



IOM
UN MIGRATION

COVID-19 IMPACT ASSESSMENT ON RETURNED OVERSEAS FILIPINO WORKERS

MAY 2021

DTM



DISCLAIMER

The findings and interpretations presented in this report can in no way be taken to reflect the official opinion and views of the International Organization for Migration (IOM), its member states or the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany. The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout the report do not imply expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IOM concerning legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning its frontiers or boundaries.

Publisher: International Organization for Migration (IOM)
Philippines Country Office
28th floor, BDO Towers Valero
8741 Paseo de Roxas
Makati City, 1226 Philippines
Tel: (+63) 2 8230 1999
Fax: (+63) 2 8848 1257
Email: IOMPhilippines@iom.int
Web: philippines.iom.int

Cover photo: ©IOM Philippines

©2021 International Organization for Migration (IOM)

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior written permission of the publisher.



This research was undertaken as part of the IOM Philippines response to the global COVID-19 pandemic. This was made possible through the generous funding of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany and with the support and partnership of the Department of Labor and Employment's Overseas Workers Welfare Administration.

IOM Philippines would like to express its appreciation to the following individuals:

- Ambassador Anke Reiffenstuel, Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany in Manila
- Administrator Hans Leo Caddac, Overseas Workers Welfare Administration
- Director Jocelyn Hapal, OWWA Policy and Programs Development Office
- Director Regina Galias, OWWA Repatriation Assistance Division
- Director Roel Martin, National Reintegration Center for OFWs

IOM Philippines would especially like to thank all the OFWs who generously gave their time to take part in this important survey.

Finally, we acknowledge the following team members who tirelessly drafted, analysed, designed and prepared this report: Karissa Atienza, Marion Biolena, Francis Borja, Maureen Dela Cruz, Troy Dooley, Andrea Empamano, Roxette Flores, Ma. Franchesca Iñigo, So Young Kim, Laine Lorenzo, Josua Mariano, Mariah Erika Pelobello and Erina Yamashita and the IOM Asia-Pacific DTM team.

The ongoing global COVID-19 crisis and border restrictions continue to have an adverse impact on human mobility with migrant workers and their remittance-dependent communities being some of the most vulnerable groups. In 2020, the Philippines saw a drastic 75% reduction in the deployment of Overseas Filipino Workers (OFWs), which constitutes the lowest deployment numbers in over three decades. Meanwhile, the number of Returning Overseas Filipinos reached nearly 800,000 by the end of December 2020.

Recognizing the devastating impact of COVID-19 on migrants and their livelihoods, the Government of the Philippines must be sincerely commended in their immense efforts to protect Filipinos around the world during this crisis. The Department of Foreign Affairs (DFA) was relentless in their efforts to repatriate hundreds of thousands of stranded Filipinos in over one hundred countries around the world, while the Philippine Coast Guard (PCG) and the Department of Labor and Employment's Overseas Workers Welfare Administration (OWWA) worked tirelessly to provide immediate assistance upon their arrival, including testing, accommodation, and onward transportation to their homes throughout the Philippines.

While COVID-19 was first and foremost a health crisis, it has reinforced the need to strengthen migration governance and international cooperation adhering to the *Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (GCM)*. The Philippines was a leader in advocating for the adoption of the GCM in Marrakesh in 2018, where Secretary Teodoro Locsin of the DFA reminded the world of the benefits of migration, and at the same time called upon us all to protect migrants against exploitation and abuse, appropriately calling the GCM a “compact of decency.” Since then, the Philippines has also been recognized as one of twenty Champion Countries of the GCM, and President Rodrigo Roa Duterte was the first global leader at the United Nations General Assembly in 2020 to call upon all States to implement the GCM in the COVID-19 response and recovery, “leaving no migrant behind”.

As the Coordinator and Secretariat of the UN Network on Migration in the Philippines, IOM has conducted various studies on the impact of COVID-19 on migration. With the support from the OWWA, IOM carried out the following assessment on the needs and vulnerabilities of OFWs returning to their communities of origin in the Philippines. We hope that these findings will support key stakeholders in continuing to develop migrant-centered policies and programs with the most recent and relevant information. Such evidence-based programming will ultimately enhance efforts to respond to the immediate needs of migrants while ensuring the sustainable reintegration of returning migrants, their families, and communities.



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K. Dadey', positioned above the printed name.

KRISTIN MARIE DADEY

IOM Philippines Chief of Mission

OVERVIEW

03

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

04

FOREWORD BY
IOM PHILIPPINES
CHIEF OF MISSION

06

DEFINITIONS
AND ACRONYMS

07

METHODOLOGY

09

KEY FINDINGS

10

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTERS

12

1. PROFILE OF
RETURNED OVERSEAS
FILIPINO WORKERS

19

2. SOCIO-
ECONOMIC PROFILE

27

3. RECRUITMENT
EXPERIENCE

32

4. RETURN AND
REINTEGRATION

ANNEX

41

COUNTRY PROFILES

DEFINITIONS

Overseas Filipino Worker

Filipino migrant workers, or Filipino citizens who reside in another country for the purpose of employment. The Philippine government officially used the term in the **2002 POEA Rules and Regulations Governing the Recruitment and Employment of Land-based Overseas Workers**. In this document, OFWs being discussed refer to the 8,332 Filipino migrant workers who returned to the Philippines after 16 March 2020 and was interviewed during the survey period.

Returning Overseas Filipino

Filipino citizens who are returning to the Philippines from another country. These include OFWs, Filipino tourists and students, among others. The reports generated by the Department of Health on the returns during the pandemic count ROFs and returnees from Sabah.

ACRONYMS

DFA	Department of Foreign Affairs
GCC	Gulf Cooperation Council
GCM	Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration
IOM	International Organization for Migration
OFW	Overseas Filipino Worker
OWWA	Overseas Workers Welfare Administration
PHP	Philippine Peso
POEA	Philippine Overseas Employment Administration
PRA	Private Recruitment Agency
ROF	Returning Overseas Filipino
TIP	Trafficking in Persons
USD	United States Dollar



The COVID-19 Impact Assessment on Returned Overseas Filipino Workers captures data on the demographic profile of OFWs, the circumstances of their migration journey, their places of origin and last country of habitual residence, and intentions upon their return. The survey questionnaire comprised of four main sections: Consent, Sociodemographic and Economic Profile, Migration Journey, Challenges and Future Plans. The survey questionnaire was designed under the data protection principles of IOM which include informed consent for collection and use of information. The methodology of the survey included the use of quantitative data and information collection methods.

The considerations for the design of the survey included: i) The urgent need to collect the information on the target population, ii) the changing context of the pandemic and health protocols, and iii) the limited options for conducting data collection. The Returnee Survey was meant to be a descriptive and exploratory exercise to better understand the circumstances surrounding OFWs affected by COVID-19. Because of the exploratory nature of the report, IOM used non-probability sampling to determine the respondents of the survey.¹

The survey covered a total of 8,332 or 2.7% of the OFWs estimated to arrive during the pandemic by the end of 2020.² The final number of respondents exceeded the planned sample size of 6,615 at 90% confidence level and 1% margin of error. The sample size was calculated using the statistical formula shown.

Only the data of OFWs who returned after the implementation of the nationally imposed quarantine and travel restrictions on 16 March 2020 were collected.

$$\text{sample size} = \frac{\frac{z^2 \times p (1-p)}{e^2}}{1 + \left(\frac{z^2 \times p (1-p)}{e^2 N} \right)}$$

Where, N = population size
 e = margin of error
 z = confidence level

¹ In exploratory research, the aim is not to test a hypothesis about a population, but to develop an initial understanding of a small or under-researched population. Non-probability sampling techniques are often used.

² The Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG) estimated about 300,000 OFWs to return by the end of 2020 at the time the survey was designed. <https://news.abs-cbn.com/news/05/25/20/300000-ofws-to-return-to-philippines-due-to-coronavirus-pandemic-dilg-chief>

DATA COLLECTION

Remote data collection methods were utilized in gathering data. Respondents were identified from anonymized data from government and IOM. Their information was collected from (1) an anonymized database of returnees from OWWA, (2) beneficiaries of IOM transportation assistance, and (3) migrants who responded directly to the Returnee Survey on social media, quarantine facilities and airports in Manila. Informed consent was requested from respondents to use their contact information for the returnee survey. The survey itself was fully anonymous and voluntary. Respondents were called by IOM enumerators. All respondents were asked for their consent to be interviewed and proceed with the remainder of the questions.

IOM trained and deployed 45 enumerators (13 M, 32 F) to conduct phone surveys with the respondents identified. Enumerators were oriented on data collection, interview techniques, and basic privacy and protection principles. Briefings and debriefings were also conducted before and after data collection. Data collection was conducted by IOM from September to December 2020.

LIMITATIONS

As the survey used non-probability sampling, the sample is not necessarily representative of the OFW population. There may be underrepresentation of sea-based returnees and OFWs returning to Visayas due to the sampling methods. In the analysis of land- and sea-based OFWs, prevalence is used instead of proportion as applicable.

Another limitation of the survey was the hesitance of OFWs in answering questions related to finances, such as income, remittances, and debt. OFWs often chose not to answer these questions, especially on debt. Thus, data collected on debt was not included in the analysis.

IOM put its best efforts to reduce bias through the design of the survey and analysis of the data. Nonetheless, careful interpretation of the results of the survey is advised.

PROFILE OF RETURNED OVERSEAS FILIPINO WORKERS

- The OFWs from the top two receiving countries of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates make up close to 50% of all returns captured in this assessment. Four of the top five receiving countries are part of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC).
- 67% of all OFWs stated that their decision to return was due to COVID-19. The remaining 23% stated that they were planning to return to the Philippines regardless of COVID-19 and 10% did not want to answer the question.

SOCIOECONOMIC PROFILE

- Over 19% of all OFWs reported an early termination of their contract, of which 59% did not receive their separation or compensation pay. Female OFWs were more affected than males.
- 17% of OFWs did not receive their final wage payment.
- An alarming 83% of OFWs reported they were still unemployed on an average of three months post-arrival.
- Almost half, or 48%, of OFWs reported more than a 60% drop in their household income upon return.

RECRUITMENT EXPERIENCE

- Close to 60% of OFWs were deployed through a Private Recruitment Agency (PRA).
- Male and sea-based OFWs were more likely to make use of licensed agencies, but female and land-based OFWs had higher prevalence of being charged recruitment fees and costs, at higher rates.

RETURN AND REINTEGRATION

- Nearly 16% of all OFWs bore the costs of the return journey, with females being more likely to finance and arrange the return journey themselves at 20% compared to 13% of males.
- Female OFWs were more likely to be in the lower wage brackets and less likely to receive overall repatriation support than male OFWs.
- Nearly 80% of OFWs reported that their biggest challenge post-arrival was finding a job or generating income.
- Although just under half of all OFWs expressed intent to start a business, only 27% reported having the capital required to do so.
- More than half, or 54%, of OFWs would like to upgrade their skills, mostly through TESDA.
- 74% of OFWs preferred cash as the modality of assistance, with 53% stating it would be directed towards basic needs.
- Nearly half, or 48%, of returning OFWs expressed a desire to re-migrate internationally, while only 2% showed an interest in internal migration.


INTRODUCTION

Since the 1980s, Overseas Filipino Workers (OFW) have been hailed as *bagong bayani* (modern-day heroes) in the Philippines. In 2019, remittances from OFWs reached a record high of USD 33.9 billion, equivalent to nearly 10 percent of the country's gross domestic product (GDP). The Philippines also has one of the largest diasporas in the world with an estimated 10 million Filipinos living abroad. The COVID-19 global pandemic, however, put Filipinos living overseas in a precarious situation, facing unprecedented challenges and leaving many extremely vulnerable. When businesses started to shut down because of the worldwide mobility restrictions, many OFWs found themselves stranded, unemployed and at risk of COVID-19. The tourism industry was particularly impacted, including many cruise lines that were forced to suspend their operations. The mass repatriation of OFWs escalated significantly and continued all throughout 2020 as a direct result of the pandemic. With a focus on ensuring the safety and dignity of OFWs, the consequences of this mass return on OFWs remains relatively unknown.

In 2020, the Philippines saw an unprecedented number of repatriations of 791,623 Returning Overseas Filipinos. Of these repatriations, 481,305 were land-based; 308,332 were sea-based; and 1,986 were transferees from Sabah. Of these total returns, the DFA repatriated 327,511 OFWs with land-based workers making up 71% or 231,537, and the remaining 29% or 95,974 were sea-based workers from more than 150 cruise ships, oil tankers, and other bulk vessels.³


³ <https://dfa.gov.ph/dfa-news/dfa-releasesupdate/28480-dfa-repatriates-327-511-overseas-filipinos-in-2020>

RETURNING OVERSEAS FILIPINOS IN 2020



Data from the Department of Health

REPATRIATED OVERSEAS FILIPINO WORKERS IN 2020



Data from the Department of Foreign Affairs

Meanwhile, the Philippines also experienced a drastic reduction of OFW deployments overseas in 2020 with a total of only 549,841 deployed. This reflects a 75% drop in deployments from a record high of 2.16 million in 2019 according to data from the Philippines Overseas Employment Administration (POEA). The 2020 deployment figure was the lowest since 1990. Breaking down the deployment numbers, there was a 79% drop in newly-hired OFWs in 2020, while rehiring sank a larger 80% year-on-year. Land-based worker deployment shrank by 78%, while seafarers saw a decrease of 57%.

Finally, joblessness in the Philippines hit a record-high of 10.3% in 2020 as a result of COVID-19 and the associated lockdowns.⁴ Compared to joblessness rate of 5.1% in 2019, 4.5 million Filipinos did not have jobs in 2020. Compounded by the 75% drop in OFW deployments together with the mass returns of OFWs, an understanding of the impacts on OFWs and their families is critical to inform interventions and identify emerging gaps in migration governance to further respond to this unprecedented challenge.


Seeking to better understand the impact of COVID-19 on OFWs, this report is an effort to capture the experiences and challenges before, during and after an OFWs

migration experience. IOM gathered data through in-depth telephone interviews with 8,332 returned OFWs with a focus on five distinct areas:

- **Profile of Returned OFWs:** Analysis of gender, age, educational background, employment type and location, location post-return, reasons for return.
- **Socioeconomic Profile:** Analysis of employment and contract termination, compensation and separation pay, education and employment status and type post-return, comparative income levels pre- and post-return.
- **Recruitment Experience:** Assessment of those OFWs deployed through a Private Recruitment Agency (PRA), including an analysis of the recruitment fees and costs charged and reimbursement.
- **Return and Reintegration:** Assessing repatriation support, intentions to re-migrate, access to government assistance, challenges upon return, and livelihood options.
- **Country Profiles:** Analysis of the top 5 receiving countries.

⁴ <https://www.bworldonline.com/unemployment-rate-hits-record-high-in-2020/>

DEPLOYED OVERSEAS FILIPINOS (IN MILLIONS)





CHAPTER 1

PROFILE OF RETURNED OVERSEAS FILIPINO WORKERS



8,332 OFW RETURNEES WERE INCLUDED IN THIS SURVEY

PROFILE AND OVERVIEW

This section is a summary of the overall profile of OFW returnees with particular attention given to sex, age, educational background, employment type and location, location post-return and reasons for return.





A total of 8,332 Overseas Filipino Workers (OFWs) were interviewed for this survey over the course of September to December 2020. Of those interviewed, 56% identified as male and 44% identified as female. Although OFWs were asked to identify their sex for the survey, it will be referred to as gender throughout the report as the discussion deals with the interpretation of data and the gender implications for the workers.

The distribution of gender varied depending on the country of return and type of sector of employment. For example, in the top five countries of employment, Kuwait and Hong Kong SAR, China had an overrepresentation of female returnees at 75% and 82% respectively.

Of all respondents, 80% were land-based OFWs and 20% were sea-based OFWs. While the gender ratio for land-based OFWs has some representation balance with females at 53% and males at 47%, sea-based male OFWs are overrepresented at 97%, reflecting the male-dominated employment trends of the sea-based sector.

AGE

Overall, the average age of a returned OFW was 37 for males and 35 for females. However, sea-based OFWs were generally younger than land-based OFWs. The average age of a returning sea-based worker was 37 for males and 33 for females, with 25-29 the most prevalent age. The average age of a returning land-based worker was 38 for males and 36 for females, with 30-34 being the most prevalent age. Across both land and sea-based categories, females were younger than males by almost 2 years on average.



HOUSEHOLD


Of interest is the family size of the returned OFWs. In the Philippines, the average family size accounts for 4.4 members per Household (HH) (2015 Philippine Statistics Authority). However, returned OFWs had a larger HH average of 5.1. When analysed further, 80% of land-based OFWs were more likely to have a HH size larger than the national average compared to sea-based OFWs at just under 20% over the national average. Of the land-based OFWs, females were more likely to have above average HH than males, while sea-based worker males were more likely to have larger households.

The larger than average HH of the returned OFWs needs to be examined further to understand the correlation between HH size, desire to migrate, and access to resources and services. This could include studies on “children left behind” as an important and an emerging area of focus across the region. Understanding the social, nutritional, and educational impacts depends on context, gender, existing social structures, and access to services and technology. Further studies to understand how families of different profiles of migrants are impacted, both negative and positive, will be a critical area to ensure the benefits of migration are fully realized.

NATIONAL AVERAGE

4.4


MEMBERS PER HOUSEHOLD



RETURNED OFWs

5.1

MEMBERS PER HOUSEHOLD




EDUCATION ATTAINED

Overall, a high percentage of OFWs had at least completed high school at 82%. In terms of highest level of education attained, females were more likely than males to respond that their education finished at high school. However, males were more likely to advance towards both undergraduate and graduate degrees. Similar trends were observed when comparing land-based and sea-based OFWs, wherein sea-based OFWs were more likely to advance their education beyond high school.

In regards to advanced studies, 32% of the OFWs stated they obtained an undergraduate degree as their highest attainment, with much higher rates amongst sea-based OFWs. Likewise, sea-based OFWs were more likely to hold a graduate degree compared to land-based OFWs.

82%

COMPLETED SECONDARY AND HIGHER STUDIES



Top Fields of Study




21% MARINE STUDIES



14% INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY




13% FOOD AND HOSPITALITY



RETURN TO THE PHILIPPINES

The data on the location of return was based on asking OFWs what they consider their home province and region are after their most recent return. More than half of the returnees went home to the following regions: CALABARZON (16%), the National Capital Region (11%), and Central Luzon (11%) in the northern part of the country followed by Zamboanga Peninsula (8%) and Northern Mindanao (7%) in the southern part of the country.


In regards to gender, Region IV-A (CALABARZON), National Capital Region (NCR) and Region III (Central Luzon) were both the largest receivers of both female and male OFWs. Male OFWs outweighed female OFWs for these locations within their respective gender, however there was an increased percentile of females compared to males to Region IX (Zamboanga Peninsula) which is the fourth largest recipient region.




TOP REGION OF RETURNED OFWs

53%
OF OFWs RETURNED HOME TO THESE REGIONS

- ① **16%** CALABARZON REGION IV-A
- ② **11%** NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION (NCR)
- ③ **11%** CENTRAL LUZON REGION III
- ④ **8%** ZAMBOANGA PENINSULA REGION IX
- ⑤ **7%** NORTHERN MINDANAO REGION X





RETURNING DOMESTIC WORKERS


Returning domestic workers highlighted two different trends from the two sending countries of KSA and Kuwait. Whilst domestic workers from KSA were more likely to return home to Region IX (Zamboanga Peninsula) and Region VI (Western Visayas), for Kuwait, they were more likely to travel to Region XIII (Caraga), and Region V (Bicol Region).

Whilst there is some awareness in the Philippines of sending communities for specific jobs and locations, there is further opportunity to use this data to conduct additional research and analysis to identify local networks and trends that shape migration patterns at the community level. Further research could inform counter-trafficking and prevention measures through targeted capacity building based on location and demographics. Domestic work is one of the largest sources of employment for Filipino women both domestically and abroad; however, it is also a sector of work that is prone to the risks of trafficking in persons (TIP). Young Filipino women and children from rural areas in the Philippines are particularly vulnerable to exploitation and trafficking abroad with many migrant domestic workers deceived during recruitment about the nature of their job, working conditions, pay, living conditions, and the identity of their employer, among others.⁵

⁵ <https://iomx.iom.int/resources/safe-migration/factsheets/migration-trends-maguindanao-women>

REASONS FOR RETURN

Close to 70% of all OFWs held the view that their decision to return was impacted by COVID-19. One of the main reasons for return related to the termination and non-renewal of contracts because of COVID-19, followed by OFWs being requested by employers to leave because of COVID-19. Just over 14% stated they were scheduled to return to the Philippines regardless of the pandemic. See further analysis in socioeconomic profile (Chapter 2) and return and reintegration sections (Chapter 4) of this report.





“

- 30%** *“My contract ended, and it did not get renewed due to COVID-19”*
- 16%** *“I was told to leave the country by my employer because of COVID-19”*
- 13%** *“I could not find work / I lost my job because of COVID-19”*
- 7%** *“My family and I were worried because of COVID-19 so I came home”*

”

INTENTION TO RE-MIGRATE

Nearly half or 48% of all OFWs indicated that they plan to re-migrate abroad in the future and just 2% had an interest in internal migration. Meanwhile, 34% stated they would like to remain home and just under 15% stated they were undecided. Overall, males and land-based OFWs were much more interested in re-migrating internationally at the time of the survey. Females were more likely to consider internal migration than males, less likely to stay at home, and had lower rates of being undecided. The intention was measured on average three months post-arrival. Of all countries, OFWs from Kuwait had the lowest rates of the returnees having an intention to return to the sending country.






CHAPTER 2

SOCIOECONOMIC PROFILE


EDUCATION



Overall, 82% of OFWs had completed high school. Land-based workers were more likely to list high school as their highest education level attained. However, sea-based workers had much higher levels of undergraduate or graduate degrees when compared to land-based workers. For example, over 40% of land-based OFWs listed high school as their highest level of education while 70% of sea-based OFWs completed undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate studies. This is likely because some of the sea-based professions require higher education. Of the post-secondary studies, Marine Studies was the most dominant course of study followed by Information Technology, and Food and Hospitality.

In terms of gender dynamics, females were more likely to complete high school, and males were more likely to advance to both undergraduate and graduate degrees. This accounts for both the high representation of women in domestic work and low representation of women in the sea-based sector.


SEX AND EMPLOYMENT DISAGGREGATION OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT



92% **55%**

FEMALE WORKERS AND LAND-BASED WORKERS WERE MORE LIKELY TO COMPLETE HIGH SCHOOL

MORE FEMALE WORKERS WHO COMPLETED HIGH SCHOOL WERE EMPLOYED IN DOMESTIC WORK



UNEMPLOYMENT


An alarming 83% of OFWs were still unemployed three months after their return to the Philippines. There was a slightly higher rate of unemployment amongst females than males, at 84% compared to 82%, as well as amongst sea-based compared to land-based OFWs. This came at a time whereby joblessness in the Philippines hit a record-high of 10.3% for 2020 as a direct result of COVID-19 and the associated lockdowns. OFWs stated their biggest need was to obtain employment with over 78% of all returnees identifying income generation as their greatest challenge.



78%
IDENTIFIED INCOME GENERATION AS THE BIGGEST CHALLENGE

48%
HAD A 60% DROP IN INCOME

17%
DID NOT RECEIVE THEIR SALARY BEFORE RETURN



12 OUT OF 14

INDUSTRIES DECREASED IN EMPLOYMENT



Domestic Work



Technicians and Associate Professionals



Service and Sales



Elementary Occupations



Plant and Machine Operators and Assemblers



Food and Food Processing



Craft and Related Trades



Skilled Agricultural, Forestry and Fisher



Hotels/Accommodation & Restaurants



Managers



Professionals



Health and Social Work Activities



Transportation




Clerical Support Workers

OCCUPATION

The general trend for OFWs is that very few utilize the skill sets acquired overseas when they return home to the Philippines. For the 14% of OFWs who had gained employment post-arrival in the Philippines, there were very few OFWs who worked in the same industry or utilized their skills learned abroad.

For the unemployed, there was also a notable change in their preferred work sector compared to employment abroad. The top three aspirational work sectors upon return were: service and sales work (28%), food and food processing (20%), and skilled agricultural, forestry and fishery work (12%). It is worth noting that although the top work abroad was domestic work, only 9% wished to engage in domestic work upon return. See reintegration section (Chapter 4) for preferred upskilling.

OCCUPATION PREFERENCE OF UNEMPLOYED OFWs UPON RETURN



INCOME AND REMITTANCES


In 2020, and as a result of COVID 19, the Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas (BSP) predicted an annual remittance decline of 0.8%, while the World Bank predicted a sharp 13% drop. However, the Philippines registered only a 0.8% annual remittance decline in 2020. Trends reflect that remittances from the United States actually increased overall in 2020, while remittances from GCC countries declined. Whilst remittances remained surprisingly stable over 2020, accounting for nearly 10% of GDP, the majority of OFWs, especially from the top five countries, were impacted significantly.

The largest remittance corridor in the Philippines originates in the United States of America, from which an estimated USD 11.4 billion was sent in 2018, according to the World Bank Bilateral Matrix.

Remittances from the United States registered growth from January to September 2020, representing 40% of the total remittances into the country in 2020, according to the BSP.


The GCC countries represent another significant source of remittance inflow, with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia sending USD 3.2 billion, the United Arab Emirates sending USD 3.2 billion, Qatar sending USD 1.2 billion, and Kuwait sending USD 1.2 billion in 2018, according to estimates from the World Bank Bilateral Matrix.

REMITTANCE INFLOW (USD MILLIONS)



USD 11.4B
OF REMITTANCES IN 2018
CAME FROM THE UNITED
STATES OF AMERICA (USA)

MONTHLY REMITTANCE INFLOW 2019 VS 2020






INCOME

When earning abroad, more than half or 55% of the OFWs, reported having a monthly income between PHP 20,001-50,000. Another 19% earned between PHP 5,001-20,000. It was found, however, that females were overrepresented in the lower wage categories, having comparatively higher percentile than males for both the PHP 5,001-20,000 and PHP 20,001-50,000 monthly income categories. The trend reversed, however, for the higher wage categories where males were more likely to earn more. For example, 31% of males earned over PHP 50,000 per month while only 17% of females reported earning over PHP 50,000 per month.


In examining land- and sea-based OFWs, land-based OFWs had larger comparative percentile in both PHP 5,001-20,000 and PHP 20,001-50,000 monthly income categories. While, as per females, this trend reversed with sea-based workers with higher comparative representation in categories which earned PHP 50,000 per month or above.

Looking at income trends in the top five countries of employment, OFWs from Hong Kong SAR, China are most likely to be within the lower monthly income bracket with 95% having a monthly salary of PHP 50,000 or below. In comparison, OFWs from Qatar earned the highest income, with 21% earning between PHP 50,001-100,000 monthly.

OFWs' MONTHLY INCOME (IN PHP) WHILE ABROAD



OFWs' MONTHLY REMITTANCE (IN PHP) WHILE ABROAD



REMITTANCES


The OFWs' return had a significant impact on household income. Of all OFWs interviewed, 26% remitted PHP 10,000-15,000 per month and a further 26% remitted between PHP 15,001-20,000 per month. Only 15% of OFWs remitted PHP 20,001-25,000 monthly, and 9% remitted PHP 25,001-30,000 monthly. Similar to trends in income levels, females and land-based OFWs were equally overrepresented in the lower bracket categories for remittances. In fact, 64% of females fell into the two lowest categories of monthly remittances: Less than PHP10,000 and PHP 10,000-15,000. Meanwhile, 43% of males fell within these lower categories. Comparatively, 57% of males fell within the remaining higher categories whereby females were underrepresented.

In examining land- and sea-based OFWs, land-based OFWs had a larger comparative percentile in both Less than PHP 10,000 and PHP 10,000-15,000 per month categories. While, as per females, this trend reversed with sea-based workers with higher comparative representation in categories which remitted PHP 15,000 per month and above.

Looking at remittance trends in the top five countries of employment, OFWs from Kuwait were sending lower brackets of remittances with 73% sending PHP 20,000 and below. 68% of OFWs from Hong Kong SAR, China were sending remittances in the same bracket while the remaining 32% of OFWs from Hong Kong SAR, China were sending more than PHP 20,000 monthly.

As a result of lost remittances, almost half of all OFWs or 48% reported more than a 60% decline in their household income upon return.

PERCENT OF OFWs WHO REPORTED A DROP IN HOUSEHOLD INCOME UPON RETURN







REASONS FOR RETURN

OFWs were asked their reasons for return to the Philippines to measure the impact of COVID-19 on their decision-making process on returning home. Of all OFWs, 10% did not want to answer the question, while 23% stated that they were returning to the Philippines regardless of COVID-19. The remaining 67% stated that COVID-19 was a determining factor in their return during this period. Of the 67%, the primary reason given was due to non-renewal of their contract because of COVID-19, followed by OFWs being told to leave the country because of COVID-19.

When looking at specific trends in land-based and sea-based OFWs amongst the 67%, land-based workers had higher representation on all categories, with the highest being a lack of work as a result of COVID-19. This was followed by OFWs being told to leave the country. For sea-based workers, their largest representation was reflected in the non-renewal of contracts and concern for personal safety because of COVID-19.

Overall, females were represented higher than males for one category related to returns due to COVID-19. Females outweighed males 51% to 49% for listing their family and themselves being worried about COVID-19. Males had a higher representation in the remaining categories, with the highest difference in their contract not being renewed at 61% compared to females at 39%.




TERMINATION AND WAGE PAYMENT

All OFWs were asked about termination and wage payment. Regarding their last payment, 17% reported they did not receive their final wage payment. The prevalence amongst land-based OFWs exceeded sea-based OFWs, with 19% versus 8%, and having an overall higher representation in the group at 90% vs 10%. However, in comparing male and female OFWs, the non-payment was nearly evenly distributed even though males had a greater prevalence of contract termination.


19% of all OFWs reported an early termination of their contract by their employer with a large variation between land-based and sea-based OFWs. Sea-based OFWs had a prevalence of 11% of early contract termination while land-based OFWs had a much higher prevalence at 21%. Land-based workers also represented a larger proportion of the total cases recorded with 17% versus 2% with sea-based workers. Males had a higher prevalence of contract termination than females at 20% versus 18%.

Of the 19% with terminated contracts, close to 60% reported that they did not receive their separation or compensation pay. The likelihood of non-payment was higher amongst sea-based workers at 62% compared to 59% of terminated land-based workers. Females OFWs had a greater likelihood of not receiving separation or compensation pay with 66% of terminated female OFWs compared to 59% of terminated male OFWs. In summary, while male OFWs had a slightly greater likelihood of contract termination and equal likelihood of not receiving final wages compared to females, females were less likely to receive any separation or compensation pay.

FINAL SALARY



SEPARATION PAY





CHAPTER 3

RECRUITMENT EXPERIENCE

OVERVIEW

International labour recruitment is a complex process that requires the close coordination of multiple parties to ensure safe, legal and transparent migration. At minimum, the process only requires the coordination of a worker with an employer. However, entities such as Private Recruitment Agencies (PRAs) and governments may play key roles in the facilitation of this process for migrant workers and to create safeguards against recruitment related risks such as deception, forced labour and human trafficking.

Pertinent issues encountered by migrant workers during their employment and return phases may have been caused by certain practices during the recruitment phase. For instance, fees and costs charged during the recruitment phase often cause indebtedness among migrant workers and in worst cases, may cause issues of debt bondage.⁶ Indebtedness is also critical in shaping migrant workers' return experiences, plans to re-migrate, or likelihood to take up less desirable but more immediately available work upon return.⁷ Understanding the manner in which returned OFWs were recruited is therefore essential in analysing the circumstances around their return, their current challenges in the Philippines, and in preparation for their reintegration or re-migration.

In the Philippines, PRAs are responsible for the recruitment and deployment of over 90% of OFWs.⁸ Since the Government of the Philippines allowed the participation of PRAs in the recruitment and placement of OFWs, PRAs have played a crucial role in ensuring the protection of the fundamental labour rights of OFWs. For example, of the 27% of OFWs who received pre-departure and repatriation support from their employers, 81% were recruited through PRAs. This will be discussed further in the return and reintegration section (Chapter 4).

⁶ A form of forced labour in which a person's labour is demanded as means of repaying a loan, trapping the individual into working for little or no pay until the debt is repaid

⁷ Debt and the Migration Experience: Insights from Southeast Asia, (IOM, 2019): <https://publications.iom.int/books/debt-and-migration-experience-insights-south-east-asia>

⁸ Country Migration Report: The Philippines, (IOM, 2013): https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/cmreport_philippines2013.pdf





RECRUITMENT FEES AND RELATED COSTS

In spite of the benefits of being recruited and deployed through PRAs, studies show that in general, transactions with recruiters or recruitment agencies are likely to heighten the vulnerability of migrants to different forms of labour exploitation.⁹ Unscrupulous recruitment agencies can place migrant workers at higher risk of being trapped in situations of debt bondage by charging excessive recruitment fees and costs.

The term “recruitment fees” refers to payments for recruitment services offered by PRAs in matching offers of and applications for employment and “recruitment related costs” refers to requirements needed to legally migrate for work such as working visa, travel, and medical clearance costs.¹⁰ Both are incurred in the recruitment process for workers to secure employment or placement.

The survey included questions that examine the number of respondents having paid recruitment fees and/or related costs, whether those identified paid are within the legal limits, and the average amount of recruitment fees and costs paid by the respondents. In the Philippines, OFWs may be charged with recruitment fees of up to one (1) month of their basic salary.¹¹ The exceptions to this rule, whereby it is completely prohibited to charge recruitment fees to workers, are if they are domestic workers, deployed to countries which disallow such fee charging, or are seafarers.¹² All land-based OFWs are bound to pay for limited recruitment related costs such as documentation, non-employer-specific training to qualify for job vacancies, and medical clearance for visa applications; whereas seafarers are bound to pay for their documentation costs.

⁹ Recruitment Agencies have been the top site of vulnerability (place where migrants are particularly vulnerable to exploitation) based on studies compiled by IOM in “Migrants and their Vulnerability to Human Trafficking, Modern Slavery and Forced Labour” (2019): <https://publications.iom.int/books/migrants-and-their-vulnerability-human-trafficking-modern-slavery-and-forced-labour>

¹⁰ General Principles and Operational Guidelines for Fair Recruitment and Definition of Recruitment Fees and Related Costs (ILO, 2019): https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_protect/---protrav/---migrant/documents/publication/wcms_536755.pdf

¹¹ Revised POEA Rules and Regulations Governing the Recruitment and Employment of Land-based Overseas Filipino Workers of 2016

¹² This is based on the 2016 Revised POEA Rules and Regulations Governing the Recruitment and Employment of Seafarers. All sea-based workers, including offshore workers, are covered by this Rules and Regulations



PROFILE

In order to provide a more accurate analysis and discussion involving the rules and regulations around the recruitment fees and costs that can be legally charged to OFWs, those who were employed through PRAs were identified as a specific group for this chapter, and were further divided into three main categories: land-based OFWs (excluding domestic workers), domestic workers, and sea-based workers.



Overall, 60% or 4,989 of the 8,332 respondents were deployed by a PRA. Sea-based OFWs were more likely recruited through PRAs at 91% compared to domestic workers at 76%, and land-based OFWs (excluding domestic workers) at 71%. It was also found that male OFWs had a higher likelihood of using PRAs at 79% compared to female OFWs at 70%.



4,989
OF THE 8,332 RESPONDENTS
WERE DEPLOYED BY PRAs



SEA-BASED OFWs WERE
MORE LIKELY RECRUITED
THROUGH PRAs AT
91%




AMOUNT OF FEES AND COSTS CHARGED

Among the group deployed by a PRA, 33% paid recruitment fees and related costs. More land-based OFWs were charged recruitment fees and costs at 42%, compared to domestic workers at 28%, and sea-based OFWs at 5%. Females were more likely than males to be charged fees at 37% versus 30%.

The average total fees and costs borne by OFWs for all three categories was PHP 16,964. Land-based workers paid substantially more than sea-based workers at PHP 38,785 versus PHP 1,935. The average amount paid by domestic workers was PHP 10,200. Land-based female OFWs on average pay PHP 6,137 more in recruitment fees and costs than land-based male OFWs with an average of PHP 40,403.

The most common fees and costs paid by respondents from the three categories were: (1) documentation, medical exams, and other government fees, (2) training costs, fees for orientations, fees for skills and qualification tests, and (3) recruitment fees.

The payment of documentation, medical exams, and other government fees was common among all three categories. Sea-based workers reported to have paid for trainings, orientations, skills and qualification tests. Specifically, they paid for the costs of their on-the-job training, pre-departure orientation (PDO) and post-arrival orientation (PAO) fees, and employer-required skill and qualification tests. OFWs from all three categories reported paying recruitment fees to PRAs, including domestic workers and sea-based OFWs who, under Philippine Law, are not required to pay any recruitment fees and related costs.



33%
PAID FOR RECRUITMENT FEES AND RELATED COSTS

FEMALE OFWs WERE MORE LIKELY TO BE CHARGED FEES THAN MALE OFWs

30% < 37%

PHP 34,266 < PHP 40,403



ON AVERAGE, LAND-BASED FEMALE OFWs PAY PHP 6,137 MORE FOR RECRUITMENT FEES AND COSTS THAN LAND-BASED MALE OFWs



PHP 16,964
AVERAGE FEES AND COSTS



PHP 38,785
LAND-BASED WORKERS (EXCLUDING DOMESTIC WORKERS)



PHP 10,200
DOMESTIC WORKERS



PHP 1,935
SEA-BASED WORKERS

MOST COMMON FEES AND COST INCURRED

DOCUMENTATION, MEDICAL TRAINING AND OTHER GOV'T FEES



73%

68%

70%

TRAINING, ORIENTATIONS, SKILLS AND QUALIFICATION TESTS



45%

RECRUITMENT FEES



38%

54%

29%

A woman with long dark hair, wearing a red and white striped shirt and a light blue face mask, is smiling broadly. She is sitting in a makeshift shelter made of wooden poles and blue and white tarps. The background shows more of the shelter structure and some colorful fabrics.

CHAPTER 4

RETURN AND
REINTEGRATION

OVERVIEW

Reintegration is generally understood as a multidimensional process enabling individuals to re-establish the economic, social and psychosocial relationships needed to maintain life, livelihood and dignity and achieve inclusion in civic life. The notions of return and reintegration are intimately interlinked with that of sustainability. While there is no universally agreed definition of sustainable reintegration, as part of its integrated approach to reintegration, IOM defines sustainable reintegration as follows:

Reintegration can be considered sustainable when returnees have reached levels of economic self-sufficiency, social stability within their communities, and psychosocial well-being that allow them to cope with (re)migration drivers. Having achieved sustainable reintegration, returnees are able to make further migration decisions a matter of choice, rather than necessity.¹¹







This definition is based on trends identified in existing literature, on IOM's practice, and on a review of complementary approaches outside the traditional scope of Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration. IOM asserts that reintegration support can only be successful if there is a level of re-inclusion across all economic, social and psychosocial dimensions.

The below analysis references mostly the socioeconomic factors of the OFWs. This speaks to the urgency of OFWs to meet their most immediate needs post-arrival in the Philippines. For example, an alarming 53% of OFWs required support for basic needs. With nearly half or 48% of all OFWs indicating they aim to re-migrate abroad in the future, further gender-sensitive interventions based on an integrated approach to reintegration are required to ensure migration decisions are made as a matter of choice, rather than necessity.

¹¹ IOM Reintegration Handbook (2019)



CHAPTER 4: RETURN AND REINTEGRATION




SECTORS OF EMPLOYMENT

The top five countries make up 59% of all respondents. In these countries, 98% were land-based OFWs, 53% were female, and 31% worked as domestic workers. Domestic work far outweighed any other sector of employment for females, and was the leading employment sector in the top five countries with the exception of Qatar. In Qatar, craft and related trades, relating to mostly the construction sector, outweighed domestic work.

Overall, OFWs from Qatar and UAE reflect more balanced gender distribution and other work sectors such as service and sales work, hotel and restaurant work, and other professional work. Much of this directly aligned to the hospitality industry.

Kuwait and Hong Kong SAR, China have a larger percentage of domestic worker returns reflecting 53% and 76% of the total OFW returns from the respective countries. However, in terms of actual numbers, most domestic workers returned from KSA and UAE.




PRE-DEPARTURE SUPPORT

Overall, a significant 73% of OFWs reported that they did not receive support from their employer before leaving their host country to return to the Philippines. Land-based OFWs had a higher prevalence of not receiving assistance compared to sea-based OFWs. Meanwhile, females proved less likely than males to receive any kind of assistance from employers.

Of those that did receive support from employers, 33% reported receiving legal services support. Another 25% received logistics and administrative support, while 22% received health and safety support. Only 6% were provided Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) by their employers and 14% received other kinds of assistance.

In regards to prevalence, females were slightly more likely to access legal services than males, but males had higher rates of accessing support for all other areas. Sea-based workers were also more likely to receive logistics-related and PPE support compared to land-based workers.


7 OUT OF 10 OFWs DID NOT RECEIVE PRE-DEPARTURE SUPPORT FROM EMPLOYERS



TYPES OF PRE-DEPARTURE SUPPORT



REPATRIATION SUPPORT




Overall, over half of OFWs or 56% obtained assistance from their employer to return to the Philippines. Nearly 17% of the returns were facilitated by the Philippine Government and 16% stated they paid for the return themselves. Only 5% reported that a Private Recruitment Agency (PRA) facilitated their return while the remaining 6% found other means to support their return.

Male OFWs were more likely than female OFWs to have their return financed by the employer or by a PRA. Meanwhile, females were more likely to return with the assistance of the Philippine Government or through self-payment. Nearly 20% of females stated that they bore the costs of the return journey compared to 13% of males. Like males, sea-based OFWs had higher likelihood of their return journey being supported by their employer or by a PRA, while land-based OFWs were more likely to return as facilitated by the Philippine Government or through their own means.

INTENTION TO RE-MIGRATE

The question on the OFW's intention to re-migrate was measured on average three months post-arrival of the OFW. Nearly half or 48% indicated they would aim to re-migrate abroad in the future while only 2% had an interest in internal migration. Meanwhile, 35% stated they would like to remain home and just under 15% stated they were undecided. Overall, males and sea-based workers were much more interested in re-migrating internationally. Females and land-based workers were more likely to consider internal migration than males, but are more likely to stay at home. Of all countries, Kuwait had the lowest rate of OFWs having an intention to return.




PREVALENCE ON INTEREST TO RE-MIGRATE



In analysing countries that OFWs aspired to return to work, Taiwan Province, China had the largest representation with 80% of OFWs wanting to return to those same countries. This had equal representation of male and female OFWs. Nearly 78% wanted to return to Japan, as expressed by more males. The United States of America was also desired country for re-migration with 78% of OFWs wanting to return, comprising of 84% males.

Meanwhile, the country with the least preference for return to work was Kuwait with only 59% of OFWs intending to return. This had an overrepresentation of females at 72%, reflecting the large amount of female OFWs returning from Kuwait. Of interest, 44% of all OFW returnees from Kuwait preferred to stay in the Philippines post-return with a higher representation of females at 74% not wanting to re-migrate.

Of the 36% of OFWs looking to re-migrate to a new country, there was a high-level of interest in New Zealand and Canada, although they had not worked there before.




GOVERNMENT REINTEGRATION ASSISTANCE


Just more than half or 51% of OFWs stated that they had either registered or were eligible for post-arrival and reintegration assistance from the government. Meanwhile, 46% of OFWs responded that they did not register or access government reintegration assistance and only 3% stated they were unsure if they were eligible to access assistance.

In terms of prevalence in accessing services, land-based OFWs were more likely to not access reintegration services at 47% versus 43% of sea-based OFWs. Comparatively, males had a slightly higher likelihood of registering for government support at 52% versus 49% of females. Females were less likely to register or know whether they were eligible for government assistance.

In exploring the delivery of reintegration support, 26% of OFWs stated that they had received assistance by the time this question was asked in December 2020. Comparatively, more male OFWs at 29% reported filing a claim and receiving post-return and pandemic-related government assistance than females at 21%. This could support the above finding of higher rates of registration for reintegration support by male OFWs. However, with regards to pending claims, there were higher rates amongst female OFWs compared to males at 44% versus 38% who have filed a claim at the time of the survey but has yet to receive their assistance.



ASSISTANCE PREFERRED



OFWs were asked the type of reintegration assistance they would prefer to receive from government. About 75% of OFWs preferred cash assistance which was evenly reflected for both males and females and in both land and sea-based OFWs. The next highest preference of assistance was for business and livelihood at 14%. There was minimal difference between gender and type of OFWs for this category.


Regarding how the cash assistance would be primarily utilized, 54% of OFWs stated it would be directed towards basic needs, indicating a low level of savings amongst the OFWs. Basic needs was equally represented across gender and type of OFWs. Addressing the most basic needs is by far the biggest concern amongst OFWs. Second to basic needs was business or livelihood activity at 37%. Females were more likely to select this option than men, at 40% versus 34%, with higher rates amongst land-based OFWs than sea-based at 38% versus 31%.

CHALLENGES UPON RETURN

The survey sought to understand three key challenges faced by OFWs post-arrival. The clearest and most prevalent challenge selected by 78% of OFWs was finding a job or income-generating activity. In fact, most OFWs decided not to provide two other key challenges and instead opted to select only one option due to its importance.

Of those who did provide a secondary answer, 24% noted that repayment of debts was their second most prominent challenge. Male and land-based OFWs had higher rates of concerns over debts than females and sea-based workers.

The reflection of both debt repayment and finding a job or income-generating activity aligns to the previous finding that 83% of returned OFWs are unemployed and almost half or 48% reported a 60% drop in household income post-return. It should be noted though that although the understanding of debt in this circumstance is critical, the ability to capture its nature and typology was limited in this survey. Please see methodology for further clarification.





INCOME GENERATION PLANS

OFWs were asked what type of income opportunities they were most interested in taking up in the coming months, with the intention of understanding of what they view as key opportunities and preferred jobs. OFWs showed a preference towards self-employment with 45% choosing this as the preferred option. Females had an increased prevalence with 48% versus 39% of males, reflecting a similar trend with land-based workers at 44% versus 38% of sea-based workers.

Second highest interest was engagement in public or private employment at 27% in which males had more prevalence at 28% compared to females at 24%. Sea-based OFWs had a higher prevalence at 31% compared to land-based OFWs at 25%. This highlights that sea-based OFWs have a higher likelihood of choosing to enter into private employment compared to land-based OFWs, however land-based OFWs are more likely to enter into self-employment compared to sea-based OFWs.

There remained an equal percentile between males and females at 18% for not having any clear plans for employment or economic opportunities. This was slightly higher amongst sea-based workers at 20% compared to 18% for land-based workers. Daily labour was identified more as an option for males than females at 11% versus 8%, with similar trends for land-based than sea-based OFWs at 10% versus 8%.




CAPITAL AND CAPACITY BUILDING

Although just under half or 45% of all OFWs expressed an intent to start a business, only 27% reported having the capital required. Over 69% of those who have a desire to set up a business do not have the means to do so, while the remaining 4% were unsure if what they have is enough.

Overall, females were less likely to have the capital required to start a business at 72% compared to males at 66%. Land-based OFWs were equally less likely to have the capital required to start a business at 71% versus 62% for sea-based workers. As a result, both males and sea-based workers had higher rates of having the capital to start a business at 29% for males versus 23% for females, and 33% for sea-based versus 25% for land-based.



45%
OF ALL OFWs
WANTED TO
VENTURE INTO
BUSINESS



LAND-BASED WORKERS WERE MORE LIKELY TO NOT HAVE CAPITAL THAN SEA-BASED WORKERS

71% > 62%




- 50%** DO NOT KNOW HOW TO FINANCE BUSINESS
- 30%** ARE WILLING TO TAKE OUT A BANK LOAN
- 15%** WILL POOL THEIR FAMILY'S FINANCES

MEANS

Of the 69% of OFWs who did not have the capital to start a business, 50% reported that they are unclear on how capital could be obtained with a higher prevalence amongst female OFWs at 54% compared to male OFWs at 43%. Likewise, land-based OFWs were at 51% compared to sea-based OFWs at 46% in the same category. Males appeared more likely to take out loans compared to females at 32% versus 28%. Meanwhile, sea-based workers were slightly more likely to take out a loan than land-based workers at 31% versus 30%.

PREFERRED BUSINESS VENTURE




TYPOLOGY OF BUSINESS

Of the 45% of OFWs who wanted to venture into business, there was a high interest in service and sales (35%), food industry (27%), and agriculture, forestry, and fishery (14%). Included in the food industry option was the intent to cook or bake food at home to sell online, acquire a food franchise, or work or invest in a small food stand/restaurant. In the service and sales category, OFWs expressed specific desires of setting up a sari-sari stores or selling assorted goods like garments and beauty products.

When looking at preferences amongst males and females, the trends on typology of business remain the same overall, with a slight variation in females being more likely to enter into services and sales than males with a 10% difference, while males being likely to enter into skilled agricultural, forestry and fisheries than females with a 7% difference. Meanwhile, sea-based OFWs were 3% more likely to enter into skilled agricultural, forestry and fisheries than land-based OFWs, but just over 2% less likely to enter into food-related businesses.

UPSKILLING AND TRAINING



More than half or 52% of OFWs stated that they were interested to upgrade their skill set now that they have returned to the Philippines. There was a higher rate of interest amongst females than males at 55% versus 50%, noting that males have higher educational attainment levels. Land-based OFWs were more likely to answer 'yes' to upgrading their skillset at 53% compared to sea-based OFWs at 50%.



Of those interested to upgrade their skill set, 93% expressed a desire to undergo some form of training. The types of training preferred were TESDA training at 71%, certificate courses at 14% and online short courses at 11%. For TESDA training, the gender ratio were close to reflecting the overall returned OFW population. There was also very little gender difference in prevalence. However, there was a variation between land- and sea-based workers, with land-based OFWs having higher rates of opting for TESDA training at 74% versus 56%.

Males and sea-based OFWs had a higher likelihood of selecting certificate courses, while the opposite was true for online short courses whereby females and land-based OFWs were more likely to enroll.




ANNEX

COUNTRY PROFILES



24%
OF TOTAL RESPONDENTS




1%
SEA-BASED OFWs




99%
LAND-BASED OFWs


EDUCATION



SEX AND AGE



EMPLOYMENT WHILE ABROAD



CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS

TOP 3 OCCUPATION WHILE ABROAD




TOP 3 PREFERRED OR ACTUAL OCCUPATION UPON RETURN




KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA

MONTHLY INCOME WHILE ABROAD



MONTHLY REMITTANCE



REASONS FOR RETURN

“



“My contract ended, and it did not get renewed due to COVID-19”



“I was told to leave the country by my employer because of COVID-19”




“I could not find work / I lost my job because of COVID-19”


”

RE-MIGRATION




RECRUITMENT FEES AND RELATED COSTS





21%
OF TOTAL
RESPONDENTS



2%
SEA-BASED
OFWs




98%
LAND-BASED
OFWs

EDUCATION




■ High School Diploma ■ Undergraduate Degree
■ Graduate Degree ■ Others


SEX AND AGE



EMPLOYMENT WHILE ABROAD



CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS



TOP 3 OCCUPATION WHILE ABROAD




TOP 3 PREFERRED OR ACTUAL OCCUPATION UPON RETURN




UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

MONTHLY INCOME WHILE ABROAD



MONTHLY REMITTANCE




REASONS FOR RETURN

“


- 24% *“My contract ended, and it did not get renewed due to COVID-19”*
- 19% *“I was told to leave the country by my employer because of COVID-19”*
- 17% *“I could not find work / I lost my job because of COVID-19”*



”

RE-MIGRATION



RECRUITMENT FEES AND RELATED COSTS





6%
OF TOTAL RESPONDENTS




1%
SEA-BASED OFWs




99%
LAND-BASED OFWs


EDUCATION



SEX AND AGE



EMPLOYMENT WHILE ABROAD



CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS

TOP 3 OCCUPATION WHILE ABROAD




TOP 3 PREFERRED OR ACTUAL OCCUPATION UPON RETURN




QATAR

MONTHLY INCOME WHILE ABROAD



MONTHLY REMITTANCE




REASONS FOR RETURN

“


- 26% *“My contract ended, and it did not get renewed due to COVID-19”*
- 18% *“I could not find work / I lost my job because of COVID-19”*
- 16% *“I was told to leave the country by my employer because of COVID-19”*


”

RE-MIGRATION




RECRUITMENT FEES AND RELATED COSTS





4%
OF TOTAL
RESPONDENTS




1%
SEA-BASED
OFWs




99%
LAND-BASED
OFWs


EDUCATION




SEX AND AGE




EMPLOYMENT WHILE ABROAD



CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS



TOP 3 OCCUPATION WHILE ABROAD




TOP 3 PREFERRED OR ACTUAL OCCUPATION UPON RETURN




KUWAIT

MONTHLY INCOME WHILE ABROAD



MONTHLY REMITTANCE




REASONS FOR RETURN

“


- 16% *“I was told to leave the country by my employer because of COVID-19”*
- 14% *“My contract ended, and it did not get renewed due to COVID-19”*
- 12% *“I was already scheduled to return when the COVID-19 travel restriction took effect”*









”

RE-MIGRATION




RECRUITMENT FEES AND RELATED COSTS






HONG KONG SAR, CHINA

MONTHLY INCOME WHILE ABROAD



MONTHLY REMITTANCE



REASONS FOR RETURN

“

- 17% *“I was told to leave the country by my employer because of COVID-19”*
- 14% *“My contract ended, and it did not get renewed due to COVID-19”*
- 14% *“My contract ended, and it did not get renewed”*

”

RE-MIGRATION



RECRUITMENT FEES AND RELATED COSTS



