

**Economic and Social Council**Distr.: General  
31 May 2010

English only

---

**Economic Commission for Europe****Conference of European Statisticians****Fifty-eighth plenary session**

Paris, 8-10 June 2010

Item 5 of the provisional agenda

**Conference of European Statisticians manuals, guidelines and recommendations****Results of the electronic consultation on the Report on  
Potential Indicators for Measurement of Quality of  
Employment****Note by the secretariat***Summary*

The present note summarises the comments by countries and international organizations on the Task Force Report on Potential Indicators for Measurement of Quality of Employment, collected through an electronic consultation in April 2010. Forty-four responses were received (from 41 countries and three international organizations), out of which 42 respondents approved the approach proposed by the report. Two countries expressed some reservations.

The Report is presented to the 2010 plenary session of the Conference for endorsement, in accordance with the Procedure for Adopting Products and Recommendations by the Conference of European Statisticians (ECE/CES/2006/37/Rev.1).

## I. Organization of the consultation

1. In February 2010, the CES Bureau reviewed the draft Report and decided to proceed with a large consultation on the Report. The Report was updated by the TF Chair (Canada) to take into account the comments made by the Bureau. The Bureau also decided that the country pilot reports should be made available to assist the consultation process (see [www.unece.org/stats/documents/quality of employment](http://www.unece.org/stats/documents/quality_of_employment)). The UNECE Secretariat was asked to coordinate the consultation and prepare a note on the outcome to be presented to the Conference.
2. To assist further the consultation, the secretariat asked the members of the Conference to structure their comments along five main questions. The majority of countries and international organisations followed the proposed structure. Detailed presentation of the comments is presented in Annex 1. The ILO comments are reproduced in Annex 2 in their entirety as requested.
3. The replies and suggestions by all respondents that relate to a next stage of the work – developing operational definitions, identifying sources, dealing with data comparability aspects – are deposited with the Secretariat and will provide the basis for outlining future work in this domain.
4. The feedback is summarised in section II. Section III outlines possible further work. **A proposal to the Conference is presented in section IV of this note.**

## II. Summary of feedback

5. The Task Force Report on Potential Indicators for Measurement of Quality of Employment was circulated to the Conference for written comments on 8 April 2010. Ten country pilot reports that accompany the document and the Validation study were made available for the consultation on the dedicated web page of the UNECE Statistical division. **Forty-four responses were received from 41 countries and 3 international organisations.** The specific, detailed comments by countries and organisations are presented in Annexes 1 and 2.
6. **Forty-two respondents endorsed the report's approach on measuring quality of employment**, and many of them provided comprehensive replies to the questions that were asked during the consultation. These are: Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Interstate Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS Statistical Committee), Statistical Office of the European Union (Eurostat) and International Labour Office (ILO).
7. **Two respondents** — Australia and Luxembourg — expressed reservations regarding the main concept of the paper and provided their comments, reflected in Annex 1.
8. Brazil, Finland, Germany, Kazakhstan, Mexico, New Zealand, and Spain provided very extensive replies including descriptions of their national experiences and a number of valuable suggestions for further work in this area.

9. Thirty-nine (out of 44) respondents indicated explicitly that the Report, in outlining the basic structure for statistical measurement of quality of employment, is comprehensive and relevant for producing statistics at the national level (see Annex 1 section A).
10. Thirty-four respondents (out of 44) noted explicitly that the proposed seven dimensions sufficiently represent the quality of employment (see Annex 1 section B).
11. The majority of respondents agreed that at the current stage the proposed indicators populate the chosen dimensions in a balanced way. A number of countries proposed some additional indicators for consideration. (See Annex 1 section C.)
12. Many respondents referred to the comprehensiveness of the Report's structure of indicators on quality of employment as an advantage, stating that such an approach offers the opportunity in a systematic manner to discern the state of quality of employment in a country and provides new elements to extend and interpret basic quantitative indicators of the labour market (see Annex I section D).
13. Many countries and all international organisations indicated that interest in statistics on quality of employment is high and growing and reported on existing national initiatives in this area. Many reported willingness or existing plans to develop and disseminate special sets of statistical information based on the Report's structure. Eurostat intends to assess the options to advance the production of such statistics. France together with the Indicators' group of the EU Employment Committee is planning to take stock of the empirical testing of the Report's set of indicators in order to link them with the ILO indicators on decent work. Belgium, Germany, France and Mexico pointed out the potential relevance of the proposed indicators for the implementation of the recommendations in the *Stiglitz/Sen/Fitoussi-report* on the "Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress". (See Annex 1 section E.)

### III. Possible further work

14. The Report outlines a basic structure for statistical measurement of quality of employment and proposes a set of potential indicators grouped under seven dimensions. As such, the Report does not provide for the detailed metadata on the indicators including operational definitions, methodological guidelines and suggestions on specific data sources. It refers mainly to the measurement of quality of employment at the national level in the broad sense and is not intended for international comparisons.
15. Ten country pilot reports, that accompany the Report have tested the applicability of the proposed set and grouping of indicators under a broad variety of situations and highlighted the possible data sources and some operational definitions. The Validation study conducted by Italy also explored internationally available data sources for harmonized indicators for future consideration.
16. Many respondents pointed to the need for further work in this field. The set of indicators probably should be reviewed and extended on the basis of results of further practical experiences collected from actual implementations. This procedure has already proven fruitful during the Task Force work as shown by the country reports. Further voluntary tests of the framework at the country level should be encouraged.
17. In the current Report, the indicators are proposed without full specification, which corresponded to the Task Force's aim to develop a conceptual frame. The Validation study conducted by Italy provided standard definitions and identified sources for a part of the indicators. For the remaining indicators this still has to be done. Hence, next steps should be undertaken towards providing more precise definitions of indicators, their computation methods and sources.

## **IV. Proposal**

18. In view of the work undertaken or planned on measuring quality of employment in many countries and the expressed support to the proposed set of indicators, it is proposed that the Conference endorse the Report on Potential Indicators for Measurement of Quality of Employment as basis for further work.

19. It is proposed that the CES Bureau consider the further work at its meeting on 11 June 2010 in view of the proposals made and the issues raised by countries during the consultation.

## Annex 1

### Consultation on Potential Indicators for Measurement of Quality of Employment: detailed countries' comments

#### Introduction

1. In February 2010, the CES Bureau decided to proceed with a large consultation on the Report. At the request of the Bureau, the Report was updated by the TF Chair (Canada). In order to assist the consultation process, the CES Bureau also decided that the country pilot reports should be made available. The UNECE Secretariat was asked to coordinate the consultation and prepare an information note on the outcome to be presented to the Conference. To assist the consultation process, the secretariat asked the CES members to structure their answers according to the five questions indicated below.

#### A. Question 1: Do you find the Report's basic approach to the statistical measurement of quality of employment relevant and comprehensive in general and in the case of your country?

2. **Thirty-nine respondents indicated that the Report's approach is comprehensive in general and relevant for producing statistics on quality of employment at the national level:** Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kazakhstan, Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, CIS Statistical Committee, Eurostat and ILO. Russian Federation agreed with the comprehensiveness of the Report's approach but noted that the lack of data on certain indicators undermine the relevance of the approach at the national level.

3. **Germany** pointed out that the Report's systematic structure in which the indicators are presented in seven dimensions is straightforward and makes the complex subject easy to understand. "Using the underlying concept, a coherent picture of the various dimensions of quality of employment has been achieved, which will be highly useful for a user-friendly way of data dissemination". Germany suggested referring to the set of indicators as a framework and not as "potential indicators".

4. **France and ILO**, too, pointed to the structural clarity of the approach and suggested to rename the Report's "potential indicators" as a "framework for measuring quality of employment".

5. **Switzerland** acknowledged that a comprehensive and periodic measurement of quality of employment is worthwhile. Yet it is necessary to take account of the following constraints: "(i) the most interesting aspects that enable to complete existing statistics and indicators are in many cases very difficult or even impossible to use, or cannot provide meaningful results (e.g. informal work, measurement of decent work); (ii) the interpretation of indicators relating to the quality of employment can sometimes be subjective and; (iii) the measurement of qualitative indicators is also more difficult to interpret".

6. **Australia** expressed reservations about the capacity of the Report's approach to assess objectively quality of employment. According to Australia, "the purpose of the document, and how it would be used, remain unclear. There are likely to be problems in

using it for international comparisons, but also problems in using it to genuinely discern changes in the quality of employment in a particular country”. (*Note by the secretariat: this is acknowledged in the paper. The explanatory note, as well as the Report itself, clearly state that the set of indicators are proposed for measuring quality of employment at the national level at this stage*). Australia further commented that there is also a need to clarify as to whether it is the quality of employment, quality of work, or quality of a job which is being considered.

7. **Australia, Austria, Belgium, Israel, Luxembourg, Norway and the United Kingdom** commented on the potential issue of subjectivity in interpreting quality of employment indicators and noted that for some qualitative indicators it is not always clear what is ‘good’ or ‘bad’ and if a change in a variable should be seen as improvement in quality or not.

8. Commenting on coverage, **Israel, Spain, and Mexico** pointed to the need to add some indicators related to self-employment and other workers. For a more inclusive approach, Mexico proposed to consider various levels of disaggregation of indicators across all dimensions. The basic classifications/breakdowns proposed –orthogonal to the seven dimensions – are (i) sex, (ii) age, (iii) status in employment, (iv) economic activity sector, (v) institutional sector and (vi) status at home.

9. **The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia** referred to the complexity of the issue and highlighted the need for paying attention to the country-specific legislative basis, policies and strategies when assessing quality of employment.

## **B. Question 2: How well the proposed seven dimensions outline/reflect the quality of employment?**

10. **Thirty-four respondents (out of 44) noted explicitly that the proposed seven dimensions sufficiently represent the quality of employment.** Eight countries did not respond directly to the question but provided some comments reflecting national specificities.

11. **Switzerland** acknowledged that the proposed wide range of dimensions “enables each country that has surveys on the economically active population to apply the model. Each country can freely and independently define an order of priority for the dimensions and indicators that best fit its labour market”.

12. **Spain** noted that as different factors/dimensions “are grouped into the same conceptual framework, the entire system offers an overall integrated perspective and, at the same time, allows showing the specific influence of each factor/dimension in the quality of employment”.

13. **Italy** specifically supported the Report’s approach towards the sub-dimension on Fair treatment in employment: “proposed by the Task Force as a transversal dimension *it* proved to be very effective to describe the Italian context”. In addition, Italy suggested considering a more specific dimension on work satisfaction.

14. **Turkey** commented on the potential difficulties to gather data for the dimension on Fair treatment in employment since this kind of statistics is not always produced by the NSOs.

15. **Eurostat** supported the Report’s “approach towards the quantitative aspects of access to employment as explained in paragraph 21 of the report: These aspects are undoubtedly important, but they can better be treated in conjunction with the quality of employment indicators rather than by additional indicators inside the set proposed”.

16. **France**, referring to the paragraphs 21 and 49 of the Report, advocated for including a dimension on access to employment. **Mexico** also suggested that the proposed set should be complemented by a set of indicators addressing access of employment and not to depart from the ILO's decent work indicators.

17. **Finland** noted that "the concept should be seen from the angle of its changing character. Changes in working life will also change the need for dimensions/indicators in the future. This is why the list should be seen as flexible as possible".

18. **New Zealand** suggested some changes to terminology: to change the 'Safety at work' sub-dimension "to 'Safety and health at work' to better reflect the indicators contained therein. In addition, it would be more relevant, if the 'Social dialogue' dimension was renamed 'Collective representation and bargaining'".

**C. Question 3: Does the main set of proposed indicators populate adequately the dimensions/sub-dimensions? Do you have any suggestions for adding/removing/reallocating indicators under specific dimensions (in general, not at metadata level)?**

19. **The majority of respondents agreed that, in general, at the current stage, the proposed indicators populate the chosen dimensions in a balanced way. A number of countries proposed some additional indicators for consideration.**

20. **Eurostat** observed that the current set of indicators can be reviewed and extended, "but only on the basis of results of further practical experiences collected from actual implementations. This procedure has already proven fruitful during the Task Force work as shown by the country reports". **Hungary** expressed a similar position and advised against an "endless reactive discussion on sets of indicators".

21. **Poland** did not exclude amendments to indicators under specific dimensions "depending on the development of labour market statistics and coherent statistics based on well-documented, statistical sources of good quality".

22. **Germany and CIS Statistical Committee** advised that if necessary at the national level, additional indicators could be added. For instance, some countries may consider including an indicator on commuting time.

23. **Austria** suggested adding indicators on the access to the labour market for specific age groups or other sub-populations having difficulties integrating into the labour market (e.g. employment rates for elderly/younger population groups/migrants).

24. **Belgium** proposed considering 'share of employed persons who never/sometimes/usually work at home' or 'share of employed persons who have the possibility to work at home' for a set of indicators under dimension 3 Working hours and balancing work and non-working life.

25. **Brazil** specified some economic and social context indicators to be used: economic - GDP annual growth, real growth of GDP per capita, annual inflation rate, interest rate, employment distribution by economic sector and labour productivity; social - average years of schooling of the population aged 15 and over, the enrolment rate of the population aged 15 and over, literacy rate of the population aged 15 and over, Gini coefficient and life expectancy.

26. **Finland** reiterated a few points previously discussed by the Task Force but not fully reflected in the Report regarding the indicators populating dimension 3 Working hours and balancing work and non-working life. **Italy** noted a need for indicators on job satisfaction in dimension 7 Workplace relationships and work motivation.

27. **Ireland** mentioned that “an indicator on receipt of information from employer on the organisation could prove somewhat useful as a supplement within the 7b sub-dimension”, e.g. ‘Share of employed people who receive regular information from their employer on the operation or performance of the business.’

28. **Latvia** stated that the indicator “‘Gender pay gap’ is important for income dimension and should be added to dimension 2 (a) Income from employment”.

29. **Luxembourg** suggested “removing ‘Public social security expenditure as share of GDP’ under *sub*-dimension 4b, as there is no direct link to employment quality or working conditions”.

30. **Republic of Korea** proposed to adjust the list of indicators in order “to improve the measurability and to enhance the practicality”. In particular concerning dimension 1, since most countries prohibit child labour by law, Republic of Korea questioned whether attempts to measure such labour are practical in most countries. The indicators can either be removed from the list or be rearranged as a sub category.

31. **Spain** noted that “there is a lack of indicators referring to self-employed workers, *as degree of difficulty* to create their own enterprise (excessive bureaucracy, *access to credit*) or prejudice *against female entrepreneurs*”.

32. **Switzerland** suggested considering additional indicators for:

(a) Measuring the dynamics of the labour market (which would facilitate the study of transitions from one status to another, e.g. the transition from an economically active to economically inactive status or the transition from a vulnerable to a non-vulnerable status, etc.);

(b) Measuring under-employment and over-employment and hence the correspondence between qualifications and employment;

(c) Focusing more on the satisfaction with working conditions or balancing work and family life (for example: percentage of nurseries per economically active person of childbearing age). All the more so because the labour force survey offers, at regular intervals, supplementary modules that relate to certain aspects of quality of employment (balancing work and family life, unpaid work, social situation, continuous education and training, etc.).

33. **Republic of Moldova** referred to additional relevant indicators under the dimension Security of employment and social protection: “‘employment in the informal sector’ and ‘informal employment’ which reflect the lack of social protection for a significant part of the employment”. **The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia** also suggested adding the indicators related to the ‘informal employment’.

#### **D. Question 4: For implementation: what are potential advantages and disadvantages in using the suggested approach to measure quality of employment?**

34. **Many respondents referred to the comprehensiveness of the Report’s structure of indicators on quality of employment as a potential advantage.** Bulgaria, CIS Statistical Committee, Eurostat, Germany, Ireland, ILO, Italy, Kazakhstan, Lithuania, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Spain and Ukraine stated that, in their opinion, such an approach offers the opportunity in a systematic manner to discern the state of quality of employment in a country and provides new elements to extend and interpret basic quantitative indicators on the labour market.



35. Austria, Brazil, Eurostat, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, New Zealand, Spain, and Republic of Moldova recognise the advantage of the Report's integrated approach that unifies dimensions populated by indicators in a single conceptual frame on quality of employment.

36. It should be noted that the Report focuses explicitly on measuring quality of employment at the national level and does not elaborate on metadata and interpretation of indicators at this stage for reasons which are explained in the document. Nevertheless, countries and international organisations often referred to the above issues in their reflections on the implementation of the proposed set of indicators. Although these are not in the scope of the current Report, such comments are included in the below discussion in order to convey the respondents' views in a holistic manner and as an indication of possible future work in this area. **In the following paragraphs country comments and reflections on potential advantages and disadvantages of the proposed set of indicators are grouped broadly under the three headings:** 1. International comparisons; 2. data sources; 3. measurement and interpretation of indicators.

#### 1. International comparisons

37. **Eurostat** supported "the cautious attitude towards using the framework for international comparisons, but thought that the potential the framework offered in this respect was not fully worked out in the report. This can only be elaborated upon after further experience has been accumulated, and thus does not constitute a flaw in the report".

38. **Mexico and Republic of Korea** also agreed that at this stage the international comparisons might be misleading. Similarly, **Norway** saw as a reasonable approach "not to establish an international reporting requirement for the NSOs".

39. **Ireland** remarked that "the nature of the indicators does not facilitate international comparison as harmonised definitions are not offered. This does not diminish its usefulness nationally but could mean that individual countries could separately undertake work which will not be coordinated or yield comparable results".

#### 2. Data sources

40. **Estonia, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Republic of Moldova and Spain** identified the unavailability of statistical sources in the case of some indicators and countries as a potential disadvantage. It can affect the degree of coverage in certain dimension and, therefore, in the whole system of indicators. If new surveys were launched to obtain data on the indicators the burden on respondents would increase. **Russian Federation** indicated that a "few indicators from the list could be considered as sociological (for example, social dialogue, workplace relationships and work motivation) and it could be difficult to organize statistical survey for them".

41. **Czech Republic, Cyprus, Italy, Slovenia, New Zealand, Portugal, and Turkey** pointed out that the Report's approach calls for using various existing and new sources/surveys to build up the indicators. This may result in a lack of consistency between the numerators and denominators of these indicators, and in inconsistent reference periods.

42. **Kazakhstan and Israel** indicated as a potential drawback the reliance on subjective responses and opinions of the respondents, which may lead to incomplete/inaccurate responses, and as a consequence may affect the quality of data. Similarly, **New Zealand** pointed out that there might be a lack of awareness by some workers of their working conditions and employment arrangements.

### 3. Measurement and interpretation of indicators

43. **New Zealand** commented on possible implementation issues, namely on the feasibility of collecting all indicators, difficulties with using inconsistent reference periods, references to current main jobs versus all jobs and collecting income data.

44. According to **Spain, Slovakia and Slovenia**, other limitation relates to the lack of operational definitions of the indicators. While the common methodology including definitions and sources exists for about two thirds of indicators tested by Italy in the Validation study, these still have to be developed for the remaining one third.

45. **Australia** noted that “it could be difficult for an agency implementing the proposed model to interpret information from a large number of indicators, when movements in some of these indicators are not unambiguously positive or negative for employment quality. There are also likely to be significant issues in reliably and validly measuring a number of indicators outlined in the report, which may impact on the capacity of agencies to implement the model proposed in the report”.

### E. Is there any interest in or plan for providing statistics on quality of employment in your country?

46. **Many countries and all international organisations indicated that interest in statistics on quality of employment is high and growing.**

47. **Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Mexico, New Zealand, Poland, Russian Federation, Slovakia, and Sweden** mentioned the existing national initiatives to provide some quality of employment statistics albeit in a less comprehensive or systematic way and often under different headings (“Decent work country profile”, reports on “Working conditions”, “Quality of Work Life Survey”, “Survey of Working Life”, “Strategic indicators”, reports on results of ad-hoc Labour Force Surveys). Russian Federation, on the other hand, is planning a “pilot survey on measurement of quality of employment and integration processes in labor market” in 2010-2011.

48. **Brazil, Bulgaria, Israel, Kazakhstan, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, and Spain** reported their willingness and/or existing plans to develop and disseminate special sets of statistical information based on the Report’s structure for analysis of quality of employment in their countries. **Germany** plans to produce their first publication comprehensively covering quality of employment on the basis of the Report’s indicators set in 2010.

49. **France:** continues working on the quality of employment statistics at the national level and together with the Indicators’ group of the EU Employment Committee in Brussels is planning before the 19<sup>th</sup> ICLS to take stock of the empirical testing of the Report’s set of indicators in order to link them with the ILO’s indicators on decent work. **Eurostat** intends to assess the options to advance the production of such statistics.

50. **Australia** already regularly collects and disseminates some of the indicators in the Report (average weekly earnings, leave entitlements, hours worked and trade union membership). ABS does not have plans at this stage to provide official statistics on other aspects of quality of employment.

51. **Brazil** is “already in the process of remodeling its system of household surveys, allowing the creation of indicators to measure the quality of employment”.

52. In **Bulgaria**, “although there are no specific plans for disseminating dedicated statistics on quality of employment, indicators related to its measurement are published in

the national labour force survey publications”. In general, Bulgaria is “interested in developing such statistics and considers the subject highly relevant to its users and policy makers”.

53. **CIS Statistical Committee** indicated “the study of the quality of employment in the CIS countries and its statistical measurement as one of the priority tasks related to the improvement of labour statistics in these countries”.

54. **Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Latvia, Luxembourg, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Sweden, and Switzerland** informed that they have no plans for the time being to provide statistics on quality of employment in a systematic way.

55. **Finland** will continue conducting the Quality of Work Life Surveys which have been administered in six-to-seven year intervals. This survey forms the basis for analysing quality of employment. “In addition, all other statistical tools, like the Labour Force Survey, Statistics on Income and Living Conditions, Structure of Earnings Survey, Statistics on Occupational Accidents and Adult Education Surveys will continue to be available”. “This new set of indicators on quality of employment will be an important tool for coordinating statistics in this field and for giving an overview of developments in working life, not to mention the future opportunities for international comparisons”.

56. **Germany** has been publishing information on many of the proposed indicators for many years. “In summer 2010, the indicators proposed by the Task Force will be the basis of the first publication of the Federal Statistical Office comprehensively covering quality of employment. The indicator framework is an ideal example for a cross-sectional publication bringing together the different aspects of a complex phenomenon and covering all data sources available”.

57. “Most of the indicators are released in different databases in **Hungary** and some of them are well known even in international datasets”. Presently Hungary does not intend to provide separate statistics on quality of employment since there are already a lot of datasets containing some of indicators. However, it plans to use the concept in their analysis of quality of employment.

58. **Ireland** “recently published a report on working conditions covering access to benefits, training, knowledge of employment rights cross classified against various socio-demographic characteristics of the employee and characteristics of the employment”. There is sufficient interest to further develop the domain in Ireland but there are no immediate plans to formally adopt the framework.

59. **Israel** is interested in providing data on quality of employment in future national statistics publications. In order to include this into work plans, “standard data collection tools are needed”.

60. **Italy** is interested in providing statistics on quality of employment at the national level and some steps in that direction are already taken: “ISTAT, for the first time, in 2008/2009, inserted a specific ad hoc module focused on mobbing (“harassment at work” or “bullying at work”), in the Multipurpose survey on the Citizens’ security, which is carried out every five years”.

61. In 2005 **Kazakhstan** “started development and publication of statistical indicators to measure decent work, based on the methodological recommendations of the ILO”. In 2010, “the statistical agency developed and approved the “Strategic Plan of the Agency of Statistics for 2010-2014”, which includes work on the development of quality of employment statistics”. Kazakhstan “is interested in the formation of statistical data on measurement of the quality of employment, but for this it needs consultative assistance and practical interaction with experts in this field”.

62. **The Republic of Korea** has been developing and calculating indicators for measuring quality of employment since 2010. The plan was set up as part of the Korean economic policy to ‘Create new jobs’”. It will proceed in two stages: (i) in 2010, studies are performed to review the relevant research done by other countries, and to establish the framework of the indicator sets; (ii) “in 2011 and beyond, more indicators will be adopted and tested, and the availability of new data will be improved through surveys or by other methods”.
63. “In the strategy of Statistics **Lithuania**, covering the period of 2008–2012, there are no plans for providing statistics on the quality of employment. The report “Potential indicators for the measurement of the quality of employment” was sent to the Ministry of Social Security and Labour of the Republic of Lithuania for information”.
64. As for **Mexico**, some of indicators are provided within ENOE (Mexican Labor Force Survey). The dissemination platform of information on a quarterly basis is called Strategic Indicators. However, to the extent that the Report’s approach encompasses multiple sources, it is vital to assure the participation of the Ministry of Labour (Secretaria del Trabajo y Previsión Social) before taking future steps.
65. **Republic of Moldova** plans to conduct a campaign (workshop, seminar) to sensitise the users about Indicators for measurement of quality of employment and to publish available indicators on the agency’s website”.
66. **New Zealand** “collected information on a number of the indicators listed in the Task Force Report” through the 2008 Survey of Working Life (SoWL) and identified other available resources for other indicators. The SoWL “was designed specifically as a repeating supplement to the Household Labour Force Survey. Ideally, the survey should be repeated approximately every three years to monitor changes and trends in employment conditions, work arrangements and job quality”.
67. **Poland** “has already covered most dimensions of quality of employment proposed in the Report, e.g. The CSO collects and disseminates “indicators regarding safety at work, some data on fair treatment of employment, income from employment, indicators referring to working hours and working time arrangements. However, the information has never been gathered within the joint title ‘quality of employment’. Inspired by the report **Poland** plans to prepare special statistical information referring to the analysis of quality of employment for the Polish economy. The results are expected to be of high interest for different groups of data users”.
68. **Slovakia** plans “to provide statistical information related to the quality of employment in the extent laid down in the EC regulations: outputs from the European ad hoc modules on the labour force sample surveys dealing with these issues (e.g. Ad hoc module 2001, 2004, 2005, 2007) and regular information in the field of social statistics, in which the theme of the measuring quality of employment is also included, in compliance with European legislation and Eurostat requirements. Slovakia does not plan any other activities in this field”.
69. The National Statistical Institute of Spain, specifically the Labour Market Statistics Directorate, expressed its interest in developing indicators suggested in the Report and informed that they have started some work related to the possible development of the proposed system.

## Annex 2

### ILO Comments

1. Due to the nature of the questions mainly targeted at specialists working at the National Statistical Offices, the ILO would like to limit its comments to Question 1(a) reproduces below:

#### **A. Do you find the Report's basic approach to the statistical measurement of quality of employment relevant and comprehensive in general and in the case of your country, concerning**

##### **1. Underlying concept**

2. First of all, we would like to congratulate the Task Force and its Chair, Geoff Bowlby (Statistics Canada), on preparing the revised version of the original report written for and discussed at the fifth 2009 Joint UNECE/ILO/Eurostat Meeting on the Measurement of Quality of Employment.

3. At the same time, we regret that the new document changed its original title *Statistical Measurement of Quality of Employment: Conceptual framework and indicators* used at the above Meeting, which in our view much better reflected the content, structure, philosophy and conceptual basis of the original report and the work of the Task Force preceding its preparation.

4. We would like to recall in this regard that the Task Force was given a clear mandate by the fourth 2007 Joint UNECE/ILO/Eurostat Meeting to further develop and test the draft framework of labour quality measures discussed at the 2007 Meeting in order to come up with a more comprehensive conceptual framework and coherent set of indicators to measure quality of employment at the national level and internationally.

5. The Task Force established in 2007, worked on the implementation of these recommendations throughout 2007-2009.

6. It should be noted that senior national specialists from 25 countries, both representing the UNECE Region and coming from the National Statistical Offices of Asia and Latin America, as well as a number of international experts representing the European Union (DG Employment, Brussels), EUROSTAT, the ILO, the UNECE and the WIEGO worked together, lead by the Task Force Steering Committee, on the development, refinement, testing and application of the Quality of Employment Framework documented in the report prepared for the fifth 2009 UNECE/ILO/Eurostat Meeting (*Statistical Measurement of Quality of Employment: Conceptual framework and indicators*).

7. The validity and applicability of the suggested framework and indicators underpinning it were tested in the Validation Study carried out by the Italian National Institute of Statistics (ISTAST) and the *Quality of Employment Country Pilot Profiles* written by leading specialists working at the National Statistical Offices of the following nine countries and: Canada, Israel, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Mexico, Moldova and Ukraine - financial support for the Validation Study and Country Profiles was provided from the ILO/EU Project "Enhancing the understanding of decent work issues by developing decent work indicators".

8. In our opinion, the discussions held at the fifth 2009 UNECE/ILO/Eurostat Meeting on the Measurement of Quality of Employment were open, constructive, useful and forward

looking. As a result, the Quality of Employment Framework and its seven dimensions were largely approved by the participants, representing 25 countries and 5 international organisations. For easy reference the recommendations of the fifth Meeting are reproduced below:

9. “The Meeting recommended:

(a) Inclusion of the improved versions of the framework (to be finalized in consultation with the current Task Force members), the validation study and of the country reports in the Task Force Report;

(b) Publication of a collected volume which includes the framework, the country reports and the indicator validation study;

(c) Convening a meeting in two years. There was overwhelming support for another meeting from the participating countries. The discussion in the next meeting should center on:

(i) New and updated country profiles implementing the framework, including the work of Eurostat in this field;

(ii) Further refining of the list of indicators and their definitions.

(d) Formation of an informal Organizing Committee by the UNECE, ILO, Eurostat, and Canada in order to organize the next expert meeting in two years and take on board any emerging issues regarding the conceptual framework, such as providing advice to countries in the implementation of the framework at the national level;

(e) Further voluntary tests of the framework at the country level during the two years leading up to the next meeting;

(f) Work towards more precise definitions for the indicators and computation methods in cooperation with the ILO based on the ongoing metadata compilation under the ILO’s approach to measure decent work. It was also suggested that the quality of employment framework could be used for an in-depth qualitative analysis of relevant ILO decent work dimensions”.

10. Given the above, we were surprised to read some recommendations of the Bureau, and especially that requesting to replace the word “framework” with “potential indicators” and re-write the Task Force report accordingly.

11. This change not only takes away from the tremendous work carried out by the Task Force members, its Steering Committee and the participants of three meetings held in Paris (June 2008) and Geneva (May and October 2009) on further development and refinement of the Quality of Employment Framework and indicators measuring its seven dimensions, but takes the entire effort some 5 years back and does not take into consideration the views and position of almost half of the member States of the UNECE Region and those of international organisations working in the area under discussion.

12. To conclude, we would like to:

(a) Recommend a new title for the Task Force report acknowledging the Bureau’s recommendation with respect to the indicators proposed: *Statistical Measurement of Quality of Employment: Conceptual framework and potential indicators*;

(b) Support the recommendations concerning possible use, testing and further developmental work on the quality of employment indicators documented in Part V: *How to use the indicators* of the CES Task Force report;

(c) Revert to the use of and reference to the Quality of Employment Framework as documented in the Task Force report prepared for the Bureau’s Meeting held in New

York (February 2009), which incorporated the comments and suggestions of the participants of the fifth 2009 Joint UNECE/ILO/Eurostat Meeting on the Measurement of Quality of Employment.

---