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Executive Summary

The aim of this review is to assess the ways in which Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) address the issue of internal migration, and to evaluate the extent to which this discussion is related to rural-urban linkages and rural livelihood strategies. To a lesser extent, the review also investigates the discussion of other types of migration within DWCPs – including emigration, immigration and regional migration protocols.

The results of this work can provide FAO and other development agencies with new insights in their collaboration with ILO and national governments in the implementation of DWCPs. This study was not conceived as an evaluation of ILO’s Decent Work Agenda, but rather as a means to identify key entry points for integrating rural migration issues into DWCPs.

Despite increased interest in the links between migration and development over the past decade, the linkages between internal migration and development have been overlooked. This is despite the fact that internal migration arguably has greater potential for poverty reduction than international migration. This is due to the fact that internal migration is much more accessible to large numbers of poor people in developing countries because of the lower barriers to this type of mobility such as cheaper travel and a lack of formal restrictions on movement.

Rural inhabitants often migrate to diversify incomes and manage risk. In Sub-Saharan Africa, for example, it is now relatively common for households to have family members in both rural and urban areas, with subsistence agriculture undertaken by some family members while others migrate. The source family provides the migrant with a degree of insurance against the risk of migrating while the remittances sent by the migrant can help to mitigate the risks associated with poor access to credit and insurance markets in rural areas of developing countries. Importantly, the types of internal migration that are pursued may differ according to key variables such as gender and access to land.

Migration for employment can bring potential benefits in terms of increased income for households, but it is also clear that internal migration exposes migrants to significant risks and costs, as they are often employed in exploitative, insecure or dangerous work. These hardships can compromise the development and poverty reduction potential of migration. Furthermore, migration often occurs within a negative policy environment where national bureaucracies are hostile to internal migratory movements, social exclusion occurs on the basis of ethnicity, caste, tribe and gender, and enforcement of the rights of the poor is weak. Indeed, it is relevant to consider issues of forced migration and trafficking as well, as evidence from Indonesia, for example, shows that in practice there is a continuum between voluntary and involuntary ‘migration decisions’. This range of vulnerabilities illustrates some of the challenges of extending Decent Work standards to internal migrants’ employment in both rural and urban areas.

Altogether 51 DWCPs were reviewed, encompassing all of the DWCPs that were publicly available at the time of the review (November-December 2010). Only one active DWCP was available from 2005 (Pakistan) while the majority of them (i.e. 50) were produced between 2006 and 2010.
The review methodology was multi-layered, beginning with looking at the number of hits for search terms to provide a snapshot of the extent to which migration and related issues were discussed in each country’s policy document and then content analysis to place this discussion of migration in context.

The discussion of internal migration in DWCPs was then analysed in-depth and a typology created in order to illustrate countries’ perspectives on internal mobility. Finally a Sub-Saharan African case study featured in-depth content analysis for search terms in all categories, including migration-related sectors and rural-urban linkages.

In terms of aggregate hits a number of countries have made a clear link between migration issues and Decent Work priority areas in their DWCPs, which is reflected in substantial discussion of migration in their country programmes. However, many countries’ DWCPs contain minimal discussion of migration – in fact, these constitute the majority as just 18 of the 51 DWCPs surveyed contain ten or more references to ‘migra*’ (with captures references to, inter alia, migrant, migration, etc). Nevertheless, it should be stressed that the level of discussion on migration in each country’s DWCP may not reflect the overall importance of migration in the country or even the country’s established migration policy, in cases where there is disharmony between different policy frameworks.

Internal migration is an increasingly common form of mobility in many developing countries and internal migrants are often employed in insecure or dangerous types of employment where Decent Work standards are lacking. Despite this, only 23 of the 51 DWCPs included in the review mention internal migration at all – and even those that do so typically discuss it in a limited way. In fact, 21 of the 23 DWCPs that mention internal mobility have fewer than five hits for ‘migra*’, or for migration-related terms that refer directly to internal migration. The lone exceptions to this rule are China’s DWCP, which has 25 references to ‘migra*’ and migration-related terms that directly discuss internal migration, and Timor-Leste’s DWCP, which has eight such terms.

All 23 DWCPs that mention internal migration were scrutinised in order to determine whether they saw internal migration as being ‘positive’ or ‘negative’. The majority of DWCPs that discuss internal migration have a ‘negative’ perception of internal migration, while others contained a ‘mixed’ view, with both positive and negative narratives about internal migration, and a small number of countries had a ‘positive’ perception of internal migration. The authors look at four narratives of internal migration that emerged in DWCPs: ‘Pessimists’ – where countries see migration as a failure of development; ‘Critics’ – which blame migration for exacerbating problems; ‘Optimists’ – those that recognise the potential benefits of migration; and, finally, the ‘Supporters’ – those that demonstrate an inclination to offer migrants a range of support programmes and services. These are not meant to be absolute categories, but rather a tool for highlighting common aspects of DWCPs’ discussion of internal migration. In some cases, the discussion of internal migration in countries’ DWCPs resonates with more than one of these categories, especially for DWCPs with ‘mixed’ perspectives, underlining the ambivalent perception of internal migration in these DWCPs.

The report includes a case study on Sub-Saharan Africa which was chosen for in-depth analysis due to the fact that it presents some of the most challenging environments for
introducing Decent Work standards, as the majority of its rural and urban workforce is employed in the informal sector. The region as a whole has some of the highest fertility rates in the world and is regarded as a high potential region for migration triggered by climate change, conflict and demographic changes in the future. Out of 34 countries in the region, there were just six active DWCPs at the time of the review, although many DWCPs were in preparation.

The number of hits for ‘migra*’ were low in the region, with a maximum of five in Lesotho and a minimum of two in Tanzania and Zambia. Discussion of internal migration was also limited and all Sub-Saharan African DWCPs, except for Lesotho, have negative views of internal migration or ignore the topic altogether. This is consistent with the largely negative view towards internal mobility held by most states in the region. Despite this low level of discussion on migration in Sub-Saharan African DWCPs, existing evidence shows that different types of migration are significant in all of these countries for various historical and contemporary reasons, involving different groups of people with general implications for Decent Work.

The analysis of DWCPs conducted in this report shows that the vast majority of these policy documents discuss internal migration in a limited way, with most countries taking a negative view on this type of migration – if indeed their DWCPs mention it at all. Moreover, the overall discussion of migration in DWCPs varies widely, with some countries discussing the rights of international labour migrants in a substantive way, while others apparently consider human mobility to bear little relevance to their Decent Work concerns.

Given the paucity of discussion of internal migration, we identify seven key areas for collaboration within the DWCP framework, in order to mainstream consideration of internal migration – and the rural-urban links it can foster – into the implementation of DWCPs in rural areas.

First, in countries with significant levels of internal migration, there is a need to assess current evidence on the working conditions of internal migrants and incorporate their specific vulnerabilities into the DWCPs.

Second, there is a need to identify and fill existing knowledge gaps on internal migration. We suggest that at the country level, ILO, FAO and other international development institutions work in close collaboration with migration researchers and civil society organisations to map categories of migrant workers and to identify specific migration streams so that Decent Work plans and programmes can be geared towards them.

Third, there is a need to engage with rural communities where there are high rates of rural out-migration. In these situations, working with migrants’ networks to foster their organisation into groups or organisations can be useful to disseminate information about labour rights and working conditions.

Fourth, there is a need to develop policies that support the positive role that internal migration can play in rural livelihoods.

Fifth, migrant children in agriculture represent one of the most vulnerable categories of migrants. The issue of child labour is highly complex and needs to be understood holistically.
before offering standard solutions. There is a need for collaboration between different stakeholders (including producers’ organisations, workers’ organisations and migrant communities) to understand why child migration is occurring and what can be done about it.

Sixth, there is a need to focus on issues of youth migration and employment, as youth are a highly mobile group in many countries that have prepared DWCPs. Youth employment constitutes an important area for policy action in Sub-Saharan Africa, in particular, as projected population growth in this region over the coming decades will increase the proportion of young workers in the overall workforce.

Seventh, the changing gender roles linked to migration are a potentially important aspect of FAO’s work on the implementation of DWCPs, as these are often linked to issues of gender inequality, especially in agriculture and rural areas.

It is important to highlight the scope for international development institutions to partner and develop comprehensive programmes to address these issues, enabling synergy and policy coherence, and to promote a supportive approach to internal migration, ensuring access to Decent Work by internal migrants and leveraging the positive impacts of migration and mobility to reduce poverty, especially in rural areas.
1. Introduction

In recent decades, there has been a growing recognition that migration is an inherent part of development, rather than merely a failure of development. An early version of this view was pioneered by Zelinsky (1971). Based on an analysis of the western experience, he argued that societies pass through four phases of mobility during their transformation from traditional subsistence societies to urban-industrial states: pre-modern transitional, early transitional, late transitional, and advanced. Zelinsky’s mobility transition theory has been challenged over the years, in part because of its assumption that traditional societies were largely immobile (Skeldon 1997). Nevertheless, there is ample evidence showing that development combined with high population growth tends to initially lead to an increase in internal migration, and later to international migration (Bauer and Zimmermann 1998). The initial increase in migration then levels off and eventually decreases as development levels increase. This is the so-called ‘migration hump’, which describes how countries transform from net labour exporters to net labour importers as they achieve greater levels of development (Martin and Taylor 1996).

Migration and mobility are as old as humanity with different countries in different stages of the migration transition as described by Zelinsky. But there is recent evidence that internal migration – including temporary and circular migration – is increasing within many large developing countries with persistent regional inequalities, a development that has been aided by improved communications and transport. Circular migration allows people to keep one foot in the rural economy, while accessing remunerative work either in urban zones or other rural areas. The increasing importance of internal migration suggests that migration is becoming a common aspect of livelihood strategies for rural inhabitants of developing countries. As a consequence, the linkages between rural and urban areas are becoming a more prominent characteristic of many developing countries, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa and Asia.

However, many of the internal migrants from rural areas are employed in risky or insecure occupations, often within the urban informal sector, export-processing zones or commercial agriculture plantations. In many of these cases, internal migrants lack formal contracts or access to social protection and work in jobs with poor health, safety or environmental conditions. It is notoriously difficult to enforce labour standards in such situations (Deshingkar 2009). Nevertheless, given that internal migrants are estimated to outnumber

---

1 This paper acknowledges the diversity of the phenomenon across regions and countries. While currently much growth in internal migration from rural areas is observed in sub-Saharan Africa and Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean also registered high levels of migration originating from rural areas in the past. In fact, during the last fifty years this region has urbanized rapidly. The process was related to industrialization and the introduction of capitalist modes of production in rural areas. Latin America and the Caribbean are the world’s most urbanized developing region, with an urban population percentage of 77.4% in 2005. Hence, rural-urban migration dominated the region for decades. More recently spatial movements have changed with the growing importance of international migration and urban-urban migration flows (see also: Rodríguez, 2008). Bearing this in mind, the present paper pays particular attention to sub-Saharan Africa and Asia.
international migrants by a ratio of about four-to-one (UNDP 2009), and are usually poorer than international migrants, it is imperative to introduce Decent Work standards in sectors that employ large numbers of these migrants. These standards can facilitate an increase in the potential benefits of this type of migration, such as the reduction in poverty and the fostering of food security, and help minimise the employment risks that internal migrants face.

The increased importance of internal migration in developing countries is highly relevant to the involvement of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in implementing Decent Work initiatives. FAO’s mandate is to raise levels of nutrition, improve agricultural productivity, better the lives of rural populations and contribute to the growth of the world economy. Hence, FAO seeks to promote food security for all through agricultural and rural development and the sustainable management of natural resources. In particular, FAO highlights the importance of decent employment promotion for the achievement of food and nutrition security and poverty reduction. It is in line with target 1.B ‘Achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and young people’ in Millennium Development Goal (MDG) 1 ‘Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger’. The link between promoting decent employment and food security is evident in rural areas, where labour is often the only asset of the poor and poverty is too often associated with a disadvantaged employment status. Within this context, and given the importance of migration for rural livelihoods, it is important to harness the potential of labour migration for agriculture and rural development. A better management of rural migration will contribute to the efforts to promote food security and reduce rural poverty.

Broadly speaking, Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) are the key element for the implementation of ILO’s (International Labour Organization) Decent Work Agenda. These country programmes identify key national priorities and constitute a coherent strategic approach towards employment and Decent Work. Furthermore, DWCPs provide the main framework for collaboration between FAO and ILO at the country level concerning the promotion of Decent Work in rural areas.

The aim of this review is to assess the ways in which DWCPs address the issue of internal migration, and to evaluate the extent to which this discussion is related to rural-urban linkages and rural livelihood strategies. To a lesser extent, the review also investigates DWCPs’ discussion of other types of migration – including emigration, immigration and regional migration protocols. The results of this work can provide FAO with new insights in its collaboration with ILO and national governments in the implementation of DWCPs. While ILO has a lead role in labour migration, FAO has a comparative advantage and a crucial complementary role in promoting rural employment and decent work, especially with respect to agricultural and informal employment, non-farm employment in agro-processing and rural marketing enterprises and industries, and issues of food security (FAO 2011a). Thus, this study was not conceived as an evaluation of ILO’s Decent Work Agenda, but rather as a means to identify key entry points for integrating rural migration issues into DWCPs.
This working paper begins with introductory sections that provide a short history of the Decent Work Agenda, state the case for mainstreaming internal migration in DWCPs and outline the research methodology used in this review. Subsequent sections provide an overview of the review’s findings with respect to DWCPs’ discussion of migration, migration-related areas of work and rural-urban linkages. The paper then turns to an in-depth analysis of the discussion of internal migration in DWCPs, in particular, followed by a case study of the DWCPs completed by Sub-Saharan African countries. It concludes with a set of seven policy recommendations for mainstreaming internal migration into the planning and implementation of DWCPs.

2. A short history of the Decent Work Agenda

ILO introduced the Decent Work Agenda in 1999, following its Declaration of Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work in 1998. The basic worker rights in this declaration include the right to free association and collective bargaining, the elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labour, the abolition of child labour and the elimination of discrimination in employment. Subsequently, Decent Work has been adopted at the UN level. ILO has partnered with other UN bodies in the implementation of the Decent Work Agenda (Løken et al. 2008: 17). The wider salience of the Decent Work Agenda was evident in 2004, when a report from the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization suggested that Decent Work for All should be made a global goal pursued by coherent policies within the multilateral system (ibid: 17-18). One example of the growing importance of the Decent Work Agenda was the inclusion of the target, ‘Achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and young people’ in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) as a sub-goal of ‘MDG 1: Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Hunger’ (FAO 2011a: v). Furthermore, ‘full employment and decent work for all’ is the theme for the second UN Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (2008-2017). Decent and full productive work is central for rural areas, where 70 per cent of the world’s poor live (IFAD 2011). Promoting decent work and social protection for all have featured also high in the global agenda in response to the global economic and financial crisis (Global Jobs Pact, Social Protection Floor Initiative), as well as to growing concerns over food price volatility and climate change.

The concept of Decent Work is based on the understanding that work is a source of personal dignity, family stability, peace in the community, government accountability and economic growth that expands opportunities for productive jobs and enterprise development. The concept is now being operationalised through DWCPs developed in close collaboration with national governments. A DWCP is the one of the main instruments for ILO cooperation over a period of four to six years in a specific country. DWCPs are based on four strategic objectives (with gender equality constituting a crosscutting dimension):

- Creating jobs: building an economy that generates opportunities for investment, entrepreneurship, skills development, job creation and sustainable livelihoods.

---

1ILO’s guidebook for the preparation of DWCPs is available online: www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/program/dwcp/download/guidev2.pdf
• Guaranteeing rights at work: all workers, and in particular disadvantaged or poor workers, need representation, participation and laws that work for their interests.
• Extending social protection: ensuring that working conditions are safe, allow adequate free time and rest, take into account family and social values, provide for adequate compensation in case of lost or reduced income and permit access to adequate healthcare.
• Promoting social dialogue: involving strong and independent workers’ and employers' organisations is central to increasing productivity, avoiding disputes at work, and building cohesive societies.

The genesis of DWCPs occurred in 2000, when ILO introduced the first DWCP pilot programmes in developing nations. Since then, DWCPs have become the most important element of ILO-led efforts to implement the Decent Work agenda (Løken et al. 2008: 18). Løken and colleagues observe that DWCPs, ‘...are time-bound and resourced programmes organized around a limited number of priorities and outcomes based on national needs and conditions, with monitoring and evaluation guidelines’ (ibid: 18-19). Tripartite dialogue and consultation are seen as being integral to both the planning and implementation of DWCPs, which frequently involve consultation with agencies across national governments as well as workers’ organisations and residents. Where appropriate, ILO and UN organisations, including FAO, provide technical assistance to countries in the implementation of their identified DWCP priorities.

Promoting employment and decent work is particularly important in rural areas, where labour markets are distinguished by poor working conditions, high levels of informality, a preponderance of casual employment, high rates of self-employment, gender inequality, labour force fragmentation and information asymmetries. In this context, rarely enforced labour legislation, poor health and safety conditions, as well as limited access to social protection, further compound the situation (FAO 2011a). FAO has a comparative advantage in addressing employment and Decent Work in rural areas, based on its strong focus, expertise and knowledge on agriculture and rural development. FAO maintains close collaboration with governments and ministries, as well as with other agricultural and rural stakeholders; it has also the normative and technical capacity to support the formulation and implementation of rural employment programmes and policies.

As we argue below, migration and Decent Work overlap in a number of ways. In the case of international labour migration, ILO is already active in advocating for the extension of Decent Work standards to labour migrants, focusing in particular on international migration in Asia (for example see ILO 2009b). However, to date efforts have not highlighted the importance of internal migrants’ access to fair employment standards in a comparable way. Such a focus is much needed, especially as internal migrants tend to be poor people who are employed in informal sector occupations where labour standards are routinely flouted. The hardships, risks and costs for poor migrants compromise the development impact that their earnings would otherwise have for them and their families. In particular, the Decent Work pillars of guaranteeing rights at work, extending social protection and promoting social dialogue are relevant to internal migrants. However, as this review will show, few DWCPs
indentify the specific vulnerabilities of internal migrant workers and there is little evidence of substantive dialogue or consultation between planners on DWCPs and internal migrants.

3. The case for mainstreaming internal migration in DWCPs

Just as the Decent Work Agenda has become more prominent in recent years, the past decade has also seen increased interest in the links between migration and development. This has included institutional interest from UN organisations, the World Bank and donor governments, a number of major new research projects on migration and development and a growing number of practical measures on behalf of development actors to engage with migrants and capitalise on the resources that they accumulate (Black and Sward 2009: 1). Indeed, in countries with significant migrant flows, remittances now provide a more reliable and significant inflow of foreign capital than official aid (Ratha 2003). There have been efforts on behalf of both development organisations and developing country governments to involve diaspora groups in development efforts, including programmes that promote the return of skilled migrants (including temporary and even ‘virtual’ return), and efforts to encourage diaspora members to invest in development projects or diaspora bonds (for example see Ratha and Ketkar 2010 and Migration DRC 2009a). Although there are some indications that international migration has slowed as a result of the economic downturn, widespread return of migrants to their countries of origin has not occurred and remittances continue to be a resilient source of foreign exchange for source countries (Ratha et al. 2011). Moreover, policy issues, such as the potential linkages between migration and climate change (see Black et al. 2011), point to the likelihood of migration remaining a key development issue in future years.

However, the linkages between internal migration and development have to a large extent been overlooked in recent years. This is despite the fact that internal migration arguably has greater potential for poverty reduction than international migration, due to the fact that internal migration is much more accessible to large numbers of poor people in developing countries because of the lower barriers such as cheaper travel and a lack of formal restrictions on movement in most countries. (Deshingkar 2006: 88). In both Africa and Asia, deteriorating opportunities in traditional, low-yield agriculture contribute to internal population movement to cities, with migrants often moving to unplanned settlements and attempting to earn wages via casual employment or the informal economy (Deshingkar 2006: 88; Bryceson 2009). These migratory movements can be seen as forming part of risk aversion strategies undertaken by rural residents in developing countries, livelihood strategies that have long been noted by migration scholars (see for example Stark and

‘FAO is aware of the challenges that this involves, also given the specificities of promoting Decent Work in agriculture and rural areas. See ‘FAO (2011) Guidance on how to address rural employment and decent work concerns in FAO country activities’, [online] available at: www.fao.org/docrep/013/i1937e/i1937e.pdf
Levhari 1982). However, there is also evidence to suggest that internal mobility is not only linked to changing realities for smallholder agriculture producers but also to increasing demands for female labour in developing countries and changing aspirations among rural youth (Tacoli and Mabala 2010: 394).

Importantly, available research suggests that internal migration – particularly of the rural-to-urban variety – is on the rise in a number of developing countries in Africa and Asia. Longitudinal studies conducted by Hugo (1975, 1978, 1982, 2003) in Indonesia show growing migration to urban areas, whilst studies in Vietnam (Anh 2003) and India (Srivastava 2005) document growing levels of circular migration between poor villages and urban centres. There is evidence of rural-urban migration becoming increasingly common in Sub-Saharan Africa as well, as illustrated in recent studies in Tanzania (de Weerdt 2010), Kenya and Uganda (Mulumba and Olema 2009). Moreover, in West Africa, surveys under the Network of Surveys on Migration and Urbanization in West Africa project (NESMUWA) in seven countries (Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Niger and Senegal) show very high rates of internal migration. More recently, Awumbila (2005) has highlighted the growing phenomenon of the circular migration of young women and girls from rural areas of Ghana to the country’s capital, Accra.

Rural inhabitants often migrate to negotiate inequities that exist both between rural and urban areas and within rural communities and households. In Sub-Saharan Africa, for example, it is now relatively common for households to have family members in both rural and urban areas, with subsistence agriculture undertaken by some family members providing a safety net that allows other household members to experiment with non-farm types of employment (Bryceson 2009). Importantly, the types of internal migration that are pursued may differ according to key variables such as gender and access to land. One study in northern Tanzania found that employment opportunities in tourist centres and urban areas were increasingly attractive to young rural women, in part because they are otherwise expected to carry out unpaid labour on family farms that they do not traditionally inherit. While the study found that only about one-third of young women from rural areas migrated internally – compared to about two-thirds of young men – women’s movements were typically further afield and for longer durations, whereas young men’s migration was mostly seasonal, as they had to return to rural villages during the farming season. In this instance, young women moved for more permanent forms of off-farm employment, while men’s temporary employment mainly supported their smallholder farming operations (Tacoli and Mabala 2010: 391).

---

1 Personal communication with Prof John Oucho, head of the African Migration and Development Policy Centre.
Conversely, Garikipati’s (2008) research in the state of Andhra Pradesh in India shows that, despite having a higher share of wage employment as compared to men, women’s relative wages remained low and their working conditions remained poor. Most women worked as casual farm workers locally while men migrated. Women had a lower status in the labour market because they were unable to diversify into remunerative non-farm work through seasonal migration, and this hindered their ability to bargain for better wages. The study also found that, despite contributing heavily to family provisioning, women had little control over household assets and resources. They were therefore unable to move into self employment or better paying work. Men, on the other hand, were able to use migration incomes to strengthen their ownership over land and other productive assets.

Both examples provide insights into the types of rural-urban linkages that internal migration can foster and how the motivation to migrate is often mediated by a wide range of economic and social factors. While off-farm employment can bring potential benefits in terms of increased income for rural households, it is also clear that internal migration exposes migrants to significant risks and costs, as they are often employed in exploitative, insecure or dangerous work. Among the sectors that commonly employ migrants in urban locations are the garment/textile industry, construction and domestic work, while rural-to-rural migrants oftentimes find work on plantations, in mines or in the fishing sector. It is also common for migrants to find work as street vendors, or in export-processing zones. In the Indian garment industry, which employs large numbers of female migrants, insecure employment is commonplace. Krishnamoorthy’s (2006) study of three major garment centres in Delhi, Tirupur and Mumbai, found that employers use a number of practices to systematically evade labour laws. Subcontracting is widespread, with several layers of contractors and subcontractors, and this makes law enforcement difficult because the employer-employee relationship is not clear. Workers are employed on a casual basis and are vulnerable to being fired without notice or compensation (Krishnamoorthy 2006).

Available evidence (for example Rafique et al. 2006) underlines the importance of migration as a livelihood and risk spreading strategy for the poor, but the hardships involved can make it a ‘reluctant’ livelihood strategy. On the one hand, migration may provide migrants with access to better wages, which can translate into vital material improvements for migrant households. On the other hand, however, migration also carries with it considerable risks and costs. In the case of internal migration, its potential for poverty reduction is frequently constrained by significant barriers, including national bureaucracies that are hostile to

---

1Different countries employ different definitions of ‘urban’ based on, inter alia, population density and agricultural/non-agricultural occupations and the UN recognises this. For example, see: http://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic/sconcerns/densurb/densurbmethods.htm. Overall, there is a need to view rural and urban areas not as discrete entities, but as forming a continuum facilitated by rural-urban linkages formed by the flow of people, goods and ideas (Tacoli 2006).
internal migratory movements, social exclusion on the basis of ethnicity, caste, tribe and gender, and poor enforcement of the rights of the poor (Deshingkar 2006: 88). Indeed, it is relevant to consider issues of forced migration and trafficking as well, as evidence from Indonesia, for example, shows that in practice there is a continuum between voluntary and involuntary ‘migration decisions’ (Czaika and Kis-Katos 2009). This range of vulnerabilities illustrates some of the challenges of extending Decent Work standards to internal migrants’ employment in both rural and urban areas.

4. Explanation of review methodology

Altogether 51 DWCPs were reviewed, encompassing all of the DWCPs that were publicly available at the time of the review. DWCPs that had expired and were no longer publicly available through ILO’s website were thus not included in this review. Only one active DWCP was available from 2005 (Pakistan) while the majority of them (i.e. 50) were produced between 2006 and 2010.

The review methodology was multi-layered, with the number of hits for search terms providing a snapshot of the extent to which migration and related issues are discussed in each country’s policy document and subsequent content analysis placing this discussion of migration in context. A list of search terms was prepared to capture the discussion of migration-related phenomena, migration-related work and sectors and rural-urban links and agriculture (see Appendix 1). Hits for ‘migra*’ capture, inter alia, references to migration, migratory, migrate, and migrant(s), although content analysis is necessary to distinguish between internal and international migration or disaggregate sub-categories of internal migration such as rural-urban, rural-rural or indeed urban-rural flows. Migration-related terms include references to topics such as circular, seasonal or return migration, refugees, trafficking and remittances. Migration-related work and sectors include terms which captured references to sectors which often employ large numbers of migrant workers such as the textile or garment industry, domestic work, child labour, etc. Finally, terms related to rural-urban links and agriculture were included as these are areas of FAO’s comparative advantage in implementing DWCPs. These include reference to the terms ‘rural’ and ‘urban’, as well as discussion of the agriculture, fishing, livestock and forestry sectors.

Each DWCP was scanned for these terms, providing insights into the level of discussion of migration, as well as terms included under ‘migration-related topics’, ‘migration-related work/sectors’ and ‘rural-urban linkages’. Subsequently, content analysis was undertaken,

---

6 This review of the DWCPs was carried out from November 2010 to December 2010.

7 DWCPs also varied substantially in their length, which made comparisons across DWCPs difficult.

8 A similar methodology has been used in Black and Sward (2009).

9 These terms are consistent with FAO’s broad definition of ‘agriculture’, which encompasses the farming, livestock and forestry sectors.
which looked at all references to migration and migration-related terms cited in the DWCPs, in order to determine which type of migration the DWCP was referring to (internal migration, emigration, immigration, etc.). The discussion of internal migration in DWCPs was then analysed in-depth and a typology was created in order to illustrate countries’ perspectives on internal mobility. The Sub-Saharan African case study included at the end of this research report, meanwhile, features in-depth content analysis for search terms in all categories, including migration-related sectors and rural-urban linkages.

The review’s inclusion of a range of search terms that cover rural-urban linkages, the agricultural sector and other work sectors which typically employ migrants also creates the possibility for isolating gaps in the discussion of migration and Decent Work. Gender issues were considered as a cross-cutting issue, and looked at especially through content analysis. This is particularly relevant in instances where discussion in the aforementioned areas is robust and discussion of migration is scant.

The review did have some limitations, however. DWCPs publicly available at the time of the review were recent (2005-2010) and relatively small in number. This partially allowed controlling for trends over time and changes across regions, opening the scope for future research. Furthermore, due to unforeseen difficulties in accessing searchable PDF versions of all DWCPs, which resulted in subsequent time constraints in carrying out the review, it was not possible to conduct systematic content analysis for all groups of search terms included in the review, as originally planned. Instead, content analysis was conducted for all DWCPs for references to ‘migra*’ as well as for the group of migration-related search terms. Thus, content analysis was not carried out for references to search terms related to ‘migration-related work sectors’ or ‘rural-urban linkages’. These areas could potentially be investigated further in future research. Further analyses might be also carried out to cross check how decent employment and internal migration issues are tackled and translated into policies, beyond the DWCPs and in comparison with other policy documents relevant to the FAO mandate, such as agricultural and rural development policies or the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs). This might also be linked to the creation of an index, as used by Jobbins (2008) in his analysis of migration and PRSPs.

5. Migration in DWCPs: An evolving picture over time?

Figure 1 shows the average number of hits for all four categories of search terms included in the review over time. Although direct comparisons between years are problematic due to the varying number of DWCPs published each year, some trends can be discerned. For example, there were proportionately more hits for ‘migra*’ for DWCPs published in 2006, 2009 and 2010 than in other years.

10 At the time of the review, there was one active DWCP published in 2005; 12 DWCPs from 2006; eight from 2007; 20 from 2008; six from 2009; and four from 2010. Active DWCPs are publicly available through the ILO website: www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/program/dwcp/countries/index.htm.
While some years had a higher average discussion of the review’s search terms than others, there was a significant degree of heterogeneity witnessed in each year’s results. For example, the 12 DWCPs completed in 2006 – the year which has the highest average number of hits for ‘migra*’ at 12.9 hits per DWCP – differ substantially in their discussion of migration. The average for the year is buoyed by a high number of hits for migra* in a handful of DWCPs, including those for Indonesia (47 hits), Jordan (30), China (23) and Bangladesh (20). However, a number of DWCPs from 2006 have fewer than five hits for migra*, including Azerbaijan (no hits), Bulgaria (one), Romania (one), Tanzania (two) and the Ukraine (two). The heterogeneity of the results for 2006 is mirrored by the yearly results for DWCPs published from 2007 through 2010, with some countries including a substantial discussion of migration in their DWCPs while others have minimal references to migration. This snapshot of the hits for ‘migra*’ reveals that there is little discernible change in the level of migration discussion in DWCPs over time. A number of countries have made a clear link between migration issues and Decent Work priority areas in their DWCPs, which is reflected in substantial discussion of migration in their country programmes. However, many countries’ DWCPs contain minimal discussion of migration – in fact, these constitute the majority as just 18 of the 51 DWCPs surveyed contain ten or more references to ‘migra*’. Nevertheless, it should be stressed that the level of discussion on migration in each DWCP.
country’s DWCP may not reflect the overall importance of migration in the country or even the country’s established migration policy, in cases where there is disharmony between different policy frameworks. Moreover, as the subsequent sections will show, aggregate hits only provide a partial window into migration discussion, and content analysis is needed in order to assess what types of migration are discussed and the extent to which countries view migration as being relevant to their Decent Work priorities.

6. Types of migration in DWCPs: An overview by region

The review showed that 23 out of 51 countries discuss internal migration, 26 discuss emigration and/or return migration and 12 discuss immigration. Only three countries’ DWCPs (those for Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Panama) have no discussion of migration. While averages by year show no clear pattern, examining the data by global region does reveal some broad patterns of discussion (see Figure 2). More countries in Eastern Europe discuss emigration compared to internal migration, whereas the discussion in East Asia is dominated by internal migration and countries in the Middle East and Caribbean are primarily concerned with immigration. To an extent this reflects migration challenges faced by the different regions.

Figure 2. Discussion of different types of migration by region

In East Asia, the DWCPs for China and Mongolia are attempting to find ways to better manage internal migration. By contrast, Middle Eastern DWCPs are primarily concerned with immigration, having become a major destination for labour migration from poor countries across Asia and Africa. Meanwhile, DWCPs for countries from Sub-Saharan Africa focus primarily on regional migration protocols and issues of internal migration, as shall be discussed in greater depth in the Sub-Saharan case study below. Central, South and Southeast Asian countries, meanwhile, include discussion of internal migration and the issues of emigration and return as a number of countries witness significant levels of these types of mobility. For example, the 2006 DWCP for Kyrgyzstan claims that both internal and cross-border migration, are linked to poverty and population growth in poorer areas.
Internal migration is represented mainly by the flow of rural inhabitants towards larger cities (mainly Bishkek and Osh).

Only Eastern Europe and Latin America include countries with DWCPs that do not discuss migration at all: Bosnia and Herzegovina in Eastern Europe and Panama and Bolivia in Latin America. From existing research, the lack of discussion regarding migration in these states’ DWCPs does not reflect the relative importance of human mobility in these countries.

Discussion of internal migration in DWCPs is most commonly found in DWCPs from Asia and the Pacific Islands. A number of DWCPs view rural-urban internal migration as resulting partly from rural poverty or linked to rural youth seeking new employment opportunities in urban centres. In some instances, DWCPs appear to recognise the important role internal migration can play in poverty reduction. For example, Albania’s DWCP describes internal migration as a coping strategy for the poor and disadvantaged (Albania DWCP 2008: 3), while China’s DWCP mentions the need to remove bureaucratic hurdles to migrants’ internal mobility and to ensure that they have access to social protection (China DWCP 2006: 6; 12). By contrast, DWCPs, particularly those of Pacific Island Countries, perceive rural-urban migration as negatively affecting urban areas by putting pressure on services or contributing to social problems and unemployment. Uganda’s DWCP explicitly links internal migration of girls and boys to child labour (Uganda DWCP 2007: 13). Additionally, a relatively small but not insignificant number of DWCPs mention internally displaced persons (IDPs).

7. Content analysis: The five DWCPs with the most migration discussion

The top five DWCPs in terms of references to migration are Indonesia, Moldova, Tajikistan, Cambodia and Jordan, five states which are vastly different in terms of size, population densities, socio-cultural characteristics, histories and levels of development.

---

13 Please refer to the dedicated section on internal migration in this research report for more information on this discussion.


15 This argument is made in the DWCPs for Timor-Leste (2008), Lesotho (2006) and Kyrgyzstan (2006).

16 The negative impacts of rural-urban migration on urban areas are noted in the DWCPs for Fiji (2010), Kiribati (2009), Mongolia (2006), Nicaragua (2008), Papua New Guinea (2009), Paraguay (2009), Solomon Islands (2009), Timor-Leste (2008) and Tuvalu (2010).

### Table 1: Top five DWCPs in terms of references to migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of hits for ‘migra*’</th>
<th>Population density per sq km</th>
<th>GDP per capita in $ (World Bank 2009)</th>
<th>HDI rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2349</td>
<td>51 (med)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>42 (med)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>55 (med)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>67 (med)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4216</td>
<td>24 (v high)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noteworthy that all five are predominantly concerned with international migration, with particular attention to protecting vulnerable irregular migrants who have migrated internationally, as opposed to internal migration, reflecting the relative neglect of the latter in development policy dialogues, as was already noted above. Despite this broad commonality, these five DWCPs discuss different categories of international labour migrants who in turn have distinct vulnerabilities.

The Indonesia DWCP’s discussion of migration is primarily focused on the need to protect vulnerable female emigrants, as nearly 72 per cent of Indonesian migrant workers are women, with almost 90 per cent of them employed as domestic workers in the Middle East and Southeast Asian countries (Indonesia DWCP 2006: 7). The Indonesian government has long been concerned about the welfare of independent female migrants, a concern that is shared in many Muslim countries. Partly reflecting these concerns, the country’s overseas labour contract programme was restructured in 2006 with the establishment of a National Agency for the Placement and Protection of Indonesian Migrant Workers (IOM 2008).

By comparison, the 32 hits for ‘migra*’ in the DWCP for Tajikistan are concerned primarily with the protection of irregular male emigrants, who face different types of risks and difficulties than female migrants. Ranked as the poorest non-African country in 2001,

---

Hugo (2007) describes Indonesia as a quintessentially labour-surplus country, with high rates of both unemployment and underemployment. Indonesia has become a major migrant-sending country in recent years, with skilled migrants moving to OECD countries and temporary, unskilled migrants leaving for the Middle East and other parts of Asia (Hugo 2007).
Tajikistan has seen large-scale emigration due to collapsing industry and ensuing poverty and unemployment. A majority of male migrants move to other countries in the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) through irregular channels for low-level jobs (Jones et al. 2007).

Similarly, the Moldovan DWCP notes that a large number of the country’s citizens are emigrating, with an estimated 25 per cent of the working age population now living abroad (Moldova DWCP 2008: 2). The 42 hits for ‘migra*’ in the DWCP refer mainly to the need for better management of emigration and a number of policy options are explored, including improving data on migration and providing migrants with pre-departure training and returnees with access to social security (ibid: 12). The remittances that migrants send home are hugely important, according to the DWCP, amounting to nearly 35 per cent of the GDP in 2007 (ibid: 2).

In Cambodia’s DWCP, the 31 hits for ‘migra*’ are predominantly related to the protection of vulnerable irregular migrants crossing the border into Thailand and Vietnam, although this DWCP does also contain some discussion of rural-to-urban internal migration. Much like Indonesia’s DWCP, Cambodia’s DWCP calls for the protection of irregular female emigrants and the establishment of safe migration channels through the creation of a Labour Migration Taskforce (Cambodia DWCP 2008: 22). The DWCP also calls for a Rapid Assessment to be carried out in 2009-2010 to evaluate the needs of migrants who returned to rural villages from the capital Phnom Penh or from neighbouring countries as a result of the economic crisis (ibid: 7, 15).

By contrast, Jordan’s DWCP is concerned with protecting immigrants. It notes that immigrant domestic workers in Jordan are mostly female migrants from the Philippines and Sri Lanka, while ‘Asian migrants’ make up an estimated two-thirds of the workforce in the country’s export-processing zones (Jordan DWCP 2006: 4). The DWCP also mentions that in 2006 the US-based National Labour Committee condemned the abusive working conditions in these export-processing zones, which were created as part of the US-Jordan Free Trade Agreement, claiming that firms in these zones used practices that bordered on trafficking and forced labour. The DWCP calls for ‘Legal and administrative mechanisms for migration management and protection of migrant workers rights’ (ibid: 7). These include the establishment of a complaints service for migrant works, the prosecution of employers and recruiters who violate migrant workers’ rights, raising awareness about trafficking and forced labour among migrant workers and allowing migrant workers to join trade associations (ibid: 11-12; 19).
8. An overview of the discussion of migration in DWCPs

8.1 Migration-related search terms

The review also included a set of migration-related terms in order to assess the various forms of migration and mobility that were being discussed. The rationale for including this group of search terms was several-fold. Firstly, this group of search terms provides a comprehensive window into the overall discussion of migration in DWCPs. A number of the terms refer to migration-related phenomena such as remittances, seasonal movements, displacement and mobility that may not be captured in references to ‘migra*’ in DWCPs. Secondly, the list sought to incorporate both migration-related terms that are commonly associated with positive development outcomes by migration researchers (including circular and seasonal migration, mobility and transfers/remittances) as well as terms related to displacement (including forced migration, refugees, Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) and trafficking).

On average, the hits for migration-related terms were lower than ‘migra*’ (see Figure 1). There appears to be a steady increase in references to migration-related terms over the years, bearing in mind that the varying number of DWCPs published each year makes comparisons difficult. The migration-related terms that attracted the most overall discussion in DWCPs were trafficking, remittances and refugees. Importantly, there were a number of search terms that were included in the review that attracted little to no discussion in the DWCPs, and these terms are conspicuous in their absence. There were no or negligible hits for ‘circula*’ and ‘commut*’ (word roots that were designed to capture discussion of circular migration and commuting, respectively), indicating a lack of discussion on nonpermanent and short duration movements. Given the fact that such movements are growing in incidence, this is a serious omission. Circular migration and commuting are equally, if not more, important than permanent migration in many Asian countries due to a combination of factors including rising people-to-land ratios, stagnating rural wages, rising urban wages, improved communications and transport links and stronger social networks.

Table 2: Top five DWCPs in terms of the references to ‘migra*’ and migration-related search terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of hits for migra* and migra*-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For full list see Appendix 1.

20 The reason being is that even in cases of displacement, recent research has shown that a level of migrant agency is still involved – and that displacement itself is often inter-related with other patterns of migration, including rural-urban flows (see for example Czaika and Kis-Katos 2009). Moreover, in countries that have experienced civil conflict, or are housing refugees from neighbouring countries, the influx of displaced persons into rural communities can have an impact on working conditions in these locations.

The top five DWCPs in terms of the number of combined hits for ‘migra*’ and migration-related terms are shown in Table 2. Three of the countries, namely Moldova, Indonesia and Cambodia, appear in the top five list for ‘migra*’ hits as well, so clearly these DWCPs have devoted substantial attention to the subject of migration and mobility. Moldova’s DWCP has the highest overall discussion of ‘migra*’ and migration-related search terms. The policy document’s 42 references to ‘migra*’ are accompanied by significant discussion of trafficking (21 hits) and remittances (14 hits), while return migration is also mentioned twice. The Moldova DWCP’s discussion of trafficking overlaps with its discussion of irregular migration22 (Moldova DWCP 2008: 11-12) and the ‘worst forms of child labour’ (ibid: 13-14). As was mentioned above, the Moldova DWCP states that remittances accounted for 35 per cent of the country’s GDP in 2007 (ibid: 2) and the DWCP calls for a National Remittances Program that increase the medium- to long-term impact of remittances to the country (ibid: 11).

The Indonesia DWCP’s inclusion in the top five of this category is mostly due to its 47 hits for ‘migra*’, although it does include six references to trafficking as well. The DWCP mentions trafficking in relation to preventing forced labour among international labour migrants (Indonesia DWCP 2006: 7-8) and also links it to efforts to eliminate the ‘worst forms of child labour’, including sex work (ibid: 6). Similarly, Cambodia’s DWCP includes 14 references to trafficking and five references to return migration, in addition to the document’s 31 ‘migra*’ hits. The DWCP identifies women from poor backgrounds as being especially vulnerable to trafficking (Cambodia DWCP 2008: 6) and includes a National Plan on Child Labour and Trafficking, which seeks to eliminate the ‘worst forms of child labour’ (ibid: 21-23). Thus, the DWCPs for Moldova, Indonesia and Cambodia are primarily preoccupied with the dangers of irregular international migration and the perceived links between trafficking and the ‘worst forms of child labour’, with the Moldovan DWCP also taking an interest in trying to use migrant remittances more productively.

---

22 While there is no reliable data on the number of people trafficked in Moldova, the majority are irregular migrants and it is clearly an area of policy concern for the Moldovan government (Pantiru et al. 2007).
The DWCPs for the Pacific Island Countries (PICs) of Tuvalu and Kiribati, meanwhile, contain significant discussion on seasonal worker migration to New Zealand under the Recognised Seasonal Employment (RSE) policy, which allows workers from PICs to work on plantations during the agricultural growing season\(^{23}\). Both of the DWCPs also note the importance of remittances both from workers involved in this scheme and from other islanders who have moved abroad through other emigration routes\(^{24}\). However, the DWCPs for both these countries suggest that they have become economically dependent on emigration and remittances and are thus classified as MIRAB countries. As Kiribati’s DWCP states: a ‘MIRAB country depends on Migration, which stimulates substantial Remittance flows. Alongside remittances, Aid is a significant source of income, and these sources have contributed to the emergence of an urban Bureaucracy’ (Kiribati DWCP 2009: 5, emphases in original).

8.2 Migration-related work sectors

Overall, the level of discussion in DWCPs surrounding migration-related work sectors is much higher on average than for both ‘migra*’ and migration-related terms (again, see Figure 1). While most of the DWCPs from 2006 had fewer than 100 overall hits for this group of search terms (with the exception of Bangladesh), there is a sharp peak in 2007 as a result of the large number of overall hits in this category for the DWCPs produced by Kenya (133), Uganda (101), Zambia (134) and India (91). There is a drop again in 2008 with the only DWCP produced that year to have a comparable level of overall hits being the Cambodian DWCP with 129 hits.

It is instructive to look more closely at the countries that have the greatest number of overall hits for the search terms included in this area in order to assess their specific concerns. References to both ‘child labour’ and ‘informal sector’ appear repeatedly under this category in the DWCPs for Kenya, Uganda and Zambia. Child labour and the informal sector are also the chief concerns in terms of migration-related work sectors for the India DWCP, while the Cambodian DWCP primarily discusses the garment sector, child labour, exports and the informal sector.

Although we know from research in various countries that child labour and the informal sector can be closely linked to migration, this is not necessarily always the case. Also, the link is often not made explicitly in the DWCPs under review. When looking at the linkages between migration and child labour it is necessary to underline that ‘it is legitimate for children of working age to seek employment opportunities’ elsewhere, when decent employment is not available at home (van de Glind 2010: 14). However, migrating children

---

\(^{23}\) Tuvalu’s DWCP has 14 references to seasonal migration to New Zealand under the RSE, while Kiribati’s DWCP has 11 references to this topic.

\(^{24}\) Tuvalu’s DWCP has 14 hits for remittances, while Kiribati’s has seven.
may be more vulnerable to various forms of exploitation and potentially be engaged in child labour. Overall, the discussion of child labour in DWCPs is quite substantial and this is clearly due in part to ILO’s efforts to eliminate child labour, particularly the ‘worst forms of child labour’ – such as slavery, bonded labour and illicit activities including sex work and armed conflict (ILO Convention 182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labour 1999). In fact, many DWCPs directly refer to ILO’s initiative to eliminate the ‘worst forms of child labour’ and 19 DWCPs mention child labour at least 20 times, highlighting the high profile of child labour concerns in DWCPs. Concerns about this topic resonate in Sub-Saharan Africa, in particular, with the DWCPs for Kenya (82 hits), Zambia (69), Tanzania (56), Uganda (56) and Côte d’Ivoire (53) all containing more references to child labour than any other DWCP. The discussion of child labour in this group of DWCPs is primarily linked to the incidence of poverty in rural and urban areas, AIDS orphans, children dropping out of school and the need to stamp out the worst forms of child labour. In addition to these five Sub-Saharan African countries, Fiji (44 references to child labour), India (33), Papua New Guinea (33) and Yemen (31) all have more than 30 references to the issue in their DWCPs.

It is notable that there is a strong link between child labour and child trafficking in some DWCPs, including Côte d’Ivoire, which mentions child trafficking 32 times in relation to its efforts to eliminate the ‘worst forms of child labour’. However, with the exception of Uganda’s DWCP, which mentions children migrating for work, there is virtually no acknowledgement of less coercive forms of child mobility in DWCPs. Recent research suggests that child migration for work is fairly common in West Africa and Southeast Asia. Indeed, in two of the countries that have DWCPs which widely discuss child labour – India and Bangladesh (which has 24 references to child labour) – research has shown that child migration for work is commonly motivated by ‘push factors’ in their home communities, such as economic deprivation, social discrimination, environmental degradation, family illness or educational failures, and ‘pull factors’, such as the desire to learn new skills or experience a new life at their place of destination (for examples see Whitehead et al. 2007; Khair 2008; Iversen 2005). Overall, these studies reveal that child migration for work is often a route taken up by youths in order to try to make the best of difficult situations – and this constitutes an apparent blind spot in most current DWCPs.

8.3 Rural-urban links and agriculture

Search terms included in this category were designed to capture references to possible rural-urban linkages, as well as to FAO priority sectors including agriculture, forestry, fishing

* Please refer to the Sub-Saharan African case study in this report for further discussion of child labour concerns in this group of DWCPs.
and livestock\textsuperscript{26}. Overall, a number of search terms included in the review attracted a lower threshold of discussion than was anticipated. The review initially included ‘rural-urban’ as a search term, but as there were a negligible number of hits for this term found in DWCPs it was removed from the finalized list of search terms. While there were hits in some DWCPs for ‘local economic development’ and ‘diversif\textsuperscript{*}’, subsequent content analysis did not clearly link these terms to any discussion of migration. Additionally, there was little or no discussion on terms such as ‘multi-positional’, ‘multi-sectoral’, ‘peri-urban’, ‘squat\textsuperscript{*}’, ‘informal settlement’, ‘shanty’ or ‘slum’. Finally, no reference to landless people is made in DWCPs, which is a significant omission as so many of the poorest workers come from poorly-endowed families. Landlessness is an important characteristic of labouring households across several Asian countries especially in South Asia.\textsuperscript{27}

Nevertheless, a number of DWCPs did contain a significant amount of discussion of the search terms included in this category, with the five DWCPs with the most overall discussion being China (83 hits overall), Timor-Leste (56), Cambodia (52), Lesotho (46) and Kyrgyzstan (43). In all of these cases, this reflects a larger preoccupation with rural-urban relationships, and, perhaps not coincidentally, all five of these DWCPs are among those which actually discuss internal migration in their DWCPs. This is particularly relevant in China’s DWCP, where hits for search terms ‘rural’ and ‘urban’ constitute the majority of the overall hits in this category, pointing to a larger discussion in which the document’s statements about internal migration are embedded. By contrast, a number of the DWCPs – mostly located in Central Asia, Eastern Europe, and Latin America – have few hits for this category of search terms\textsuperscript{28}.

The review did reveal that a number of DWCPs do explicitly discuss Decent Work concerns that are related to agriculture and other FAO priority areas such as fisheries and forestry. On the whole, DWCPs reflect a concern for working conditions in agriculture and the two most common themes linking agriculture to migration are child labour and trafficking. For example, the Indonesian DWCP makes reference to child labour in agriculture and fishing. However, no links are made between children’s work and their mobility in Indonesia’s DWCP. This is despite the fact that an independent study suggests that there is widespread trafficking of children from rural areas within the country (Rosenberg 2004). A case in point

\textsuperscript{26} See Appendix 1 for full list of search terms included in this category.

\textsuperscript{27} See for example McKay 2005 for the Philippines and Deshingkar and Farrington 2008 for India and Bangladesh.

\textsuperscript{28} The DWCPs for Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Paraguay, Panama, Romania and the Ukraine all have five or fewer total hits for the search terms. Only two of these countries, Azerbaijan and Paraguay, mention internal migration flows in their DWCPs (with the Azerbaijan’s lone reference a single mention of internally displaced persons).
is the recruitment of young boys from villages for work on fishing platforms off the coast of North Sumatra (ibid).

The Moldovan DWCP also mentions child labour in agriculture and has six hits for ‘agri*’, but the links between child labour and migration are not made even though these links are evident in other publications of the Moldovan government. For example, the Moldovan Ministry of Agriculture and Food Industry notes on its webpage ‘Future crop: an agriculture without child’s labour’\(^29\) that children are pushed into work on family farms as adults migrate.

9. Internal migration and DWCPs: an analysis of policy perspectives

As was mentioned above, internal migration is an increasingly common form of mobility in many developing countries and internal migrants are often employed in insecure or dangerous types of employment where Decent Work standards are lacking. Despite this, only 23 of the 51 DWCPs included in the review mention internal migration at all – and even those that do so typically discuss it in a limited way. In fact, 21 of the 23 DWCPs that mention internal mobility have fewer than five hits for ‘migra*’, or for migration-related terms that refer directly to internal migration. The lone exceptions to this rule are China’s DWCP, which has 25 references to ‘migra*’ and migration-related terms that directly discuss internal migration, and Timor-Leste’s DWCP, which has eight such terms.

All 23 DWCPs that mention internal migration were scrutinised in order to determine whether they saw internal migration as being ‘positive’ or ‘negative’. ‘Positive’ discussion of internal migration was defined as including the following categories of discussion: (1) internal migration as a coping or poverty reduction strategy; (2) efforts to improve internal migrants’ rights; (3) measures to enhance internal migrants’ mobility (for example, by removing bureaucratic barriers to internal migration); and (4) consultation with internal migrants. Conversely, categories that were defined as examples of ‘negative’ discussion on internal migration included: (1) internal migration putting pressure on the urban population/economy; (2) links with child labour; (3) links to HIV and AIDS; (4) portrayals of internal migration as a chaotic process that needs to be managed or regulated; (5) links to ethnic or political tensions; and (6) discussion of IDPs. Importantly, these categories were derived from topics that were present in DWCPs’ discussion of internal migration, and thus do not include important topics such as internal remittances, which DWCPs do not mention at all.

\(^29\) Available at: www.maia.gov.md/print.php?l=en&idc=52&id=13262W
Figure 3 Treatment of Internal Migration by Year

As Figure 3 shows, the majority of DWCPs that discuss internal migration have a ‘negative’ perception of internal migration. A smaller number of countries have a ‘mixed’ perception of internal migration, as their discussion includes both ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ statements about the implications of internal migration. A handful of DWCPs focus solely on the positive aspects of internal migration, primarily in terms of its role as pathway out of poverty. As shown in Figure 3, DWCPs’ discussion of internal migration has not become more ‘positive’ over time.

Next, DWCPs that have negative discourses on internal migration are categorised according to two groups – the ‘Pessimists’ and the ‘Critics’. The DWCPs that have ‘positive’ or ‘mixed’ perspectives on internal migration fall under the categories ‘Optimists’ and ‘Supporters’.

- DWCPs with a ‘negative’ view of internal migration include: Afghanistan (2010); Azerbaijan (2006); Cote d’Ivoire (2008); Kiribati (2009); Nicaragua (2008); Pakistan (2005); Papua New Guinea (2009); Paraguay (2008); Samoa (2009); Solomon Islands (2009); Sri Lanka (2008); Timor-Leste (2008); Tuvalu (2010); and Uganda (2007). DWCPs with a ‘mixed’ view of internal migration include: Albania (2008); China (2006); Fiji (2010); India (2007); and Mongolia (2007). DWCPs with a ‘positive’ view of internal migration included: Cambodia (2008); Kyrgyzstan (2006); and Lesotho (2006). Syria’s DWCP (2008) mentions internal migration but was classified as having ‘no opinion’.

- These are not meant to be absolute categories of discussion, but rather these categories highlight common aspects of DWCPs’ discussion of internal migration. In some cases, DWCPs’ discussion of internal migration may resonate with more than one of these categories, especially for DWCPs with ‘mixed’ perspectives.
9.1 The ‘Pessimists’: Migration a symptom of underdevelopment in rural areas

Countries in this category view migration mainly as a symptom of rural distress and see the need to devise policies and interventions to prevent and control it. The term ‘distress migration’ has value in such analyses. The India DWCP, for example, claims that ‘[s]low agricultural growth has widened the rural-urban divide and contributed to distress migration from rural to urban areas’ (India DWCP 2007: 7). Similarly, Kiribati’s DWCP notes that ‘[w]hile paid employment is difficult to obtain throughout the country, the chances are still much better on South Tarawawa than the outer islands. This has fuelled the rapid migration from Kiribati’s outer islands to the capital during the past decade’ (Kiribati DWCP 2009: 7). Kiribati’s DWCP also claims that most young people seek waged labour in the informal economy due to a paucity of other opportunities on the islands. Similarly, Timor-Leste’s DWCP states that ‘[u]nder-employment is, without any doubt, one of the underlying causes of the growing tendency towards rural-urban migration with the rural youth migrating in large numbers to cities to eke out a living. As a result, the urban population is growing at an average rate of 5% per annum. This fusion of recent rural-urban migration with associated unmet aspirations and pent-up frustrations was understandably a significant factor fuelling the 2006-2007 crisis’ (ibid: 5). Timor-Leste’s DWCP also points to gender as a key variable in internal mobility, noting that ‘[w]omen carry a heavy load of family responsibilities while male youth are highly mobile because of the fragile political conditions: such gender trends have restricted their participation and thus benefits from development process’ (ibid: 5).

The ‘pessimistic’ views of internal migration generally ignore any positive impacts that this type of mobility may hold for either migrants or society. As was mentioned earlier in this report, empirical research has shown that internal migration from rural communities is often a means by which people can increase their income through off-farm livelihoods, potentially resulting in access to investment funds and improvement in livelihoods (de Haan and Rogaly 2002: 5). For many households, internal migration allows them to keep one foot in rural communities, even if some family members attempt to diversify the family’s earnings by moving elsewhere. While this type of mobility does not resolve larger rural-urban inequities, it can have a significant impact on the viability of rural livelihoods, particularly in countries where traditional agrarian practices are becoming tenuous (Hoang et al. 2005).

---

This refers to the domestic crisis in Timor-Leste in 2006 and 2007 that began as a dispute regarding internal discrimination within the country’s military. The crisis witnessed widespread unrest and looting amongst the civilian population, culminating in a foreign intervention led by Australia, New Zealand, Malaysia and Portugal (Scambary 2009).
These countries blame migration for a host of ills from overburdening civic amenities in destination areas, to unemployment, crime, disease and broken families. The Papua New Guinea DWCP articulates this classic negative view of internal migration, claiming that ‘[m]igration to major city centres in the past decade has contributed to urban unemployment and social problems. Crime is a major factor hampering economic growth and the development of employment opportunities’ (Papua New Guinea DWCP 2009: 6). Tuvalu echoes these sentiments, noting that ‘[a]round 75% of Tuvalu’s labour-force work in the subsistence and informal economy. Subsistence agriculture and fishing remain the primary economic activities, particularly in the outer islands. Migration from the outer islands to Funafuti, and under-employment of youth put pressure on the job market in Funafuti’ (Tuvalu DWCP 2010: 6). Samoa, meanwhile, blames migration for unemployment among youth: ‘The Household Income and Expenditure Survey 2002 by the Ministry of Finance highlighted the main challenges faced by youth which are rural to urban migration and the inability of the Samoan economy to provide sufficient paid employment to the majority of its youth’ (Samoa DWCP 2009: 8). Similarly, the Solomon Islands’ DWCP states that ‘[a]lthough the urban population is small, it has increased rapidly over the last two decades, largely as a result of out-migration from the rural areas. This urban drift has led to a rise in urban unemployment and contributed to the period of ethnic tensions between 1999 and 2003’ (Solomon Islands DWCP 2009: 4).

This view is not only present in the DWCPs for Pacific Island Countries, as Latin American DWCPs generally put forward this critical view of internal migration as well. For example, Nicaragua’s DWCP asserts that ‘[t]he majority of the unemployed (75%) are in the urban sector, which signifies an important migration from the countryside to the city, and a consequent pressure on services in the urban sector’ (Nicaragua DWCP 2008: 3). Meanwhile, the DWCP for Paraguay states that ‘a great part of the labour market problems are expressed in underemployment – principally through salaries below the minimum wage, and the pressure of migration’ (Paraguay DWCP 2009: 1). It adds that, ‘informality and migration tend to limit the development prospects of workers and employers (ibid: 2). ILO

---

33 Authors’ translation of original Spanish text: ‘La mayoría de las personas desempleadas (75%) se encuentran en el área urbana, lo que significa una importante migración del campo a la ciudad y una consecuente presión por los servicios en el área urbana.’

34 Authors’ translation of original Spanish text: ‘gran parte de los problemas del mercado laboral se expresan en el subempleo – principalmente a través de remuneraciones inferiores al salario mínimo - y en la presión migratoria.’

35 Authors’ translation of original Spanish text: ‘… la informalidad y las migraciones tiende a limitar las perspectivas de desarrollo de trabajadores y empresarios.’
is working with authorities and stakeholders to create a youth employment policy that includes a focus on employment and migration. Among its aims is to ‘address the growing phenomenon of migration’\textsuperscript{36} \textit{(ibid: 3)}.

Meanwhile, Mongolia’s DWCP refers to internal migration negatively in relation to it contributing to a growing urban informal economy. It notes that ‘[h]igh levels of migration to urban areas exist for mostly economic reasons. Ulaanbaatar grew by 5.5\% in a single year and comprises 33\% of the population (2002-2003). Migrants tend to concentrate in suburban areas in so-called Ger districts named after the traditional dwelling in which many migrants live’ (Mongolia DWCP 2006: 3). This is linked to a wider discussion of rising poverty and unemployment in the DWCP, which it claims is linked to the elimination of subsidies and privatisation.

Other DWCPs characterise internal migration as contributing to the spread of disease or the incidence of child labour. Pakistan evidently sees internal migration as linked to the spread of HIV and AIDS, as its DWCP includes a project to combat migrant workers’ susceptibility to this disease (Pakistan DWCP 2005: 5, 11). Finally, some countries, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa, link internal migration with child labour.\textsuperscript{37} For example, the Uganda DWCP claims that child labour is linked to conflict and poverty in some regions of the country, which prompts girls to move to cities to work in the sex trade or as domestic workers and pushes boys to work on plantations, in the mining sector and in commercial fisheries (Uganda DWCP 2007: 13).

These are just a few examples of the ‘Critics’ perspective on internal migration. This type of negative portrayal of internal migration is frequently repeated, often without questioning any of its assumptions, across diverse disciplines and policy arenas. It appears to be rooted in conventional understandings of urbanisation and rather old-fashioned analyses of migration impacts that were based on research conducted in the 1970s (see Adebusoye 2006 on Africa and Deshingkar 2006 on Asia). Only a handful of countries have taken a more balanced view of internal migration, recognising that it has helped several people who would otherwise have had no option but to depend on poorly paid and scarce local work.

9.3 The ‘Optimists’: Internal migration linked to improved employment access

This category of countries does not attempt to halt or reverse migration and instead appears to recognise that migration allows people to access better job markets. For example, the DWCP for Lesotho observes that new patterns of internal migration are emerging in the country which see young women increasingly moving from rural areas to cities in order to find employment in the textile export industry (Lesotho DWCP 2006: 19).

\textsuperscript{36} Authors’ translation of original Spanish text: ‘abordar el fenómeno de la creciente migración.’

\textsuperscript{37} See Sub-Saharan case study for country-by-country analyses.
This newfound form of female mobility in Lesotho is replacing the previously dominant form of migration in the country, which saw young men move to South Africa to work in the mines (ibid). Fiji takes a similar position, stating that ‘in a situation where rural-urban migration is accelerating and job opportunities in the wage sector are declining, the informal sector appears to play an important role in absorbing surplus labour, contributing to GDP and augmenting household income (Fiji DWCP 2010: 7). Albania is another country that acknowledges the benefits of migration, with both internal and international migration explicitly cited as common coping strategies in the face of poverty and unemployment (Albania DWCP 2008: 3).

Exactly how and why these countries have developed this positive view of migration is not altogether clear. However, it is likely that the benefits of migration have been recognised because they play such an important role in these countries. For example, in Lesotho, a survey in 2003 found that 37 per cent of the people interviewed reported a family member working in South Africa (Cobbe 2004). Similarly, Albania has also seen mass emigration. It is estimated that roughly 25 per cent of the total population (over 35 per cent of the labour force) has emigrated to Greece, other European countries and North America. Albania’s migration flow has, since the early 1990s, been five times higher than the average migration flow in developing countries (Kosta 2004).

9.4 The ‘Supporters’: Improving working and living conditions for migrants

Countries in this category emphasise the need to provide migrants with access to services and support of other kinds. The China DWCP, in particular, discusses the need to improve the living and working conditions of migrants throughout its policy document. It acknowledges the widespread internal population movements occurring in the country, stating that ‘[t]here is an estimated 120 million surplus workers [in rural areas] who have migrated and at least 80 million more [who are likely] to go’ (China DWCP 2006: 1). With rural-urban migration occurring on a wide scale, the DWCP argues that fundamental worker rights of migrants must be ensured, while facilitating an orderly migration process is seen as one of the state’s key challenges (ibid: 10).

As such, promoting employment with a focus on the unemployed and ‘internal rural migrants’ is one of the priority areas of China’s DWCP, further illustrating the importance of the issue of internal migration flows in contemporary China (China DWCP 2006: 5, 7). The DWCP notes that this priority area will be pursued by removing restrictions for rural migrants seeking work in urban areas and by providing training in skills and enterprise development (ibid: 6). Although laws linking household registration with access to services have been formally eased, the Chinese DWCP concedes that in practice these rules still result in migrants being denied services in their receiving locations (ibid: 12). Occupational safety is also an issue for migrants, and cooperation among institutional actors is needed to ensure safe migration channels and to combat trafficking and forced labour (ibid).
Additionally, the Chinese DWCP makes light of the lack of social security available to migrants (ibid: 2; 9), and includes a proposal to research how this could be remedied (ibid: 11). Finally, the DWCP mentions that labour protection for migrants is partly defined by a document entitled ‘Circulars on Migrant Workers Issues from the State Council’, although it acknowledges that this needs to be mainstreamed into national policies (ibid: 3).

Another ‘Supporter’ of internal migration is the Cambodia DWCP, which highlights the need to help returnee migrants. This need is articulated in a section of the DWCP that outlines responses to the financial crisis, which calls for '[i]mproving preparedness for migrants and returnees and the undertaking of a Rapid Assessment of the impact of the crisis on workers returning from Phnom Penh and overseas to rural villages (three selected provinces)' (Cambodia DWCP 2008: 15). Similarly, the Mongolia DWCP, which has a ‘mixed’ view of internal migration, provides a level of support for internal migrants, suggesting that employment services should provide improved services to migrants (Mongolia DWCP 2006: 14).

In an ideal world, countries would move from being pessimists and critics to being optimists and supporters of migration. Organisations such as FAO and ILO would have a critical role to play in this transition.

10. Case Study: DWCPs from Sub-Saharan Africa

Sub-Saharan Africa was chosen for in-depth analysis due to the fact that it presents some of the most challenging environments for introducing Decent Work standards, as the majority of its rural and urban workforce is employed in the informal sector (ILO 2007). The region as a whole has some of the highest fertility rates in the world and is regarded as a high potential region for migration triggered by climate change, conflict and demographic changes in the future. Out of 34 countries in the region, there were just six active DWCPs at the time of the review, although many DWCPs were in preparation.³⁸ A number of Sub-Saharan African countries have Decent Work plans that have expired, including Burkina Faso (2006-2007); Ghana (2006-2009); Nigeria (2005-2009); Ethiopia (2006-2007); Mali (2006-2009); Senegal (2006-2009) and Zimbabwe (2006-2007). Additionally, new DWCPs for Benin and Togo were published after the conclusion of the review.

The number of hits for ‘migra*’ were low in the region³⁹, with a maximum of five in Lesotho and a minimum of two in Tanzania and Zambia. Discussion of internal migration was also limited, as only Lesotho and Uganda mention ‘voluntary’ forms of internal migration, while

---

³⁸ For the current status of DWCPs being developed by Sub-Saharan African states, please see: www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/program/dwcp/download/statusafrica200511.xls

³⁹ Appendix 4 provides an overview of the hits for different search terms in the Sub-Saharan Africa DWCPs.
Côte d’Ivoire mentions internally displaced persons. The fact that Sub-Saharan African DWCPs, except for Lesotho, have negative views of internal migration or ignore the topic altogether is consistent with the largely negative view towards internal mobility held by most states in the region (Adebosoye 2006). A 2002 UN review of policies affecting migration in Sub-Saharan Africa showed that governments are averse or at best neutral to migration, especially rural-urban migration (ibid). Despite this low level of discussion on migration in Sub-Saharan African DWCPs, existing evidence shows that different types of migration are significant in all of these countries for various historical and contemporary reasons, involving different groups of people with general implications for Decent Work. This shall be explored in more detail in the breakdown of each country’s DWCP below.

By far the most discussed search term in all the DWCPs was child labour, an issue that is closely related to migration, as already mentioned. Indeed, as van de Glind notes in an overview of child labour and migration for ILO International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC), ‘[m]igration can be an important determinant for child labour. The recently adopted Roadmap for Achieving the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour recognizes the need to address child vulnerabilities related to migration’ (van de Glind 2010: 1, emphasis in original). But as noted earlier, this means neither that child labour always refers to migrating children, nor that migrating children are always involved in forms of child labour. Three of the DWCPs for Sub-Saharan Africa – Côte d’Ivoire, Zambia and Kenya – link child labour concerns to child trafficking. On the whole, DWCPs from Sub-Saharan Africa seem to see the mobility of children for work as being necessarily coercive. However, empirical studies on child migration show that child trafficking, though a serious problem, nevertheless appears to represent a small minority of the cases of child mobility (Migration DRC 2009: 9).

The second most commonly referenced term was the informal sector, or informal employment. Despite the fact that internal migrants are often (but not always) employed in informal settings, in Sub-Saharan African DWCPs there are only few attempts to explore these linkages. Terms that are relevant to FAO, such as ‘rural’, ‘urban’ and ‘agriculture’, are next in frequency. All six countries mention them but there are relatively more hits in Lesotho, whereas Zambia discusses issues related to agriculture more than its regional counterparts. Additionally, many sectors that are potential employers of migrant labour are mentioned, including mining, domestic work, fishing and the garment industry. The in-depth analysis of each of the Sub-Saharan African DWCPs in this case study explores the migration context of reference of each DWCPs and accounts for how this is related to DWCPs’ priority areas, where relevant.
10.1 East Africa

Kenya

Based on the number of hits, the main focus of the Kenyan DWCP, with regards to migration, is on regional integration and the free movement of labour in the East African Community (EAC). All four hits for ‘migra*’ in the Kenyan DWCP refer to that (Kenya DWCP 2007: 7, 23, 24) and five references to ‘move*’ are also related to the EAC protocol (ibid: 6, 22, 23). The DWCP notes that ILO will support the implementation of the EAC protocol by providing technical support for labour laws relevant to the agreement, which EAC countries have recently adopted or are in the advanced stage of adopting (ibid: 23). They will advise on enforcement and implementation, focusing on the harmonisation of labour legislations, investment codes, fiscal and monetary policies (ibid).

There is no discussion on international migration in the Kenyan DWCP independent of the references to the EAC protocol. However, it is clear from existing studies that this is a significant issue (Okoth 2003). With growing economic and political uncertainty in the 1980s and 1990s many Kenyans began to emigrate. The intake of Kenyan students in US universities increased rapidly in the early 2000s but has declined steadily since, with other countries, including China and India, overtaking Kenya (Open Doors 2010). There was also a departure of many highly skilled professionals in the areas of technology, health and administration to Southern Africa and the North Americas. Others have migrated for low-skilled positions such as drivers, domestic servants and security guards in Gulf countries such as Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Bahrain (Okoth 2003). However, while some DWCPs discuss implementing measures to protect their citizens whilst they are abroad40, Kenya’s DWCP ignores the Decent Work considerations of Kenyan emigrants.

Similarly, available evidence suggests that internal migration in Kenya occurs on a significant scale. Areas such as the Rift Valley, Western Kenya and Nyanza, where a large number of agricultural plantations are located, receive migrants seeking opportunities for employment (Drimie et al. 2009). The high rate of youth migration in the country is also relevant to the discussion of Decent Work – while unemployment is mainly an urban phenomenon, large numbers of youth continue to flow into urban areas every year (Sommers 2003).

Although the Kenya DWCP does not refer to internal migration as such, it does discuss informal employment, which is a sector where internal migrant workers are often employed in. There are 26 hits for the ‘informal economy/sector’, which overlaps with youth employment and child labour issues.

40 For example, see discussion earlier in this report of the top five DWCPs in terms of ‘migra*’ hits.
The DWCP’s first priority area focuses on the issues of youth employment and the elimination of child labour (Kenya DWCP 2006: 7-16). Although it is not explicitly stated in the DWCP, it is likely that young migrants are heavily involved in the informal economy. For example, the DWCP states that:

Young workers in Kenya are found in most economic activities, but have a greater concentration in the urban, informal economy in commercial services (sales, cleaning, domestic care etc.) and trade. The informal economy and small-scale agriculture account for more than two thirds of the total employment in Kenya. There, many young women and men are engaged in casual or temporary terms of employment with poor salaries and low, if any, social protection. In the modern sectors, young workers are concentrated in food processing industries, textiles, transport and commercial services (Kenya DWCP 2006: 9).

At a recent workshop at the newly launched African Migration and Development Policy Centre (AMADPOC) in Nairobi, where one of the authors was present, the issue of youth employment was raised as being important to discussions on migration41. The lack of attention to these issues in the Kenyan DWCP represents a missed opportunity to highlight these linkages between the employment of youth and migration and to explore relevant policy solutions.

The Kenya DWCP widely discusses the term ‘child labour’, which attracts 82 hits – the most of any DWCP. The DWCP broadly links child labour to poverty in both rural and urban contexts. Related areas of concern are children’s education and the perceived vulnerability of working children to HIV infection. Kenya is developing a targeted plan with ILO’s assistance to eliminate the ‘worst forms of child labour’. It is clear from other sources that child labour is indeed an issue of acute importance in Kenya. The Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) conducted a countrywide Integrated Labour Force Survey (ILFS) in 1998-1999 that incorporated a child labour module, which showed a total of 1.9 million working children, mainly from poorer families in Coast, Eastern and Rift Valley Provinces (Government of Kenya 2001). The survey showed that 34 per cent of these children worked in commercial agriculture or commercial fisheries, 23.6 per cent worked in subsistence agriculture or fishing, and 17.9 per cent worked as domestic helpers, cleaners or launders.

It is unclear how many of these children were migrants, as the child labour module survey report does not mention migration at all (Government of Kenya 2001). Other studies mention rural-urban migration as an important reason for increasing rates of child labour in the country, suggesting that children either migrate for work independently or start working after migrating with their parents (Manda et al. 2003). The DWCP does not make these links clear, possibly because of the difficulties involved in tackling the issue of Decent Work

41 Visit the AMADPOC website for more information about the centre: www.amadpoc.org
standards for migrating children, such as identifying migration flows and working to establish appropriate social safety nets.

Migration-related sectors, in particular mining and the textile industry, are discussed, but again there is no direct link made with migration although it is likely that the sectors employ migrant workers. The DWCP also mentions the need to provide workers in export-processing zones with training in trade union membership (Manda et al. 2003: 22). Meanwhile, domestic care is highlighted in relation to youth and child employment, again with an emphasis being placed on the need to extend better worker protection to this vocation (ibid: 9; 12). Commercial sex work was also mentioned in relation to child labour, and ILO and its partners will provide technical assistance in this area (ibid: 12).

With regards to agriculture, there is discussion of both small-scale agriculture and commercial plantations in rural areas. The DWCP reports that the agricultural sector is important to the country’s overall employment profile, but it also points out that the sector has high rates of informal employment, a lack of formal social protection, a high incidence of child labour and youth employment and high rates of HIV infection, particularly on commercial plantations (Kenya DWCP 2006: 3, 9, 11, 12, 19). Additionally, there are references to the fishing industry which cite concerns about high rates of HIV infection and child labour in this sector (ibid: 12, 28). The DWCP’s discussion on livestock involves plans to provide young people working in livestock production with training and better access to markets (ibid: 11). There are also references to ‘urban’ and ‘rural’, though little direct discussion of any linkages between the two. Furthermore, there are limited hits for ‘local economic development’, ‘slum’ and ‘diversification’, but here too explicit connections to migration are not made.

Although the DWCP does not make explicit links between agriculture and its subsectors and migration, available evidence suggests that these linkages do exist. For example, in the Lake Victoria region there are significant levels of migration to capital-intensive, export-oriented, large-scale agricultural plantations. Migrant workers are employed as casual or seasonal workers and are heavily disadvantaged in terms of pay, social protection, housing and medical care. Often entire families migrate, although only the head of the family is formally employed. The children may work too but do not figure on the payroll and are paid on a piece-rate basis (Drimie et al. 2009). There is clearly a need to address Decent Work standards in such contexts.

Tanzania

The Tanzania DWCP discusses migration in a very limited way. The two hits for ‘migra*’ both refer to the development of the East African Community protocol for the free movement of labour, with the DWCP noting that ILO is providing support in this area (Tanzania DWCP 2006: 8). There are also two hits for ‘move*’, which also discuss the EAC protocol.
There is no direct mention of internal migration, which is a major omission given that existing studies point to high migration rates within the country. A study by IIED found that 50 to 80 per cent of rural households across all wealth categories had at least one migrant member, with increasing trends of women moving as independent migrants (Tacoli 2002: v). Indeed, Tanzania has a long history of rural-rural and rural-urban migration, including significant labour recruitment from neighbouring countries to provide a workforce for plantation agriculture (Drimie et al. 2009). Moreover, recent research has shown that small-scale mining has become an important form of non-farm employment in Tanzania, with ‘hundreds of thousands’ migrating internally to prospect for gold in rural areas (Bryceson and Jønsson 2010: 379).

Despite the limited discussion on migration in the DWCP, migration-related work and sectors are discussed widely. There are 56 hits for child labour and the second ‘priority area’ of the DWCP aims to reduce the incidence of child labour, especially in the sectors of agriculture, mining and quarrying, domestic service and commercial sex (Tanzania DWCP 2006: 11). However, the relation between child labour and migration is not clearly stated. The DWCP argues that child labour inhibits children from pursuing primary education, impeding progress on Millennium Development Goal 2, and notes that the tourism and fishing industries both have high rates of child employment (ibid: 12). There are further links between child labour and children orphaned by HIV and AIDS and the need to provide education and training alternatives to children who are in work.42

There are 18 hits for ‘informal economy’, with the DWCP’s strategy for promoting youth employment targeting young people who are employed in the urban informal economy (Tanzania DWCP 2006: 11). The DWCP also notes the need to extend the country’s HIV and AIDS prevention training to the informal economy (ibid: 15) and bring informal economy actors into the Decent Work dialogue (ibid: 7, 17). Furthermore, the DWCP notes that women are over-represented in the informal economy, with 75 per cent of economically active women involved in subsistence agriculture (ibid: 5). Once again, the DWCP fails to highlight the ways in which internal migration is linked to rural and urban forms of informal employment and what this implies in terms of appropriate policy solutions.

Additionally, there is discussion of ‘self-employment’ and ‘forced labour’. Self-employment through entrepreneurship training is viewed as a way to increase youth employment prospects (Tanzania DWCP 2006: 9), while the DWCP also mentions that Tanzania has ratified ILO’s convention on forced labour (ibid: 10). The DWCP’s discussion of migration-

42 There is no link between trafficking and child labour in Tanzania’s DWCP (whereas other regional DWCPs for Cote d’Ivoire, Zambia and Kenya make this link), and in general the relevance of children’s mobility to child labour issues is ignored.
related work sectors also includes mention of the mining sector, street vending, domestic work and the export sector. Mining is identified as one of the sectors where the ‘worst forms of child labour’ occur (ibid: 11) and where more capacity is needed for employment promotion and creation (ibid: 18). Meanwhile, street vending is referred to as one of the major avenues for informal sector employment (ibid: 5, 9), while training in trade union membership is set to be extended to women working in difficult sectors, including export-processing zones (ibid: 18).

The Tanzanian DWCP also contains considerable discussion on agriculture, claiming that up to 82 per cent of Tanzanians are employed in this area (Tanzania DWCP 2006: 5, 9). This is also seen as an area where child labour is prevalent (ibid: 11), where training in union membership is needed (ibid: 18), and which is affected by loss of labour because of the HIV and AIDS epidemic (ibid: 14). However, the link to migration is not made, despite the fact that studies have shown that there is much migration for work in commercial agriculture in the Lake Victoria region (Drimie et al. 2009). The fishing sector is linked in the DWCP to incidence of child labour (Tanzania DWCP 2006: 7, 12).

Furthermore, there is some discussion of ‘rural’ and ‘urban’ issues, with the DWCP noting that poverty and unemployment are higher in rural areas (Tanzania DWCP 2006: 4, 5). Rural youth account for a large percentage of the unemployed in the rural sector at 32 per cent (ibid: 9) and improved access to micro-finance in rural areas is proposed as a solution to youth unemployment (ibid: 10). By contrast, the DWCP states that HIV infection rates are twice as high in urban areas as in the rural sector (ibid: 13). Youth employment is also a concern in urban areas, especially in the informal sector (ibid: 11), with youth making up to 28 per cent of the urban unemployed (ibid: 9). Urban poverty and unemployment rates were lower than in the countryside (ibid: 4, 5).

Interestingly, Tanzania’s DWCP has shied away from making direct links between internal migration and potentially connected areas such as the urban informal economy, child labour and youth employment. For example, it is very likely that female migrants work in the country’s export-processing zones, but one is left to guess at these linkages based on the lack of discussion of migration trends in the DWCP. Similarly, child migration could be a dimension of the programme’s concern regarding child labour but no connections are made within the document itself. Likewise, the discussion on youth employment does not address migration, although studies suggest that youth migration is significant and presents challenges for planners in terms of poverty reduction and employment. One study showed that Tanzanian youth already in urban areas have a strong resolve to remain there even though unemployment rates of youth in urban areas far exceed those of adults. This

* According to UNIFEM, women dominate employment in most export processing zones (UNIFEM 2008/2009: 10).
determination persists even though the urban poor are very often worse off than rural dwellers (Linden 1996). Another study in Dar es Salaam notes that the government carried out a series of campaigns in the 1980s and 1990s to ‘repatriate’ unemployed rural migrants, most of whom were young men who did not wish to return to rural areas. In all cases, these ‘repatriation’ policies failed to stop rural-urban migration or affect urban unemployment (Sommers 2003: 3).

Uganda

As is the case with Kenya and Tanzania, Uganda’s DWCP is somewhat preoccupied with implementing the protocol for the free movement of labour within the EAC44, with the majority of references to migration referring to it.45 Labour migration is referred to, but because it is unclear whether this refers to internal or international migration (Uganda DWCP 2007: 1).

As in other East African DWCPs, child labour is mentioned repeatedly throughout the document.46 Evidence on child labour is summarised as follows: ‘According to 2005/06 UNHS 3.8 million (32 per cent of all the children) Ugandan girls and boys are working [sic] of these, 1.7 million (16 per cent) are child labourers [the] majority of whom are between 10 and 14 years of age’ (ibid: 13). Rural-urban and rural-rural migration by children is mentioned, too, with the DWCP noting that, ‘Child labour is also a result of on-going armed conflict, poverty situation [sic] particularly in rural areas and cultural practices that push particularly girls to move to urban areas to look for domestic work or commercial sex and pushes boys to work in plantations, stone quarries and fishing’ (ibid: 13). Hence, the DWCP does acknowledge a link between children’s mobility and employment, setting it apart from other Sub-Saharan African DWCPs. Given the fact that a large proportion of Ugandan child workers are migrants, this discussion is not misplaced. An ILO study of child labour in the urban informal economy of Uganda revealed that 63 per cent of working children were migrants. Domestic work is an occupation with a high proportion of migrant girls, with data from a national household survey revealing that 46 per cent of children employed as domestic workers were migrants (ILO 2004). In the DWCP, child labour is also partly linked to children orphaned by HIV and AIDS, which constitutes 14 per cent of all children in the country. Additionally, one hit discusses IDPs, predicting that ‘[a]s work towards peace

\[\text{\textsuperscript{41}}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{44}}\] See updates related to this on the website of the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD) for Africa http://igad.int

\[\text{\textsuperscript{45}}\] There are four hits for ‘migra*’ and two hits refer to the development of the EAC protocol (Uganda DWCP 2007: 5; 18) while five of the seven hits for ‘move*’ in the DWCP also refer to this agreement (ibid: 5; 18; 19).

\[\text{\textsuperscript{46}}\] There are 56 hits for child labour, and ‘eliminating the worst forms of child labour’ is one Uganda’s Decent Work priority areas (Uganda DWCP 2007: 13-16).
intensified [sic], it is expected that about 400,000 IDPs will spontaneously move out of camps’ (ibid: 2).

There were 21 hits for ‘informal economy’ in the Ugandan DWCP. The DWCP notes that the informal sector makes up 26.5 per cent of the economy (Uganda DWCP 2007: 1) – not including the agriculture sector – and is a site of some of the ‘worst forms of child labour’ (ibid: 14). This includes widespread discussion of programmes to combat HIV and AIDS in the informal sector (Uganda DWCP 2007: 7, 16-18). The DWCP also mentions linkages to youth employment, as most of the 390,000 youth who enter employment each year take on informal work (ibid: 6, 9, 11), and the need for improved human resources development and worker safety in this sector (ibid: 21, 13). Informal sector organisations are viewed as key stakeholders in the implementation of the DWCP (ibid: 23).

In terms of the discussion of migration-related work sectors, there are references to domestic work, mining, commercial sex and export-processing zones. The hits for domestic work refer explicitly to child labour in this sector (Uganda DWCP 2007: 6, 13, 14, 16), as does the reference to commercial sex (ibid: 13). Mining is identified as a sector where capacity building is needed to support workers’ rights (ibid: 22) and export-processing zones are viewed as an area where worker training in trade union membership is needed (ibid: 21). There are also hits for ‘casual labour’ and ‘self-employment’. Self-employment is seen as a way to ease youth unemployment (ibid: 8, 11), and the DWCP also notes that self-employment in agriculture is increasing by 11 per cent per year (ibid: 1), while casual work is common among youth (ibid: 9).

The DWCP discusses a number of agriculture-related issues. The agricultural sector is recognised as the largest sector in the country, making up 73 per cent of the overall economy (ibid: 1), employing 65 per cent of the youth who are in involved in work (ibid: 9). The need to increase capacity building and training around workers’ rights in the sector is recognised (Uganda DWCP 2007: iii, 21-23). The DWCP also links commercial agriculture and farm work to child labour (ibid: 6, 14). The DWCP also refers to underemployment in rural areas (ibid: 2, 9) and the need for improved access to rural finance (ibid: 2). Employment programmes that target rural youth (ibid: 11) and the incidence of child labour and child migration out of rural areas are also mentioned (ibid: 13). Local economic development (LED), meanwhile, is referenced in relation to a programme to eliminate child labour and increase social protection (ibid: 16) and with regard to reintegration efforts in the post-conflict context of Northern Uganda (ibid: 9). Urban issues are also discussed, including youth employment in the urban informal economy (ibid: 11). The DWCP notes that there are higher levels of unemployment in urban areas, in comparison to underemployment in the countryside (ibid: 2), while also noting linkages between the informal urban economy and child labour (ibid: 14).
In sum, the Ugandan DWCP does identify the urban-rural and rural-rural movements of children for the purposes of work and issues of internal displacement. However, the policy document fails to address the overall importance of internal mobility in the country. One study notes that migration is common in the country, with Ugandans migrating because of reasons of insecurity, to search for livelihood opportunities, to obtain seasonal water for animals or to seek better services (Black et al. 2004). Migrants often live and work in difficult conditions. In addition to migration from all districts to Kampala, rural-rural migration was also noted from Kalangala, Kapchorwa, Kisoro, Kabarole, and Bushenyi Districts (ibid).

10.2 West Africa

*Côte d’Ivoire*

The DWCP for *Côte d’Ivoire* was the only active DWCP available from West Africa at the time of the review. Until the late 1990s, *Côte d’Ivoire* was one of the more stable economies of West Africa and a major locum for regional migration, receiving significant flows of migrants from Mali, Niger, Burkina Faso and other surrounding countries (de Haas 2007). But since the turn of the century, it has seen an economic and political collapse due to civil war and it is likely that the proportion of foreigners is much smaller now, as many migrants have returned to their native countries and urban residents have moved to rural locations. Especially after the military coups of 1999 and 2002 and the outbreak of the civil war in 2002, increasing xenophobia prompted hundreds of thousands of migrants, predominantly Burkinabè, to flee the country (Black et al. 2004; Drumtra 2003; Kress 2006). Although many migrants did stay, and others initially fled before later returned, *Côte d’Ivoire* ceased to be the focal point of regional migration in West Africa. In fact, there is some evidence to suggest that many West Africans who had previously migrated within the region began to migrate to North Africa and Europe around this period of time (de Haas 2007). More recently, violence following the disputed national election results of November 2010 led to at least 500,000 people being internally displaced in early 2011 (UNHCR 2011).

Historically, internal migration has also been significant in *Côte d’Ivoire*. Internal movements, associated with environmental stress, escalated rapidly in the 1970s. The Baule people are known for migrating from the Central region to the Southwest of the country (Asseypo et al. 1985). There have been conflicts over agricultural land in destination areas. Asseypo et al.’s study also notes a growth in independent migration among girls between the ages of 15 and 19 who migrate from poor families to Abidjan, Bouake or Yamoussokro, where they work as housemaids or sex workers.

Despite this, the Ivorian DWCP has no hits for ‘migra*’, meaning that internal migration, immigration and emigration are all largely ignored by the policy document. However, the DWCP does include two references to ‘IDPs’. It calls for the effective return of internally displaced persons to their original place of residence (*Côte d’Ivoire* DWCP 2008: 6) and
Notes that IDPs are one of the groups most in need of policies of employment creation (ibid: 14). There are also 32 hits for ‘traffick*’, which is discussed in the context of eliminating child labour (there are 52 hits for this topic) and the trade in child workers. In fact, the elimination of child labour and child trafficking constitutes one of the DWCP’s priority areas (Côte d’Ivoire DWCP 2008: 20-22). The policies discussed under this priority area include developing a national plan of action to combat the trafficking of children and the worst forms of child labour, such as an assistance program for victims or at-risk children and the involvement of local communities. The DWCP also calls for the government to pass laws necessary to combat the trafficking of children and the worst forms of child labour (ibid: 21). Work in agriculture is linked to the ‘worst forms of child labour’ and the country’s Ministry of Agriculture is involved in the implementation of the national action plan on child labour, according to the DWCP (ibid: 22).

In sum, there is minimal discussion of migration in Côte d’Ivoire’s DWCP and where it does exist it merely focuses on involuntary migration, with widespread discussion of the need to stamp out child trafficking accompanied by some discussion of IDPs. The DWCP does not seem to consider the fact that migration can act as a livelihood strategy. This apparent uneasiness about the movement of persons – and the desire to resettle IDPs in the places of origin – may be interconnected with the civil strife that has been present in the country in recent years.

10.3 Southern Africa

Lesotho

Existing studies on internal migration in Lesotho suggest that people from the underdeveloped districts in the eastern part of the country migrate to the districts in the northern and western part of the country. Internal migration is age and sex selective, with a majority of migrants being in the 15-29 age group and mostly female (Government of Lesotho 2002). Moreover, Lesotho has a long history of cross-border migration to the mines in South Africa. Although there has been a decline in work opportunities for Basotho men in South African mines, migrant remittances remain Lesotho’s major source of foreign exchange, accounting for 25 per cent of the country’s GDP in 2006. With the decline in employment opportunities for men in the South African gold mines, there has been an increase in female migration, both in terms of cross-border and internal movements, with many women migrating to work in textile manufacturing. The decline in mine work has led to an increase in poverty levels among those who were previously dependent on this work. While return migration has been seen in other Sub-Saharan African countries it is not

Note also that the east of the country is characterized by mountainous topography and harsh winter conditions.
common in Lesotho because of the poor prospects for making a living in rural areas (Crush et al. 2010).

The five hits in the Lesotho DWCP for ‘migra*’ refer directly to both internal migration and cross-border migration into South Africa, as well as to the prevalence of rural-urban migration in the country, acknowledging the types of migration described above. The policy document observes that:

Migration has been the main escape route for the rural population, especially for young people from the clutches of subsistence farming and rural poverty. As employment opportunities diminished in South Africa’s mining industry, the pattern of migration has also changed. Migration has become more internal with people (mostly youth) moving from rural to urban areas in search of better employment opportunities. This new migratory pattern (internal) is now dominated by young women, as opposed to the old pattern (external) which was dominated by young men. This is due to the large textile manufacturing sector in the country which employs almost exclusively females (Lesotho DWCP 2006: 19).

The Lesotho DWCP repeatedly references the historical importance of migration for work in the South African mining sector (ibid: 2). It notes that ‘[i]n 2003, the total number of [Basotho] male miners in South Africa stood at over 61,400 with total estimated remittances of US$5 million’ although changes favouring the employment of South African workers in the mines threaten this important source of income (ibid: 2. The Lesotho DWCP includes mention of the decrease in international remittances from Basotho migrant miners: ‘with the restructuring of the South African mining sector, starting in the late 1980s, the employment of Basotho miners has fallen by more than half. As a result the contribution of remittances from Basotho mineworkers in South Africa has also fallen dramatically, from 40% of GDP in 1992 to 30% in 2000’ (Lesotho DWCP 2006: 19).

Additionally, there are 36 hits for ‘textile’, linked to the country’s textile export industry, which (as mentioned above) the DWCP identifies as a key employer of female internal migrants. This discussion highlights the importance of the sector to the country’s Decent Work context. Textiles were Lesotho’s most important export at the time of the DWCP, although the sector is struggling to keep pace with competitors in the global market, most notably China (ibid: 10). The DWCP mentions the need to identify new textile product lines, to provide social protection for workers laid off in the wake of shifts in global demand and to diversify the country’s export products to reduce its reliance on the textile sector.

There are also a handful of references to other migration-related sectors, including ‘child labour’, ‘self-employment’ and the ‘informal economy’. The DWCP notes that a sub-regional programme to eliminate child labour is being implemented in Lesotho (Lesotho DWCP 2006: 6), while self-employment is seen as being a valuable alternative form of employment for women and youth in particular (ibid: 16). Meanwhile, the informal economy is mentioned with regard to youth employment in rural areas (ibid: 19) and the need to develop social security in this sector (ibid: 12). There are also references to ‘mining’ and ‘construction’. The references to mining all refer to Basotho migrant workers in South Africa’s mining industry.
(ibid: 2, 10, 15, 19), while the reference to construction mentions the need to implement improved safety standards in this sector (ibid: 7).

The discussion surrounding rural-urban and agriculture search terms provides some additional context as to why rural areas are experiencing out-migration, as this sector is lagging behind in terms of employment and education. The DWCP notes that 70 per cent of Basotho live in rural areas and rely on subsistence agriculture to make a living (Lesotho DWCP 2006: 2). Inhabitants of rural Basotho are on average less educated than their urban counterparts. The DWCP notes that poverty is associated with subsistence farming and the need to improve food security (ibid: 2, 3, 19). Furthermore, ‘local economic development’ is discussed as a means to improve employment options in both rural and urban areas, particularly for women (ibid: 15, 17). The DWCP claims, hence, that there is a need to embark on a comprehensive employment programme in both rural and urban areas (ibid: 9, 15, 16, 23, 24).

In conclusion, although the discussion of migration in Lesotho’s DWCP is relatively limited, its policy document does actually explore how internal and cross-border migration trends are affecting the country’s Decent Work context, unlike many of its Sub-Saharan African counterparts. Because this link is made, it is possible to locate internal migration within the DWCP’s larger discussions on the need to improve working conditions in the textile export industry and to promote rural development.

Zambia

Zambia has a long history of men migrating for work, for example in large agricultural estates and mines in the Copperbelt Province (Potts 2005). In colonial Zambia, workers migrated to the mines in Zimbabwe, Tanzania and South Africa, with more than 50,000 such migrants working in mines outside the country in 1930. The copper mines of Zambia also imported migrant workers from Zimbabwe and Malawi. Up to the present day Zambia’s economy is heavily dependent on mining copper, cobalt, zinc, silver and gold. Mining constituted 9.1 per cent of GDP in 2006. However, the fall of international copper prices negatively affected the industry and consequently formal employment in mines has fallen.

While migration to the mines has decreased, other mobile groups have emerged, including truck drivers, sex workers, fisherfolk and fish traders, seasonal agricultural workers, cross-border traders (especially young women), uniformed services personnel, prisoners and refugees. There is also a precedent of food crises in the country resulting in population movements (IOM 2006: 7). Zambia has a long history of men migrating internally to work in large agricultural estates in the rural Lusaka Province and sugar estates in the Southern Province. Due to the poor working and living conditions, men typically leave their families behind. Field research in the Southern Province shows that labour migration is an important coping strategy when drought occurs (Ito 2010). At the same time, urban poverty in some locations has resulted in reverse migration from cities to rural areas. The viability and desirability of this as a livelihoods strategy is uncertain but depends critically on the viability
of rural production and access to productive resources (Crush and Peberdy 2005). In terms of international migration, Zambia has a low level of emigration by regional standards, although this type of migration is skewed towards the skilled and away from the unskilled (Amin and Mattoo 2007: 1).

Given this backdrop, the discussion of migration in the Zambia DWCP is inadequate as there are a mere two hits for ‘migra*’. Migration is linked to child labour, with the DWCP stating that additional resources are needed ‘[t]o explore connections between child labour, forced labour, trafficking and migration’ (Zambia DWCP 2007: 22). For migration-related terms, there are three hits for ‘traffick*’, which are also linked to child labour concerns (ibid: 7, 21, 22). In this vein, the DWCP mentions an EU-funded study that is investigating child trafficking in the country (ibid: 7).

These linkages between migration and children trafficking underline a larger preoccupation with the issue of child labour in the DWCP. There are 69 hits for ‘child labour’, and the ‘[e]limination of child labour in its worst forms’ is one of the DWCP’s priority areas (ibid: 20-22). The DWCP aims to combat child trafficking by increasing awareness about the issue and mainstreaming child labour concerns into national projects (ibid: 21). Children’s involvement in work is highly prevalent in Zambia, according to evidence available from other sources. The country’s 2005 Labour Force Survey estimates that 47 per cent of children aged 7 to 14 (over 1.2 million children in absolute terms) were economically active. Agricultural work, domestic labour, commercial sex, mining and quarrying work, and work in the urban informal sector constitute the worst forms of child labour in Zambia. The main causes of child labour include poverty, lack of coping mechanisms with respect to food security, vulnerability to economic shocks, lack of basic social services such as quality education, limited social protection, stressed traditional safety nets (e.g. extended family), HIV and AIDS and cultural and gender practices (ILO 2010).

There are several references to migration-related work sectors but – as in most DWCPs for Sub-Saharan Africa – the discussion does not refer explicitly to migration. There are 30 hits for ‘informal economy’, which is relevant given the fact that a majority of poor labour migrants in developing countries work in the informal sector. Eighty per cent of Zambians work in the informal sector (Zambia DWCP 2007: 10) and the DWCP sees bringing informal enterprises into the formal economy as key to improving worker rights (ibid: 17, 18). Extending HIV and AIDS prevention to the informal economy is widely discussed (Zambia DWCP 2007: 7, 10, 11, 19, 20), as is the lack of social protection in this sector (ibid: 11, 12, 15). There is also reference to the high incidence of child labour in the informal economy in both urban and rural areas (ibid: 10), and in response to this the DWCP suggests apprenticeships and self-employment training for children and youth (ibid: 22, 26).

Additionally, there are references to forced labour, self-employment, casual labour, mining and domestic work. The references to forced labour are linked to Zambia’s ratification of
ILO’s conventions on forced labour (Zambia DWCP 2007: 8, 21, 23) and to child labour and trafficking (ibid: 22). Self-employment is seen as a key to increasing employment access for women and youth (ibid: 17, 18). Casual work in the country is said to be increasing, making it more difficult to ensure Decent Work standards (ibid: 11). The need to extend HIV and AIDS prevention to the mining sector is also mentioned (ibid: 19, 27), along with plans to improve investment in the mining sector (ibid: 12). Domestic work is included in the DWCP, in the context of eliminating child labour in this sector (ibid: 25).

In terms of FAO priority areas and their potential bearing on the discussion of migration in Zambia’s DWCP, the most significant area of discussion is agriculture, including mention of the Comagri project, which sought to eliminate child labour on commercial farms (Zambia DWCP 2007: 25). Additional hits refer to agriculture-related ILO conventions ratified by Zambia, HIV prevention in the sector (ibid: 27), increasing trade union membership and investment in this employment area (ibid: 10, 12). Discussion of rural areas includes mention of child labour in the rural informal economy (ibid: 10), the need to introduce small and medium enterprises (SME) in rural areas (ibid: 26) and the country’s ratification of ILO’s rural worker convention (ibid: 24). Local economic development is discussed in the context of decreasing risks to target groups, especially women and youth, in both rural and urban areas (ibid: 13, 17, 18). Urban issues discussed in the DWCP include child labour in the urban informal economy (ibid: 10), small and medium enterprise development in urban areas (ibid: 26), and the need to link feeder roads to urban areas (ibid).

11. Conclusion: Policy implications related to internal migration and rural employment in DWCPs

The preceding review of DWCPs shows that the vast majority of these policy documents discuss internal migration in a limited way, with most countries taking a negative view on this type of migration – if indeed their DWCPs mention it at all. Moreover, the overall discussion of migration in DWCPs varies widely, with some countries discussing the rights of international labour migrants in a substantive way, while others apparently consider human mobility to bear little relevance to their Decent Work concerns.

Given the paucity of discussion of internal migration, we identify seven key areas for FAO to work with ILO within the DWCP framework in order to mainstream consideration of internal migration – and the rural-urban links it can foster – into the implementation of DWCPs in rural areas. ILO has the lead role on labour migration, but FAO has a comparative advantage in promoting employment and Decent Work with respect to agriculture and rural development, and therefore an important complementary role to play in mainstreaming internal migration into DWCPs’ implementation, as well as agricultural and rural policies, programmes and strategies, jointly with ILO.
First, in countries with significant levels of internal migration, there is a need to assess current evidence on the working conditions of internal migrants and incorporate their specific vulnerabilities into the DWCPs. Previous research shows that internal migrants from rural areas are often employed in informal or unregulated sectors, where they may be exposed to exploitative or dangerous working conditions. In many developing countries, sectors that fall into this category include mining, commercial agriculture, domestic work and manufacturing, including export industries such as the ready-made garment industry. There is a need for advocacy among governments in order to raise awareness about the implications of failing to address these issues which are a vulnerability to poverty, indebtedness and loss of assets due to underpayment; the risk of ill health due to working in risky and dangerous conditions and the absence of social security and insurance against all of these risks. It is also necessary to assess the working and living conditions of migrants in such sectors and to develop strategies for enforcing Decent Work standards and labour laws in these areas.

Second, following on from the above point, there is a need to identify and fill existing knowledge gaps on internal migration. We suggest that at the country level, ILO, FAO and other international development institutions work in close collaboration with migration researchers and civil society organisations to map categories of migrant workers and to identify specific migration streams so that Decent Work plans and programmes can be geared towards them. This could include:

Developing migration maps for the country showing major regions of origin and destination, especially for seasonal and circular migrants, as there are currently no comprehensive data on this.

Developing a more detailed understanding of the types of informal sector jobs that poor rural-urban migrants commonly take on, using variables such as class or land-holding status, gender and education in order to develop a typology.

Developing a capacity needs assessment of national stakeholders, including producers’ organisations and workers associations in the informal sector. There is a need to involve a wider range of actors in consultation processes to include rural and agricultural actors, as well as ensuring the representation of internal migrants.

Based on the above, identifying specific areas where international development partners can work together based on their respective comparative advantages to promote Decent Work in agriculture and rural areas. In particular, international organisations such as ILO and FAO can join forces at country level to support government capacity and structures for collecting and analysing rural labour migration data, disaggregated by sex and age, as well as the flows of remittances and their use in rural areas.
Third, there is a need to engage with rural communities where there are high rates of rural out-migration. In these situations, working with migrants’ networks to foster their organisation into groups or organisations can be useful to disseminate information about labour rights and working conditions. In particular, there is the potential to develop targeted programmes that provide support to rural-rural migrants who are working in the agriculture sector at their destinations, ensuring that they have access to basic social protection and rights at work. There is a need to stimulate the political will needed to better protect farm workers who tend to have a weak political voice. It is also necessary to foster the linkages between migrants and their areas of origin, in view of favouring investments in productive activities. FAO, along with other international organisations, could support participatory research, involving local communities and migrant associations, and support the participation of migrants and their associations in relevant processes for defining agricultural and rural development policies, programmes and strategies.

Fourth, there is a need to develop policies that support the positive role that internal migration can play in rural livelihoods. Available evidence suggests that, in some cases, households in developing countries in Sub-Saharan Africa and Asia keep a foothold in rural communities while some family members migrate for work elsewhere. These can be mutually reinforcing strategies, as for example smallholder agriculture may provide a rural ‘safety net’ for family members who migrate for work, while this migration may in some cases produce capital that can lead to investment in family agricultural plots. One way that FAO can build upon such rural-urban linkages is by working in collaboration with ILO, IOM, IFAD, World Bank and other partners, to create programmes which support rural migrants. For example, there is a need for mechanisms that facilitate socio-professional integration of returned migrants in rural areas with information on job opportunities, access to finance, training and business development services to support the start-up of agro-entrepreneurial activities.

Fifth, migrant children in agriculture represent one of the most vulnerable categories of migrants. The study has found that several countries acknowledge the need for tackling child labour in agriculture, especially its most hazardous forms. Concerning children left behind in rural areas, while remittances may provide additional resources to the household, children may suffer from the separation from their parents and may also be required to take on family or working responsibilities. The issue of child labour is highly complex and needs to be understood holistically before offering standard solutions. Past efforts to eliminate

---

Overall, the evidence on whether migration has a positive effect on agriculture is mixed. While some studies suggest that remittances, particularly from international migration, may be invested into farming operations back home (de Haan 2005; Taylor et al. 1996), in other instances migration seems to facilitate a transition away from agriculture towards off-farm employment (Davis et al. 2010). More research is needed into the factors that mediate migration’s impact on agriculture in different locations and contexts.
child migration for work without providing support for child migrants and their families have for the most part proven unsuccessful (Migration DRC 2008). There is therefore a need for collaboration between different stakeholders (including producers’ organisations, workers’ organisations and migrant communities) to understand why child migration is occurring and what can be done about it. National governments and stakeholders could then translate these findings into policy interventions based on an approach that includes data-gathering, analysis and identification of good practices and lessons learnt. Considering the existence of the Working Group on Children on the Move\textsuperscript{49}, more work on migrant children in agriculture could be explored. Since its launch in 2007, the International Partnership for Cooperation on Child Labour in Agriculture\textsuperscript{50} has brought together stakeholders from labour and agriculture organisations to find solutions to child labour in agriculture.

Sixth, there is a need to focus on issues of youth migration and employment, as youth are a highly mobile group in many countries that have prepared DWCPs. Youth employment constitutes an important area for policy action in Sub-Saharan Africa, in particular, as projected population growth in this region over the coming decades will increase the proportion of young workers in the overall workforce. In most of Sub-Saharan Africa, two-thirds or more of the population is under the age of 30 and with the current fertility rate of 2.2 a youth bulge is likely in the near future.\textsuperscript{51} There are indications of changing aspirations of rural youth in many developing countries, and this in turn has important implications for the future of agriculture, and for the future of rural economies in general. Youth migration can contribute to rural-urban linkages, as families adopt risk aversion strategies by maintaining rural assets while young people migrate for work elsewhere (Tacoli and Mabala 2010). In this context, there is a need to enable youth to make better informed decisions about migration; to ensure that they are provided with skills and information on job opportunities; and to support them in joining organisations or creating their own organisations; and be given the capacity for having voice and representation.

\textsuperscript{49}ILO, UNHCR, UNICEF, IOM, UN Special rapporteurs, Save the Children UK and Sweden, Plan International, WVI, Terre des Hommes, Global Movement for Children, Oak Foundation.

\textsuperscript{50}The International Partnership For Cooperation On Child Labour In Agriculture includes: International Labour Organization (ILO); Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO); International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD); International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI); of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR); (formerly) International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP); International Union of Food; and Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers’ Associations (IUF). For more information: www.fao-il.org/fao-il-child/international-partnership-for-cooperation-on-child-labour-in-agriculture/en/

\textsuperscript{51}www.unfpa.org/worldwide/africa.html
Seventh, the changing gender roles linked to migration are a potentially important aspect of FAO’s work on the implementation of DWCPs, as these are often linked to issues of gender inequality, especially in agriculture and rural areas (FAO 2011b; FAO et al. 2010). More women are migrating independently as new opportunities open up for them in export industry, domestic work and other occupations where there are often gender-specific hiring practices. It is important that key gender aspects of migration are identified and accounted for in the implementation of DWCPs in rural areas, as these have important implications for rural labour markets. These flows can have important repercussions for rural social relations and may create temporary or permanent gender imbalances in sending communities. Policies should consider how rural households respond to migration of family members and re-allocate the division of labour and how this affects gender-specific work burdens. Gender aspects of remittances in this process need to be considered as well so that these resources support a pathway out of poverty for both male and female recipients. Further, migrant groups and social networks can contribute to address gender inequalities in communities of origin. Policies could create opportunities for female returnees to obtain employment and/or start-up entrepreneurial activities, while also paying attention to mobility constraints faced by rural women who face difficulties in access to markets and to better paid jobs. Both men and women have to be informed about their labour rights and be supported in getting access to or creating their own organisations and social services (including training, health and social benefits, such as child care and maternity leave).

In conclusion, it is important to highlight the scope for international development institutions to partner and develop comprehensive programmes to address these issues, enabling synergy and policy coherence, and to promote a supportive approach to internal migration, ensuring access to Decent Work by internal migrants and leveraging the positive impacts of migration and mobility to reduce poverty, especially in rural areas. By addressing the above key areas, migration from and within rural areas will contribute to sustaining stronger links between rural and urban areas in favour of food security and poverty reduction. The international development community, especially FAO and ILO, but also the World Bank, IFAD, IOM and other key partners, could work in collaboration to address these issues by considering their areas of comparative advantage. Such a multi-faceted effort would help to generate more momentum for the extension of Decent Work in the rural areas and among internal migrants.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Search terms used in the review

migra* (migration, migrant, etc.)
move* (migration-related terms)
temporary
seasonal
circula*
commut*
mobil*
return*
forced (migration)
displace*
distress
IDPs
refugee
traffick*
remit*
transfer*
child labo* (migration-related work/sectors)
contract labo*
wage labo*
self employment
casual labo*
forced labo*
landless
informal
formal
non formal (education/training)
mining
garment
textile
export
construction
domestic*
street vend*/hawk*
rural (rural-urban linkages; FAO priority areas)
urban
multi-sectoral
agri*
non-agri*
farm
non-farm
forest*
fish*
livestock

Appendix 2: Number of hits by country for ‘migra*’ and other groups of search terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year published</th>
<th>Migra* hits</th>
<th>Migra-related terms</th>
<th>Migra-related work/sectors</th>
<th>Rural-urban links; agri* hits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average 2008</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average 2009</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average 2010</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Types of migration discussion in all DWCPs
(NB: 1 = part of category; 0 = is not part of category)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Interna l Migra* (rural-urban, etc)</th>
<th>Emigration/return</th>
<th>Immigration</th>
<th>No discussion of migra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td>Column 3</td>
<td>Column 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asia Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia CIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4: Hits for all search terms in Sub-Saharan African DWCPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Term</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Tanzania</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
<th>Zambia</th>
<th>Lesotho</th>
<th>Côte d'Ivoire</th>
<th>Total hits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>migra*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child labo*</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>informal (econ.)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agri*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traffick*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-employ*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>move*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>domestic</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local economic development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fish*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forced labo*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diversif*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>casual labo*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multi-sectoral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDPs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remit*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>street vend*/hawk*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex work*/commercial sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forest*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displace</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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