decent Work (ILO-EC Project)
RECAP	ILO-EC Project on Strengthening the Capacity to Devise and Analyse Decent Work Indicators
SAARC	South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SME	Small and Medium-sized Enterprises
TME	ILO Tripartite Meeting of Experts (2008)
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
WEAMU	West African Monetary Union
WG	Working Group

1. Background: measuring decent work, why and how?

The concept of ‘decent work’ was first introduced by the former Director-General of the ILO, Juan Somavía, in his first report to the International Labour Conference in 1999. Since the launch of the Decent Work Agenda in 1999, there has been much debate on how it can be measured in practice, since decent work is a wide ranging concept with both quantitative and qualitative components. The concepts of decent work were quickly taken on by other UN agencies as well as by other regional organizations as integral parts 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 of efforts to assess the social effects of the global open market system. In June 2008, the International Labour Conference adopted the *Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization*, which supported national assessments of progress towards decent work. The ILC adopted a Resolution on strengthening the ILO’s capacity to assist its Members’ efforts to reach its objectives in the context of globalization.²

Some early attempts were made within the ILO to identify a set of possible indicators that could best reflect the four pillars of decent work in quantitative terms. Such aims were based on the need to identify authoritative means to measure national progress toward decent work, both in relation to poverty and other developmental objectives, and to ensure such methods allowed for international comparability.³ In parallel to these efforts, the ILO launched collaborations with the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), EUROSTAT (the statistical office of the European Commission) and the European Foundation for the improvement of Working and Living Conditions to develop a framework on the measurement of the quality of employment, which encompasses key elements of the decent work agenda.

The preliminary work on measuring decent work was discussed at the 17th *International Conference of Labour Statisticians* (November 2003). Talks here focussed on the preliminary list of core indicators to measure decent work, identified by the ILO under ten headings. The need to carry out more work on this topic, for example by considering regional experiences in measuring employment quality, was emphasised. The ICLS Working Group on Decent Work Indicators highlighted the importance of analysing each statistical indicator (or group of indicators) alongside other complementary indicators of the legal framework. At the same time, an earlier idea of aggregating these indicators to form a “composite index” of decent work for the purpose of ranking countries was ruled out because of concerns over the subjectivity of the “weighting” process for the component indicators, as well as related definitional and measurement issues. A comprehensive report was requested for submission to the 18th ICLS and for discussion in a tripartite meeting of experts to be held before the 18th ICLS.

The Office has provided the Governing Body with regular overviews of its activities in the area of measuring decent work, during which it has posited a number of conclusions and proposals for future work. The Governing Body itself has debated this issue on various occasions and provided guidance

² International Labour Conference, 97th Session, Geneva, June 2008.

³ see Anker *et al.* (2002) “Measuring Decent Work with Statistical Indicators”, International Labour Office, Geneva. Available at: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---integration/documents/publication/wcms_079089.pdf; International Labour Review (2003)

on the main principles that should guide the measurement of decent work (see for example, GB 300/20/5, GB 301/17/6, GB 303/19/3).⁴

At the *Governing Body Session of March 2008*, the main objective of measuring decent work was recalled and attention was also drawn to the need to use quantitative decent work indicators within a broader socio-economic, legal and policy context, reflecting on the qualitative dimensions of decent work.⁵ As such, the Office proposed to hold a tripartite meeting of experts in 2008 to discuss a framework of indicators, and asked the ICLS to review a progress report in December 2008, as well as to develop statistical methodologies to test the framework at the national level. The Office provided outlines of a framework for measuring decent work (Appendix of GB 301/17/6) which were developed in greater detail in a discussion paper submitted to the Tripartite Meeting of Experts (TME MDW/2008)⁶.

Held in September 2008, the international *Tripartite Meeting of Experts on the Measurement of Decent Work* followed the adoption of the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization. The Declaration reaffirmed the commitment of the ILO and its Members to the four strategic objectives of the Decent Work Agenda, highlighted the importance of national, regional and global strategies towards decent work, and called upon member States to consider the establishment of appropriate indicators or statistics to monitor and evaluate progress made toward decent work, if necessary with ILO assistance (GB.303/19/3).

The Tripartite Meeting of Experts (TME) provided advice and guidance on possible ways to measure decent work across all its dimensions, with a view to preparing a set of recommendations for consideration by the Governing Body. A resulting discussion paper of the TME proposed a set of “main” and “additional” statistical indicators (the latter of which were dependent on data availability), and outlined a number of advantages and limitations for each indicator. Meeting experts reviewed the indicators and identified those that would require further developmental work, including those pertaining to stability and security at work, employment of persons with disabilities, and labour market discrimination. Recognising that many of the statistical indicators being proposed were already common and widely collected indicators of the labour market, it was also recommended that indicators should be based on international statistical standards, to guide both their definition and interpretation.

The framework for measuring decent work proposed at the Tripartite Meeting was subsequently presented in a report to the ILO *Governing Body in November 2008* (see Chairperson’s report, 2008 and GB.303/19/3). The meeting concluded that any framework for measuring decent work would be

⁴ Examples of such principles include the guidance that a composite index for ranking countries should not be pursued; and that the approach should assist constituents to assess progress towards decent work from a set of indicators also available for other countries.

⁵ It was emphasised that it was important to have a “clear goal in mind that reflects the needs of constituents as well as country circumstances”. Hence “the main value of measuring the dimensions of decent work would be to assist constituents in assessing progress at national level towards the goal of decent work against a set of indicators that are also available for other countries... (particularly) in countries with Decent Work Country Programmes alongside the more specific data related to programme targets and outcomes... (contributing) to results-based management” (GB.301/17/6).

⁶ “The development of a framework to monitor progress towards decent work, in support of the global Decent Work Agenda and National Decent Work Programmes, is a process which involves work on at least three distinct aspects, including: 1) the identification of a template of qualitative and quantitative indicators that can be used to measure progress towards decent work at the country level; 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 to identify country-specific dynamic picture (main progress and gaps) and to inform policy makers” (TME Discussion Paper, 2008).

incomplete without adequate consideration of both the quantitative *and* qualitative dimensions of decent work. As such, the proposed framework set forth a list of statistical decent work indicators alongside a set of descriptive “legal framework indicators” to contextualise the legal and policy framework in a country. It was also proposed that definitions for indicators would be based to the extent possible on agreed international standards, and a number of indicators not yet defined would be earmarked for further development. With regard to national applicability, it was noted that the framework would need to retain some flexibility to respond to the specific needs and circumstances of individual countries. To test the framework, it was proposed that national assessments known as “decent work country profiles” would be developed in a number of pilot countries.

At the *18th International Conference of Labour Statisticians* (24th November to 5th December 2008), a working group (WG) on the measurement of decent work was convened and attended by representatives from 75 member States, from Workers and Employers’ groups of the Governing Body and international organisations.⁷ The WG discussed the indicators (further refinements and additions) and emphasized the need to generate comparable, reliable and consistent data. Delegates noted that “*sound measurement helped 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*” (GB.306/17/5, and Report of the Conference 18th ICLS, 2009). A number of countries emphasized that it was feasible to collect data on decent work and that enhancing data collection to produce decent work indicators had already been planned.

The conceptual framework for measuring decent work covers ten substantive elements plus an additional “social and economic context” element, which cover the four strategic pillars of the Decent Work Agenda (see Annex 1). These elements represent the groupings under which corresponding statistical and legal framework indicators are organised, as well as the chapter structure of the “decent work country profiles” which are discussed later in this paper. The framework also organises different statistical indicators according to their importance and current availability. Indicators are thus identified as either “main”, “additional”, “future” or “context” indicators.

Legal framework indicators, which are descriptive and qualitative rather than quantitative in nature, represent the second type of indicator in the conceptual framework. These aim to summarize legal and policy information across 21 key topics relevant to the measurement of decent work, against a range of criteria, including laws, policies or institutions in place, benefit levels and thresholds, coverage in law and practice, and evidence of implementation effectiveness. They also include country-specific reference to relevant international labour standards and decisions of the ILO’s supervisory machinery.

The 18th ICLS in 2008 adopted a Resolution concerning the continuation of work on the measurement of decent work (Report of the Conference, 18th ICLS, 2008), which recommended – among other things- that the ILO conduct further work to develop statistical indicators in areas highlighted by the Tripartite Meeting. It also requested that the ILO provide a progress update report at the next (19th) ICLS, in order to provide further guidance on the measurement of decent work (see Box 1).

⁷ These included UNECE, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the African Development Bank (AfDB) and the Economic and Statistical Observatory of Sub-Saharan Africa (AFRISTAT).

Box 1. Resolution IV – 18th ICLS

Resolution concerning further work on the measurement of decent work

The 18th International Conference of Labour Statisticians,

Recognizing the need to measure decent work and its four strategic objectives, namely productive and freely chosen employment; social protection; social dialogue; and standards and fundamental principles and rights at work,

Taking note of the 2008 ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization that states that ILO member States may consider the establishment of appropriate indicators or statistics, if necessary with the assistance of the ILO, to monitor and evaluate progress made,

Having reviewed the work undertaken by the ILO and the guidance provided by the Tripartite Meeting of Experts on the Measurement of Decent Work (September 2008);

Recommends that:

- (i) the Office, in cooperation with the ILO's constituents and interested national statistical offices, prepare pilot decent work country profiles based on the outcome of the Tripartite Meeting of Experts on the Measurement of Decent Work and in accordance with the guidance by the Governing Body;
- (ii) the definitions of statistical decent work indicators be based, in as far as possible, on existing ICLS resolutions and guidelines and other relevant international statistical standards in order to ensure the greatest possible degree of consistency and international comparability;
- (iii) the Office carry out further developmental work on statistical indicators in areas highlighted by the Tripartite Meeting of Experts on the Measurement of Decent Work and during the proceedings at this 18th International Conference of Labour Statisticians;
- (iv) a full report on progress and outcomes be prepared for the 19th International Conference of Labour Statisticians, in accordance with its agenda and taking account of decisions taken by the Governing Body, to provide further guidance on the measurement and monitoring of decent work.

Source: ILO, *Report of the Conference, 18th ICLS*, 2009 (p. 68).

2. Work accomplished since the 18th ICLS

(i) The ILO conceptual framework has been tested

Since 2009, the ILO framework for measuring decent work has been promoted and tested in a range of countries, both under technical cooperation projects and regular budgetary ILO support.⁸ Accordingly, and in line with the first recommendation of Resolution IV of the 18th ICLS, the primary mode by which this has been achieved has been through the development of national assessments known as “decent work country profiles.” These documents consist of 11 thematic chapters, each one pertaining to a specific area of decent work, and each containing a set of both statistical decent work indicators and descriptive indicators of the legal and policy framework for decent work. Each chapter also contains a short analytical narrative that attempts to bring both statistical data and legal framework information together into a contextually grounded assessment of recent decent work trends, typically over a ten-year period.

⁸ The two major projects in this regard are the MAP Project (Monitoring and Assessing Progress on Decent Work) and the RECAP Project (Strengthening the capacity to devise and analyse decent work indicators), both of which are funded by the European Commission.

Decent work country profiles were first launched in a number of pilot countries in 2009, a process which began in each country with the identification and compilation of national lists of decent work indicators (both quantitative and qualitative/descriptive), based on the standard ILO list proposed by the 2008 Tripartite Meeting of Experts. To date, thirteen country profiles have been published and a number of others are under development.⁹ This work has benefited particularly from the EC-funded MAP project (“Monitoring and Assessing Progress on Decent Work”), which has developed profiles in nine countries since 2009.¹⁰

(ii) Further developmental work on certain decent work indicators has been conducted

Following the third recommendation of the Resolution IV of the 18th ICLS, the ILO has also undertaken work to develop a number of indicators originally marked “future” in the conceptual framework, as well making further refinements to already-defined “main” and “additional” indicators, during the pilot testing phase.¹¹ These indicators include the share of employed persons in casual, seasonal and short-term employment or those whose contracts can be terminated at short notice (referred to as “*precarious employment*”); mean job tenure; subsistence worker rate; the share of women in non-agricultural wage employment (which reflected the fact this had already been included as a Millennium Development Goals employment indicator); and the poverty headcount ratio. There is also ongoing work to develop measures of labour underutilization.

The 2008 Tripartite Meeting of Experts also requested the Office to examine ways with which the application of freedom of association and rights at work could be measured. Subsequent Office work in this area is currently being evaluated ahead of further discussion in the Governing Body in 2014.

At the same time, between 2009 and 2013, the pilot initiative has addressed the need for consideration of these issues through the addition –in every decent work country profile- of legal framework indicators 20 and 21, on freedom of association and the right to organize and collective bargaining, respectively. Guidance on these and other legal framework indicators can be found in the ILO Manual, Decent Work Indicators: concepts and definitions (2012).

(iii) The ILO has developed guidance on the concepts and definitions of decent work indicators

The ILO manual “Decent Work Indicators: Concepts and Definitions” (First version) was published in May 2012 and launched at a MAP project meeting in June 2012. By providing clear guidance for defining and interpreting the full range of decent work indicators (both statistical and legal), this document is designed to be the key reference point for a range of data users, from ILO constituents and staff to policymakers and development practitioners, both at the national and international level. To ensure the greatest possible degree of consistency and international comparability between indicators developed at the country level (and indeed following Resolution IV of the 18th ICLS in this regard), statistical definitions presented in the manual are based on existing ICLS resolutions and guidelines and other relevant international statistical standards.

⁹ Published profiles are available at <http://www.ilo.org/mdw>. Profiles under development in 2013 include Jordan, Moldova, Namibia, Senegal and Pakistan.

¹⁰ See <http://www.ilo.org/map>

¹¹ See also the manual, ILO (2012) “Decent work indicators: Concepts and Definitions,” ILO Geneva. Available at: http://www.ilo.org/stat/Publications/WCMS_183859/lang--en/index.htm

(iv) Capacity building activities and guidelines have been developed for ILO constituents

Between 2009 and 2013, training and knowledge-sharing workshops (both national and regional), together with technical assistance activities on measuring decent work (e.g. defining concepts and definitions, and collecting, processing, tabulating and analysing data) have been organised in a range of countries with the support of two joint EC-ILO projects, MAP and RECAP.

In addition to developing the aforementioned manual on concepts and definitions, the Office has also produced a set of guidelines on assessing progress toward decent work, as well as a manual outlining a global methodology for monitoring and assessing decent work based on the country experiences and lessons learned under the MAP project. Similarly, the Office has developed a Household Survey Module for measuring the scope of maternity leave laws (coverage in law and in practice), as part of the legal framework indicators,¹² and is currently developing a toolkit to guide the design of labour force survey questionnaires and related data tabulation exercises.

A meeting of ILO and its constituents from MAP and other countries was held in June 2012 in Geneva, with the primary goal of facilitating exchange of knowledge and experiences.¹³ A conference to officially close the MAP project will be held in November 2013 in Brussels, during which the ILO will present the main outcomes and lessons of the project and disseminate the aforementioned global methodology.

3. Piloting the measurement of decent work: main results

3.1. Using the framework at the country level

Since 2009, the ILO framework on measuring decent work has been piloted in a diverse range of countries across four continents. To date, this process has produced thirteen published profiles (nine as part of the ILO-EC MAP Project) with a number of others still under development. In each instance, documents have been developed by the ILO with its tripartite constituents, particularly (but not exclusively) Ministries of Labour, employers' and workers' organisations, as well as national statistical offices.

The framework was designed with the twin goals of ensuring international comparability as well as adaptability to individual country contexts. Hence, alongside promoting a standard list of indicators based to the extent possible on agreed international standards, it was considered equally important for the framework to retain a degree of flexibility to incorporate additional indicators at the country level, if so required. In this regard, the pilot programme has seen a number of country-specific adaptations to the ILO framework since 2009, mostly concerning thresholds, age bands, and disaggregation levels of statistical indicators.¹⁴ Some have also developed their own indicators based on so called "future"

¹² Module 13 of the Maternity Protection Resource Package launched in November 2012, available at: www.ilo.org/maternityprotection

¹³ See *Report of the Meeting on measuring and monitoring decent work. Lessons learnt from MAP countries*. June 2012, available at: http://www.ilo.org/integration/themes/mdw/map/WCMS_209893/lang--en/index.htm

¹⁴ The age bands contained in the ILO framework (based on international standards) does not always comply with national practice, for example, youth can be defined as ages 15–35 years in some countries, rather than as 15–24 years (see Niger and Zambia Profiles); the working-age population is not always defined as those aged 15–64 years (from 16 years in Brazil see the Brazil Profile); the retirement age might not be 65 and in some countries, workers remain economically active beyond the age of 64 due to inadequate pensions; the threshold of 48 hours per week for "excessive hours" may differ in national legislations (see Indonesia Profile). See Decent Work Country Profiles available at: www.ilo.org/mdw and the *Report of the Meeting on measuring and monitoring decent work. Lessons learnt from MAP countries*. June 2012, available at: http://www.ilo.org/integration/themes/mdw/map/WCMS_209893/lang--en/index.htm

indicators identified in the 2008 ILO framework (such as in the area of combining work, family and personal life).¹⁵

Experience from the pilot countries has demonstrated the success of the ILO framework both in maintaining a high degree of international comparability and allowing scope for flexible application at the country level (i.e. for countries to add indicators according to national circumstances and requirements).¹⁶ This has been evident in the diversity of countries in which decent work country profiles have been produced since 2009, not just in terms of income levels and economic development, but also institutional strength, statistical infrastructure, and legal environment and policy development.

Sustained engagement and tripartite consultation at the national level has been critically important to the success of the pilot programme. In all countries tested, the ILO's tripartite constituents (comprising the government, workers and employers, and also national statistical offices) have been involved from an early stage to agree on a comprehensive list of decent work indicators relevant to that country.¹⁷ In addition, once a list has been agreed upon and work has started to develop a profile, constituents have also been given a number of additional opportunities to shape its content as the document is developed. Profiles are usually drafted by national consultants and before finalization are also subject to a tripartite validation workshop, during which constituents can review and provide recommendations for the improvement of the document ahead of its official publication.

A number of countries under the pilot phase have also taken additional steps to extract a smaller selection of decent work indicators from their national lists and incorporate these into national plans and monitoring frameworks - including national development strategies, labour and employment policies, and decent work country programmes.

3.2. Key issues and remaining developmental work

In some of the pilot-countries, national partners and constituents have called for further improvements to the framework, in a number of areas:

- ***The classification of the indicators as “main” and “additional” could be revised:*** the classification as set up by the TME of September 2008 is maintained in the revised ILO framework (see Annex 1), even though recommendations were made in this regard by various countries in the pilot-phase and previously by the working group on the measurement of decent work at the 18th ICLS. A revision of this classification might be necessary but should be discussed on a tripartite basis in a future meeting of experts.

¹⁵ See also ILO, *Decent work indicators: Concepts and Definitions*, Manual, First version, May 2012.

¹⁶ Under the pilot phase, “main indicators” from the standard ILO list are compiled as a matter of course in all countries, while for additional indicators, countries have been given more flexibility to add or remove according to country requirements.

¹⁷ The process of indicator selection in the pilot phase has involved tripartite consultations in each country. Under the MAP project, tripartite consultation workshops were organized in which a background study on the national labour market information system was presented, and on the basis of the ILO conceptual framework, 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 workshop participants as well as of all key dimensions of the framework in the final list of indicators. Selected indicators were identified according to whether or not they were currently feasible given current data collection instruments. An exercise in prioritizing the indicators was often carried out to ensure that those indicators deemed most important were targeted first in data collection activities and incorporated in the monitoring system of national policies. See reports of the *tripartite consultation workshops on measuring decent work* (MAP countries), available at: <http://www.ilo.org/integration/themes/mdw/map/about/activities/national-consultation-workshop/lang--en/index.htm>

- ***The development of indicators for combining work, family and personal life***, in addition to the indicators on maternity leave (legal and actual coverage) under preparation by the Office: requires further research by referring to the examples developed by the pilot-countries or to the recommendations made at the 18th ICLS (flexible working-time arrangements that accommodate family responsibilities, to the female employment rate by role in the family and the gender distribution of unpaid house work).
- ***The inclusion of indicators on enterprises***, including SMEs and conducive environment for sustainable enterprises should be considered seriously at the next stage, by the Office, as requested by various countries in the pilot-phase¹⁸ (the Enterprises Department might be responsible to design a suitable methodology and to identify indicators and collect data that 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.

3.3. Defining and interpreting decent work indicators

As has been noted, the Office has undertaken considerable efforts since 2008 to design and then refine a framework for measuring decent work. The aforementioned ILO manual, *Decent Work Indicators: Concepts and definitions*, first published in 2012¹⁹ and drawing on empirical experience in pilot countries, offers a robust and easily understandable basis on which this now-tested framework can be understood and implemented at the country level.

Following the same thematic chapter structure of the decent work country profiles, the guidance manual contains 10 chapters devoted to a substantive component of the decent work measurement framework and one chapter on the social and economic context for decent work. The guidance it provides can be summarised as follows:

- (i) ***Guidance on statistical indicators***: focusses on measurement objectives and rationale, method of computation, concepts and definitions, recommended data sources, metadata and disaggregation, and guidelines to interpretation of these indicators.
- (ii) ***Guidance on the 21 legal framework indicators***: focusses on qualitative/descriptive aspects of the law(s) in question, namely: (1) laws, policies or institutions that are in place; (2) benefit levels and thresholds; (3) evidence of implementation effectiveness; rough percentage of workers covered, both in (4) law and in (5) practice, based on estimation routine; and (6) the ratification of relevant ILO Conventions.
- (iii) ***Guidance for interpreting each indicator in the social and economic context*** and with other complementary indicators in a holistic and integrated analytical approach.

¹⁹ An updated (second) version of the Manual on Decent Work Indicators will be published by the ILO in October 2013 and presented at the 19th ICLS.

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

Another recently produced document, entitled *Guidelines on assessing progress on decent work*, prepared by the MAP project, offers additional guidance to ILO constituents on how to conduct integrated analysis of statistical and legal framework indicators as part of the process of developing decent work country profiles.

3.4. Data sources for measuring decent work

(a) Household labour force surveys as a major source

A major challenge in measuring decent work originates from the quality and scope of data available to produce the indicators (both statistical and legal). Although it depends somewhat by country, the majority (between 60 and 70 per cent) of statistical indicators calculated during the pilot phase came from *Labour Force Surveys (LFS)*. This underscores the importance of household data in computing decent work indicators for an effective and comprehensive assessment of progress toward decent work. By contrast, relatively few indicators were compiled from establishment surveys, mostly because in the countries tested such surveys were rare and often limited in scope (e.g. limited worker and sector coverage, and so on).

Since LFS are the main vehicle for data collection used for constructing quantitative decent work indicators, the necessity to increase the scope and quality of such instruments has been noted by country constituents, even in countries where such surveys are well developed and regular. In several pilot countries, the majority of indicators from the standard ILO framework have been computed using existing survey data, however constituents still requested additional work since they were not systematically computed by national statistical offices or not computed on the basis of international statistical standards. In other countries, the identification of nationally relevant indicator lists led to concurrent demands for new questions to be added to national household surveys, or even entirely new surveys, to capture a wider variety of decent work dimensions and related indicators.

(b) Administrative records

Certain indicators are best calculated from *administrative sources*, i.e. those drawn from records kept by various government ministries, as well as other state and non-state bodies. These include labour inspection rates, minimum wage rates, strike and lockout rates, social protection coverage and the coverage of collective bargaining agreements. In general, experience from pilot countries has shown that the quality and scope of data available from these sources remains a major concern, in both developing 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.

(c) Legal framework information

A large proportion of *legal framework indicators (LFIs)* outlined in the ILO decent work measurement framework can be compiled from official national sources and complemented with information compiled by the ILO, for example from reports of the Office's supervisory machinery on the application of ILO conventions and recommendations (both in law and in practice). Experience from pilot countries has revealed a strong desire on the part of national constituents to ensure full and

accurate LFIs, which they argue enrich and add contextual background to the interpretation and analysis of statistical indicators.

3.5. Improving data collection

As has been noted, *Decent Work Country Profiles* are designed to help strengthen the capacity of national constituents to measure progress toward decent work objectives. Owing often to data gaps and weaknesses identified in the process of developing the decent work indicators and country profiles, constituents in a number of countries have since called for stronger national efforts to improve data collection across a range of areas, to enhance the quality, scope and periodicity of data on decent work. Improving instruments such as labour force surveys and government administrative records related to decent work are the two key areas in which this need is most pertinent.

In countries with relatively advanced statistical systems like Brazil, Indonesia and Ukraine, for example, selected decent work indicators have been incorporated into regular statistical activities of the national statistical office, thus facilitating future updates to monitor progress of key indicators. In others (such as Bangladesh, Cambodia, and Zambia), entirely new labour force surveys have been designed so as to broaden the scope of topics covered and to improve compliance with international statistical standards. In less developed countries in particular, statistical offices have sought to build a case for additional resource allocations from the national budget to implement regular labour force surveys, to enable more regular compilation of indicators and for monitoring progress towards decent work. Owing to the volume of labour statistics that are typically derived from them, having a regular labour force survey is considered a key prerequisite for the long term sustainability of decent work indicators and related assessments at the country level (GB.317/INS/12/1).

In general, experience from the pilot countries has demonstrated that data can usually be found or computed for around three-quarters of the eighteen main statistical decent work indicators, and in some cases gaps could be filled by using close or proxy indicators. Depending on data availability and priorities identified by constituents, some countries have also produced additional indicators to support and supplement main indicators produced in their decent work country profiles.

Although in most countries a majority of standard decent work indicators have been available from existing surveys or administrative records, the importance of quality data that complies with international standards was noted, while problems with the periodicity of published data and coverage issues were often mentioned by national partners as a key challenge in developing a comprehensive assessment of progress towards decent work. Most notably, governments and social partners expressed concern that the limited frequency of national surveys (especially labour force surveys) would undermine future efforts to produce regular and up to date follow-up assessments.

In low income countries, resource constraints were identified as the major obstacle preventing regularly conducted household surveys (like Zambia, Niger, and Cambodia). However, other countries with higher resources (middle-income countries), have also called for continued ILO support –i.e. beyond the current pilot phase- to their efforts to allow regular data collection and improve data quality, as well as for greater “South-South” cooperation efforts and knowledge sharing

between countries (as discussed, for instance, at the Asian regional meeting on measuring decent work in Bangkok, November 2012)²⁰.

At regional level, efforts have been made to harmonise concepts and definitions and develop common household labour force survey questionnaires. Regional knowledge sharing workshops held from 2009 to 2012 and supported by ILO and the MAP project helped to identify potential future collaborations to develop common data collection instruments (in particular, labour force surveys) and sub-regional databases on decent work statistics.

3.6. Decent Work Country Profiles: experience and lessons learned

As has been noted, decent work country profiles have been the main product the ILO has used to implement the framework for measuring decent work at the national level. The standard structure of a profile consists of eleven thematic chapters (corresponding to the ten “substantive areas” of the decent work agenda plus the socio-economic context), each comprising a set of statistical and legal framework indicators, together with a short analytical narrative which brings the two types of information together and gives a factual and objective assessment of recent progress toward decent work.²¹

The experience of the Office in working with the constituents is that the methodology and design of decent work country profiles is both robust and relevant in a wide variety of countries.²² The ten thematic areas –which range from “employment opportunities” to “social dialogue, workers’ and employers’ representation”– have proven highly applicable to the needs of national constituents irrespective of a country’s development level, while the combined use of statistics *and* descriptive indicators to assess progress has also been identified as a major strength in the design of the profiles. To date, profiles have been developed or are under development in more than twenty countries, while a number of governments have already integrated key indicators from these documents into the monitoring frameworks of national policies and programmes.²³

Profiles are developed in collaboration with the ILO’s tripartite constituents at the country level, as well as National Statistical Offices and other relevant state and non-state bodies. In order to ensure that profiles are factually accurate and reflect constituents’ concerns, a process of extensive consultation is followed, with initial consultation meetings and tripartite validation workshops held in all countries prior to the drafting and finalization (and publication) of the documents. By engaging constituents from the start and providing them an opportunity to shape the profile’s development, the framework has been successful in fostering national ownership over the process, enhancing social dialogue between tripartite partners, and in enhancing the relevance of the profiles to national

²⁰ The report of the Regional Training and Knowledge Sharing Workshop: Enhancing labour statistics for measuring decent work in Asia and the Pacific (27-30 November 2012) is available at: [http://www.ilo.org/integration/themes/mdw/map/events/WCMS_194589/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/integration/themes/mdw/map/events/WCMS_194589/lang-en/index.htm)

²¹ Whilst the standard 11-chapter methodology is a universal feature of all pilot profiles, some countries have also added an extra chapter to highlight specific regional disaggregations or links to the Decent Work Country Programme.

²² A formal evaluation of the Office’s activities on measuring decent work is underway for presentation to the Governing Body.

²³ To date, decent work country profiles have been developed for Tanzania (mainland), Brazil (including a second edition), Austria, Ukraine (including a second edition), Cambodia, The Philippines, Armenia, Zambia, Azerbaijan, Indonesia, Bangladesh, Niger and Cameroon. Meanwhile, profiles for Ethiopia, South Africa, Senegal, Peru, Moldova, Namibia, Kyrgyzstan, Cape Verde, Jordan and Pakistan are under development, while a number of other countries have expressed interest in developing them. In Brazil and Indonesia, profiles have also been produced at the provincial level, to reflect decentralised governance systems and divergent socio-economic and labour market conditions

policymaking and development planning. Moreover, tripartite consultation has also helped to overcome disputes and build consensus around difficult issues, thus strengthening the legitimacy of the initiative in the eyes of constituents.

The close involvement of constituents throughout the process has proven to be a major and perhaps the defining factor in the positive response to the decent work country profiles to date. Cooperation with national statistical offices and other institutions has been crucial in ensuring that the analysis contained in the profiles is based on reliable and nationally recognised statistics, while the official validation process –conducted in the form of a tripartite workshop to discuss the first draft profile- has been shown to be an effective forum in which to verify information and recommend further revisions before finalisation.

The general approach followed in all countries for the development of decent work country profiles can be identified according to six stages, outlined below:

- (i) **Early consultations** with constituents regarding the objectives of the profile and the identification of nationally relevant indicators. Discussions on which indicators should be included alongside “main indicators” are conducted and national lists of indicators agreed by constituents.
- (ii) **Compilation of statistical indicators** (usually by a national consultant statistician), in close collaboration with national statistical offices and other relevant national agencies: these indicators are usually obtained from published sources or computed from primary data sets (household surveys and administrative data).
- (iii) **Compilation of legal indicators** (usually by a national consultant lawyer) with information on rights at work and the legal framework for decent work (national legislation, information generated by the ILO supervisory system, and existing ILO legal databases).
- (iv) **Preparation of a draft profile by an ILO-contracted consultant**, who typically also serves as the lead consultant supervising the work of the national statistician and lawyer (compiling statistical and legal framework indicators, respectively);
- (v) **National tripartite validation workshops** to allow constituents and other stakeholders to review and recommend revisions to the draft profile before finalisation and to ensure that profiles are accurate and adequately reflect constituents’ concerns;
- (vi) **Official launch events**²⁴ 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, and policy briefings have been produced to illustrate the links between decent work country profiles and policymaking.

Experience in pilot countries suggests that decent work country profiles are both relevant and useful for the ILO and its tripartite constituents. A number of key observations can be highlighted from this experience:

²⁴ ILO-sponsored launch events have only been conducted in countries covered by the MAP Project. In other countries, launch events have been held at the discretion of national constituents.

- (i) **Constituents have expressed support for 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 enhance national capacities on data processing and calculation of decent work indicators.
- (ii) **Constituents have expressed support for the design of the profiles**, and specifically the use of integrated analysis that contextualises statistical trends against the backdrop of relevant laws and policies. The compilation of both sets of information and data in one document, simple as it seems, is rarely attempted in practice, particularly in such a concise and standardised format. As such, the opportunity to examine possible interactions between laws and policies and movements in the key statistical indicators has been welcomed by national constituents.
- (iii) **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 drawn upon in other countries. Furthermore, some countries have expressed appreciation for the fact profiles can facilitate comparisons between countries 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 advocacy activities, particularly when it comes to examining laws and policies of countries at a similar level of development to their own.²⁵
- (iv) **Profiles have proven useful in mapping the decent work landscape** and identifying not only areas of recent progress, but more importantly, identifying gaps where aspects of decent work are lagging. Profiles thus provide a key tool for effective policy diagnostics enabling the analysis of progress in the framework of national economic, labour and social policies.
- (v) **The data and analysis contained in the profiles can also aid strategic planning and the design of national development plans and policies.** Decent Work Country Programmes in particular can be improved through the use of reliable data baselines that would inform both design and priority setting. ILO country offices have highlighted the potential value of integrating profiles into the DWCP development cycle, so as to strengthen the information and evidence base for the design and evaluation of these documents.²⁶
- (vi) **Owing to the process of tripartite consultation pursued in the development of the profiles, data contained in these documents is typically viewed as more legitimate** and less controversial than that which is presented by single actors (which are often seen to have a unilateral agenda). Reaching broad acceptance of the data at validation stage is a key feature of the profiles, and has proven to be a major strength when it comes to facilitating reasoned and fact-based discussions and helped constituents to engage in discussion of national policies and plans concerning labour and employment issues and wider socio-economic development.

²⁶ In the cases of Zambia, Niger and Armenia, for example, current DWCPs were formulated based on the information contained in the country profiles, which provided constituents with an evidence base on which to prioritize the DWCP outcomes and strategies.

The experience of the profiles has also revealed a number of insights into the usefulness and applicability of the ILO framework for measuring decent work at the national level. These can be summarised as follows:

- (i) Profiles provide evidence that the framework is both relevant and feasible to implement in various types of countries. At the country level, the development of a profile has enabled constituents to lever (and in some cases adapt) existing resources and capacities to develop an effective means to measure changes in various decent work dimensions over time. Moreover, owing to the widespread use of international standards and definitions (as set out by the ILO framework), profiles are also broadly comparable between countries, something which has proven useful for constituents wishing to conduct comparative analysis (particularly between countries in the same region).
- (ii) Profiles have also provided insights into the institutional capabilities and related expectations for countries in terms of developing national systems and processes to measure 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 scope of data on decent work (often above and beyond the standard ILO indicator list), and this has resulted in often very comprehensive decent work country profiles. However, in countries with weaker institutional capacities, profile datasets have typically contained large time intervals (between data points) and gaps in the coverage of the ten substantive areas, leading to incomplete assessments of progress towards decent work.
- (iii) Although in some countries there are certain areas for which data accuracy and coverage has been a challenge (such as wages, social security, or social dialogue), general experience from the profiles has shown that it remains feasible to collect data on a broad range of decent work topics, as envisaged by the framework.
- (iv) Profiles 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 and revise and refine the framework itself, by improving guidance on definitions, interpretation and analysis of the decent work indicators.

3.7 Capacity building activities

Capacity building activities on measuring decent work have been implemented by the ILO technical departments and the MAP project. National capacities on data collection (from questionnaire design to data processing and tabulation) and data analysis (concepts and definitions, data interpretation, drafting reports and studies) have been strengthened in various countries. National awareness and social dialogue have been improved through various support mechanisms and ILO guidance.

Under the MAP project, training and knowledge-sharing workshops have been organized at the national level, and in-country technical assistance has been provided to constituents, particularly national statistical offices and ministries of labour.²⁷ Moreover, some ten regional workshops and a

²⁷ Among the main training activities conducted under MAP project: National Training and Knowledge-Sharing Workshop on Measuring and Monitoring Progress on Decent Work in Ukraine (September 2012, Lvov, Ukraine); Capacity-building Workshop on Data Analysis for

global meeting have also been organised by the MAP project between 2009 and 2012, the main aim of which has been to share country experiences in developing decent work indicators and country profiles and move towards the establishment of a global methodology and knowledge base on how to effectively measure decent work.²⁸ In this regard, the ILO has produced and is producing a number of tools that draw on the experiences of the pilot countries and offer guidance on best practices for developing indicators and measuring progress towards decent work objectives. These include the aforementioned manual on decent work indicators (concepts and definitions) and the global methodology for measuring decent work (based on the experience of the MAP project), as well as various guidelines aimed at supporting constituents to develop integrated approaches for making regular assessments of decent work.

4. Looking ahead

(i) *Electronic profiles and the Information and Knowledge Management Gateway*

Since the launching of the pilot programme on measuring decent work, the Office has also launched a new Information and Knowledge Management Strategy to harness the ILO's extensive institutional knowledge and information base into a single user-friendly interface, and thus consolidate current ad hoc and parallel efforts. A key component of this strategy is the design and development of a new *Information and Knowledge Management Gateway* ("the Gateway") which will consist of several practical tools that provide a "one-stop" access to country level decent work statistical legal and policy information.²⁹ This includes the development of a user-friendly IT application to make existing ILO databases accessible through a single entry-portal.

Based on the outcomes of the current evaluation of the ILO's work on measuring decent work, the Office may consider the development of electronic, web-based decent work profiles ("e-profiles") that would be available on the Gateway platform and updated on a regular basis.³⁰ The use of e-profiles may be particularly useful for enabling the ILO to pursue a gradual approach to building up indicators, which is particularly pertinent in countries with inadequate and poor quality data (e.g.

Monitoring Progress towards Decent Work (June 2011, Jakarta, Indonesia); Capacity-building Workshop on Data Analysis for Monitoring Progress towards Decent Work (May 2011, Dhaka, Bangladesh); Data Analysis Training Workshop for Labour Market Information and Monitoring Decent Work (January 2010, Siavonga, Zambia); Training workshop on decent work indicators (July 2012, Niamey, Niger); Training courses: Designing labour force surveys & labour force modules for household surveys to measure decent work; and Analysing survey data to monitor labour market conditions & progress towards decent work (May 2009, November 2010, February 2011, Turin, Italy). The project also provided technical assistance to the design and the implementation of labour force surveys, in collaboration with STATISTICS Department, IPEC/SIMPOC, Forced Labour Programme, and TRAVAIL, for Zambia (2012 LFS), Cambodia (2011/12 LFS and Child Labour Survey), Bangladesh (2012 LFS and Child Labour Survey), Niger (2012 LFS and informal sector survey), Indonesia (2012 provincial LFS), Philippines (2012 provincial LFS), and Brazil (2012 new households survey PNAD and municipal households surveys). Documentation available at: <http://www.ilo.org/integration/themes/mdw/map/about/activities/better-statistics/lang--en/index.htm>

²⁸ In 2012, regional knowledge sharing events were organized for 10 countries of Eastern and Central Europe (Kiev, Ukraine) and for 10 countries of Asia and the Pacific (Bangkok, Thailand). Participants in these events included government bodies (Ministries of Labour and National Statistical Offices in particular), employers' and workers' organizations, independent researchers and regional organizations (such as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, ASEAN, and South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation, SAARC). Similar regional events took place in Africa and Latin America involving MAP countries, including in Santiago (October 2012), Lima (October 2011), and Dakar (November 2011), while meetings of the Southern African Development Community (SADC) (November 2011) and West African Monetary Union (WEAMU) (May 2012 and July 2013) were also convened on the same subject.

²⁹ The Gateway will also contain information on ILO technical cooperation projects, best practices related to various thematic areas, publications, etc.

³⁰ See the March 2013 GB decision on this subject, available at: http://www.ilo.org/gb/decisions/GB317-decision/WCMS_208514/lang--en/index.htm

where labour force surveys are lacking). More comprehensive and up-to-date country information would respond to constituents' demand, for both advocacy and policymaking, and could also support the design and evaluation of Decent Work Country Programmes.

(ii) Sustainability and the role of the ILO

Although “national ownership” has been a key feature of the national experiences during the pilot phase, the extent to which this has been the case, and indeed the extent to which ILO support has been decisive in ensuring completion and success, has varied between countries. In the future, it is likely that in certain countries (particularly less developed ones), a level of continued ILO engagement and support - including through direct technical and financial assistance - will be expected if the collection of data on decent work is to be sustained. In others, particularly those at middle and upper income levels, there is evidence to suggest that there is both the capacity (institutional and financial) and the political will to sustain the collection of selected indicators as part of a regular, state-led process.³¹ Such efforts should also be accompanied by periodic assessments of progress towards stated decent work goals and objectives.

When requested, the Office should be ready to provide support to countries wishing to develop decent work indicators and related national assessments such as decent work country profiles. Key areas in which this support may be offered include: (i) support the dissemination of international statistical standards (concepts and definitions), data collection and calculation of decent work indicators at national and regional level; (ii) technical assistance toward the preparation of new national assessments, namely decent work country profiles, and (iii) support to regional initiatives on measuring decent work.

(iii) Post-2015 sustainable development agenda

Amongst the issues likely to be discussed as part of the emerging post-2015 sustainable development framework are indicators of progress on agreed goals and targets. The work conducted to date in developing decent work indicators provides the ILO with a useful resource on which to draw if and when indicators might be needed for a goal on full and productive employment and decent work.

³¹ The main challenges identified by constituents in the pilot-phase concerned the lack of timely and regular data and differences between national and international definitions (for instance, age bands of international standards and national legislation), as well as the lack of financial resources for (continued) statistical data collection. Many countries have thus called upon the ILO to provide new and/or continued support to this work, in both a technical and financial capacity.

ANNEX 1.

Measurement of decent work based on guidance received at the Tripartite Meeting of Experts on the Measurement of Decent Work (September 2008) and updated in 2009-2013.

Substantive element of the Decent Work Agenda	Statistical Indicators	Legal Framework Indicators
<p>Numbers in parentheses in the first column below refer to ILO strategic objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Standards and fundamental principles and rights at work; 2. Employment; 3. Social protection; 4. Social dialogue. 	<p>Selection of relevant statistical indicators that allow monitoring progress made with regard to the substantive elements.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Economic and social context for decent work</p>	<p> 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 in PPP\$ (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 **</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Employment opportunities (1 + 2)</p>	<p>M – Employment-to-population ratio (S)* M – Unemployment rate (S) M – Youth not in employment, education, or training, 15-24 years (S)*</p>	<p>L – Government commitment to full employment L – Unemployment insurance</p>

	<p>M – Informal employment rate (S)*</p> <p>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]</p> <p>A – Youth unemployment rate, 15-24 years (S)</p> <p>A – Unemployment by level of educational attainment (S)*</p> <p>A – Employment by status in employment (S)</p> <p>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]</p> <p>A – Share of wage employment in non-agricultural employment (S)</p> <p>F – Labour underutilization (S)</p> <p>Memo item: Time-related underemployment rate (S) grouped as A under “Decent Working time”</p>	
Adequate earnings and productive work (1 + 3)	<p>M – Working poverty rate (S)*</p> <p>M – Employees with low pay rate (below 2/3 of median hourly earnings) (S)*</p> <p>A – Average hourly earnings by occupation group (S)*</p> <p>A – Average real wages (S)</p> <p>A – Minimum wage as a percentage of median wage</p> <p>A – Manufacturing wage index</p> <p>A – Employees with recent job training (past year / past 4 weeks) (S)</p>	L – Statutory minimum wage*
Decent Working Time (1 + 3)*	<p>M – Employment in Excessive Working Time (more than 48 hours per week) (S)*</p> <p>A – Employment by weekly hours worked (hours in standardized hour bands) (S)*</p> <p>A – Average annual working time per employed person (S)*</p> <p>A – Time-related underemployment rate (S)</p> <p>F – Paid annual leave (developmental work to be done by the Office; additional indicator)</p>	<p>L – Maximum hours of work</p> <p>L – Paid annual leave</p>
Combining work, family and personal life (1 + 3)	<p>F – Asocial / unusual hours (Developmental work to be done by the Office)</p> <p>F – Maternity protection (developmental work to be done by the Office; main indicator)</p>	<p>L – Maternity leave (including weeks of leave, and rate of benefits)</p> <p>L – Parental leave*</p>
Work that should be abolished (1 + 3)	<p>M – Child labour rate [as defined by ICLS resolution] (S)*</p> <p>A – Hazardous child labour rate (S)*</p> <p>A – Rate of worst forms of child labour (WFCL) other than hazardous work (S)**</p> <p>A – Forced labour rate (S)**</p> <p>A- Forced labour rate among returned migrants (S) **</p>	<p>L – Child labour (including public policies to combat it)</p> <p>L – Forced labour (including public policies to combat it)</p>

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) <u>Memo item:</u> Informal employment is grouped under employment opportunities.	L – Termination of employment* (incl. notice of termination in weeks) <u>Memo item:</u> ‘Unemployment insurance’ is grouped under employment opportunities; needs to be interpreted in conjunction for ‘flexicurity’.
Equal opportunity and treatment in employment (1, 2 + 3)	M – Occupational segregation by sex 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 retirement age (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) <u>additional indicator</u> 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	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 <u>Memo item:</u> ‘Unemployment insurance’ is grouped under employment opportunities.

	indicator) [Interpretation in conjunction with legal framework and labour market statistics.]	
Social dialogue, workers' and employers' representation (1 + 4)	M – Trade union density rate (S) * M – Enterprises belonging to an employers' organization [rate] 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 A – Days not worked due to strikes and lockouts*	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 in PPP\$ (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.

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

*Wording modified by ILO in the pilot phase; **Indicator added by ILO in the pilot phase.