



Governing Body

333rd Session, Geneva, 9 June 2018

GB.333/INS/INF/2

Institutional Section

INS

FOR INFORMATION

Report of the Meeting of Experts in Preparation for the 20th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (Geneva, 5–9 February 2018)

Summary: This document, submitted to the Governing Body for information, contains the report and conclusions of the tripartite Meeting of Experts on Labour Statistics in Preparation for the 20th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (MEPICLES/2018/1), which took place in Geneva from 5 to 9 February 2018.

Author unit: Department of Statistics (STATISTICS).

Related documents: GB.330/INS/9, paragraphs 14 to 20; MEPICLES/2018; MEPICLES/2018/1.

1. At its 330th Session in June 2017, the ILO Governing Body decided to convene a tripartite meeting of experts in February 2018 to examine proposals to update the current international standards for statistics on work relationships, including the International Classification of Status in Employment (ICSE-93). The conclusions of this tripartite meeting of experts would be taken into account by the Office to develop proposals for presentation to the 20th ICLS in October 2018, with a view to adopting a new, revised international classification. The discussion at the meeting was based on a report¹ prepared by the Office which included a draft resolution concerning statistics on work relationships in the annex. A revised draft resolution was prepared immediately after the meeting.² The Office will further develop and refine this draft, taking into consideration the conclusions of the meeting of experts and any further comments received from experts, for presentation to the 20th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (Geneva, 10–19 October 2018)³ with a view to adopting new, revised international standards.
2. The tripartite Meeting of Experts on Labour Statistics was chaired by the Government expert from Finland, Dr Hanna Sutela, and was composed of 11 Government experts, five Employer experts and six Worker experts. There were also Government observers from three member States, and representatives from the International Organisation of Employers (IOE) and the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC), as well as from certain intergovernmental and international non-governmental organizations. The list of participants is provided at the end of the report.
3. The report of the tripartite Meeting of Experts in Labour Statistics (MEPICLS/2018/1) as well as the conclusions adopted are submitted to the Governing Body for information.

¹ http://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/meetings-and-events/international-conference-of-labour-statisticians/20/preparatory-meetings/WCMS_615360/lang--en/index.htm.

² http://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/meetings-and-events/international-conference-of-labour-statisticians/20/preparatory-meetings/WCMS_619086/lang--en/index.htm.

³ <http://www.ilo.org/20thicls>.

Appendix I

Final report of the Meeting of Experts in Labour Statistics in Preparation for the 20th International Conference of Labour Statisticians: Statistics on work relationships (Geneva, 5–9 February 2018)

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	1
Agenda of the Meeting	1
Participants	1
1. Opening of the Meeting	1
1.1. Background	1
1.2. Opening remarks, election of the Chairperson and adoption of the agenda	2
2. Technical discussions	3
2.1. Background to the development of the proposed new standards	3
2.1.1. Overview and limitations of ICSE-93	4
2.2. Reference concepts	5
2.2.1. Definition of job or work activity	5
2.2.2. Type of authority: Independent and dependent workers	5
2.2.3. Definition of entrepreneurs	6
2.2.4. Type of economic risk: Workers in employment for profit and for pay	6
2.2.5. Quasi-corporations and household market enterprises	6
2.3. Status in employment (ICSE-18) – Alternative hierarchies	7
2.4. Independent workers in employment	7
2.5. Dependent contractors	8
2.6. Employees	11
2.7. Family helpers	12
2.8. International classification of status at work (ICSaW)	13
2.8.1. Definitions for employers and own-account workers in own-use production work	14
2.8.2. Volunteers and other unpaid workers	14
2.9. Cross-cutting variables and categories	14
2.9.1. Duration of the job or work activity and hours of work	15
2.9.2. Reason for non-permanent employment	16
2.9.3. Contract type	16

	<i>Page</i>
2.9.4. Form of remuneration.....	17
2.9.5. Seasonal workers	17
2.9.6. Place of work.....	17
2.9.7. Home-based workers	18
2.9.8. Domestic workers.....	18
2.9.9. Multi-party work relationships	19
2.9.10. Informal employment relationships.....	21
2.10. Data sources and guidelines for data collection.....	21
3. Review of draft resolution.....	22
4. Future work, next steps and closure of the Meeting.....	23
List of participants.....	25

Introduction

1. At its 330th Session (June 2017), the Governing Body of the International Labour Office decided to convene a Meeting of Experts in Labour Statistics. The Meeting was held in Geneva from 5 to 9 February 2018.

Agenda of the Meeting

2. The terms of reference for the Meeting were to examine the issues relating to the revision of the current International Classification of Status in Employment (ICSE-93) from the 15th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS, 1993), as well as adaptation and expansion of the classification to reflect the forms of work framework set out by Resolution I of the 19th ICLS (ICLS, 2013). The conclusions of the Meeting of Experts would be taken into account by the Office to develop proposals for presentation to the 20th ICLS in October 2018, with a view to adopting a new, revised international classification.

Participants

3. Twenty-four experts were invited to the Meeting, 12 from the Governments, six from the Employers' group and six from the Workers' group of the Governing Body. However, only 11 experts participated from the governments (Chile, China, Finland, France, Indonesia, Jordan, Mexico, Singapore, Switzerland, Uganda and United States), five from the Employers' group and six from the Workers' group. Present also at the Meeting as observers were representatives of the specialized agencies (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations), governments (Belgium, Islamic Republic of Iran and Spain), intergovernmental organizations (African Union, European Union, Gulf Cooperation Council and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) and of non-governmental organizations (International Organisation of Employers, International Trade Union Confederation and Women in Informal Employment: Globalizing and Organizing). The list of participants is given at the end of the report. The Government of the Republic of Korea was unable to send a representative to the Meeting. Nonetheless, Statistics Korea provided written comments which were distributed to all participants and discussed during the Meeting.

1. Opening of the Meeting

1.1. Background

4. The deliberations were based on a report¹ prepared by the ILO in its three working languages (English, French and Spanish). The report summarized the rationale underlying the review of the current classification, and described the main elements proposed for the

¹ ILO: *Statistics on work relationships*, Report for discussion at the Meeting of Experts on Labour Statistics in Preparation for the 20th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (Geneva, 5–9 February 2018) (MEPICLS/2018).

new classification. It also contained a draft resolution concerning statistics on work relationships in its appendix.

1.2. Opening remarks, election of the Chairperson and adoption of the agenda

5. Ms Monica Castillo, Head of the Statistical Standards and Methods Unit of the ILO Department of Statistics welcomed the participants and the Department Director, Mr Rafael Diez de Medina, provided opening remarks, explaining that this Meeting of Experts was a critical and long-standing part of the consultation process for developing international statistical standards which culminates in the ICLS.
6. Mr Diez explained that the purpose of the Meeting was to provide expert advice and that the participants were there as experts not as representatives of their respective institutions. No decision-making was required from the Meeting but the inputs received would support the development of the proposal to be presented to the ICLS. To the extent possible any issues arising would be taken into account in updating the current draft resolution.
7. The strong mandate received from the 19th ICLS to revise ICSE-93 reflected the need to provide better information on relationships between workers and the entities for which work is performed. These relationships had become more varied and complex over time as new contractual arrangements arose. These developments called into question the relevance of the existing distinction between self-employment and paid employment and created demand for statistics to track non-standard forms of employment over time.
8. The initiative of the Director-General of the ILO, Mr Guy Ryder, to establish a Future of Work Initiative associated with the ILO centenary in 2019, was focused on various forces which were transforming the world of work. These included technological and climate change and ever changing relationships between workers, employers and clients. Furthermore, there was growing recognition of the need for better measurement of unpaid work including the work relationships that exist in unpaid forms of work in line with the standards agreed at the 19th ICLS.
9. The extensive consultation process which had contributed to the development of the proposal to be discussed at the Meeting included the establishment of a working group which had met four times and a series of regional consultations in all regions of the world. Mr Diez noted the assistance received from many agencies that had been actively supporting the process.
10. While further work was needed, the proposals had so far been very well received with strong support in all regions and were widely accepted as necessary and overdue. The discussions of the Meeting of Experts would be an important part of that work and Mr Diez wished the participants all the best in the deliberations.
11. Dr Hanna Sutela (Finland) was elected to chair the Meeting. Mr David Hunter, representative of the Office, gave an overview of the proposed agenda of the Meeting which was accepted without modification.

2. Technical discussions

2.1. Background to the development of the proposed new standards

12. The Office, represented by Mr David Hunter, presented the background to the development of the new resolution on statistics on work relationships.
13. As working relationships evolved, ICSE-93 no longer adequately described existing and evolving types of working relationships. These concerns centred on “non-standard” forms of employment where “standard” referred to work that is full time, indefinite, formal and part of a subordinate relationship between an employee and employer. Forms of employment not fitting the description “standard” included multi-party employment relationships, dependent self-employment and various forms of non-permanent employment arrangement. These types of arrangement could not be identified using the categories defined in ICSE-93. The proposed new set of standards sought to address these varying limitations.
14. Policy discussion among ILO stakeholders on non-standard forms of employment had exposed the need for better data to understand the different types of working relationships that exist. In particular, the policy demand focused on describing the type of economic risk and authority which workers can have with respect to their work, understanding the strength of attachment between workers and the entities for which they work, the impact of economic cycles on precarious employment situations, and the evolution of self-employment and entrepreneurship and their impact on job creation. Moreover statistics classified by status in employment provided important input to the production of statistics for the national accounts and for various types of social analysis. As a consequence of these extensive demands, information on status in employment was obtained from a wide range of statistical sources.
15. Like the report to the Meeting of Experts, the report to the ICLS would provide descriptive and relatively detailed information on the proposals, whereas the draft resolution provided as an appendix to the report would contain the critical elements of the standards and essential supporting information. Room documents were proposed to add detail on necessary topics.
16. In discussing the introductory section of the report to the Meeting, the experts noted the need for more balanced wording to reflect both the positive and negative impacts of certain types of employment arrangement, the association between non-standard employment and job insecurity, and the representation of part-time and temporary agency work as non-standard forms. The report to the ICLS should reflect the need to measure these forms of work without seeming to judge their desirability while retaining the point that there had been an evolution in the world of work which changed the balance of economic risk between workers and enterprises.
17. The experts also noted the complexity but desirability of measuring multiple jobs given that non-standard employment arrangements commonly occur in jobs that are not a person’s main or even second job. The prevalence of these forms of employment may therefore be under-reported as many household surveys measuring employment only cover a main job, or possibly main plus second job. The report and resolution should reflect the relevance of measuring multiple jobs, even though this was recognized as complex, in order to measure the prevalence of non-standard employment. This was a broader challenge facing household surveys measuring labour and not limited to statistics on work relationships.
18. It was stressed that the distinction between standard and non-standard forms of employment should not directly be equated with a particular level of economic risk as many exceptions may be found if a simple relationship is assumed. Part-time work was considered non-

standard but did not necessarily infer the transfer of risk to the jobholder. The section on uses of statistics on work relationships only discussed employment and should be extended to cover forms of work other than employment. It was critically important that the revised ICSE and related standards should capture in statistics the emerging trends in employment that labour market researchers did not expect to abate, as well as existing employment practices that were widespread in developing countries.

2.1.1. Overview and limitations of ICSE-93

19. Mr Hunter described the coverage of ICSE-93 including its five substantive categories and its limitations. There were a number of cases where boundaries between different categories were ambiguous or the categories were not considered useful. The lack of any breakdown of “paid employment” beyond the single category of “employee” was a limitation as it represented a large share of employment. Within self-employment, while there were four categories, the usefulness of considering all those included in these categories as self-employed was questionable. For example, contributing family workers were exposed to economic risk as their livelihoods were dependent on the profits made by the enterprise for which they work, but do not have authority over it.
20. In the case of members of producers’ cooperatives there was little guidance on the distinction between this group and other self-employed workers. Few countries measured them and in those that did the numbers were very small. The statistics produced, however, understated the impact of cooperatives on employment and on the economy. Work was ongoing on this topic through a separate ILO Working Group on Cooperative Statistics but for the purposes of the revision of the ICSE it is not intended to include specific guidance or definitions other than ensuring that members of producers’ cooperatives can be correctly classified in ICSE-18.
21. Part of the need to revise ICSE-93 derives from the adoption of new standards on statistics of work, employment and labour underutilization at the 19th ICLS in 2013. Mr Kieran Walsh of the ILO Department of Statistics presented the main features of those standards and how they related to statistics on work relationships. Most notably the 19th ICLS standards include a narrower definition of employment than the one included in the 13th ICLS but adopts a broader definition of work and separate forms of work. These changes have direct implications for the ICSE and create a need for a classification which covers forms of work other than employment.
22. Mr Hunter gave an overview of the objectives and scope of the resolution on work relationships and in particular the issues which needed to be addressed in revising ICSE-93. These included creation of an overarching framework to ensure coherence with the 19th ICLS, covering the different forms of work. The usefulness of the existing dichotomy between self-employment and paid employment also needed to be assessed along with appropriate alternatives. The treatment of various specific types of worker, some of which were identified but not comprehensively addressed in ICSE-93, needed to be reviewed and data collection guidelines were also a high priority. As it would be difficult to accommodate all needs within a single classification, there was a clear consensus at the 19th ICLS on the need to replace ICSE-93 with a suite of standards addressing working relationships.
23. Experts agreed that the proposed resolution should include a section on future work which should make reference to the need for pilot testing of the different elements of the standards. Selected issues arising from the 19th ICLS will need to be dealt with in the development of the draft resolution; however it was noted that the main elements of the 19th ICLS resolution including the forms of work framework were not the subject of the Meeting or the draft resolution.

2.2. Reference concepts

24. Mr Hunter gave an outline of the proposed new standards. The first element was a conceptual framework and the new International Classification of Status in Employment (ICSE-18), with alternative hierarchies based on authority (ICSE-18-A) and economic risk (ICSE-18-R). The second main element was a classification of status at work (ICSaW-18) which includes all forms of work in a consistent conceptual framework using the same classificatory variables as ICSE-18. The third main element was the specification of a variety of cross-cutting variables which are not part of the classification itself but considered important to produce comprehensive statistics on work relationships.

2.2.1. Definition of job or work activity

25. The draft resolution referred to a number of statistical units including persons, economic units, jobs and work activities. The statistical unit job or work activity is defined in paragraph 12b of Resolution I of the 19th ICLS and its definition was particularly important as this is the unit against which status in employment or status at work is measured. For the purposes of the revision of statistics on work relationships some refinements to the 19th ICLS definition were proposed in the draft resolution. Some of these refinements were concerned with terminology. More substantial refinements were needed to clarify the treatment of dependent contractors in order to identify the number of jobs held by those individuals. It was proposed that the number of jobs should equal the number of economic units on which the worker is dependent.
26. The experts raised some concerns about the proposed changes to the definition of “job” for those in dependent self-employment. Some clarification would be useful on terms like “another economic unit who directly benefits from the work” or “dependent ... for determination of the price” which had been taken from the proposed definition of “dependent contractors”. With these considerations in mind it would be important to have clarity in the definition of boundaries between different jobs and multiple job holding. Simplified wording was proposed in order to provide more clarity and avoid repeating elements of the definition of “dependent contractors” in the definition of job.
27. In reference to other forms of work, separate work activities were defined where a person is engaged in both own-use production of goods and own-use provision of services. This distinction was needed for national accounts purposes. The experts agreed with this proposal.

2.2.2. Type of authority: Independent and dependent workers

28. Type of authority was used to distinguish between independent and dependent workers although a continuum of dependence can exist in reality. Dependence could be either operational or economic in nature. The draft resolution included specific definitions distinguishing independent and dependent workers and various subgroups within each high-level category. Specific points of note included the proposal that dependent workers be defined as having no employees. Some concern was raised about the use of terminology like dependent and independent. However, on balance, the experts were in general agreement with the description and labels relating to independent and dependent workers presented, subject to minor drafting observations.

2.2.3. Definition of entrepreneurs

29. The draft resolution noted that entrepreneurs could be identified using the proposed category of “independent workers” within ICSE-18 as this category aligns with the concept of those who create work for themselves and potentially others. Under this proposal, entrepreneurs will include groups such as employers in corporations, employers in household market enterprises and independent workers in either household market enterprises or corporations without employees. It would, however, exclude dependent contractors and contributing family workers. Some concern was raised by participants about the potential over-identification of “entrepreneurs”, for example by identifying small landowners or other independent workers with limited choice in their activities. On the other hand, there was recognition that many such people can be investing in their business/farm and potentially creating employment opportunities for others so a careful balance needed to be struck.
30. It was also observed that the term “entrepreneur” may have positive connotations and be associated with innovation and creativity which may not match the reality of many of the jobs in question, for example waste pickers in major urban centres. It was concluded that the resolution should state that the category of “independent workers” provided the best starting point for the identification and compilation of statistics on entrepreneurs and should note that added detail would be needed on issues such as size of the business to properly understand the nature of the group identified.

2.2.4. Type of economic risk: Workers in employment for profit and for pay

31. In discussing type of economic risk as a classification criterion it was acknowledged that all workers could be exposed to some forms of economic risk, for example deferred income as a result of engaging in volunteer work. However, for the new standards and classification it primarily referred to employment and own-use production work. Within employment, economic risk could be assessed by looking at the existence and nature of remuneration for the work performed and the type of protections available. The dichotomy created on this basis for ICSE-18 is “workers employed for pay” and “workers employed for profit”.
32. Some experts noted difficulty with the idea of identifying owner-operators of corporations (with or without employees) as workers in employment for pay. The justification for this treatment presented in the draft resolution, namely that they may receive a wage or salary, was not convincing. It was unclear if there was empirical evidence that a large part of this group is paid a wage or salary. Moreover, they are often exposed to economic risk given their personal investment in the corporation. This risk, however, was mitigated due to limitations of personal liability arising from incorporation of the enterprise as a separate legal entity. One suggestion was to allow some flexibility as to where they are classified depending on the specific context. This would be difficult, however, without creating risks of inconsistency of application of the standards and related incomparability. It was concluded that the current placement of this group among workers employed for pay was appropriate but that the resolution should note the nature and limitations of their exposure to economic risk, as well as the different types of payment which they can receive.

2.2.5. Quasi-corporations and household market enterprises

33. Mr Hunter presented the definitions of some additional concepts proposed for the purposes of the updated standards and their relationship to the definitions used in the 2008 System of National Accounts (SNA). These included corporations, quasi-corporations, households and household market enterprises. For ICSE purposes some refinements and clarifications were

necessary. Household market enterprises that can provide a complete set of accounts are treated in the SNA as quasi-corporations. In the proposed standards for statistics on work relationships they are treated as household market enterprises as their owners are exposed to a similar economic risk to those who cannot provide a complete set of accounts. In the case of household market enterprises there was also some lack of clarity on the number of jobs held when household members have multiple informal activities. However, this was not of primary concern for the new standards and would not be addressed in the resolution.

34. The experts considered that additional clarification could be provided on the treatment of quasi-corporations to specify that for the purposes of labour statistics and the ICSE, the availability of accounts is not a key defining criterion. The report to the ICLS and possibly the resolution should specify that owners of household market enterprises should be treated consistently regardless of the availability of a complete set of accounts.

2.3. Status in employment (ICSE-18) – Alternative hierarchies

35. Mr Hunter gave an overview of the two hierarchies proposed for ICSE-18, namely by type of authority (ICSE-18-A) and by type of economic risk (ICSE-18-R). The ten detailed categories within the proposed classification can be aggregated according to both hierarchies. The different hierarchies can support different types of analysis with the hierarchy by authority being suitable for many types of social analysis and monitoring of impact of employment creation policies. The hierarchy by economic risk is analogous to the traditional distinction between paid employment and self-employment. It has particular value for providing inputs to national accounts and supporting wage/earnings analysis and is also more suited to administrative data.
36. One suggestion made by the experts was to change the title of the hierarchy from “type of economic risk” to “type of labour income” to more accurately reflect the differences between the types of workers as represented in the hierarchies, i.e. depending on the institutional sector it can be mixed income, property rent, etc. and this might be clearer if the term “type of labour income” were used. There was concern, however, that changing the title of the hierarchy by type of economic risk could be difficult as terminology like “labour income” may be quite technical and also changes some of the criteria previously agreed to distinguish workers within the classification. Also it does not align with the intention that the main categories primarily distinguish workers based on exposure to economic risk and thus the change proposed may not be suitable.
37. Subject to other drafting suggestions and clarifications, the experts were in favour of the proposed structures and hierarchies.

2.4. Independent workers in employment

38. Mr Hunter described the definition of the aggregate category “independent workers” and the subcategories within it. The proposed definition of “employers” specified that they must have hired workers for at least one hour during a specific reference period with the option to separately identify those who had employees on a regular basis. This was an update from ICSE-93 which referred to employers as those who engage employees on a continuous basis, which was not adequately defined and considered problematic to apply.
39. During the discussion there was concern that in some African countries the proposed definition of employers would result in the majority of own-account workers (as identified in ICSE-93) being categorized as employers, since engaging workers on an occasional basis

was common. There were a number of examples where specifying a low threshold to identify someone as an employer could lead to questionable identification of employers (for example cases where a person employs someone only for one hour). This could also cause difficulties for comparability between developing and developed countries with “occasional” employers being more prevalent in developing settings. It was felt by some experts the differences in context between developed and developing countries should be explicitly referenced. There was some preference expressed for retention of the condition of “continuous” engagement of employees while others suggested options such as defining employers as those who “regularly” engage employees, perhaps according to a specified threshold such as half the months of the year. However, other experts noted the value of retaining consistency with the standards covering employment, i.e. which sets a criterion of one hour in a reference period while clarifying that it referred to a “usual” or “regular” situation.

40. There were mixed opinions as to whether it was preferable to directly reference the one-hour criterion (given that it is already stated in the 19th ICLS resolution) and/or add a reference to regularity or a usual situation. It was noted that implementation of concepts based on usual or regular (for example working time) can be problematic which should be borne in mind when developing the definitions. The possibility of asymmetry between statistics on employers and employees was also raised but experts noted that some asymmetry was inevitable. The current proposal, which stated that countries could present information on regular engagement of employees, could be a useful way to ensure continuity of existing time series of statistics on employers while transitioning to the new standards. For this purpose, additional breakdowns between “occasional” versus “regular” employers and related definitions would be useful.
41. It was also noted that the detail of the definition set for “employers” would have effects for other subcategories. For example, the proposed definition of “dependent” contractors specified that they could not be employers. Any changes in the boundary of employers will impact their measurement.
42. It was concluded that there was value in providing some clarity on the term “regular basis” as it relates to employers, and emphasizing the need to collect and disseminate information on this. This would create difficulty in the use of administrative sources, however, and removed the possibility to have breakdowns between “regular” and “occasional” employers. It could also be useful to add references in the resolution to the value of collecting information about the number of employees.
43. Modifications to the draft resolution were proposed to reflect this and are included in the draft posted on the ILO website shortly after the meeting.

2.5. Dependent contractors

44. The need for statistics on “dependent self-employment” was among the most challenging but also most important objectives of the revision work. The ILO report for discussion at the Meeting of Experts on Non-Standard Forms of Employment held in 2015 described this as a situation where “workers perform services for a business under a civil or commercial contract but depend on one or a small number of clients for their income and receive direct instructions regarding how the work is to be done”. Dependent self-employed workers were typically not covered by the provision of labour or social security laws, although a number of countries had adopted specific provisions to extend some protection to them.
45. Two groups of dependent self-employed workers could be identified: workers who provide their labour to others but have contractual arrangements that are akin to self-employment, and workers who own and operate their own business but do not have full control or authority

over their work. Statistics were needed about both groups to inform policy concerns about use of contractors, transfer of economic risk from employers to workers and trends in non-standard forms of employment. The concept of dependent contractors proposed in the draft resolution covered both of these groups but allowed for the separate identification of the two subgroups if feasible and relevant in the national context.

46. Much of the early work on measurement of this group had focused on dependence on one or a small number of clients. The working group for the revision of the ICSE had proposed additional features which could be used to identify dependent contractors such as payment of social contributions, type of payment received, dependence on another entity for access to the market (for example through a ride providing application) or different forms of control over the work performed.
47. In considering different criteria which could be used it was possible to identify many different types of workers, for example hairdressers who rent a chair in a salon and whose access to clients is entirely dependent on the salon owner, vehicle drivers whose work is organized by a transport company or ride providing service, subcontracted home-based workers, etc. This created a need to ensure, to the extent possible, that criteria proposed in a definition and related guidance identify cases of genuine policy interest and distinguish different types of worker where relevant.
48. The proposed definition provided a set of criteria which could support identification of dependent contractors as well as a set of exclusion criteria for cases such as those who employ others, have a contract of employment with the entity on which they depend, or who operate incorporated enterprises.
49. There was very strong support during the regional consultations for the provision of a definition of “dependent contractors” and there was strong demand for provision of statistics about them. However it was recognized to be a complex group for measurement creating a need for good operational guidance. The ILO had been engaged in pilot testing in partnership with different countries to test different operational approaches, such as the “main client” or “price setting” approaches but results have not been fully assessed as yet.
50. The proposed measurement approach focused on initially allowing the worker to self-report their status in employment. Depending on whether they self-identify as employees or self-employed they would be asked different sets of questions. The draft resolution noted the potential to subdivide dependent contractors between those who provide labour to others but have contractual arrangements similar to self-employed versus those who own and operate their business but do not have full control or authority over the work. However, testing experience was insufficient to allow detailed guidance to be provided in time for the 20th ICLS.
51. The experts emphasized the importance of this topic and the need for a good room document describing the background and clear measurement guidance to the extent possible. Substantial progress had been made but in view of the complexity there was a need for a strong proposal to be brought forward. However, the concept of dependency was complex, not limited to dependent contractors and there was concern about possible misclassifications.
52. Following on from earlier discussions about the definition of “employers”, it was noted that the criterion that dependent contractors cannot have employees may seriously limit the number of dependent contractors identified in settings where engaging employees only occasionally is common. This could also make the measure volatile as workers could change status between employers and dependent contractors depending on the specific reference period chosen. This may lead to a misrepresentation of the reality of dependence.

53. Some experts noted positive experiences arising from recent cognitive interviewing exercises which assessed questions on price setting and control of access to the market or supervision of work. Workers in different dependent situations were found to be able to understand and answer questions on these criteria but it was seen that the appropriate criteria to identify dependence could differ very much by the context of the individual worker. For example, those selling goods from a catalogue do not control price and only have a single supplier but have direct access to the market so the single supplier may be the most appropriate criterion in this case but may differ in others.
54. Reflecting the varied realities which were of policy interest it was suggested that the criteria needed to be further considered to allow some flexibility in application depending on the context and activity of the worker in question. It should also be recalled that further measurement experience was needed to refine any measurement guidance. This did not, however, diminish the importance of identifying this group within the classification as doing so will lessen their visibility and lower the likelihood of measurement and dissemination of statistics on the topic.
55. Other experts noted that there can be confusion when workers provide services through different mechanisms, for example if a driver is simultaneously available to take a passenger through a ride providing application or directly from the street. For these cases the issue was complex but may be more about identifying whether the person has one or multiple jobs. If the driver is free to take work by either means this could be considered an independent worker. As much as possible, treatment of cases of this nature should be clarified in the resolution and/or related materials.
56. The current draft of the report and resolution were considered to lack some material to clarify the motivation for identifying dependent contractors. This included tracking structural change in important and growing forms of employment not visible with existing classifications. Adding this could also assist in putting the definition in context or indeed updating the definition itself. For example, the idea that employment relationships can be operationally dependent or economically dependent may assist in framing the definition or related measurement guidance. Consideration could also be given to allowing separate measurement approaches for different industries or contexts, for example agriculture versus non-agriculture, which may facilitate improved measurement.
57. Bearing in mind the measurement challenges, a few experts expressed a preference not to include a separate category for dependent contractors. An alternative would be to include some additional cross-cutting variables to allow measurement of dependence among workers employed for profit. This would create various limitations on visibility of the group, however, and make the treatment of these workers within the classification unclear as they would need to be classified in other groups.
58. Many experts noted that the existing categories were inadequate for this important group whose visibility was limited when in reality they existed in large numbers in many countries. This meant that other categories were overstated as these workers would need to be assigned somewhere in the classification. The majority of participants felt that the good progress already made should be built on by retaining the group within the classification and working to further refine the definition and develop supporting guidance. It was emphasized that any operational guidance should be based on experience accumulated to date, which was growing, and subject to revision as further experience is gained. In this regard, the Office noted the need for additional countries to engage in testing of questions on this topic to contribute to ongoing knowledge development on this subject.

59. In concluding, Mr Hunter noted the strong but not universal support for inclusion of dependent contractors as a category in the classification. The complexity of measurement was universally accepted but there had already been some positive measurement experiences which should be built on through additional testing work. There was a need for further work on details of the definition and supporting guidelines. Previous versions of the definition had been more detailed and complicated but the current proposal may now be oversimplified. The report to the ICLS and draft resolution would need more information to clarify the motivation for identifying dependent contractors.

2.6. Employees

60. Mr Hunter described the definition of the category “employees” and its subcategories. The proposed definition of employees was “workers employed for pay who do not hold controlling ownership of the economic unit in which they are employed”. This covered a diverse set of workers as reflected in the detailed inclusions and exclusions related to the proposed definition.
61. To meet the need for statistics on non-standard forms of employment and to provide information on the permanence and stability of employment arrangements, four subcategories of employees were defined, namely permanent employees, fixed-term employees, casual and short-term employees, and paid apprentices, trainees and interns.
62. One detail which arose during regional consultations was the boundary to distinguish fixed-term from short-term employees, which was proposed as one month. There was not universal agreement on this as it is shorter than the duration of two or three months used in a number of countries to define short-term employment for migrant workers. Several experts preferred a change to three months which would ensure the group might be large enough to measure in typical household surveys.
63. The experts were concerned that the category “casual and short-term employees” included two very distinct groups and that consideration should be given to fully separating these. There was also some concern about the use of the term “casual” as this may imply judgement about the quality of employment and could capture some relatively stable arrangements in certain countries. It was concluded that some clarity could be added for the subcategory “casual and short-term employees” while noting that countries may wish to separate them for national publication purposes. A redrafted proposal along these lines, providing separate definitions for “short-term employees” and “casual and intermittent employees” was presented during the Meeting and was received favourably. This draft also extended the boundary between casual and short-term and fixed-term from one month to three months.
64. Concerning the overarching definition of employees, there was some confusion regarding the condition that they do not hold controlling ownership of the enterprise. It was felt that some qualification could be added to clarify the underlying intention. There was also a need to provide additional detail to distinguish dependent contractors from employees. The boundary proposed related to the type of payment received, with workers who are paid for time worked identified as employees, while those paid only by the piece or commission may be identified as dependent contractors if not working on the premises of the employing entity and responsible for making their own arrangements for payment of social contributions. Since there were other cases, such as street vendors, which made the boundary between employees and both dependent and independent worker employed for profit difficult to measure, there was a need to provide additional clarification for borderline cases.

65. Some experts noted that the definition of “permanent employees” may cause difficulties in some countries as it included arrangements without a fixed end date (provided a certain number of hours of work was guaranteed). For example, domestic workers may have an agreement with no specified duration when the actual duration of employment could vary greatly. Clarity was sought as to whether the intended treatment was to represent these as permanent employees.
66. With reference to paid apprentices, trainees and interns, the key elements of the definition were that the motivation is the acquisition of workplace experience or skills while payment is received for the work performed. Since most workers in this group would otherwise be classified as fixed-term employees, their separate identification would assist in ensuring comparability of statistics on fixed-term employees given the substantial variability in the prevalence of paid apprenticeship or trainee systems across countries. There was a view that it could be appropriate to include them as a subcategory of fixed-term employees or alternatively reverse the order of the groups with casual and short-term employees and explicitly reference that they are a special case of fixed-term employees. There could be some difficulty with including them under fixed-term employees however, as the aggregates would be compared, meaning that the concerns about incomparability would remain. Another perspective was that paid trainee arrangements may sometimes be of indefinite or short duration, and should not be considered as fixed term, especially if the boundary between short-term and fixed-term employees was extended beyond one month. It was noted that some additional classification criteria could potentially be developed to better distinguish paid apprentices, trainees and interns and that the wording for the definition of this category should be reviewed.
67. Mr Hunter presented the proposed definition of persons in “unpaid trainee work” which for the purposes of the resolution directly referenced the appropriate part of the 19th ICLS resolution. The experts noted the need to retain consistency between definitions of “employment” and “unpaid trainee work” from the 19th ICLS standards. A suggestion was made to specify that the minimum wage could be used as a minimum requirement to identify paid apprentices, trainees and interns but difficulties were noted with this, including that it deviates from the 19th ICLS. A minimum wage approach could also lead to difficulties for consistent application across countries as not all countries have minimum wages and it may not reflect the reality of apprenticeship systems. It was concluded that some clarification could be added without making significant changes.

2.7. Family helpers

68. Mr Hunter presented the proposed definitions for “family helpers” and their treatment within the proposed classifications. This group exists both within employment and other forms of work. The draft guidance on measurement stated that in the case of employment they will generally be directly identified from a self-identification question on status in employment. Additional questions on type of remuneration received (to confirm no regular payment is received) and role in decision-making in the family business could be used to confirm their appropriate classification in countries where the group is statistically important. Some clarifications were sought and provided on the interpretation of elements of the definition, such as what type of payment may be received, decision-making role and the relationship of the definition for this group to the definition of “dependent contractors” and others. It should be clarified that a contributing family worker can perform work for someone who is classified as a dependent contractor without changing the classification of either worker.

2.8. International classification of status at work (ICSaW)

69. Mr Hunter explained that the proposed ICSaW was a three-level hierarchical classification with 20 mutually exclusive categories at its third level. Aggregate categories were based on the type of authority as this was more relevant to forms of work other than employment than economic risk. It was an extension of the proposed ICSE in that it contained the subcategories of ICSE and additional subcategories for the other forms of work.
70. The purpose of the ICSaW relates to achieving coherence and consistency of classification across different forms of work. It was unlikely that the complete classification would be used on a regular basis or applied completely in a labour force survey. The classification provided a basis for coherent statistics to be used at whatever frequency information is collected on the different groups, or whatever sets of surveys may be used to capture information on the different forms of work.
71. Some experts raised concerns about the scope and proposed structure of the ICSaW. In particular, they considered that its use of terms such as “dependent” and “independent” for forms of work such as volunteer work and own-use provision of services were not useful and possibly confusing. They felt that the concepts of risk and authority did not apply as naturally to these forms of work as they do to employment. Other experts stressed that the distinctions provided were of clear policy interest and reflected some key differences in roles between men and women. These experts argued that there was a clear policy interest in providing statistics on the level of dependence of workers in forms of work other than employment and a preference among many experts to establish a consistent framework covering all forms of work rather than excluding or separating some forms of work.
72. Many experts noted that there was a strong mandate to produce a coherent classification and it was important to highlight that ICSE-18 will be narrower in scope than ICSE-93 given the new definition of “employment” from the 19th ICLS resolution. Forms of work previously covered by ICSE-93 were no longer covered within the ICSE creating a need to consider how statistics produced through the two classifications relate. This would be best dealt with through an overall coherent classification covering the different forms of work. In addition, some of the subcategories of the proposed ICSaW were of significant interest and represented important groups, such as employers in own-use production of goods, either regularly or occasionally hiring employees, for example during harvesting or employers in own-use provisions of services. These categories reflected important labour relationships which should be identified.
73. An alternative hierarchy proposed by an expert received some, but not widespread support. The alternative used the different forms of work as a starting point for the classification with different categories within each form of work. There was no consensus to replace the proposed ICSaW-18 hierarchy based on authority with this alternative, however. An option would be to include it as an alternative way of representing the status at work categories. Some experts felt that, while this hierarchy may warrant discussion in the report, it could cause confusion if presented in the resolution alongside ICSaW-18. It was agreed that the Office should further develop the draft alternative hierarchy and circulate it for further views including on whether and how it should be presented in the report and resolution.

2.8.1. Definitions for employers and own-account workers in own-use production work

74. Mr Hunter presented the definitions proposed for employers and own-account workers in own-use production of goods and own-use provision of services. It was noted that persons who engage in activities which can be partially used to generate an income, for example looking after one's own children while also caring for others in return for pay will be identified as employment or own-use production work depending on which is the "main" intended destination of the work. The application of main intended destination for own-use provision of services required careful operationalization as checking the main intention of the activity could entail multiple questions in the questionnaire.
75. The proposed resolution included a minor revision of the 19th ICLS resolution in the case of subsistence foodstuff producers. In the 19th ICSL resolution, paragraph 25, it is stated that subsistence foodstuff producers cannot employ others. However, based on evidence captured during pilot testing of the prevalence of this phenomenon, particularly at planting or harvesting, it was considered necessary to update this so that people can still be identified as subsistence foodstuff producers even if they employ others.
76. Some concerns were expressed about the application of a main intended destination approach to own-use provision of services. The one-hour criterion for identifying employment set a low bar for activities to be considered employment based on the intention to generate pay or profit through the work. Excluding cases where the main intention is own-use of the services provided can be very complex for surveys and respondents, and its justification was not clear to some. The main intention criterion, however, was consistent with the conceptual approach taken to own-use production of goods and was not a revision to the 19th ICLS resolution, rather a clarification of something which was not clearly elaborated. Also the group may be insignificant in many cases thus not justifying substantial additions to labour force surveys but may warrant attention for other surveys such as time-use surveys or others measuring own-use production work. It was noted that this issue could benefit from further consideration by the ILO.

2.8.2. Volunteers and other unpaid workers

77. Mr Hunter gave an overview of the definitions for "own-account volunteers" (proposed to be called "direct volunteers" from now on) and "organization-based volunteers", the background to them and notable inclusions and exclusions. Since the two categories proposed on volunteers can include those who produce goods or those who produce services they included some activities inside the SNA production boundary and others activities outside the SNA production boundary. A possibility would be to create additional groups to separate these and allow complete alignment with the production boundaries of the SNA.
78. Other unpaid workers covered workers who cannot be classified in any other groups in the ICSaW. One option to consider is to state explicitly that it aligns with people engaged in the form of work "other work activities" from the 19th ICLS resolution. It was not intended as a residual to cover cases where insufficient information is available to classify cases. No observations were made on the specific definitions presented and there was no desire expressed for additional splits of the presented categories.

2.9. Cross-cutting variables and categories

79. Mr Hunter explained the purpose of defining cross-cutting variables, which was to provide more detailed information of interest which cannot be derived from the classifications according to status. There were three types of cross-cutting variables, namely those required

to compile statistics according to the ICSE-18 classification, those essential for analytical purposes on the work relationship and those which are recommended. The experts noted that many of the variables were already collected in labour force surveys and the typology presented was supported. It was noted that it might not be justified to collect some of the variables very frequently if they related to phenomena which are insignificant in particular countries.

2.9.1. Duration of the job or work activity and hours of work

80. In addition to being necessary to compile statistics on status in employment, information on the duration of work arrangements could provide important insights on the nature and stability of both permanent and non-permanent jobs. This was of particular relevance to employees. Two variables were proposed for this purpose, namely duration of work contract and duration of employment with the current economic unit. The variables related to working time made reference to definitions already stated in the resolution on the measurement of working time adopted by the 18th ICLS (2008).
81. In the case of *duration of employment in the current economic unit*, clarification was needed about the economic unit to which it refers, for example a local unit, enterprise, or enterprise group. In this regard, one consideration was whether different rights such as pension, seniority, etc. are retained when a worker changes jobs within an enterprise with multiple establishments or moves from one government department to another. Some clarifications for these issues were needed while retaining flexibility to reflect national circumstances. It was concluded that the text should be updated to indicate a specific economic unit which can be used for reference (e.g. enterprise or enterprise group) and how this applies to different sectors such as government.
82. There was discussion on what duration should be considered as a break in employment. Multiple experts supported a one-month threshold although this was not universal and some special national cases were noted where this might not be appropriate. Other experts expressed a preference for a three-month threshold and there was no clear consensus. The intention was to identify something which relates to stability and continuity of employment and this should be reflected in the definition. There was a need to clarify that for workers employed through agencies the recorded duration of employment should be the duration with the agency not the client of the agency.
83. With respect to *duration of work contract* some experts questioned its relevance to dependent contractors given that by definition an employment contract does not exist in such cases and the commercial contract may not have a specified duration. There was some discussion on the meaning of permanent/without limit of time and its relationship to measurement of duration of work contract. The terminology may not adequately reflect the nature of working engagements involved and some improved wording may be found such as “without stated limit of time” so as to avoid the inference that all such cases are permanent while many of the cases likely to be captured do not have clear expectation of permanence. It was concluded that additional detail should be introduced to specify how this can apply to different types of engagements such as written fixed-term contracts, open-ended arrangements, unwritten/implicit agreements and so on.

2.9.2. Reason for non-permanent employment

84. The proposed cross-cutting variable reason for non-permanent employment was not just intended as an explanatory variable but could also potentially identify groups of interest for the classification, such as apprentices or interns who may express this as their reason for non-permanent employment.
85. As there was some interest in knowing if cases of non-permanent employment were voluntary or involuntary the current proposal made reference to the need for this information but did not provide definitions. Some experts were not convinced of the value of information on whether the non-permanent employment is voluntary as it can be very subjective. It was also unclear to some as to whether it should be collected for some of the groups listed such as casual employees. However, a majority saw value in the voluntary and non-voluntary distinction and felt it would not be difficult to collect through a labour force survey as was already done in some countries. There was broad agreement on the need to develop further material regarding the voluntary nature of arrangements based on a review of existing practices with a view to bringing a more detailed proposal to the ICLS.
86. Another point of concern was the inclusion of a category for “probation” as the types of probation systems which exist vary greatly across countries. Since respondents may give this as an answer when asked about the reason for non-permanent employment it was necessary to know how to handle these cases if the category is not included in disseminated statistics. A solution could be to remove the category but include a sentence on how such cases should be handled.
87. Some of the categories related to the person’s personal situation while others refer to characteristics of the job. In addition, a person may have multiple overlapping reasons in reality. Since the variable referred to the main reason, however, the categories were mutually exclusive. They reflected commonly reported responses to questions on this subject.

2.9.3. Contract type

88. The proposed variable for contract type distinguished between written contracts and oral agreements. A question was needed for sequencing questions but also had analytical value. This variable should not be used to directly measure informality as written contracts may not indicate formality while those with oral agreements may meet the criteria to be identified as formal. For data collection purposes it may be necessary to include “no contract”, as respondents may indicate this, but for presentation purposes this may be combined with oral agreements. It was felt that there was a need to provide greater clarity on the inclusion of a category “no contract”.
89. Some experts felt that references to individual and collective agreements should be reviewed given a concern about their relevance to contract type and the relative emphasis placed on collective versus individual agreements. One suggested option was to include a separate cross-cutting variable on the existence of a collective agreement with categories used reflecting national relevance. Household surveys, however, were not a good vehicle to collect information on collective agreements for which information may be better obtained from administrative sources. It was concluded that the resolution should note that statistics indicating whether the agreement is collective or individual should also be compiled from relevant sources.

2.9.4. Form of remuneration

90. The two variables related to form of remuneration were intended to provide information to understand the nature of the employment relationship but not to provide detailed information on remuneration more generally. The variable “forms of remuneration” should include information on all forms of remuneration received in a particular job and was required to assist with the identification of the status in employment categories. A separate variable “main form of remuneration” was also recommended and could be collected through an additional question. One issue was whether the category “wage or salary” should be changed to something like “payment for time worked including a wage or salary” to deal with cases where workers engaged on a day-to-day basis may not consider themselves to be paid a wage or salary. During regional consultations it had also been suggested to add a category for “tips from clients” since this could be the only type of payment received in some countries for certain occupations.
91. There was general support for the proposed updated categories and particularly the update to the category “wage and salary” to add a reference to “time worked”. Adding a separate question for main form of remuneration would require that respondents could initially indicate multiple forms of remuneration and created greater emphasis on the inclusion of additional categories such as “tips” as proposed. There was interest in identifying cases where this is the only form of remuneration received. Starting with a question allowing multiple responses and following up with a question on main form for those with multiple forms of remuneration could meet different information needs.

2.9.5. Seasonal workers

92. Mr Hunter presented the proposed definition for “seasonal workers” noting that it was relevant to all forms of work. Seasonal employees may be identified through questions on reasons for non-permanent employment. For accurate measurement, data collection is required at different times during the year covering all active and inactive seasons.
93. Some experts noted that seasonality may not in fact be a reason for non-permanent employment as it may cause long or short breaks in an arrangement which may otherwise be permanent in nature, for example recurring contracts with seasonal breaks such as teachers or workers in jobs related to tourism. It may be useful to reflect on national practices for the capture of seasonality as a reason for non-permanent employment for particular occupations. It may not be appropriate to identify all such cases as seasonal workers depending on the context.

2.9.6. Place of work

94. The proposed variable *place of work* referred to the type of location where the work is usually performed. The draft resolution proposed a minimum set of categories to identify groups of interest, including home-based workers, domestic workers and workers in multi-party employment relationships. In some contexts it was also relevant for the identification of dependent contractors.
95. It was noted that for multi-party work relationships the place of work recorded should be that of the ultimate client, not the employer, for example in the case of those working for temporary employment agencies. More clarity was needed on cases where a place of work can be a vehicle to provide a meaningful distinction, e.g. police who usually work from their vehicle versus a worker in a food truck. It was also noted that the purpose of a premises may change, e.g. a shop which is also used for sleeping. Clarity was required to establish if this should be recorded as own home or own business premises.

96. Some experts sought clarity on persons who always work on the street but at different locations and under which category they should be recorded, “street” or “no fixed location”. There was also a need to clarify what street refers to and whether it refers to various public places such as in a small kiosk of an underground transport station, etc.
97. There are potentially complex cases where an employer contracts people as part of a production chain and provides an open outdoor space for work to be completed, something which is known to happen in some developing countries. These cases do not naturally fit with any of the categories as they are open spaces but provided by a client/employer. Another case which could be complex and substantial in some countries was vendors who sell their products door to door.
98. The meaning of “place of work” for those who work through internet platforms and whereby the location of work can be anywhere was also raised. It was proposed to note in the resolution that, where required, countries could capture information on work through internet platforms but not as a separate category as a place of work.
99. For those working on farms which are not their own there is a need to ensure their categorization is clear. The proposed treatment was clarified as “employer’s business premises” but some additional detail may be needed for this to allow for different types of agricultural working arrangements. For this purpose, a suggestion was to add “or farm” to the categories for “client’s business premises” and “employer’s business premises” or changing “business premises” to “workplace”. The experts expressed mixed opinions on these alternatives.
100. It was concluded that there was a need to provide explanatory notes to clarify the definitions of the place of work categories and possibly to include an “other” category.

2.9.7. Home-based workers

101. Mr Hunter explained that home-based workers cuts across different categories of the ICSE and refers to all those whose main place of work is their own home. He proposed to add some additional material to clarify the boundary between dependent contractors and others who work at home. This was supported.

2.9.8. Domestic workers

102. In introducing this topic, Mr Hunter noted that the Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189), defined “domestic work” as “work performed in or for a household” and defined a “domestic worker” as “any person engaged in domestic work in an employment relationship”. This Convention notes that a person who performs domestic work only occasionally or sporadically and not on an occupational basis is not a domestic worker. These definitions were not sufficiently detailed to provide clarity for measurement and the reference to employment relationship has implications given the meaning of this within the ICSE, i.e. it would seemingly exclude dependent contractors and others. For these and other reasons refined definitions are required for statistical purposes.
103. Mr Hunter presented the proposal for the new standards along with a proposal received from experts from Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC). The proposals were close in overall scope but differed in aspects of the wording. In the case of domestic workers in employment, the LAC proposal added some specificity regarding regularity and exclusivity of the work and indicated that such work can be performed both “in and for households” as compared with the original proposal.

104. An expert from the region explained the concerns underlying the LAC proposal which revolved around current difficulties with identifying workers engaged in this type of work and the need for clarity in the new standards, given the need to properly identify this group. The group was predominantly women and of significant policy interest. This motivated the various updates contained in the proposal around issues such as regularity, types of services involved, clarity on definition of “use by the household”, etc. The idea of regularity was not just about frequency but also referred to the importance of the service in question to the ongoing functioning of the household. Also the original proposal was considered by the LAC experts not to be in line with Convention No. 189 which specified that the service provided is “in or for the household” not just “in the household”. This point was widely supported. The LAC proposal also excluded workers who have employees from domestic workers but other experts considered their inclusion to be appropriate.
105. Since some services considered as domestic services (laundry, ironing, etc.) may not be completed on the household premises, there was concern about excluding this through a focus on a specific industry and the completion of the activity mainly in the household of a client as stated in the original proposal. However, changing this would create difficulties in distinguishing domestic workers from those serving many households and operating a business for that purpose. An option would be to include a reference to the potential interest in measuring such cases where nationally relevant but not as part of the aggregate category of “domestic workers”.
106. Some experts were concerned that the inclusion of the term “exclusively for households” as contained in the LAC proposal may lead to exclusions for people performing some activities which are not for the household or which are not domestic services (for example baking for a family business for a short period of time) even though domestic work is the predominant activity involved. For this reason “mainly” may be a preferable reference point. This was widely agreed by the experts.
107. It was noted that the statistical standards needed to reflect the interest in measuring shifts over time between unpaid domestic work provided by household members and paid domestic work, and between paid domestic work performed by workers employed directly by households and those employed by third party agencies or for profit. This supported the need for measurement of all domestic work in different forms of work, and for statistics that are not restricted to workers who perform domestic work on a regular basis by employees of households.
108. There was a need to consider further the case where workers can engage in work through agencies and may also work for other entities, for example security guards who work for households during some parts of the week but work for other businesses during other periods of the week but all through the same agency.
109. The proposal for domestic work was updated by the Office to reflect the discussion and is included in the draft version of the resolution posted on the ILO website shortly after the meeting.

2.9.9. Multi-party work relationships

110. Mr Hunter noted that multi-party work relationships involved situations where a third party is involved in the relationship between the worker and the economic unit for which the work is performed. It was related to a variety of situations such as labour hire agencies, employers providing outsourced services, governments operating employment promotion schemes and others. Internet mediation could also be involved. There was demand for information about these various situations. Traditionally this group has been referred to as workers in

“triangular employment” relationships but more recently in the ILO this has been adapted to multi-party employment relationships.

111. The draft resolution described the different ways in which a third party may be involved in the working relationship and the forms of mediation which may exist for employees or workers employed for profit such as dependent contractors. The key characteristics of these relationships were described in the draft resolution. In particular, the work was not mainly performed at the premises of the agency that pays the employee. These arrangements may typically be temporary but could also be permanent. For workers in employment for profit, an intermediary may supply raw materials and receive the goods produced by dependent contractors or else access to clients may be controlled by an intermediary.
112. The report provided guidance on measurement. This included approaches where the respondent is asked the type of contract they have, possibly with a list of predefined options or with wording of the question directly referring to a nationally significant type of multi-party employment relationship, for example: “Do you have a contract with a temporary employment agency?” Another approach was to ask who pays the worker. Any such questions needed to be carefully developed and tested to ensure they pick up groups of interest. It was also noted that if the group was not large it may be difficult to reliably measure through sample surveys. The advice provided at this point should be considered indicative as insufficient experience on measurement was available.
113. The experts welcomed the inclusion of this group as it related to a topic of very substantial interest to policy-makers with no current clear reference point for measurement. The inclusion of workers provided by third-party service provision agencies, as well as labour hire agencies, was considered by several experts to be highly relevant.
114. Some experts were concerned, however, that the proposed definition was too wide as it could be interpreted to cover many service providers or suppliers of goods to other businesses which could lead to over-estimation relative to the group of policy interest. The proposal confused two very distinct groups, namely those with intermediated work relationships and subcontractors. It would not be desirable to cover all subcontractors whose operation may simply relate to the way a supply chain operates and not to a multi-party relationship. There was a need to review the references to subcontractors to ensure that this group would not be interpreted as being broader than intended. It should only identify cases of subcontracted labour and not subcontracted service or goods provision more generally.
115. It was queried whether under the current proposal home-based workers could be considered as covered by multi-party employment relationships as it does not take place on the client’s premises and may not be supervised. There was therefore a need for clarification that home-based workers in the gig economy or in intermediated home-based manufacturing could be included and that the place of work criterion was mainly relevant for employees.
116. It was pointed out that temporary agency workers and others with similar work relationships can have very similar protections or other conditions to other employees and that their economic risk and security may be similar. Some experts felt that special treatment of the group was not necessarily justified given possible negative inferences about these working relationships. The resolution and report should not suggest a negative inference for the groups identified, but rather represent them as a group of potential policy interest.
117. Mr Hunter welcomed the general support for identification of these types of relationships. He acknowledged that it would be useful to encourage the estimation of the full group but there was also a need for breakdowns to separately identify the various subgroups. The draft resolution could reflect this. Since this section of the resolution required substantial

redrafting, no attempt was made to update it in the draft version posted on the ILO website shortly after the meeting.

2.9.10. Informal employment relationships

118. Mr Michael Frosch, Senior Statistician in the ILO Department of Statistics, presented the content of the draft report and resolution on the topic of informal employment relationships. One of the motivations for including this in the new standards was that there was not a consistent approach among countries in measuring informality with respect to employees – or lack of measurement in many developed countries. Nevertheless while updates to existing guidelines for measuring informality were necessary they were outside the mandate for the revision of the ICSE. As a consequence the proposal specified three variables which can be used to compile information of interest. The three variables are job-dependent social protection, access to paid annual leave and access to paid sick leave. This proposed approach had received strong support during the regional consultations.
119. Some experts noted some of the difficulties arising from the lack of clear definitions for informality which creates concerns about including the proposed three variables as indicators of informality. While these variables were widely recognized to be of strong interest, multiple experts expressed an opinion that they should not be presented as providing an indicator of informality. While relevant, and used in some countries to identify informal employees, they were not necessarily sufficient for this purpose. However, their inclusion was important to encourage wider measurement even if they do not definitively provide a measure of informality of relevance to all contexts.
120. It was also noted that the term “informality” had connotations which may not match national realities. For example, the absence of some of these conditions may not indicate informality and can even identify work which is standard in certain countries because the condition in question is not common in the country. There was also a view that some of the variables could be difficult to collect from proxy respondents, particularly job-dependent social protection.
121. Some experts expressed strong support for maintaining the language related to the importance of the three variables for the measurement of key components of informal employment. They referred to the two sets of existing ICLS standards on the topic of measuring informality which, while recognizing that they required updating in light of the 19th ICLS resolution, nonetheless noted that they provided international standards for measurement. The experts highlighted in particular the close linkages between the ICLS guidelines on measuring informal employment and the status in employment categories defined by ICSE-93. Moreover, experts noted the importance of such variables for constructing components of the informal employment rate which is a decent work indicator and an indicator in the global sustainable development goal indicators framework.
122. Mr Frosch welcomed the general support for the retention noting that there was wide support to retain references to the relevance of the three variables for measuring informality but in a way which does not infer that they are fully sufficient to measure informality for all workers in all contexts.

2.10. Data sources and guidelines for data collection

123. Mr Frosch gave an overview of the data collection guidelines. He noted that work on the guidelines would be ongoing and the latest state of knowledge will be presented at the 20th ICLS with the understanding that ongoing revision will be required to reflect future measurement experience. The approach underlying the guidelines was to identify key

characteristics which should be measured and present questions to illustrate how measurement could be conceived. The questions were organized into modules for flexibility of implementation to allow the more detailed subcategories in the proposed ICSE-18 to be distinguished or, depending on the set, applied only to certain subsets of the categories.

124. Different levels of detail could be warranted for different sources depending on the information needed, for example a more detailed approach may be needed for a labour force survey than a time-use survey.
125. The proposed measurement approach for household surveys commences with a self-identification question on status in employment and respondents are then routed to dedicated modules depending on the initial self-identification. Specific sub-modules have been developed separately for employees, self-employed and contributing family workers. Different operational approaches had been tested and there had been positive findings on the comprehension of many of the questions. However, results are very sensitive to the operational approach chosen. Further testing on a variety of issues was required to improve knowledge of the operational difficulties involved and this will extend beyond the 20th ICLS. Guidelines on the measurement of the essential and recommended cross-cutting variables were under development.
126. Some guidance had been developed on the collection of ICSE-18 through administrative sources. Establishment surveys will also be covered but were less well addressed in the current proposal.
127. Experts welcomed the testing work and the development of measurement guidance. It was stated that it would be important to provide guidance on proposed periodicity and frequency of measurement and reporting. The relation to survey type was very important as the modules may need to reflect other topics covered by the survey. The legal context of the country may require change in measurement approach over time and this should be reflected in the guidance. Also, depending on the survey type, it might be difficult to apply only a limited set of sub-modules as some distinctions needed to confirm self-identification require the more detailed modules.
128. Mr Frosch noted the need to receive further input from national experts and the support for further testing.

3. Review of draft resolution

129. Mr Hunter presented the main revisions which needed to be made arising from the discussions during the Meeting of Experts. Revisions are required to both the report and the resolution. The revisions to the report and some of the more substantial revisions to the resolution would require further work after the Meeting. The changes to the draft resolution which could already be made were presented. Many of the changes related to the need for updated wording to clarify the intended meaning behind different concepts, for example multiple job-holding, non-standard employment and a variety of others.
130. During the discussions a number of improvements and corrections were proposed and it was noted that these would be reflected by the Office in preparing the draft resolution to be presented at the 20th ICLS.

4. Future work, next steps and closure of the Meeting

131. Mr Hunter described the section of the draft resolution on future work regarding wide dissemination of the standards and support for country implementation through technical assistance, capacity development, and preparation and update of guidance.
132. Regarding next steps Mr Hunter briefly described the activities anticipated over the coming weeks and months including the timelines for reporting on the Meeting of Experts and beyond that the work to be completed in advance of the 20th ICLS. It was planned to provide room documents and a draft report on this topic for the ICLS approximately a month in advance of the ICLS.
133. In closing the Meeting, Mr Diez expressed gratitude for the thoughtful insights presented by the experts. He noted the value of the wide regional distribution of the experts which had added substantially to the discussion through the reflection of extremely varying national perspectives which was a mirror of the ICLS itself. He welcomed the wide support for the draft resolution subject to the various updates proposed. Substantial work remained and the discussions at the 20th ICLS would be challenging and of undoubted importance. Mr Diez thanked the Chair for her excellent management of the Meeting and personal insights to the discussions.
134. Finally, he thanked the ILO team, particularly Mr Hunter, that he felt had developed a very strong proposal for consideration by the Meeting, noting the long hours worked both in preparations for and during the Meeting. He also thanked the support staff, interpreters and translators whose efforts had contributed greatly to the smooth and effective running of the Meeting.
135. The Chair added her thanks to those of Mr Diez and closed the meeting.

List of participants
Liste des participants
Lista de participantes

Members representing Governments
Membres représentant les gouvernements
Miembros representantes de los gobiernos

CHILE CHILI

Sra. Verónica HUARACÁN, Coordinadora Equipo Técnico, Encuesta Nacional de Empleo (ENE), Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas de Chile (INE), Santiago.

CHINA CHINE

Ms. Yuhui JIA, Director of Division of Employment, Department of Population and Employment Statistics, National Bureau of Statistics, Beijing.

FINLAND FINLANDE FINLANDIA

Dr. Hanna SUTELA, Senior Researcher, Statistics Finland, Helsinki.

FRANCE FRANCIA

M. Claude PICART, Institut national de la statistique et des études économiques (INSEE), Paris.

INDONESIA INDONÉSIE

Mr Sairi HASBULLAH, Deputy Chief Statistician for Social Statistics, BPS Statistics Indonesia, Jakarta.

JORDAN JORDANIE JORDANIA

Mr Amer AL-JAMMAL, Head of Labour Force Surveys Division, Department of Statistics (DOS), Amman.

MEXICO MEXIQUE MÉXICO

Sr. Rodrigo NEGRETE PRIETO, Director de Generación de Estadísticas, Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía, México D.F.

SINGAPORE SINGAPOUR SINGAPUR

Mr SHUN Wu Fang, Senior Assistant Director, Ministry of Manpower, Singapore.

SWITZERLAND SUISSE SUIZA

M. Alain VUILLE, chef de la section Travail et vie active, Office fédéral de la statistique, Neuchâtel.

UGANDA OUGANDA

Mr Michael SIJJE OGEN, Senior Statistician, Uganda Bureau of Statistics, Kampala.

UNITED STATES ETATS-UNIS ESTADOS UNIDOS

Ms. Anne POLIVKA, Supervisory Economist, Employment Research Staff, Office of Employment and Unemployment Statistics, US Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington DC.

**Members representing the Employers
Membres représentant les employeurs
Miembros representantes de los empleadores**

AUSTRALIA AUSTRALIE

Mr William GROZIER, Associate Director Workplace Relations, Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ACCI), North Sydney.

COLOMBIA COLOMBIE

Sr. José Alberto MUÑOZ VALDÉS, Economista Senior, Asociación Nacional de Empresarios de Colombia ANDI, Medellín.

**CONGO, DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF
RÉPUBLIQUE DÉMOCRATIQUE DU CONGO
REPÚBLICA DEMOCRÁTICA DEL CONGO**

M. Katuala TSHIBANGU, responsable du service juridique, Fédération des entreprises du Congo, Kinshasa.

GERMANY ALLEMAGNE ALEMANIA

Mr Holger SCHÄFER, Senior Economist, Cologne Institute for Economic Research on behalf of the Confederation of German Employers' Associations, Berlin.

GREECE GRÈCE GRECIA

Dr Chariton KYRIAZIS, Advisor to the Board, SEV Hellenic Federation of Enterprises, Athens.

**Members representing the Workers
Membres représentant les travailleurs
Miembros representantes de los trabajadores**

ARGENTINA ARGENTINE

Sra. Mónica Viviana TEPFER, Confederación General del Trabajo Argentina, Buenos Aires.

AUSTRALIA AUSTRALIE

Mr Grant Douglas BELCHAMBER, International Consultant, Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU), Saint-Genis-Pouilly, France.

BOTSWANA

Mr Austin MUNEKU, Executive Secretary, Southern Africa Trade Union Coordination Council, Gaborone.

CANADA CANADÁ

M. Sylvain SCHETAGNE, directeur, Recherche et action sociopolitique, Fédération des médecins résidents du Québec (FMRQ), Montréal.

FRANCE FRANCIA

M. Pierre CONCIALDI, chercheur, Institut de recherches économiques et sociales (IRES), Draveil.

Representatives of the United Nations, specialized agencies
and other official international organizations
Représentants des Nations Unies, des institutions spécialisées
et des autres organisations internationales officielles
Representantes de las Naciones Unidas, de los organismos especializados
y de otras organizaciones internacionales oficiales

**Permanent Mission of Belgium to the United Nations Office
and specialized institutions
Mission permanente de la Belgique auprès de l'Office des Nations Unies
et des institutions spécialisées
Misión Permanente de Bélgica ante la Oficina de las Naciones Unidas
y de otros organismos especializados**

Ms Thérèse BOUTSEN, Geneva.

EUROSTAT

Dr Riccardo GATTO, Statistical Officer – LFS methodology and Macroeconomic Imbalances Procedure, Luxembourg.

Ms Fabienne MONTAGNE, Team Leader – Labour Force Survey methodology and analysis, Luxembourg.

**Delegation of the European Union to the United Nations Office
and specialized institutions
Délégation de l'Union européenne auprès de l'Office des Nations Unies
et des institutions spécialisées
Delegación de la Unión Europea ante la Oficina de las Naciones Unidas
y de otros organismos especializados**

M^{me} Natacha TOLSTOÏ, conseillère, Genève.

M. Florin TUDORIE, ministre conseiller, Genève.

**Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture (FAO)
Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Alimentación y la Agricultura (FAO)**

Ms Yonca Leman GURBUZER, Statistician, Rome.

**The Statistical Centre for the Cooperation Council
for the Arab Countries of the Gulf (GCC-Stat)
Centre de statistique du Conseil de coopération
des Etats arabes du Golfe
Centro de Estadística del Consejo de Cooperación
de los Estados Árabes del Golfo**

Ms Duaa SALMAN, Director, Population and Social Statistics Department, Muscat.

**Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations
Mission permanente de la République islamique d'Iran auprès des Nations Unies
Misión Permanente de la República Islámica del Irán ante las Naciones Unidas**

Mr Ramin BEHZAD, Attaché BIT – Ministry of Cooperatives, Labour and Social Welfare, Geneva.

**Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
Organisation de coopération et de développement économiques (OCDE)
Organización de Cooperación y Desarrollo Económicos (OCDE)**

M. Pascal MARIANNA, ELS/EAP, Paris.

**African Union
Union africaine
Unión Africana**

Mrs Leila BEN ALI, Acting Director of Women, Gender and Development, Addis Ababa.

**Permanent Mission of Spain to the United Nations Office
and other international organizations
Mission permanente de l'Espagne auprès de l'Office des Nations Unies
et des autres organisations internationales
Misión Permanente de España ante las Naciones Unidas
y otros organismos internacionales**

Dr. Diego CANO SOLER, Consejero de Empleo y Seguridad Social, Ginebra.

Sr. Luis Carlos MELERO GARCÍA, Jefe de Sección de Empleo y Seguridad Social, Ginebra.

**Representatives of non-governmental organizations
Représentants d'organisations internationales non gouvernementales
Representantes de organizaciones no gubernamentales**

**International Organisation of Employers (IOE)
Organisation internationale des employeurs (OIE)
Organización Internacional de Empleadores (OIE)**

M. Jean DEJARDIN, conseiller, Genève.

**International Trade Union Confederation
Confédération syndicale internationale (CSI)
Confederación Sindical Internacional (CSI)**

Ms Raquel GONZÁLEZ, Secretary, Workers' Group, Geneva.

**Women in Informal Employment: Globalizing and Organizing (WIEGO)
Femmes dans l'emploi informel: Globalisation et organisation
Mujeres en Empleo Informal: Globalizando y organizando (WIEGO)**

Dr Françoise CARRÉ, Research Coordinator, Boston.

Dr Joann VANEK, Director, Statistics Programme, New York.

Adviser

Ms Jo-En LIM, Ministry of Manpower, Singapore.

International Labour Office (ILO)
Bureau international du Travail (BIT)
Oficina Internacional del Trabajo (OIT)

Department of STATISTICS
Département de la statistique
Departamento de Estadística

Mr Rafael DIEZ de MEDINA.

Mr David HUNTER.

Ms Mónica CASTILLO.

Mr Michael FROSCHE.

Mr Kieran WALSH.

Ms Elisa BENES.

Mr Ritash SARNA.

Mr Antonio DISCENZA.

M^{me} Agnès KALINGA.

M^{me} Virginie WOEST.

M. Yves PERARDEL.

Ms Andonirina RAKOTONARIVO.

Ms Alina RODRÍGUEZ DE VUILLE.

Ms Mabelin VILLARREAL-FUENTES.

Mr Weichen LEI.

Regional support
Appui régional
Apoyo regional

Mr Nader KEYROUZ, ILO Lebanon.

Other departments of the ILO
Autres départements du BIT
Otros departamentos de la OIT

Ms Maria ALEKSYNKA (INWORK).

M^{me} Florence BONNET (INWORK).

Ms Claire HOB DEN (INWORK).

Mr Harry STYLOGIANNIS (LABOURLAW).

Bureau for Employers' Activities (ACT/EMP)
Bureau des activités pour les employeurs (ACT/EMP)
Oficina de Actividades para los Empleadores (ACT/EMP)

Mr Samuel ASFAHA.

Bureau for Workers' Activities (ACTRAV)
Bureau des activités pour les travailleurs (ACTRAV)
Oficina de Actividades para los Trabajadores (ACTRAV)

Mr Michael WATT.

Office of the Legal Adviser
Bureau du Conseiller juridique
Oficina del Consejero Jurídico

Ms Giovanna BEAULIEU.

Appendix II

Meeting of Experts on Labour Statistics in Preparation for the 20th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (Geneva, 5–9 February 2018)

Revised draft

20th International Conference of Labour Statisticians resolution concerning statistics on work relationships

Preamble

The 20th International Conference of Labour Statisticians,

Having reviewed the relevant texts of the resolution concerning the International Classification of Status in Employment (ICSE), adopted by the 15th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (January 1993),

Taking into consideration the resolution concerning statistics of work, employment and labour underutilization adopted by the 19th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS) (2013), and the resolution concerning the measurement of working time adopted by the 18th ICLS (2008),

Recalling the requirements of the Labour Statistics Convention, 1985 (No. 160), and the accompanying Labour Statistics Recommendation, 1985 (No. 170), and the need for coherence with other international statistical standards, particularly with regard to the system of national accounts, working time, employment-related income, and work in the informal economy,

Recognizing the need to revise and broaden the existing standards for statistics on status in employment in order to enable better statistical measurement of various aspects of the relationships between workers and the economic units for which their work is performed; to adequately monitor changes in employment arrangements and forms of employment; to extend the scope of statistical standards on work relationships to cover all forms of work; and to provide guidelines on a wider set of measures than previously defined internationally, thereby enhancing the relevance and usefulness of the standards for countries and territories (hereinafter referred to as “countries”) at all stages of development,

Calling attention to the usefulness of these standards to enhance the international comparability of statistics on workers’ contractual situations, to their contribution to the measurement of decent work and of well-being of households and society in general, thereby supporting and facilitating the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, as well as to the achievement of gender justice,

Acknowledging that the relevance of statistics on work relationships in a given country will depend on the nature of its society, labour markets and regulations as well as user needs, and that their implementation will therefore, to a certain extent, be determined by national circumstances,

Adopts this xth day of October 2018 the following resolution in substitution for the resolution of 1993 and for paragraph 25 of the resolution of 2013 cited above.

Objectives and scope

1. The standards set by this resolution aim to guide countries in updating, harmonizing and further developing their statistical programmes that include information on work relationships. Statistics on work relationships are concerned with: (a) the authority relationships between persons who work and the economic units in which or for which the work is performed; and (b) the economic risks that follow from the contractual or other conditions under which the work is performed. These statistics can relate to all forms of work, including own-use production work, employment, unpaid trainee work, volunteer work and other forms of work.

2. These standards should facilitate the production of national statistics on work relationships for various purposes as part of an integrated national system of work statistics based on common concepts and definitions that are aligned with the current international standards and guidelines for statistics on work adopted by the International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS).

3. In order to promote the coherence and integration of statistics from different sources on multiple characteristics of work relationships, the resolution provides:

- (a) an overarching conceptual framework for statistics on work relationships;
- (b) a revised International Classification of Status in Employment (to be designated ICSE-18);
- (c) an International Classification of Status at Work as a reference classification covering all forms of work;
- (d) a set of cross-cutting variables and categories that are not reflected in the status at work categories, in order to provide information on characteristics associated with the degree of stability and permanence of a particular work arrangement, and allow the identification of particular groups of policy interest; and
- (e) operational concepts, definitions and guidelines for the collection and compilation of statistics on status in employment and the cross-cutting variables.

4. The characteristics of jobs and work activities that are relevant and of interest for statistics on work relationships vary depending on the form of work and on the analytical purposes of the statistics. Some of the concepts, variables, classification schemes and categories described in these standards are relevant, therefore, only for certain forms of work. Others should be applied to all forms of work.

5. Each country should aim to develop its statistics on work relationships in order to provide an adequate information base for a wide range of descriptive and analytical purposes, taking account of specific national needs and circumstances, in order to provide information on:

- (a) the nature of the economic risks and authority experienced by workers, the strength and nature of their attachment to the economic unit in which they work, and the impact of economic and social changes on their employment situation;
- (b) the impact of government policies in relation to employment creation, promotion of enterprise, and labour market regulation on the nature of jobs and the quality of employment;

- (c) the extent to which engagement in employment and participation in other forms of work provide access to social protection and income security;
- (d) wages, earnings and labour costs;
- (e) the fiscal impact of employment in various types of work relationships;
- (f) socio-economic status;
- (g) the volume of work or labour inputs for national production accounts, separately for workers employed for pay and workers employed for profit;
- (h) participation in different types of work relationships among population groups such as women and men, young people, children, migrants and other groups of particular policy concern; and
- (i) the relationships between different forms of work arrangements and their economic and social outcomes.

6. In developing statistics on work relationships, countries should endeavour to apply these standards to assess trends and differences for the purpose of labour market, economic and social analysis and to facilitate international comparability.

Reference concepts

Statistical units

7. The units that are relevant for the production of statistics on work relationships are persons, jobs or work activities and economic units.

8. A job or **work activity** is defined as a set of tasks and duties performed, or meant to be performed, by one person for a single economic unit:

- (a) The term *job* is used in reference to employment. This statistical unit, when relating to own-use production work, unpaid trainee work and volunteer work is referred to as *work activity*.
- (b) Persons may have one or several jobs during a given reference period. In cases of multiple job-holding, the **main job** is that with the longest hours usually worked, as defined in the current international statistical standards on working time.
- (c) Those employed as independent workers have as many jobs as the economic units they own or co-own, irrespective of the number of clients served.
- (d) For those employed as dependent workers the set of tasks should be considered to be performed for the economic unit on which the worker is dependent and a separate job defined for each economic unit on which the worker is dependent.

- (e) Separate work activities are defined when a person is engaged in both own-use production of goods and own-use provision of services for the same household. This allows the identification of work activities within and beyond the production boundary in the System of National Accounts (SNA).

9. Since statistics on work relationships refer primarily to characteristics of jobs or work activities in specific economic units, persons may have as many work relationships as they have jobs or work activities in economic units.

10. Two characteristics of jobs and work activities are relevant to differentiate them according to status at work and status in employment, and to arrange them into aggregate groups. These are the type of authority that the worker is able to exercise in relation to the work performed and the type of economic risk to which the worker is exposed.

Type of authority

11. The *type of authority* refers to the nature of the control that the worker has over the organization of his or her work, the nature of authority that he or she exercises over the economic unit for which the work is performed (including its activities and transactions), and the extent to which the worker is dependent on another person or economic unit for organization of the work and/or for access to the market. The type of authority is used to classify workers as *dependent* or *independent*.

Independent workers

12. Independent workers own the economic unit in which they work and control its activities. They make the most important decisions about the activities of the economic unit and the organization of their work. They may work on their own account or in partnership with other independent workers and may or may not provide work for others.

Entrepreneurs

13. Entrepreneurs are workers who create work for themselves and potentially for others by establishing and operating an enterprise. The category of “independent workers” in the classification of status in employment provides the best starting point for the identification and compilation of statistics on entrepreneurs. Additional information relevant to the national context, such as the size and nature of the enterprise, is needed to provide complete statistics on entrepreneurship and to accurately identify those workers who are creating employment opportunities for themselves or for others.

Dependent workers

14. Dependent workers are workers who do not have complete authority or control over the economic unit for which they work. If they are in employment for profit they have no employees, and do not make the most important decisions about the activities of the economic unit for which they work.

Type of economic risk

15. *Type of economic risk* refers to the extent to which the worker may: (1) be exposed to the loss of financial or other resources in pursuance of the activity; and (2) experience unreliability of remuneration in cash or in kind or receive no remuneration.

16. Economic risk may be measured operationally by considering:

- (a) the existence and nature of remuneration for the work performed;
- (b) the circumstances in which the job or work activity may be terminated; and
- (c) the extent to which the worker is protected in the event of sickness, accident, or termination of the job.

17. In statistics on employment, the type of economic risk is used to classify workers as *in employment for profit* or *in employment for pay* based primarily on the nature of the remuneration for a particular job. The aspects of the nature of the remuneration taken into consideration include whether or not remuneration is received or expected:

- (a) in the form of profit (and therefore also entails the risk of loss);
- (b) based on time worked;
- (c) by the piece for the goods produced or services provided; or
- (d) as a fee for the production of goods or provision of services.

Workers in employment for profit

18. *Workers in employment for profit* are employed persons whose remuneration is directly and entirely dependent on the profit or loss made by the economic unit in which they are employed, including remuneration in cash or in kind by way of a commercial transaction for goods produced or services provided. They do not receive a wage or salary in return for time worked.

19. Owner-operators of corporations are excluded from workers in employment for profit. While they are exposed to economic risk related to the potential for loss of investments made in the corporation, the risk is mitigated due to limitations of liability when corporations are separate legal entities from the persons who own them. They may receive a wage or salary whether or not the corporation is making a profit and may also be in receipt of payments deriving from profits.

Workers in employment for pay

20. Workers in employment for pay are employed persons who receive, or expect to receive, remuneration in cash or in kind, in return for time worked or for each piece or service produced. They include both employees and owner-operators of corporations who hold a job in an incorporated enterprise which they own and control.

The International Classification of Status in Employment (ICSE-18)

21. The International Classification of Status in Employment (ICSE-18) classifies jobs in employment for pay or profit into ten detailed categories based on the concepts of type of authority and type of economic risk described above. These categories may be aggregated according to two alternative classification hierarchies: the *International Classification of Status in Employment according to type of authority (ICSE-18-A)* and the *International Classification of Status in Employment according to type of economic risk (ICSE-18-R)*.

22. Both hierarchies for status in employment, based on economic risk and authority, should have equal priority when producing statistics. Statistics from labour force surveys

and, when possible from other relevant sources, should be compiled on a regular basis according to both hierarchies.

International Classification of Status in Employment according to type of authority (ICSE-18-A)

23. ICSE-18-A provides, at its top level, a dichotomy between independent workers and dependent workers in which:

Independent workers are classified into the following groups:

- A. Employers
 - 11 – Employers in corporations
 - 12 – Employers in household market enterprises
- B. Independent workers without employees
 - 21 – Owner-operators of corporations without employees
 - 22 – Own-account workers in household market enterprises without employees

Dependent workers are classified into the following groups:

- C. Dependent contractors
 - 30 – Dependent contractors
- D. Employees
 - 41 – Permanent employees
 - 42 – Fixed-term employees
 - 43 – Short-term and casual employees
 - 44 – Paid apprentices, trainees and interns
- E. Contributing family workers
 - 51 – Contributing family workers

24. This classification hierarchy is suitable for various types of labour market analysis, including analysis of the impact of economic cycles on the labour market, and of government policies related to employment creation and regulation.

25. The classification according to type of authority is also the most suitable hierarchy for use as an input variable in the compilation of statistics classified by socio-economic status.

Classification of Status in Employment according to type of economic risk (ICSE-18-R)

26. ICSE-18-R provides a dichotomy between employment for pay and employment for profit. This latter dichotomy is analogous to the traditional distinction between paid employment and self-employment, used for example in the SNA.

Workers in employment for profit are classified into the following groups:

- F. Independent workers in household market enterprises
 - 12 – Employers in household market enterprises
 - 22 – Own-account workers in household market enterprises without employees
- C. Dependent contractors
 - 30 – Dependent contractors
- E. Contributing family workers
 - 51 – Contributing family workers

Workers in employment for pay are classified into the following groups:

- G. Owner-operators of corporations
 - 11 – Employers in corporations
 - 21 – Owner-operators of corporations without employees
- D. Employees
 - 41 – Permanent employees
 - 42 – Fixed-term employees
 - 43 – Short-term and casual employees
 - 44 – Paid apprentices, trainees and interns

27. This classification hierarchy is suitable for the provision of data for national accounts, for the identification of wage employment and its distribution, and for the production and analysis of statistics on wages, earnings and labour costs.

Definitions and explanatory notes for categories in the two hierarchies of the International Classification of Status in Employment**A. Employers**

28. Employers own the economic unit in which they work and control its activities on their own account or in partnership with others, and in this capacity employ one or more persons (including temporarily absent employees but excluding themselves, their partners

and family helpers) to work as an employee for at least one hour per week. In statistics on employment, they include:

11 – Employers in corporations

12 – Employers in household market enterprises

29. Employers include those who have employees on a regular basis and those who have employees only on an occasional basis. Employers who have employees on a regular basis are those who usually have at least one employee for at least one hour each week. Employers who have an employee on an occasional basis, have employees less frequently than every week. Statistics on employers may be compiled either for those who have employees on a regular basis, or for all employers. When statistics are collected for all employers, those employers who have employees on a regular basis should, where possible, be identified separately from those who have them only on an occasional basis.

11 – Employers in corporations

30. *Employers in corporations* are workers who are owner-operators of corporations in which they employ one or more persons (including temporarily absent employees but excluding themselves, their partners and family helpers) to work as an employee for at least one hour per week.

12 – Employers in household market enterprises

31. *Employers in household market enterprises* are workers who, alone or with one or more partners, operate an unincorporated market enterprise for profit, and who, employ one or more persons (including temporarily absent employees but excluding themselves, their partners and family helpers) to work in that enterprise as an employee for at least one hour per week.

B. Independent workers without employees

32. *Independent workers without employees* operate an economic unit alone or in partnership with others, and do not employ any persons other than themselves, their partners, and contributing family workers to work in the economic unit. In statistics on employment they include:

21 – Owner-operators of corporations without employees

22 – Own-account workers in household market enterprises without employees

21 – Owner-operators of corporations without employees

33. *Owner-operators of corporations without employees* are workers who hold a job as owner-operator of a corporation in which they do not, employ any persons (other than themselves, their partners and contributing family workers) to work in the enterprise as an employee.

22 – Own-account workers in household market enterprises without employees

34. Own-account workers in household market enterprises without employees are workers who operate an unincorporated market enterprise for profit, alone or with one or more partners or contributing family workers, and do not employ any persons to work in the enterprise as an employee.

F. Independent workers in household market enterprises

35. Independent workers in household market enterprises are workers who operate an unincorporated market enterprise for profit, alone or with one or more partners or contributing family workers. They may or may not be able to provide a complete set of accounts for the activities of the enterprise. They include:

12 – Employers in household market enterprises

22 – Own-account workers in household market enterprises without employees

G. Owner-operators of corporations

36. *Owner-operators of corporations* are workers who hold a job in an incorporated enterprise (such as a limited liability corporation, limited partnership, incorporated cooperative), in which they:

- (a) hold controlling ownership of the enterprise alone, or together with other members of their families and/or one or a few partners, or other members of the cooperative; and
- (b) have the authority to act on behalf of the enterprise with respect to contracts with other organizations and the hiring and dismissal of employees, subject to national legislation regulating such matters and the rules established by the elected or appointed board of the enterprise.

37. Owner-operators of corporations include:

11 – Employers in corporations

21 – Owner-operators of corporations without employees

3. Dependent contractors

38. *Dependent contractors* are workers employed for profit, usually by way of a commercial transaction, who are dependent on another entity that directly benefits from the work performed by them and exercises explicit or implicit control over their activities. Their dependency may be of an operational nature, for example through organization of the work or control over access to the market, and/or of an economic nature such as through control over the price for the goods or services produced, or access to raw materials or capital items. The economic units on which they depend may be market or non-market units and include corporations, governments and non-profit institutions.

39. Some or all of the following characteristics apply to dependent contractors:

- (a) their work may be organized or supervised by another economic unit as a client, or as an entity that mediates access to clients;
- (b) they have an arrangement for the delivery of goods or services to a separate entity (of the nature of a commercial transaction);
- (c) their actual working arrangements or conditions may closely resemble those of employees;

- (d) the entity engaging the worker does not withhold income tax for the worker;
- (e) the worker is responsible for arranging his or her own social insurance and other social contributions (according to national circumstances); and
- (f) the mode of payment is by way of a commercial transaction.

40. Excluded from dependent contractors are workers who:

- (a) have a contract of employment (formal, informal, or implicit) with the entity on which they are dependent;
- (b) employ one or more other persons to work for them as an employee; or
- (c) operate an incorporated enterprise.

41. Two subgroups of dependent contractors may be identified if feasible and relevant in the national context:

- (a) workers who provide their labour to others but have contractual arrangements corresponding to those of self-employment; and
- (b) workers who own and operate their own business, or have committed significant financial or material assets, but do not have full control or authority over their work.

42. Identification of the two subgroups of dependent contractors requires additional information on the nature of the financial or material resources committed by the worker.

4. Employees

43. *Employees* are workers employed for pay, on a formal or informal basis, who do not hold controlling ownership of the economic unit in which they are employed. They are remunerated in cash or in kind in return for time worked or, in some cases, for each task or piece of work done or for services provided including sales (by the piece or commission). Payment for time worked is the typical mode of remuneration. Payment in kind is generally received in the form of goods. Where payment is received in the form of services, this is generally complementary to payment in cash.

44. Employees may be employed in market units, non-market units and households producing goods and/or services mainly for own consumption. They may hold shares in the economic unit in which they are employed, or have authority over aspects of the operations of the economic unit as employees with management responsibilities, but do not hold controlling ownership of the enterprise.

45. Employees include workers who have been engaged on terms corresponding to those of paid employment when the employing organization has entered into a contract only with an intermediary such as a crew leader or organizing agent, and not with the individual worker.

46. Employees may be further disaggregated according to the nature of the contractual arrangements for employment, the degree of permanency of the employment relationship and the stability of the working time available to the employee, to form the following groups:

- 41 – Permanent employees
- 42 – Fixed-term employees
- 43 – Short-term and casual employees
- 44 – Paid trainees, apprentices and interns

41 – Permanent employees

47. *Permanent employees* are employees who are guaranteed a minimum number of hours of work and are employed on an ongoing or indefinite basis. They are full-time or part-time workers employed for pay, in formal or informal jobs, who have employment arrangements whereby:

- (a) there is no specified date or event on which the employment will be terminated other than any age or time for retirement that may apply in the economic unit concerned;
- (b) the employer agrees to provide work and pay for a specified number of hours or to pay for the number of goods or services produced in a set period; and
- (c) the worker agrees to work for at least the specified number of hours, or for the time required to produce a specified number of goods or services.

42 – Fixed-term employees

48. *Fixed-term employees* are employees who are guaranteed a minimum number of hours of work and are employed on a time-limited basis for a period of three months or more. They are full-time or part-time workers employed for pay, in formal or informal jobs, who have arrangements whereby:

- (a) there is a specified date, other than any age or time for retirement, on which the employment will be terminated, or an event such as the end of the harvest or completion of a construction or other project, which will lead to termination of employment;
- (b) the total duration of the employment is expected to be at least three months from the first day of employment to the expected final day of employment;
- (c) the employer agrees to provide work and pay for a specified number of hours, or to pay for the number of goods or services produced, in a set period; and
- (d) the worker agrees to work for at least the specified number of hours, or for the time required to produce a specified number of goods or services.

49. Fixed-term employees include:

- (a) employees with fixed-term contracts of employment with a duration greater than three months; and
- (b) employees without formal arrangements or contracts when it is understood that the employment will have a duration of at least three months but not of an indefinite nature.

50. Paid apprentices, trainees and interns with fixed-term employment arrangements are excluded from this group.

43 – Short-term and casual employees

51. Short-term and casual employees are employees with short-term employment arrangements and/or without a guaranteed minimum number of hours of work per pay period. They are workers employed for pay, in formal or informal jobs, who have arrangements whereby:

- (a) there is no guarantee to offer work or to perform work during a set period; or
- (b) the arrangement is of a short-term nature, with a duration of less than three months from the first day of employment to the expected final day of employment.

52. Employment in this category may provide flexibility for workers who need to balance employment with family responsibilities, education, or other forms of work but may also entail insecurity of income and employment.

53. This category includes two groups which may be separately identified if relevant in national circumstances: *short-term employees* and *casual and intermittent employees*:

- (a) *short-term employees* are those who are guaranteed a minimum number of hours of work and are employed on a time-limited basis with an expected duration of less than three months. They include:
 - (i) employees with contracts of employment with a duration of less than three months;
 - (ii) employees without formal arrangements or contracts when it is understood that the employment will be of a duration of less than three months; and
- (b) *casual and intermittent employees* are those who have no guarantee of employment for a certain number of hours during a specified period but may have arrangements of an ongoing or recurring nature. Depending on national circumstances and specific contractual arrangements pertaining to the job, this group includes employees engaged on a casual or intermittent basis, workers on zero-hours contracts, employees who are only paid when called in to work, and workers hired on a day-to-day basis.

54. Unless the total duration of the employment arrangement is less than three months, short-term and casual employees exclude:

- (a) workers with on-call working-time arrangements who are guaranteed a specified amount of employment per pay period; and
- (b) workers who are guaranteed to be offered work and to be paid for at least one hour per week.

44 – Paid apprentices, trainees and interns

55. Paid apprentices, trainees and interns are employees who perform any activity to produce goods or provide services for others, in order to acquire workplace experience or skills in a trade or profession, and receive payment in return for work performed. Acquiring “workplace experience or skills” may occur through traditional, formal or informal arrangements whether or not a specific qualification or certification is issued. They are usually remunerated at a reduced rate compared to fully qualified workers. They include persons involved in:

- (a) paid formal or informal traineeships, apprenticeships, internships or other types of programmes, according to national circumstances; and
- (b) paid skills training or retraining schemes within employment promotion programmes, when engaged in the production process of the economic unit for which they work.

56. They exclude workers who are:

- (a) undergoing periods of probation associated with the start of a job;
- (b) undertaking general on-the-job training or life-long learning while in employment, including in market and non-market units owned by household or family members; and
- (c) working without pay in market or non-market units owned by household or family members.

E. Contributing family workers

57. *Contributing family workers* assist a family member or household member in a market-oriented enterprise operated by the family or household member, or in a job in which the assisted family or household member is an employee or dependent contractor. They do not receive regular payments, such as a wage or salary, in return for the work performed, but may benefit in kind or receive irregular payments in cash as a result of the outputs of their work through family or intra-household transfers, derived from the profits of the enterprise or from the income of the other person. They do not make the most important decisions affecting the enterprise or have responsibility for it.

International Classification of Status at Work (ICSaW-18)

58. The International Classification of Status at Work (ICSaW-18) provides an organizing framework for statistics classified by status at work from various sources. It is not expected that all of its categories will be collected with the same frequency, or used for the presentation of statistics from any particular source. It covers all jobs and work activities in all forms of work, including own-use production work, employment, unpaid trainee work, volunteer work and other forms of work. It comprises, at its most detailed level, 20 mutually exclusive categories, defined on the basis of the type of authority that the worker is able to exercise and the type of economic risk to which he or she is exposed in a particular job or work activity.

59. The detailed status at work categories may be aggregated, based on the type of authority exercised by the worker, to form eight broad status-at-work groups which may be aggregated to form a dichotomy between dependent workers and independent workers, according to the following hierarchy.

I. Independent workers

1. Employers

11 – Employers in corporations

12 – Employers in household market enterprises

13 – Employers in own-use provision of services

14 – Employers in own-use production of goods

2. Independent workers without employees
 - 21 – Owner-operators of corporations without employees
 - 22 – Own-account workers in household market enterprises without employees
 - 23 – Independent workers in own-use provision of services without employees
 - 24 – Independent workers in own-use production of goods without employees
 - 25 – Direct volunteers

D. Dependent workers

3. Dependent contractors
 - 30 – Dependent contractors
4. Employees
 - 41 – Permanent employees
 - 42 – Fixed-term employees
 - 43 – Short-term and casual employees
 - 44 – Paid apprentices, trainees and interns
5. Family helpers
 - 51 – Contributing family workers
 - 52 – Family helpers in own-use provision of services
 - 53 – Family helpers in own-use production of goods
6. Unpaid trainee workers
 - 60 – Unpaid trainee workers
7. Organization-based volunteers
 - 70 – Organization-based volunteers
9. Other unpaid workers
 - 90 – Other unpaid workers

60. Each of the detailed status at work groups in ICSaW-18 relates to only one form of work. The groups that relate to employment have the same definitions as in ICSE-18. The aggregate groups that include both employment and other forms of work, have a broader scope in ICSaW-18 than in ICSE-18-A and in some cases are assigned a different name.

61. Subsets of the detailed categories in ICSaW-18 may be used to present statistics on work relationships in own-use production work, employment, volunteer work, child labour and time-use on a conceptually consistent basis, regardless of the scope and source

of the statistics. The categories for own-use production work and volunteer work may be aggregated according to the form of work as follows:

- (a) Workers in own-use production
 - (i) Workers in own-use provision of services
 - 13 – Employers in own-use provision of services
 - 23 – Independent workers in own-use provision of services without employees
 - 52 – Family helpers in own-use provision of services
 - (ii) Workers in own-use production of goods
 - 14 – Employers in own-use production of goods
 - 24 – Independent workers in own-use production of goods without employees
 - 53 – Family helpers in own-use production of goods
- (b) Volunteer workers
 - 25 – Direct volunteers
 - 70 – Organization-based volunteers

Definitions of the categories in ICSaW-18 that are not included in ICSE-18

13 – Employers in own-use provision of services

62. *Employers in own-use provision of services* are workers who perform any activity to provide services mainly for own final use, and employ one or more persons (including temporarily absent employees but excluding other members of their household) during the reference period as a domestic employee. They may sell part of these services to others, for example, by looking after children from other households for pay or barter, at the same time as mainly looking after their own children.

14 – Employers in own-use production of goods

63. *Employers in own-use production of goods* are workers who, during the reference period, employed one or more persons in return for payment in cash or in kind (including temporarily absent employees but excluding other members of their household) to produce goods mainly for consumption by the employer's own household. A part or surplus of the goods intended mainly for own consumption may be sold or bartered.

23 – Independent workers in own-use provision of services without employees

64. *Independent workers in own-use provision of services without employees* are workers who perform any activity to provide services for own final use, but did not, during the reference period, employ any persons to work as a domestic employee. They may sell part of these services to others, for example by looking after children from other households for pay or barter, at the same time as mainly looking after their own children.

24 – Independent workers in own-use production of goods without employees

65. *Independent workers in own-use production of goods without employees* are workers who, on their own account or with one or more partners, perform any activity to produce goods for own final use who do not, during the reference period, employ any persons to produce goods for pay in cash or in kind. A part or surplus of the goods intended mainly for own consumption may be sold or bartered.

25 – Direct volunteers

66. *Direct volunteers* are workers who, on their own account or in partnership with others, and independently of any organization or community group, perform any unpaid, non-compulsory activity to produce goods or provide services for other households.

- (a) Excluded from this group are workers who:
- (i) perform non-compulsory work without remuneration through or for organizations comprising market and non-market units, including self-help, mutual aid or community-based groups of which the worker is a member; and
 - (ii) produce goods or services for consumption by members of the worker's own household or family.

5. **Family helpers**

67. *Family helpers* are workers who assist a family or household member in the production of goods or provision of services for household consumption, in a market-oriented enterprise operated by that person, or in a job held by that person as an employee or dependent contractor. They do not make the most important decisions affecting the economic unit and do not have responsibility for it. They may benefit from the outputs of their work in cash or in kind through intra-household transfers but do not receive an agreed wage or salary.

52 – Family helpers in own-use provision of services

68. *Family helpers in own-use provision of services* assist a family or household member in the provision of services for household consumption.

53 – Family helpers in own-use production of goods

69. *Family helpers in own-use production of goods* assist a family or household member in the production of goods for household consumption.

6. **Unpaid trainee workers**

70. *Unpaid trainee workers* are persons in unpaid trainee work as defined in the most recent international statistical standards concerning work, employment and labour underutilization (Currently the 19th ICLS resolution 1, paragraphs 33 to 35).

7. **Organization-based volunteers**

71. *Organization-based volunteers* are workers who perform any unpaid non-compulsory activities to produce goods or provide services for others through or for organizations comprising market and non-market units.

- (a) Included in this group are workers who produce goods or provide services for others through or for self-help, mutual aid, or community-based groups.
- (b) Excluded from this group are:
 - (i) unpaid apprentices, trainees and interns;
 - (ii) workers performing unpaid compulsory activities;
 - (iii) direct volunteers.

9. **Other unpaid workers**

72. *Other unpaid workers* are workers who cannot be classified in any other groups in the International Classification of Status at Work. They include workers performing activities such as unpaid community service and unpaid work by prisoners, when ordered by a court or similar authority, and unpaid military or civilian service.

Cross-cutting variables and categories

73. To provide complete and coherent statistics on work relationships, information is needed on characteristics of jobs and work activities that are not measured in the classifications of status at work and status in employment. This information should be measured through a set of variables and categories based on characteristics associated with the degree of risk, stability and permanence of a particular employment or work arrangement and provide definitions for situations that may be represented in several categories of the classifications by status. They may be used for the generation of statistics in their own right, or combined in output with relevant status categories to construct output classifications relevant for national purposes.

74. The following cross-cutting variables are required to compile statistics on the detailed categories in ICSE-18:

- (a) duration of work agreement;
- (b) type of employment agreement;
- (c) contractual hours of work;
- (d) forms of remuneration;
- (e) place of work;
- (f) job-dependent social protection coverage;
- (g) reason for non-permanent employment.

75. While not required for the compilation of statistics on status in employment, the following variables and categories are essential for the compilation of coherent statistics on work relationships or for the identification of important groups of interest:

- (a) duration of employment in the current economic unit;
- (b) seasonal workers;
- (c) full-time/part-time status;

- (d) domestic workers;
- (e) home-based workers;
- (f) multi-party work relationships;
- (g) paid annual leave;
- (h) paid sick leave.

76. The following additional cross-cutting variables and categories are recommended:

- (a) number of employees in the economic unit in which the worker is employed;
- (b) main form of remuneration.

Duration of the job or work activity and hours of work

77. Since many of the detailed categories in ICSE-18 include jobs which differ significantly in their capacity to provide ongoing and full employment, statistics classified by status in employment, and particularly the subcategories of employees, should be complemented by information on both the duration of the work arrangement and on hours worked. Two variables on the duration of the job or work activity are necessary to provide a full understanding of the temporal stability of work relationships and to assess the extent to which workers without permanent employment relationships have ongoing employment and income security. These are *Duration of work contract* and *Duration of employment in the current economic unit*.

Duration of work agreement

78. *Duration of work agreement* refers to the period of time from the beginning to the end of a written or oral work contract, or in the absence of a contract specifying the duration, to the date on which it is expected the employment will terminate. If the agreement does not specify the duration of the employment and there is no expected date or event on which the employment will terminate, other than the age or time for retirement, the duration is considered to be “without stated limit of time”. This variable is required for the derivation of the subcategories of employees but may also apply to unpaid trainees and volunteers.

79. When a worker has had a series of ongoing renewed temporary contracts with the same economic unit, the duration of work agreement should be based on the duration of the current (most recent) contract.

Duration of employment in the current economic unit

80. *Duration of employment in the current economic unit* refers to the time elapsed since the worker started work with a particular economic unit and can be applied to all statuses in employment. The concept of the duration of work in the current economic unit can also be applied to activities in forms of work other than employment.

81. When a worker has had a series of renewed temporary engagements with the same economic unit, the duration of employment in that current economic unit should be based on the total duration since the first engagement, unless the gap between engagements was one month or longer. When a worker has been transferred between different establishments or

locations within an enterprise, or enterprise group, or between different ministries or departments within the same government, duration in the current economic unit should be based on the highest level institutional unit considered as a single economic unit.

Categories for the presentation of statistics on duration of the job or work activity

82. The following categories should be included in standard statistical outputs for the two variables describing the duration of the job or work activity:

- less than one month;
- one to less than three months;
- three to less than six months;
- six to less than 12 months;
- 12 to less than 18 months;
- 18 to less than 24 months;
- 24 to less than 36 months;
- three years or more;
- “without stated limit of time”.

83. A category for “without stated limit of time” should also be included in data collection and statistical outputs on duration of work agreement. To facilitate analysis of the data collected, it is preferable to collect information for the duration variables using questions that do not include pre-defined categories other than “without stated limit of time”.

Working time

84. Information on full-time/part-time status, usual hours worked and contractual hours of work should be collected in accordance with the most recent international standards for statistics on working time (currently the 18th ICLS Resolution concerning the measurement of working time). Information on contractual hours of work is required to determine whether employees have arrangements that provide a guaranteed minimum number of hours of work, and is essential for derivation of the subcategories of employees.

Main reason for non-permanent employment

85. *Main reason for non-permanent employment* refers to the main reason why an employed person does not have a permanent work contract or arrangement. Statistics on the reason for non-permanent employment should be collected for all employees classified as fixed-term, or as short-term and casual employees. Such statistics should also be collected for dependent contractors if relevant for national purposes.

86. Statistical outputs on the main reason for non-permanent employment should include at least the following categories:

- seasonal work;
- combining work with education;
- combining work with unpaid care and other responsibilities;
- trainee, apprenticeship or internship;
- substitute work;
- completion of a project;
- employment creation programmes;
- no permanent jobs are available;
- other.

87. Statistics on whether the temporary employment is voluntary or involuntary should be compiled as a separate variable.

Type of employment agreement

88. A variable *type of employment agreement* is needed to provide information on whether an employee has a written contract or an oral agreement. A question on type of employment agreement is required for sequencing questions but also provides an indication of the stability of the arrangement.

89. Type of employment agreement should not be used directly to measure informality, since workers with oral agreements can be subject to social protection, and workers with written contracts may or may not meet the criteria for formality.

90. At a minimum, categories for “written contract” and “oral agreement” should be used in statistical outputs. Statistics indicating whether the agreement is collective or individual should also be compiled from relevant statistical sources.

Form of remuneration

91. *Form of remuneration* refers to the basis on which a worker is paid, rather than on the form of payment (e.g. cash or in kind). It should specify the information relevant to understand the nature of the employment relationship, but not necessarily other aspects of remuneration. The variable “forms of remuneration” is required to assist with identification of the status in employment categories and should include information about all forms of remuneration received by the worker in a particular job. A separate recommended variable on “main form of remuneration”, provides additional information that may be collected by adding an additional question.

92. At a minimum, the following categories are needed:

- for time worked (including wage or salary);
- by the piece;
- commission;

- fee for service;
- determined by profit or loss;
- tips from clients;
- other.

Seasonal workers

93. *Seasonal workers* are those with jobs or work activities whose timing and duration are significantly influenced by seasonal factors such as climatic seasons, holidays and agricultural preparations or harvests. For non-permanent employees and dependent contractors, seasonality should be measured as part of the reasons for non-permanent employment. For independent workers and contributing family workers, information is needed on whether the business operates all year round or only during a certain season of the year. When ongoing contracts for employment only at particular times of the year are common in a country or region, information about seasonality may need to be collected using dedicated questions for workers in relevant industries or occupations. For accurate measurement of seasonality, data collection is required at different times during the year, covering all active and inactive seasons.

Place of work

94. *Place of work* provides information on the type of location where the work is usually performed. When work is regularly performed in more than one type of location, this variable should be based on the main place of work. Thus, if a worker teleworks from home on an occasional basis, but spends most working time at the employer's premises, the main place of work should be the employer's premises.

95. Information on place of work is needed to identify workers such as home-based workers, domestic workers and workers in multi-party employment relationships. In some contexts it is relevant for the identification of dependent contractors. As a variable in its own right it is relevant for the identification of workers whose place of work may expose them to risk, such as on the street, or of home-based workers of all employment statuses.

96. Statistics on the following categories are required at a minimum to assist in the identification of the groups mentioned above and for analysis of employment relationships:

- own home (or area outside);
- client's or employer's home;
- employer's workplace or site;
- own business premises;
- own household farm;
- client's workplace or site;
- vehicle;
- street or other public place;

- market;
- no fixed type of location;
- other type of location.

Countries may choose to add questions or categories for their own analytical purposes. Where there is a need for information on work through internet platforms this should be captured as a separate variable rather than as a category of place of work, which would refer to the type of place where the Internet is usually accessed.

97. When the place of work is a business premises such as a retail shop or repair workshop attached to the residence but is not an integral part of the residence (if, for example, it has its own entrance) then the place of work should be considered as a business premises. When the place of work is a room or rooms within the residential premises which would normally be used for residential purposes, the place of work should be considered as “own home”.

Domestic workers

98. Domestic work is defined for statistical purposes as “all work performed in or for a household or households to provide services mainly for consumption by household members”. Domestic work is performed with payment made to employees of the household, to agencies that provide domestic services to households and to self-employed domestic service providers. Domestic work is performed unpaid by household members or by persons not residing in the household, such as family members, neighbours and volunteers.

99. In statistics on employment domestic workers are defined as workers of any sex employed for pay or profit, including in-kind payment, who perform work in or for a household or households to provide services mainly for consumption by the household. The work may be performed within the household premises or in other locations.

100. Based on the statistical definitions of domestic work and domestic workers, the following categories of domestic workers in employment may be identified:

- (a) domestic employees, defined as all workers engaged directly as employees of households to provide services mainly for consumption by the household members, irrespective of the nature of the services provided including:
 - (i) live-in domestic employees;
 - (ii) live-out domestic employees;
- (b) domestic workers employed by service providers; and
- (c) domestic service providers employed for profit.

101. Workers in employment who provide services within or for a household or households but are not employed directly by a household, are considered to be domestic workers if the nature of the work performed mainly comprises domestic services such as cleaning, childcare, personal care, food preparation, gardening, driving and security.

102. Domestic workers do not include:

- (a) workers employed for profit and employees of economic units other than private households who provide services to households that are not considered to be domestic services, for example, services consumed by the household related to educational training (home tuition) or related to maintenance and preservation of physical goods of the dwelling such as electrical installation and repair, plumbing, etc.;
- (b) workers who mainly provide services to household market enterprises;
- (c) workers who provide services frequently provided by domestic employees such as laundry, childcare and personal care, when the work is performed in the workers own business premises or residence, unless the service is provided as part of a job in which the worker is engaged directly as an employee of the household.

103. *Domestic workers employed by service providers* are employees of economic units such as agencies that provide domestic services to households. *Domestic service providers employed for profit* provide domestic services to private households as independent workers or dependent contractors.

104. Domestic employees may be identified in statistical collections when the economic activity of their employer is equivalent to ISIC Rev.4 Division 97, Activities of households as employers of domestic personnel. Other domestic workers may be identified in statistical collections if their occupation is one of those commonly held by domestic employees, and their main place of work is the client's residence. Analysis of these occupations by place of work may also allow the identification of other workers not considered to be domestic workers, but who perform services frequently provided by domestic workers (such as laundry, childcare and personal care) in settings such as their own home or workplace, or in the workplace of agencies providing such services.

Home-based workers

105. *Home-based workers* are workers whose main place of work is their own home. They may be employers, independent workers without employees, dependent contractors, employees or contributing family workers.

Multi-party work relationships

106. *Multi-party work relationships* exist when a third party is involved between the worker and the economic unit for which the work is performed. Arrangements of this type may be mediated by an institutional unit that acts as the employer and makes the worker available, on a temporary or permanent basis, to work for another economic unit while paying the wage or salary of the employee. Such economic units may include:

- (a) private employment agencies, such as labour hire agencies, temporary employment agencies, or other labour providers (labour brokers, labour outsourcing or subcontractors), that supply the workers but are not generally involved in supervision of the work;
- (b) government agencies in the context of schemes such as employment promotion programmes;
- (c) service provision agencies such as nursing agencies, domestic or office cleaning service providers, and security service providers, where the employing agency may supervise some elements of the work and establish standards of service, while the client may also provide day-to-day supervision over work performed on their premises.

107. In all of these cases, the work is not mainly performed at the premises of the agency that pays the employee. The place of work is usually the premises of the client but may be some other place under the supervision of either the client or the employer.

108. For workers in employment for profit, an intermediary may supply raw materials and receive the goods produced by dependent contractors, or else access to clients may be controlled by an intermediary, typically using the Internet. In these cases the contractor may be paid directly by the client, or payment may be received only through an intermediary that benefits from the work performed by the contractor.

Variables related to the measurement of informal employment relationships

109. Three variables related to the measurement of informal employment are required to understand the degree of social protection available to workers and the extent of economic risk to which they are exposed in the event of absence from work:

- (a) job-dependent social protection;
- (b) access to paid annual leave;
- (c) access to paid sick leave.

110. These variables are useful to assess the impact of new or non-standard forms of employment on access to leave and social protection. They are relevant for the identification of informal employment among employees, but are not sufficient for the comprehensive measurement of informal employment.

Job-dependent social protection

111. *Job-dependent social protection* provides information on whether the person is entitled to social protection as the result of employment in a particular job. It therefore excludes “universal” protection schemes that are not dependent on the person’s job.

112. When measuring job-dependent social protection the national context and labour laws should be taken into account. Measurement may be based on one or more specific forms of social protection (e.g., occupational injury insurance, old-age benefits, health insurance or unemployment insurance) depending on the national context.

Access to paid annual leave

113. *Access to paid annual leave* refers to the worker’s entitlement and ability to take paid time off granted by the employer. The number of days granted by the employer may vary between countries but also within the same country (e.g. between different industries and occupations) depending on national labour laws and regulations. It is not sufficient to have a legal right to paid annual leave if the worker does not have access to it in practice.

Access to paid sick leave

114. *Access to paid sick leave* refers to the worker’s entitlement and ability to take paid leave from employment due to personal sickness or injury. The paid sick leave should be dependent on the worker’s job and therefore excludes schemes that are not related to having a particular job. The number of days for which the worker can receive payment

during sickness or injury may vary between countries but also within the same country depending on national labour laws and regulations. It is not sufficient to have a legal right to paid sick leave if the worker does not have access to it in practice.

Data sources and guidelines for data collection

115. The conceptual framework for statistics on work relationships described in this resolution aims to allow statistics on different types of productive activity to be compiled in a harmonious and comparable manner from different types of data source.

116. The collection of data for ICSE-18 should follow the same frequency as the measurement of employment. However the level of detail may vary depending on the statistical source, and on descriptive and analytical needs.

117. All sources that are used as the basis for statistics on employment are also potential sources when collecting the information required to compile statistics on the ten detailed categories in ICSE-18. Different statistical sources have their advantages as well as disadvantages and can frequently be complementary to each other.

118. Household-based surveys are an important source of labour market statistics. In particular, Labour Force Surveys will be an important source of data for detailed statistics classified by ICSE-18.

119. Employment may also be measured in other specialized household surveys such as time-use, education and training or more general household surveys such as those concerned with living standards, household income and expenditure or household budget. In such cases it would be appropriate to include questions designed to determine status in employment with a degree of detail that is relevant for the analytical requirements for the statistics. The nature of the questions asked and the degree of detail would in such cases need to reflect the feasibility of data collection given the limitations of the particular data source.

120. Since the population census is an important source of statistics on employment, there may be a need to classify those employed by status in employment in the Census, in order to produce estimates for small geographic areas as well as for small groups. The need for a strict limit on the number of questions in most population censuses, however, would mean that a short question or module that collects the same concept but with less detail and less precision may be an appropriate solution.

121. When establishment surveys are used as a source of statistics on employment, ICSE-18 should be applied when there is a need for information about different types of employment arrangements. However the level of detail should reflect the national needs for the information, and the feasibility of collecting the information from establishments.

122. Administrative records, developed or adapted for statistical purposes, may also be an important input for the production of employment statistics. The administrative records could, for example, be based upon tax systems, employment services, pension schemes or social security administration. If a country is using administrative records in order to produce employment figures then it might also be relevant to derive status in employment categories from these records. The possibilities to do so depend on the structure and content of the country-specific administrative sources.

123. Compilation of statistics according to ICSaW-18, or subsets of it, will be dependent on the availability and frequency of collection of statistics on the different forms of work.

124. In order to facilitate international comparability of the statistics, data on work relationships should be collected on the basis of the most recent relevant data collection and methodological guidelines released by the ILO.

Future work

125. To promote the implementation of this resolution, the ILO should work collaboratively with countries, international, regional and sub-regional organizations, and representatives of workers' and employers' organizations to:

- (a) widely disseminate these standards and communicate on their impact and interpretation;
- (b) update and maintain the draft data collection guidelines published as Room Document x to this conference in order to reflect this resolution as adopted and current international best practice and experience;
- (c) develop technical manuals and model data collection instruments, to be made available in the three official languages, and in other languages with the support of partner institutions;
- (d) further conduct conceptual and methodological work including testing;
- (e) provide technical assistance, training and capacity building to national statistical agencies, to relevant statistical services in line ministries, and to other relevant stakeholders including workers' and employers' representatives.