INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION

Final Report[1]

LFS Pilot Studies Analysis Workshop

15-18 November 2016 –Geneva, Switzerland

---

[1] This document is being reproduced without formal editing.

Table of Contents

I.   Introduction

Background and objectives

1. The Labour Force Survey (LFS) Pilot Studies Analysis Workshop took place from 15 to 18 November 2016 in Geneva, Switzerland. It was organized by the ILO Department of Statistics. It hosted participants from the 10 countries participating in the pilot study. Representatives from FAO, UN Foundation and World Bank also attended the Workshop.

2. The Workshop had as main objectives to: (a) share experiences from participating countries; (b) identify the good practices and lessons learned; and (c) discuss the analysis strategy that the ILO is following to identify and consolidate the main findings from the pilot studies.

3. The main focus of the pilot studies was on testing and developing methods to align LFS questionnaires with the new standards concerning statistics of work, employment and labour underutilization adopted by the 19th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS) in 2013[2]. Among the various changes introduced by the new standards the focus of the pilot studies was placed on three key measurement objectives, namely:

    a. measurement of employment (now refined to refer to work for pay or profit);

    b. measurement of labour underutilization with reference to the three key components covered by the ICLS standards including: unemployment, the potential labour force and time related underemployment; and

    c. measurement of participation in own-use production work, including production of goods and provision of services intended mainly for the household or family. Related to this was a focus on testing approaches to establish the boundary between employment and own use production of goods which is based on the main intended destination of production in the standards.

4. The new measures identified in the new standards will be particularly relevant to support a more targeted monitoring of participation and access to labour markets; to make visible unpaid work performed both by women and men, particularly in agriculture and fishing, but also in providing unpaid services for the household; and to more broadly capture problems of underutilization including discouragement affecting in particular youth and persons living in rural areas. With the new focus on achieving the SDG goals, improving the collection and availability of these indicators, will become an important priority at national and global levels. The outcomes of this methodological work will help to ensure countries have the know-how and tools to improve their LFS data collection practices and more generally their work statistics programmes.

---

[2] 19th ICLS Resolution I: see http://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/meetings-and-events/international-conference-of-labour-statisticians/19/WCMS_230304/lang--en/index.htm

Opening session

5. Ms Monica Castillo, Head of the Statistical Standards and Methods Unit, opened the Analysis Workshop. She welcomed participants, recalled the main purpose and focus of the pilot studies and highlighted their relevance for data collection and policy-makers in particular.

Structure of the meeting

6. As shown in the Agenda (see Annex II), the meeting was structured in three parts to promote discussion on: Project implementation process (Part I), Preliminary findings (Part II), and Conclusions and Next Steps (Part III):

Part I: Overview of project implementation process

Session 1: Background and objectives of the workshop

Session 2: Pilot methodology, analysis strategy & implementation practices

Part II: Preliminary findings

Session 3: Identification of persons in employment

Session 4: Intended destination of production

Session 5: Own-use production of goods

Session 6: Status in employment (contributing family workers & dependent self-employed)

Session 7: Working time (hours actually worked, hours usually worked)

Session 8: Labour underutilization I: Time related underemployment

Session 9: Labour underutilization II: Unemployed and Potential Labour Force

Session 10: Own-use production of services

Session 11: Main activity

Part III: Conclusions and Next steps

Session 12: Workshop conclusions and recommendations

Session 13: Practical guidance

7. Prior to the meeting, selected participants were invited to act as discussants for each topic in the agenda from session 3 onwards (with the exception of session 4). The main role of the discussants was to share their experiences with the pilot LFS, in order to promote subsequent discussion in plenary sessions. In

addition, the ILO presented the background to the topic of the session and the main preliminary findings from the ILO's initial analysis of the cognitive interviews and field tests.

II.   **Summary of outcomes**

8. The main outcomes for each of the topics of the workshop are listed below. The summary is organized by session.

Session 1: Background and objectives of the workshop

9. Mr. Kieran Walsh, Sr. Statistician in the Statistical Standards and Methods Unit, started the session by presenting the main changes stemming from the 19th ICLS. He then gave an overview of the ILO pilot study objectives and design. The pilot studies involved the testing of 5 different questionnaires in 10 countries from the different world regions. The model questionnaires were developed by the ILO taking into consideration the most common LFS approaches used by countries around the world. The 5 questionnaires differed in various ways such as flow, structure and question wording, but each were aligned to be conceptually consistent with the standards.

10. Each country tested 2 questionnaires, initially through cognitive interviews and subsequently over 2 different waves of field tests. For each wave of the field tests 400 households were surveyed with an over-representation of rural households. The latter was done to better capture agricultural work in rural areas which was of key importance for the objectives of the studies, in particular the measurement of the boundary between employment and own use production work. Each country was allocated the questionnaire closest to its current national practices along with one other questionnaire for contrast. The purpose of this design was to enable good coverage of all questionnaires across regions but also to allow comparisons of two different questionnaires within the countries.

11. Finally, the Workshop objectives were outlined. The outcomes of the workshop were to serve as input to develop practical guidance on LFS to be released by the ILO in the coming future. Thus, substantial feedback from countries on their experiences of the pilot project was critical.

Session 2: Pilot methodology, analysis strategy & implementation process

12. Ms. Elisa M. Benes, Sr. Statistician in the Statistical Standards and Methods Unit, presented the analysis strategy proposed to identify the main results of the pilot study. The strategy aimed to uncover whether the different questionnaires yielded similar or different results and whether the differences were due to questionnaire design or to other reasons. The reports submitted by countries summarizing the main findings from the cognitive tests were used to identify common themes arising in different contexts with each of the 5 model questionnaires. This served to identify problems with the formulation, translation or national adaptation of questions and with the structure or order of questionnaire sections, which were addressed prior to the start of the field tests.

13. For the quantitative analysis, Ms. Benes stressed the importance of focusing on comparisons between the pairs of models tested within each country due to the experimental design of the field tests. Post-stratification weights had been developed and used as part of the analysis to allow identification of

differences in the results due to questionnaire design and not to the composition of the samples. To conclude, Ms. Benes shared some of the main reflections ILO had on the overall process, recognizing the extensive role of the National Statistical Offices (NSOs) in ensuring the successful implementation of the tests and acknowledging some of the limitations due to ambitious timelines and issues with external funding.

14. During the discussion, the NSOs shared their main views on the overall methodology of the pilot studies. In particular, there was a general agreement on the relevance and usefulness of cognitive testing for NSOs. Some participants noted that the cognitive tests had enabled the NSO not only to improve the design of the questionnaires but also to build capacity among their staff by providing them with a deeper understanding of the topics included in their national Labour Force Surveys (LFS). A few also indicated that they were now using their knowledge of cognitive interviewing methods to improve questionnaire design for other surveys. A lesson highlighted in this regard was the importance of allocating sufficient time to the planning and implementation of questionnaire testing and respondent selection for cognitive testing, as well as to the analysis and reporting of the results.

15. Some NSOs further recognized the wealth of materials developed by the ILO to support the pilot implementation. These materials were also being used for training, awareness raising and communication of the new ICLS standards within the NSOs and with key stakeholders. The NSOs in general noted that there was strong demand for tools (such as questionnaires developed for CAPI) and ongoing support for national implementation.

Session 3: Identification of persons in employment

16. Mr. Yves Perardel, Sr. Statistician in the Data Production and Analysis Unit, gave an overview of the question sequences tested to identify persons in employment. Each of the five model questionnaires had substantial differences in the measurement of employment relating to the overall structure and flow of the questionnaires as well as the wording of individual questions. Some of the models involved more respondent burden than others due to longer sets of questions. These differences were being assessed to identify the level of detail needed for comprehensive measurement or any other issues arising with questionnaire logic and question wording. An important issue assessed was the need for specific recovery questions targeting people who may not report themselves as employed initially (e.g. contributing family workers or people with casual jobs).

17. Presentations were made by participants from Moldova, Peru, Philippines, Namibia and Ivory Coast. This was followed by a presentation showing the preliminary results from the ILO cross-country analysis by Ms. Elisa Benes. The results showed that, at an aggregate level, all models yielded similar measures of employment except for model 5. Model 5 gave higher results for employment than all the other models, some explanations for this were offered and would be elaborated on further in session 4 (see below). The main conclusion drawn from these results was that despite different structures, flows and question wording, the different models could be used to generate comparable estimates.

18. Participants raised a number of issues observed with respondents' understanding of the initial questions used to identify persons employed. The tests had shown that some of the key words often used in the identification of persons employed (e.g. business, profit, payment in kind, household) were not

understood by all respondents or were interpreted in different ways. This pointed to the importance of national adaptation, testing and use of common terms that are understood by different groups of the population to achieve consistent interpretation and minimise potential biases in the measurement of LFS indicators.

19. Reference periods used in key questions were also found to be ambiguous and interpreted differently among respondents when specific dates or other anchors were not mentioned. This was the case both for long and short reference periods such as "the last 12 months", "last week" or "the last 7 days". There was a general agreement that guidance should emphasize the importance of clearly specifying the reference period within the questions, particularly when a moving week is used (e.g. "During the last week, that is from [DAY] up to [DAY/yesterday,...]").

20. Analysis of recovery questions showed that these captured a substantial share of the people in employment. This was particularly the case for persons engaged as contributing family workers, in casual jobs, or working in selected industries, in particular agriculture. Participants agreed that guidance should highlight the importance of selected recovery questions and recommend their inclusion to enable a comprehensive identification of the employed.

Session 4: Intended destination of production

21. Mr. Kieran Walsh gave an overview of the relevant questions and sections assessed and the preliminary findings. The main intended destination of production is the key element which defines the boundary between employment (mainly intended for sale) and own use production of goods (mainly intended for own use) as set out in the standards. The different model questionnaires had various differences which were being assessed including the point in the questionnaire where the assessment takes place, the level at which the assessment was done (entire activity, individual products) and various other differences in structure and flow. Also being assessed was the risk that respondents would report the same activity twice, both as employment and own use production of goods which would indicate that the questions involved were not being understood as intended.

22. Cognitive testing had indicated some risk of respondents double reporting the same activities as employment and main intended destination indicating some confusion, particularly where the questions on own use production were long and included multiple elements (activity, reference period, main intended destination). It had been attempted to address these issues in the updates to the questionnaires following the cognitive tests and to include assessment questions during the field tests to assess the extent to which it was happening. The difficulty with any confusion relating to questions on main intended destination was that it could impact the measurement of both employment and own use production of goods.

23. Although there was an overall good understanding of the questions on main intended destination, there was a general remark from countries concerning the meaning of the word "agriculture". The tests showed that its meaning varied across cultures and languages, in some cases including farming and animal husbandry, while in others referring only to farming. This was another example of the importance of ensuring that appropriate terminology was used in the relevant questions to relate to respondents the intended range of activities.

24. All model questionnaires were designed to pick up people doing either employment work in agriculture or own use production work in agriculture. Thus, it was possible to compare the overall proportion of people doing work in agriculture (whether employment or own use production) as a way to assess overall consistency between the approaches. Preliminary analysis indicated that the proportion of respondents doing work in agriculture seemed to be captured relatively consistently by the 5 model questionnaires.

25. There were some specific differences noted for model 1 which starts with a section on work in farming and fishing. In that model, own use production work in agriculture could be missed should respondents initially reported having employment in agriculture as the sequence did not allow for recovery of work in agriculture done mainly for own or family use. While this was expected due to the design of model 1 it would need to be taken into account where model 1 was being used and the intention was to measure own use production of goods comprehensively. However, this did not appear to impact the measurement of employment in agriculture.

26. Measurement of employment in agriculture differed in model 5 but this incoherence could be explained by the fact that the boundary check in model 5 was only an assessment and was not used to reassign people from employed to own use producer, unlike the other 4 models. If the question had been used to reassign respondents then comparable estimates of employment (both in agriculture and overall) would have been generated for model 5 compared with model 3 in the two countries where model 5 was tested.

27. The evidence from field tests for model 1 would indicate that respondents appeared to have relatively little difficulty to report main intended destination of production. This was indicated by a very low level of respondents reporting that they did not know the intended destination. In addition, there was mixed evidence on the impact of the level of the boundary check (activity or product). Where differences were found between two models in the same country it was in the direction expected but not all countries showed differences. It was agreed that this topic needed further consideration and possibly further testing through future rounds of pilot studies.

Session 5: Own-use production of goods

28. Ms. Elisa Benes gave an overview of the issues tested in relation to own use production of goods. Initial drafts of the model questionnaires had included some differences in reference periods for own use production of goods (30 days vs 7 days) and the impact of this was assessed. In addition there were differences in question order and type, for example within model 1 all questions on agriculture were asked at the beginning of the questionnaire with other own use production activities (e.g. fetching water) being captured later in the questionnaire. This was unlike the other models where a comprehensive dedicated section on own use production of goods was included at the end of the questionnaire. Another issue being assessed was the ability of respondents to accurately report hours spent in own use production of goods.

29. Presentations were made by participants from Ecuador, Tunisia and Ivory Coast while the main preliminary findings were presented by Mr. Umberto Cattaneo, Micro-data analyst in the ILO Department of Statistics.

30. The main highlight of this session was the improvement of the operation of questions after amendments made following cognitive testing. The cognitive testing round had shown difficulties with long questions incorporating a longer reference period, an activity and an intended destination. Evidence also showed

that shorter questions with a listing approach (separately listing different activities) seemed to perform better (models 4 and 5) versus a lower number of questions covering a wider range of activities within each. Reporting of participation in different activities was also shown to be influenced by question order. This was particularly important for activities at the boundary between production of goods and provision of services such as preparing food for storage and cooking meals for daily consumption.

31. Participants noted that reporting of hours for own-use agricultural work could be difficult. This was seen both through the cognitive and field tests. Reporting of hours using a long reference period of four weeks had been particularly difficult. Issues with misreporting of animal husbandry (e.g. omission of work animals) and market-oriented activity as own-use production were also discussed. One of the possible causes suggested related to the understanding of whether by-products (e.g. eggs) were to be included or not. Questions on gathering firewood, fetching water, construction and manufacturing goods for own use seemed to be less problematic for respondents than foodstuff production. However, a possible burden effect for model 3 was noted due to the more detailed section on own use production included at the end.

Session 6: Status in employment

32. Ms. Elisa Benes introduced the session highlighting the two different sequences of questions that had been tested. One of the sequences asked extra questions to contributing family workers to identify possible business co-operators, while the other asked additional questions to employees and self-employed workers with a particular focus on identifying dependent self-employed workers. These issues were included in the tests to provide input to the ILO working group developing an updated International Classification of Status in Employment (ICSE). These questions were not included in the cognitive tests so findings referred to the field tests only.

33. Presentations were made by participants from Kyrgyz Republic and Ecuador while the main preliminary cross-country findings were presented by Friederike Eberlein, Consultant to the ILO. As highlighted during session 3, the tests showed that separate recovery questions were very important to identify contributing family workers and classify them as employed. They also showed that women represented the majority of contributing family workers. Preliminary analysis of questions on the participation of contributing family workers in making decisions about the family business and its day-to-day administration showed that about half of those identified in this group may actually be co-operators of the family business. These results highlighted gender differences in the way respondents may refer to their involvement in family business that leads to differential treatment in the statistics. This was important for the ongoing review of the international classification of status in employment where groups of this type are under consideration. Due to relatively small samples of self-employed workers in the pilot studies less clear conclusions could be drawn on the subject of the questions relating to dependent self-employment although further analysis would be undertaken to provide any possible input to the ICSE working group.

34. Participants also shared evidence of some comprehension issues in key questions of characteristics of the employed such as understanding of different response categories to questions on status in employment and institutional sector.

Session 7: Working time (hours actually worked, hours usually worked)

35. Mr. Kieran Walsh gave an overview of the issues tested on working time. This session focused on working time in relation to employment. Two different versions of a working time module were included in the questionnaires with the main difference relating to the order of questions on usual and actual hours. The intention was to assess difficulties for respondents in differentiating between usual and actual hours and any major impact of the two versions on reporting. The questions on working time in employment were not cognitively tested so all findings referred to the field tests.

36. Presentations on country experiences were made by Cameroon and Vietnam. Preliminary findings from the analysis were presented by Mr. Carlos de Porres Ortiz de Urbina, Statistician in ILO Department of Statistics.

37. There was general evidence that different models and versions gave relatively consistent results with respect to usual and actual hours worked across all jobs. Means, medians and modes for both measures were generally consistent across models within the same country. However, countries did indicate some reporting difficulties for respondents, particularly where they undertake simultaneous working activities (e.g. working a job while caring for their child or having two paid jobs which take place simultaneously). This required consideration in the section design and instructions to interviewers on how to report time spent on such activities without giving an incorrect total number of hours worked. Likewise, the response categories in the question on reasons for differences between usual and actual working time required some revisions. Evidence showed some misreporting in this question, e.g. reasons which should indicate lower actual hours being reported when actual hours were higher than usual.

38. It was agreed that, subject to the possibility to do further testing, it could be possible to identify alternative approaches to enable easier recall of working time.

Session 8: Labour underutilization I: Time Related Underemployment

39. Mr. Kieran Walsh gave an overview of the main issues being assessed in relation to time-related underemployment. Questions on this topics were embedded within the module on working time so the impact of differences in how working time was measured was also being assessed. In addition, there was interest in the ability of respondents to report desire and availability for more working hours. There was one minor difference between the two versions in question order with respect to the positioning of the question on activities to look for additional/other work and the impact of this was also being evaluated.

40. Presentations were given be participants from Namibia and Moldova and preliminary cross-country findings were outlined by Carlos de Porres Ortiz de Urbina. Preliminary analysis of data from the field tests did not show any clear effect on the measurement of desire or availability for additional work between the two different versions of the working time section or the five different model questionnaires. However, the measurement of time related underemployment overall was sensitive to the hours threshold and working time concept used (actual or usual). It was also noted that higher time-related underemployment among females was obtained due to lower average working hours. This effect was found across all models and both versions of the working time section.

41. Version B of the working time section gave higher aggregate levels of time related underemployment for females than version A. This was despite the fact that no clear differences were found for reporting of hours worked, desire or availability for additional work. This issue will be further addressed during the ongoing analysis.

42. Participants noted that questions on desire and availability can be sensitive for respondents as they can imply a judgement is being made that the respondent should want to work more. This could have an impact on the measurement and requires careful question wording and training for interviewers.

43. While the importance of time related underemployment as a form of labour underutilization was recognized there was discussion of the importance of other measures of inadequate employment such as skills mismatch. It was noted that the ILO is working separately on the topic of skills mismatch and will report on this to the 20th ICLS.

Session 9: Labour underutilization II: Unemployed and Potential Labour Force

44. The session overview was presented by Ms. Elisa Benes. There were a variety of issues assessed both through the cognitive and the field tests. Two different versions of the module on job search and availability had been developed and they differed in question order and wording. In addition, one version included a question on self-declared main method of job search while the other listed 12 different methods and asked the respondent to indicate all that applied. One particular issue of note related to the method 'studying job advertisements'. There has been considerable debate on whether this method should be considered 'active job search' and therefore counted for the measurement of unemployment. Additionally questions on job search, future starters, desire, need and availability for work were all included for assessment.

45. Presentations were made by participants from Tunisia and Peru and preliminary cross-country findings were presented by Jacob Inganas of ILO Department of Statistics. The main conclusion regarding the questions on job search was that the recovery question for casual jobs (Module version A) was useful to recover job-seekers not captured by an initial question on trying to find a paid job or start a business. By contrast the approach in version B (an initial question on employee job search followed by a question on trying to start a business) did not serve to recover as many cases.

46. During cognitive testing it had been found that including both a recent period (last week) and subsequent period (next two weeks) in a single question on availability was confusing for respondents. For this reason it was decided to split the question into two during field testing and this seemed to improve the comprehension of the question with no issues for respondents reported.

47. There was a high level of consistency in the reporting of need and desire for work among those not seeking employment. Similar levels of need and desire were reported among respondents of different profiles (e.g. women/men, urban/rural residence), with reporting of desire being slightly higher than need, especially when the question of need was asked before the question on desire. Furthermore no major issues had been found with these questions through cognitive testing. This leads to a preliminary conclusion that carefully worded questions on need or desire can be recommended as part of a set of questions capturing labour underutilization.

48. Regarding job search methods the evidence from the version where multiple methods could be indicated was that respondents who searched for work typically used more than one method. Some respondents did report "studying job advertisements" as their main method in the version which only asked for a self-reported main method. However, the version requesting reporting of all job search methods used showed that those who report "studying job advertisements" generally also reported using other methods of job search. This will be an important consideration when choosing questionnaires using the 'main method' approach although it can certainly reduce overall burden.

49. There was a general concern among countries on the difficulties in dissemination and communication of the newly recommended labour underutilization indicators to users who are used to focusing on the unemployment rate as the single key measure of labour underutilization. The participants asked for support and guidance from ILO on dissemination and communication of labour underutilization statistics.

Session 10: Own-use provision of services

50. Ms. Elisa Benes presented the main issues tested. Among the main issues of note were the appropriateness of a 7 day reference period for own-use provision of services and with recall of hours worked. Also assessed was the ability of respondents to comprehend the different activities involved in the various questions and the effect of societal norms on the responses given.

51. Country presentations were made by Kyrgyz Republic and Vietnam. Preliminary cross-country findings were presented by Umberto Cattaneo of the ILO Department of Statistics. In line with conclusions drawn for reporting of working time in employment, there was agreement that there are particular challenges about the reporting of time where activities are simultaneous or very routine (such as caring for children while doing other work). It was noted that this issue may require further testing to identify improved methods for measurement of working time in different types of work, which can fit with labour force or other modular surveys. This was found both through the cognitive and field testing phases.

52. The reported level of participation of respondents varied across versions tested in the questionnaires. Evidence suggested that more detailed listing questions for housework (listing different activities separately) seemed to improve measurement of participation (particularly for men) and hours (particularly for women). In the case of child care and dependent adult care, descriptive questions with examples seemed to work better compared to their inclusion as part of a larger list of services. Question order also mattered, especially to reduce misreporting of housework activities as part of child or dependent adult care. Finally, in some contexts, reporting was shown to be influenced by gendered norms regarding division of tasks between women and men. The tests showed that strategic ordering of activities and examples could be used to reduce these contextual effects.

53. The field tests also identified that respondents do also report doing own use provision of services for family members living in other households. This work is also recognized in the standards but cognitive interviewing had shown confusion in reporting when a single question was used to cover both work done for the household and for family living in other households. This suggested the need to split questions (as done in one of the model questionnaires) in order to ensure accurate reporting and separate identification of working activities performed for the household and for family members living in other households.

Session 11: Main activity

54. Mr. Kieran Walsh gave on overview of the session. Four of the five model questionnaires included the same set of questions on main activity placed after the questions on employment and labour underutilization. The only model with a different approach was model 2 which had the main activity at the start of the individual questionnaire and used it as part of the sequence of questions to identify whether a person was in employment. Analysis in the cognitive phase focussed on the ability of respondents to understand and respond to questions on main activity while in the field tests the focus was on the impact in measurement of key indicators.

55. Cameroon and Philippines presented on their experiences with the questions on main activity. Mr. Kieran Walsh presented the preliminary findings from the ILO analysis. Cognitive testing revealed clear confusion among respondents when a general question on main activity was asked without a list of response categories being read. This experience had led to changes to the questionnaires in advance of the field test whereby response categories were read out in all cases and question wording was simplified. There was a general agreement among the countries that the amendments' done based on the cognitive test results significantly improved the structure of the section and, overall, major operational issues were not found.

56. Model 2 adopted a different structure and list of response categories as compared with other models and unsurprisingly yielded different results to model 3 in the three countries where this comparison was possible. Otherwise relatively little difference was found in reporting of main activity across the models.

57. The value of information on main activity was highlighted. Guidance will include a recommendation that questions of this type can be included, if there is national interest, without any clear impact on measurement of labour force status subject to correct positioning in the questionnaire, appropriate testing etc.

Session 12: Workshop conclusions and recommendations

58. Ms Elisa Benes and Mr Kieran Walsh presented the main findings in each of the 11 sessions that covered different topics of the pilot study. Participants emphasised the need for support from ILO in the follow-up at the national level, mostly, in terms of dissemination, communication and technical support for implementation. The ILO emphasised the need for continuation of the analysis to confirm and expand the findings presented during the workshop.

Session 13: Practical guidance

59. Ms Elisa Benes and Mr Kieran Walsh provided an overview of the next steps of the pilot study process. The first priority will be to produce reports about the lessons learned during both the field and cognitive tests. Secondly, the ILO will release some guidelines focused on various topics in relation with LFS methodology. Some topics mentioned were:

    a. Questionnaire development and testing
    b. LFS planning and implementation
    c. Sample design for LFS
    d. Data capture for LFS

  e. Data processing for LFS

  f. Data analysis for LFS

Finally the ILO will develop some practical tools to support LFS implementation in countries. These include:

  a. Data capture software

  b. Standard software to generate indicators

  c. Sample selection tools

60. Participants welcomed the proposed set of guidance documents and tools. Particular emphasis was given to early dissemination of guidance on questionnaire development and testing, the reports of the pilot studies and the practical tools to support country implementation.

Closure of the workshop

61. The workshop was closed by Ms Monica Castillo, Head of the Statistical Standards and Methods Unit who thanked all attendees for their active participation. The inputs received will inform the guidance to be developed by the ILO.

Annex I: List of Participants

Analysis Workshop: ILO pilot LFS studies, phase I
(Geneva, Switzerland - 15-18 November 2016)

Country	Name	Institution
Cameroon	Ms Rosalie Niekou	National Institute of Statistics
Cameroon	Mr Joël Maturin Tinga Yepdo	National Institute of Statistics
Côte d'Ivoire	Mr Michel Amani	Institut National de la Statistique
Ecuador	Mr Luis Eduardo Cañizares Hinojosa	Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos
Ecuador	Ms Carla Irene Castillo Yumbulema	Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos
Kyrgyzstan	Ms Gulnara Dzhailobaeva	National Statistical Committee of the Kyrgyz Republic
Kyrgyzstan	Ms Ainur Shakenova	National Statistical Committee of the Kyrgyz Republic
Moldova	Ms Maria Usurelu	National Bureau of Statistics
Moldova	Mr Vladimir Ganta	National Bureau of Statistics
Namibia	Mr Daniel Oherein	Namibia Statistics Agency
Namibia	Ms Linda-Vute Idhogela	Namibia Statistics Agency
Peru	Ms Lucía Gaslac Torres	Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática
Peru	Ms Zoraida Castro Ángeles	Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática
Philippines	Ms Estelita Márquez	Philippine Statistics Authority
Philippines	Ms Sotera de Guzman	Philippines Statistics Authority
Tunisia	Mr Souhail Chebbi	Institut National de la Statistique
Viet Nam	Ms Mai Nguyen Thi Thanh	General Statistics Office
Viet Nam	Ms Mai Nguyen Thi Xuan	General Statistics Office

OBSERVERS

Ms Gayatri Koolwal	UN Foundation – Data 2X
Mrs Amparo Palacios-López	World Bank
Ms Isis Gaddis	World Bank
Mr Nico Gianluigi	FAO

International Labour Office

Ms. Monica Castillo	ILO Department of Statistics
Ms. Elisa Benes	ILO Department of Statistics
Mr. Kieran Walsh	ILO Department of Statistics
Mr. Yves Perardel	ILO Department of Statistics
Mr. Carlos de Porres Ortiz de Urbina	ILO Department of Statistics
Mr. Umberto Cattaneo	ILO Department of Statistics
Mr. Jacob Inganas	ILO Department of Statistics
Ms. Friederike Eberlein	ILO Department of Statistics
Mr. Coffi Agossou	DWT/CO-Pretoria, South Africa

Annex II: Agenda

Analysis Workshop: ILO pilot LFS studies, phase I
(Geneva, Switzerland - 15-18 November 2016)

Tuesday 15 November, 2016	
Part I: Overview of project implementation process	
9:00 – 9:30 am	**Welcome and Opening** *–Monica Castillo, Chief, Standards and Methods Unit, ILO Department of Statistics*
9:30 – 10:15 am	**Session 1: Background and objectives of the workshop** *–Kieran Walsh, Senior Statistician, ILO* Main changes stemming from the 19th ICLS Overview of ILO pilot study objectives & design Workshop objectives *Plenary discussion*
10:15 – 10:30 am	*Coffee break (15 min)*
10:30 – 11:30 am	**Session 2: Pilot methodology, analysis strategy & implementation practices** *–Elisa M. Benes, Senior Statistician, ILO* Pilot study methodology ILO analysis strategy Country implementation practices
11:30 – 12:00 pm	*Plenary discussion*
12:00 – 2:00 pm	*Lunch break (2 hours)*
Part II: Preliminary findings	
2:00 – 3:00 pm	**Session 3: Identification of persons in employment** *–Yves Perardel, Senior Statistician, ILO* ILO overview of issues tested Invited Country presentations – findings and reflections from cognitive and field tests • Moldova (15 min) • Peru (15 min) • Philippines (15 min)
3:00 – 3:30 pm	*Plenary discussion*
3:30 – 3:45 pm	*Coffee break (15 min)*
3:45 – 4:30 pm	**Identification of persons in employment (continued)** *–Elisa M. Benes, Senior Statistician, ILO* Invited Country presentations – findings and reflections from cognitive and field tests. • Namibia (15 min) • Ivory Coast (15 min) ILO overview of preliminary findings
4:30 – 5:00 pm	*Plenary discussion*

Wednesday 16 November, 2016	
Part II: Preliminary findings (continued)	
9:00 – 9:45 am	**Session 4: Intended destination of production** –*Kieran Walsh, Senior Statistician, ILO* ILO overview of issues tested ILO overview of preliminary findings
9:45 – 10:15 am	*Plenary discussion*
10:15 – 10:30 am	*Coffee break (15 min)*
10:30 – 11:30 am	**Session 5: Own-use production of goods** –*Elisa M. Benes, Senior Statistician, ILO* -*Umberto Cattaneo, Micro-data Analyst, ILO* ILO overview of issues tested Invited Country presentations – findings and reflections from cognitive and field tests • Ecuador (15 min) • Tunisia (15 min) • Ivory Coast (15 min) ILO overview of preliminary findings
11:30 – 12:00 pm	*Plenary discussion*
12:00 – 2:00 pm	*Lunch break (2 hours)*
2:00 – 3:00 pm	**Session 6: Status in employment (contributing family workers & dependent self-employed)** –*Elisa M. Benes, Senior Statistician, ILO* -*Friederike Eberlein, ILO Statistics* ILO overview of issues tested Invited Country presentations – findings and reflections from cognitive and field tests • Kyrgyz Republic (15 min) • Ecuador (15 min) ILO overview of preliminary findings
3:00 – 3:30 pm	*Plenary discussion*
3:30 – 3:45 pm	*Coffee break (15 min)*
3:45 – 4.30 pm	**Session 7: Working time (hours actually worked, hours usually worked)** –*Kieran Walsh, Senior Statistician, ILO* –*Carlos de Porres Ortiz de Urbina, Statistician, ILO* ILO overview of issues tested Invited Country presentations – findings and reflections from cognitive and field tests • Cameroon (15 min) • Vietnam (15 min) ILO overview of preliminary findings
4:30 – 5:00 pm	*Plenary discussion*

Thursday 17 November, 2016	
Part II: Preliminary findings (continued)	

9:00 – 9:45 am	**Session 8: Labour underutilization I: Time related underemployment**
	–Kieran Walsh, Senior Statistician, ILO
	–Carlos de Porres Ortiz de Urbina, Statistician,, ILO
	
	ILO overview of issues tested
	Invited Country presentations – findings and reflections from cognitive and field tests
	    • Namibia (15 min)
	    • Moldova (15 min)
	ILO overview of preliminary findings

9:45 – 10:15 am	*Plenary discussion*
10:15 – 10:30 am	*Coffee break (15 min)*

10:30 – 11:30 am	**Session 9: Labour underutilization II: Unemployed and Potential Labour Force**
	–Elisa M. Benes, Senior Statistician, ILO
	-Jacob Inganas, ILO Statistics
	
	ILO overview of issues tested
	Invited Country presentations – findings and reflections from cognitive and field tests
	    • Tunisia (15 min)
	    • Peru (15 min)
	ILO overview of preliminary findings

11:30 – 12:00 pm	*Plenary discussion*
12:00 – 2:00 pm	*Lunch break (2 hours)*

2:00 – 3:00 pm	**Session 10: Own-use provision of services**
	–Elisa M. Benes, Senior Statistician, ILO
	-Umberto Cattaneo, Micro-data Analyst, ILO
	
	ILO overview of issues tested
	Invited Country presentations – findings and reflections from cognitive and field tests
	    • Kyrgyz Republic (15 min)
	    • Vietnam (15 min)
	ILO overview of preliminary findings

3:00 – 3:30 pm	*Plenary discussion*
3:30 – 3:45 pm	*Coffee break (15 min)*

3.45 – 4:30 pm	**Session 11: Main activity**
	–Kieran Walsh, Senior Statistician, ILO
	
	ILO overview of issues tested
	Invited Country presentations – findings and reflections from cognitive and field tests
	    • Cameroon (15 min)
	    • Philippines (15 min)
	ILO overview of preliminary findings

4.30 – 5:00 pm	*Plenary discussion*

Friday 18 November, 2016	
Part III: Workshop conclusions and next steps	
9:00 – 10:15 am	**Session 12: Workshop conclusions and recommendations** *–Elisa M. Benes, Senior Statistician, ILO* *–Kieran Walsh, Senior Statistician, ILO* Summary of main conclusions Identified good practice and lessons learned Recommendations for further analysis *Plenary discussion*
10:15 – 10:30 am	*Coffee break (15 min)*
10:30 – 11:15 am	**Session 13: Practical guidance** Outline for future LFS practical guide Proposed structure Proposed topics / contents Proposed tools *Plenary discussion*
11:15 – 11:45 am	**Session 14: Next steps** *Plenary discussion*
11:45 – 12:00 pm	**Workshop closing** *–Monica Castillo, Chief, Standards and Methods Unit, ILO Department of Statistics*