



International
Labour
Organization

Compendium of good practices on addressing child labour in agriculture

**International
Programme on
the Elimination
of Child Labour
(IPEC)**

Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (FPRW) Branch

Governance and Tripartism Department

Copyright © International Labour Organization 2014
First published 2014

Publications of the International Labour Office enjoy copyright under Protocol 2 of the Universal Copyright Convention. Nevertheless, short excerpts from them may be reproduced without authorization, on condition that the source is indicated. For rights of reproduction or translation, application should be made to ILO Publications (Rights and Permissions), International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland, or by email: pubdroit@ilo.org. The International Labour Office welcomes such applications.

Libraries, institutions and other users registered with reproduction rights organizations may make copies in accordance with the licences issued to them for this purpose. Visit www.ifrro.org to find the reproduction rights organization in your country.

IPEC *Compendium of Good Practices* / International Labour Office, International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) - Geneva: ILO, 2014.

ISBN: 978-92-2-128865-7 (print); 978-92-2-128866-4 (web pdf)

International Labour Office; ILO International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour

ILO Cataloguing in Publication Data

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This publication was elaborated under the ILO-IPEC Project “Cooperation to Address the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Agriculture: Support to the International Agricultural Partnership” and coordinated by Paola Termine from IPEC Geneva Office.

Funding for this ILO publication was provided by the United States Department of Labour (Project GLO/09/58/USA).

This publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the United States Department of Labour, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the United States Government.

The designations employed in ILO publications, which are in conformity with United Nations practice, and the presentation of material therein do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the International Labour Office concerning the legal status of any country, area or territory or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers.

The responsibility for opinions expressed in signed articles, studies and other contributions rests solely with their authors, and publication does not constitute an endorsement by the International Labour Office of the opinions expressed in them.

Reference to names of firms and commercial products and processes does not imply their endorsement by the International Labour Office, and any failure to mention a particular firm, commercial product or process is not a sign of disapproval.

ILO publications and electronic products can be obtained through major booksellers or ILO local offices in many countries, or direct from ILO Publications, International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland. Catalogues or lists of new publications are available free of charge from the above address, or by email: pubvente@ilo.org or visit our website: www.ilo.org/publns.

Visit our website: www.ilo.org/ipec

Available in PDF version only.
Photocomposed by

IPEC Geneva

Table of contents

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 2. BRAZIL: Good practices on protecting children and youth in rural areas by promoting social dialogue with youth members of trade unions | 3 |
| 3. DOMINICAN REPUBLIC: Good practices on diversifying family incomes through greenhouses to tackle child labour in the coffee production..... | 11 |
| 4. DOMINICAN REPUBLIC: Good practices on social dialogue to prevent and progressively eliminate child labour in the tomato sector | 19 |
| 5. INDONESIA: Good practices on addressing hazardous work of children in Jermal fishing..... | 27 |
| 6. PHILIPPINES: The WIND towards safety: reducing occupational safety and health (OSH) hazards in family farming..... | 37 |
| 7. TANZANIA: Labour saving technologies and corporate social responsibility in tobacco production..... | 47 |
| 8. THAILAND: Owning up to safe work: how employers learned the value in protecting young employees | 57 |
| 9. NICARAGUA: Good practices on education and social dialogue for the prevention of Child Labour among seasonal coffee plantation workers | 65 |

Annexes

| | |
|--|----|
| Annex 1. List of tasks, hazards and critical factors..... | 72 |
| Annex 2. Format to identify and document good practices on child labour in agriculture (English) | 74 |

1. Introduction

This compendium of good practices is based on the analysis undertaken during the implementation of the “Cooperation to Address the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Agriculture” (2009-2013) project of the International Labour Organization, within the framework of the International programme to eliminate child labour (IPEC) and with financial support of the United States Department of Labour (USDOL). The analysis follows the “Format to identify and document good practices on child labour in agriculture” developed by ILO-IPEC and based on: *Guidelines on Good Practices: Identification, Review, Structuring, Dissemination and Application* (Version 2), ILO, Geneva, 2001; *Guide to produce succinct description of a Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development (SARD) Good Practice*, FAO, Rome, 2006; and *Good practices for capacity development; Revised template for case studies*, FAO, Rome.

The good practices have been collected from on-going, or recently closed, worldwide ILO/IPEC projects in Brazil, Cambodia, Dominican Republic, Indonesia, Nicaragua, Philippines, Tanzania and Thailand. These good practices show some examples of how to address child labour in agriculture from different angles, through income generating activities to labour saving technologies, social dialogue, and occupational safety and health.

Preventing and eliminating child labour requires a multi-sectoral approach: therefore readers will find data on agriculture, employment, and relevant legislations for each country analyzed. The compendium also includes specific country-profiles on child labour in agriculture, providing child labour data and list of hazards as a general background of good practices. These good practices may be adapted, replicated and possibly scaled-up in other countries in order to prevent, reduce and eventually eliminate child labour.

2. BRAZIL: Protecting children and youth in rural areas by promoting social dialogue with youth members of trade unions

Keywords

Social dialogue, awareness-raising, youth, vocational training.

Abstract

The interventions under the ILO-IPEC Project '*Protection of children and youth in rural areas*' aimed to address the lack of integration of child labour issues in the area of family farming and in particular to promote social dialogue and awareness on child labour in agriculture among affiliates of the CONTAG (National confederation of agricultural workers) at national level. The specific objective is strengthening the protection of children and young rural workers in the Movimento Sindical de Trabalhadores e Trabalhadoras Rurais (MSTTR – Rural Trade Unions Movement) with a focus on prevention and eradication of child labour, particularly its worst forms, through a participatory process of mobilization and training with family farmers.

Context: Information on the Area of Implementation

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Brazil |
| Province, District, Village | National |
| Population under the poverty line (% total population) | 21.4% ¹ |
| Agricultural land (% of total land area) and other key natural resources ² | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land area (1000 ha): 6,271 - Arable land (1000 ha): 1,250 - Permanent crops (1000 ha): 950 - Pastures (1000 ha): 440 - Irrigated land (1000 ha): 570 <p>Share in total water use by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - agriculture: 95.2% - industry: 2.5% - domestic: 2.4% - Forest area (1000 ha): 1,860 |
| Main agricultural products, including from farming, fisheries, livestock, forestry | <p>According to FAOSTAT, the five major commodities in the country are:³</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indigenous Cattle Meat 25,684,413 - Sugar cane 21,882,413 - Soybeans 15,490,734 - Indigenous Chicken Meat 14,197,065 - Cow milk, whole, fresh 8,993,846 |
| Employment in agriculture, including | 17.4% of total employment is in agriculture |

¹ Figures from United Nations Statistics Division, World Bank and CIA, 2009:

<http://data.un.org/Data.aspx?d=MDG&f=seriesRowID%3A581;>

[https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/fields/2046.html.](https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/fields/2046.html)

² FAO Quick country facts, as of September 2011.

³ International commodity prices are used in the ranking of commodities and countries. They are applied in order to avoid the use of exchange rates for obtaining continental and world aggregates, and also to improve and facilitate international comparative analysis of productivity at the national level. Source: <http://faostat.fao.org/site/339/default.aspx>.

Context: Information on the Area of Implementation

farming, forestry, fisheries and livestock (% of total employment) by subsector if available

National legislation on child labour in agriculture (including minimum age, hazardous work list, minimum age for light work, age for compulsory education and on labour inspection in agriculture)

The 1988 Federal Constitution, which provided the legal basis for the creation and adoption of the Statute of the Child and Adolescent, stipulates that the minimum age for admission to employment is 16. Work between 14 and 16 years is permitted only under the system of apprenticeship. Under the age of 18, work that is dangerous, unhealthy, hazardous, nocturnal or harmful to the individual's physical, mental, moral or social development is prohibited (Article 7; paragraph XXXIII, as amended by Constitutional Amendment No. 20).

Statute of the Child and Adolescent (*Estatuto da Criança e do Adolescente*, No. 8069/1990), focuses on ensuring the rights of children and adolescents

Apprenticeship Law, regulated by Decree No. 5.598/2005, amended the Brazilian Consolidation of Labour Laws (*Consolidação das Leis Trabalhista*, No. 10.097/2000). It requires all medium and large sized enterprises to hire a number of teenagers and young adults between 14 and 24 years of age as apprentices, which should be equivalent to a minimum of 5 % and a maximum of 15% of the staff whose duties require professional training. The young apprentice must simultaneously work, receive training, attend school (if primary education has not been completed), and be enrolled in and attend a vocational education institution that has a collaboration agreement with the enterprise.

Decree No. 6481/2008: 1) regulates Article 3, paragraph "d", and Article 4 of the ILO Convention no. 182 concerning the **Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour**, 2) approves the **List of the Worst Forms of Child Labour** (TIP List), with 93 items and prohibits the employment of individuals younger than 18 years of age in the activities described therein; and 3) provides that the **List of the Worst Forms of Child Labour shall be periodically examined** and, if necessary, revised in consultation with the relevant employers organizations and trade unions, being the responsibility of the Ministry of Labour and Employment to organize the applicable examination and consultation processes.

Trafficking in Persons Law, especially Women and Children (also referred to as the Trafficking Protocol), ratified in 2004.⁴

⁴ More information are available at:

http://www.oit.org.br/sites/default/files/topic/labour_inspection/pub/child_labour_inspection_281.pdf

Context: Information on the Area of Implementation

Labor trafficking is criminalized pursuant to Section 149 of the penal code, which prohibits "trabalho escravo", or reducing a person to a condition analogous to slavery, including by forcing a person to work or by subjecting a person to exhausting work days or degrading working conditions.

In Brazil it is mandatory for children to go to school from age 6 to 14

Characterization of Child Labour in Agriculture

| | |
|--|--|
| Number of child labourers in agriculture and percent (%) of total child labour (by subsector or crop, if available) | At national level, 4,3 millions of children between 5 and 17 years are found in the labour market. 34,6% are found in agriculture, mostly undertaking hazardous activities ⁵ |
| Percent of child labourers in agriculture that are aged 5-14 and percent that are aged 15-17. | 60.6% of children between 5 and 13 years old 36.3% of children between 14 and 15 years old 24.3% of children between 16 and 17 years old ⁶ |
| Percent of child labourers in agriculture that are girls and percent that are boys | 59,8% boys 42,8% girls ⁷ |
| Percent of girl child labourers working in agriculture and percent of boy child labourers working in agriculture | N/A |
| Typical hours spent by boys and girls in agriculture and tasks undertaken <i>(for a comprehensive list of Tasks see Annex1)</i> | Hours: 60% of children work until 20 hours/week in agriculture; 20% of children work more than 40 hours/week in agriculture ⁸ Tasks: planting, harvesting, carrying heavy loading goods, preparing and cleaning the land for the next harvest. ⁹ |
| Main hazards faced by these children <i>(for a comprehensive list of Hazards see Annex1)</i> | Exposure to sunlight, heat, humidity and rain. Insect bites and poisonous animals. Manual lifting and carrying of excessive weight, maintenance of awkward postures and repetitive movements. Exposure to pesticides and to accidents provoked by use of sharp tools. Long days in the field. |
| Describe the specific causes of child labour in agriculture in the area | Poverty and widespread acceptance among family farmers of children's participation in economic activities as a traditional practice which contributes to inter-generational transfer of agricultural skills. Parents lack information on risks and hazards associated with agricultural tasks, and their implication on child's development. |

⁵ Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística, 2009

⁶ These data refer to child labour in agriculture as percentage of total child labour by age group. Source: Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística (IBGE), 2008.

⁷ O trabalho infantil no ramo agrícola brasileiro, ILO 2004.

⁸ Pesquisa Nacional por Amostra de Domicílios (PNAD), 2001.

⁹ <http://sistemasiti.mte.gov.br/riscos.aspx>.

| Good Practice | |
|---|---|
| Time frame | 8 th April 2007 30 th June 2008 |
| Specific objective | Promoting social dialogue and awareness on child labour in agriculture among CONTAG's affiliates at national level. |
| Why was the practice implemented? | Follow-up to a previous good practice to eliminate child labour in agriculture For further details visit : http://www.ilo.org/public//english/standards/ipecc/publ/policy/papers/africa/annex.htm |
| Partners involved | Rural trade unions' federations |
| Agricultural subsector addressed by the practice (farming, fisheries and/or aquaculture, forestry, livestock) | The practice mainly covers crop production in family farming. In particular, it addressed: processing of sisal, harvesting of fruits (including orange, coconut, mango, papaya, pineapple, and cotton), cereals and horticulture, cutting of sugar cane, and extraction of timber. |
| Specific issues addressed: | Education – vocational training Social dialogue with trade unions' affiliates |
| Description of the approach followed (including specific steps and activities carried out) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prevention of child labour through the involvement of children and youth in the following programmes: Jovem Saber - a capacity building/apprenticeship programme based on different modules focusing on: sustainable rural development and citizenship, land reform and family agriculture, organization of production, trade unions and management, methodology of community work and reproductive health. Training tools (booklets) and tests were periodically used to monitor the learning process by working groups constituted in almost all states in the country. Consórcio Social - based on non-formal education through the process of distance learning and face-to-face vocational training on: poultry and goat rearing, fruits-natives-ornamentals seeds production, fruit processing - for family agro-business, beekeeping, processing and marketing of flowers and ornamental plants and horticulture. - Awareness raising and mobilization of CONTAG's members, through events, workshops and media (including newspapers, radio programmes and spots) showing messages on child labour. - Launch of a national campaign on 'Protection of children and youth in agriculture: a harvest for the future'. - Mainstreaming of rights of children and youth and mobilization for the inclusion of the issue in public policies.¹⁰ - Conduction of a research on the participation of children and youth in family farms, disaggregated by sex/race and |

¹⁰ Organization of a National workshop on public policies for protecting children and youth in agriculture.

Good Practice

ethnicity

- Capacity building and training activities on protection of children and youth involving 350 leaders of trade unions.
- Strengthening of the debate on children and youth protection, through the creation of a working group (including representatives from CONTAG and national institutions – youth, gender, agriculture, and social policy) responsible for the implementation of the activities.
- Monitoring of school attendance by children and youth beneficiaries of the action programme, through sistema Mercury.¹¹

Demonstrated Impact

Indirect beneficiaries – number and categories

Children and youth involved as members of family farmers and agricultural workers in 14 states.

Direct beneficiaries – number and categories

27,981 children and youth prevented from child labour and included in the programmes *Jovem Saber* and *Consórcio Social*.

4,811 children monitored and recorded data through sistema Mercury.

11 classes with 3,704 study groups.

What was the impact of the practice in reducing child labour in agriculture? Can the impact of the practice be documented in some way, through a formal programme evaluation, impact assessment or other means?

- Prevention of 23,981 children from child labour
- Better understanding and knowledge of child labour's issues at community and national level
- Changing of attitudes of farmers, communities and trade unions towards the issue of protecting children and adults in agriculture. Breaking down of resistances and starting of the debate on child labour in family farms.

Improvements in beneficiary livelihood derived from the practice

The programme *Jovem Saber*¹² contributed to: a) increased technical knowledge on vocational training and unions' policy for youth¹³ members of trade unions through distance learning; b) empowerment of youth living in rural areas through micro-regional, regional and national meetings, development of events and targeted projects.

The programme *Consórcio Social* contributed to train (workshop - school) young people to develop an individual or collective income-generating activity that they will start-up when completing the training.

Is the practice and/or its benefits likely to continue in some way, and to continue being effective, over the medium to long term? Is the practice still used?

- The CONTAG is following up the activities with its own financial and human resources. The focus of the research has been defined, and two questionnaires have been developed, one addressing parents and /or guardians and the other children and youth. 33,940 questionnaires will be

¹¹ Sistema Mercury is a system developed by IPEC Brazil to monitor the beneficiaries of Action Programmes.

¹² For additional information visit <http://www.contag.org.br/sistemas/jovemsaber/#>.

¹³ Between 16 and 32 years old.

Demonstrated Impact

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>submitted by young people involved in Programa Jovem Saber.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Another strategy adopted to make the practice sustainable is the inclusion of messages about the prevention and eradication of child labour in the MSTTR media and the commitment of CONTAG to mainstream it among its members. - The ongoing training process on protection of children and youth in agriculture is also very important to make more families aware of children rights and responsible for ensuring their implementation.. |
| <p>Does the practice contribute to environmental sustainability and ecological soundness, and how?</p> | <p>N/A</p> |
| <p>Does the practice promote human rights (state which ones) and comply with ILO labour standards?</p> | <p>The practice promote the right to join a trade union, which is mentioned in article 23, subsection 4 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and also stated in article 20. The practice also complies with the following International Human Rights and Labour Standards related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Child labour/child protection - Vocational guidance and training - Employment promotion |
| <p>Does the practice contribute to social dialogue (between government, workers' and employers' organization) and collective bargaining negotiations?</p> | <p>Yes, the practice promote social dialogue and involve trade unions in the elimination of child labour in agriculture, in partnership with governemental institutions.</p> |
| <p>Which were the problems and challenges (risks and obstacles) faced within the process?</p> | <p>Young people need to get support through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - funding for projects through public and private rural credit, such as the National Programme for the Strengthening of Family Agriculture (PRONAF)-Youth, the main programme in support of young people. - access to land, for example through the programme "Our First Land". <p>Resistances to discuss about protection of children and youth in family farms hindered part of the process. Time devoted to the research was not sufficient. The group of researcher conducting the interviews should have been selected within the same rural community and sensitized on the issue.</p> |
| <p>Lessons learned</p> | <p>Although there is still resistance to discuss children/youth protection's issues, awareness raising and social mobilization become more effective when they address the issue of child labour, showing its consequences on physical, mental and social development of children and youth. After all, fathers and mothers, with few exceptions, are concerned with the welfare of their children, but in many cases they are not aware of the risks associated with child labour. Organizing awareness</p> |

| Demonstrated Impact | |
|--|---|
| | raising campaigns and workshops in a playful and interactive manner is also very important to facilitate better understanding of child labour issues. |
| Quotes from direct beneficiaries of the practice | N/A |

| Replicability | |
|---|---|
| Is this a practice that might have applicability in some way to other situations or settings? What are the elements that make the practice replicable? | Good will and commitment of trade unions's affiliates are keys to replicate the practice and transfer the message of the importance to prevent and eliminate child labour. In fact, members of trade unions who were involved in the awareness raising activities agreed that their organizations would be responsible for mainstreaming this issue in the trade unions' agenda. Trade unions' federations have included the issue in their workplans and mainstreamed it among unions. |
| Key political, economic, demographic or cultural dynamics that favoured or impeded the transformation process | The strong commitment and capacity of the trade unions. |
| Critical success factors for development/replication of the good practice (<i>for a comprehensive list of Critical factors see Annex1</i>) | Ownership and consensus Early involvement of national actors Medium to long-term time horizon |
| Resources and inputs needed to implement the practice, including physical (e.g. land, fertilizers, seeds), labour, financial and monetary inputs, and management capacity | The strong commitment and capacity of the trade unions. Financial support from ILO Project |

| General Information | |
|---|---|
| Organization / Institution promoting the practice | ILO-IPEC |
| Programme / Project | Protection of children and youth in rural areas |
| Overall objective | Strengthening the protection of children and young rural workers in the <i>Movimento sindical de trabalhadores e trabalhadoras rurais (MSTTR – rural trade unions movement)</i> with a focus on prevention and eradication of child labour, particularly its worst forms, through a participatory process of mobilization and training with family farmers. |
| Time frame | 8 th April 2007 30 th June 2008 |
| Implementer(s) | Confederação Nacional dos Trabalhadores na Agricultura – CONTAG (National confederation of agricultural workers) |
| Source of information | <i>Proteção infanto-juvenil no Meio Rural</i> , Protection of children and youth in rural áreas:(Action programme P.260.10.216.050 / P.260.10.216.052) |

General Information

Final technical report (18 September 2008)

Additional sources of information:

- 10º Congresso nacional de trabalhadores e trabalhadoras rurais, 10-14 março 2009, Brasília, Brazil
- ILO Brazil website:
<http://www.oit.org.br/sites/all/ipeec/index.php>
- CONTAG website:<http://www.contag.org.br/>

Relevant contacts

Renato Mendes, National Coordinator, IPEC-Brazil
mendes@oitbrasil.org.br
Tel: 55-61-21064618 - Fax: 55-61-3224352

Practice edited by

Valentina Bianco

3. DOMINICAN REPUBLIC: Diversifying family incomes through greenhouses to tackle child labour in the coffee production

Keywords

Coffee, diversification of agricultural production, green houses.

Abstract

Child labour in farming is openly accepted as a traditional practice, especially for seasonal production systems and lack of diversification of the production. The Project specifically promoted labour saving technology and in particular the establishment of greenhouses as a as part of a **multi-pronged strategy**, starting with the sensitization of community members, local authorities and social workers (health, education, agriculture and labour inspectorate) about child labour issues and providing agricultural, financial and health services to children and their families involved in agricultural production.

The main objective is to discourage the practice of employing children in agricultural work and reducing the demand for child labour by diversifying the production, increasing the production cycle for the families (beyond coffee) and eventually increasing incomes; ensuring predictability and reliability of production as with the greenhouse technique, and keeping external factors such as plagues and climatic effects under control.

Context: Information on the Area of Implementation

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Dominican Republic |
| Province, District, Village | Province of San José de Ocoa, City of San José de Ocoa, towns of San José de Ocoa y Rancho Arriba |
| Population under the poverty line (% total population) | 40,4% of the population lives under the poverty line ¹⁴ |
| Agricultural land (% of total land area) and other key natural resources | 53.4% of land area is agricultural land 55% of land area in San José de Ocoa is agricultural land or forest 47% of arable land is used for coffee production. |
| Main agricultural products, including from farming, fisheries, livestock, forestry | Sugarcane Banana Rice Industrial tomato |
| Employment in agriculture, including farming, forestry, fisheries and livestock (% of total employment) by subsector if available | 21.78% of total employment is in agriculture, including crop production, fisheries and aquaculture, forestry and livestock |
| National legislation on child labour in agriculture (including minimum | Labour code of the Dominican Republic – Law No.16-92; Principle XI, Title II on Child Labour (from Art. 244 to Art. 254) |

¹⁴ United Nations Statistic Division, 2011, National Source (Oficina Nacional de Estadística) Encuesta Nacional de Fuerza de Trabajo; April and October average; Moderate Poverty Line (individuals)

Context: Information on the Area of Implementation

| | |
|---|--|
| age, hazardous work list, minimum age for light work, age for compulsory education and on labour inspection in agriculture) | Minimum age: 14 years (light work: 12 years; hazardous work: 18 years) Resolution 52-2004 on the prohibition of hazardous activities for children under 18 General Education Law – No.66-97 Age for compulsory education: 6-14 Labour inspection in agriculture: the Dominican Republic has not ratified the Labour Inspection (Agriculture) Convention, 1969 (No.129) |
|---|--|

Characterization of Child Labour in Agriculture

| | |
|--|---|
| Number of child labourers in agriculture and % of total child labour (by subsector or crop, if available) | At national level child labourers in agriculture are 88,000, namely 23% of total child labour (423,000) |
| Percent of child labourers in agriculture that are aged 5-14 and percent that are aged 15-17. | 64.7% of children are between 5 and 14 years old (21% between 5 and 9 and 43.7% between 10 and 14) 35.3% of children are between 15 and 17 years old |
| Percent of child labourers in agriculture that are girls and percent that are boys | 92% are boys 8% are girls |
| Percent of girl child labourers working in agriculture and percent of boy child labourers working in agriculture | According to the Project baseline survey on child labour conducted in 2001, 25% of girls and boys child labourers were working in agriculture. |
| Typical hours spent by boys and girls in agriculture and the tasks undertaken (for a comprehensive list of Tasks see Annex1) | Hours:- Tasks: transporting and planting seedlings to farm, weeding and harvesting. |
| Main hazards faced by these children (for a comprehensive list of Hazards see Annex1) | Physical: long hours of work, strenuous labour, repetitive movement, heavy loads, uneven and steep ground, humidity Biological: insects and bacteria Ergonomic: inadequate tools, lack of protective equipment for adolescent workers Psychological: structural discrimination on wage (children are less paid than adults, girls are less paid than boys, children are less paid than adolescents), exposure to unhealthy behavior (smoking, alcohol, drinking, promiscuity), isolation |
| Describe the specific causes of child labour in agriculture in the area | Parents lack information on the adverse consequences of child labour. Openly accepted traditional practices: parents think their children should work because they have been raised in the same way. Community representatives and figures from social institutions are not aware of the problem and its potential risks. High demand for child labour during the harvest season. Small farms that are not profitable: in order to ensure its subsistence, a family with 5 members should have an average |

Characterization of Child Labour in Agriculture

of 50,320 square meters for subsistence crops. However, 92% of coffee farmers have an average of 31,450 square meters¹⁵. Coffee plantations are too small to cover the basic needs of a family.

Seasonal production systems, lack of diversification of the production, which reduce family incomes.

Education: high dropout rates, high repetition rate, high percentage of over-age children.

High education costs and reduced education options.¹⁶

No labour inspections.

Good Practice

| | |
|---|---|
| Time frame | 2002-2006 |
| Specific objective(s) | <p>Increase family income</p> <p>Diversify production and increase the production cycle for the families (beyond coffee)</p> <p>Reduce the impact of intensive agriculture production on the environment</p> <p>Increase productivity and profitability of family farms</p> <p>Ensure predictability and reliability of production as with the greenhouse technique, and keep external factors such as plagues and climatic effects under control</p> <p>Reduce production costs</p> <p>Transfer technology to small farmers</p> <p>Promote gender equity by ensuring that women organizations would be direct beneficiaries of the project. Empower and enable women to be less dependent on their husbands.</p> <p>Enhance property right and right to work and promote motivation and self-esteem.</p> |
| Why was the practice implemented? | ILO Time Bound Programme. |
| Partners involved | <p>Ministry of Labour</p> <p>Ministry of Education</p> <p>Ministry of Agriculture</p> |
| Agricultural subsector addressed by the practice (crop production, farming, fisheries or aquaculture, forestry, livestock) | Crop production (coffee) |
| Specific issues addressed | <p>Agricultural practices and techniques</p> <p>Others: livelihoods diversification, income generation, OSH,</p> |
| Description of the approach followed (including specific steps and activities carried out) | The practice specifically promoted labour saving technologies and established greenhouses as part of a multi-pronged strategy, starting with the sensitization of community members, local authorities and social workers (health, |

¹⁵ Instituto Dominicano de Investigaciones Agropecuarias y Forestales (IDIAF).

¹⁶ Although basic education is free, there is a high cost associated with school materials, uniforms, and transport costs that must be paid by the families.

Good Practice

education, agriculture and labour inspectorate) about child labour issues.

It based its intervention on the existing Community Councils "*Consejos Comunitarios*" - CCs established by the implementing agency. Through the CCs, information campaigns on child labour were carried out that reached children, their parents and farmers. CCs, together with community members, established criteria to select child beneficiaries of the Project.

- Establishment of a new productive model by the Ministry of Agriculture: through the establishment of greenhouses for complementary productions to coffee (see below for detailed explanation on the good practice) the Ministry of Agriculture contributed to the start-up of a new productive model.

Support by Ministry of Labour: throughout the implementation of the project, the Ministry of Labour supported its activities and started conducting inspections in the farms.

Monitoring of child labour: with the support of the project, the CCs started to monitor child labour in the communities and designed a protocol to be followed by the local actors when cases of child labour were identified.

Setting up health centres: in collaboration with the provincial office of the Ministry of Health, community health centers were set up, which detected and monitored sicknesses and injuries caused by exploitative labour to children.

Additional components were: Education and health: in collaboration with the Ministry of Education, levelling classes were set up to support pupils with difficulties at school and over-age children. The coordination between the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Health allowed reviving health programmes in schools, including nutrition, preventive health and dental care.

Demonstrated Impact

Indirect beneficiaries – number and categories

Community and institutions (Ministry of Labour, Agriculture, Health, Education) increased awareness about child labour in agriculture.

Direct beneficiaries –number and categories

2,000 children withdrawn from child labour (actual target: 2,063) and 4,000 children at risk prevented.
1,082 families received financial support (grants, revolving funds, micro-credits) from partner institutions, and benefited from the establishment of greenhouses and were trained on this production model.

What was the impact of the practice in reducing child labour in agriculture? Can the impact of the practice be documented in some way, through a formal programme

Reduction of the demand for child labour through:
- Increase of productivity: in a greenhouse, it is possible to produce the same quantity of green peppers on a surface that is 12 times smaller than with a traditional outdoor production.
The production cycle is longer, increasing from 3 to 9 months.

Demonstrated Impact

| | |
|--|--|
| evaluation, impact assessment or other means? | <p>For the same result, the level of workforce is smaller for a production in the greenhouse than outdoor (4-6 hours for a greenhouse compared to 10-12 outdoor).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase of household incomes and better use of generated incomes (parents investing in child education). - Attitudinal change regarding child labour practices. Based on the findings on an investigation on the perception of child labour by the Dominican society (<i>"Percepción de la sociedad dominicana sobre el trabajo infantil, OIT-IPEC, 2006</i>), San José de Ocoa is the province where the tolerance against child labour is the lowest, from all the areas where the IPEC programme implemented action programmes. |
| Improvements in beneficiary livelihood derived from the practice | <p>Greenhouses allowed the diversification of agricultural production in family coffee production. Families were able to start producing and marketing other products. This helped improving family income and autonomy throughout the year. To give an example, within the first year a beneficiary has received RD \$ 84.000. This distributed during 12 months means RD \$ 7,000 per month. In concrete terms, by adding the coffee production, this would provide for basic food basket of RD \$ 8.500 set by the Dominican government. But, as a beneficiary affirmed, this also allowed improvements in the livelihood, provision of infrastructure, housing, education expenditure, and reinvestment in the maintenance of the production unit.</p> <p>Greenhouses are a good practice because, within a short period of time, they compensate for the decrease in the family income (when children and adolescents stop working) in an efficient and relatively cheap manner, taking into account the speed at which the initial investment is recuperated.</p> <p>The greenhouse initiative also keeps children and adolescents out of the workplace as their families begin to earn enough money and, therefore, their participation in the world of work is no longer necessary for survival.</p> <p>Furthermore, the construction of greenhouses has been key to break the traditional production system of families and help to increase the productivity of the area through transfer of technology.</p> <p>Also, families benefit from the training processes associated with the initiative and with the awarding of seed funds in-kind. All these positive outcomes draw the family out of its traditional production dynamic and allow it to generate higher incomes as there is no longer a need or dependency on child labor as a survival strategy.</p> |
| Is the practice and/or its benefits likely to continue in some way, and to continue being effective, over the medium to long term? Is the practice still used? | <p>The greenhouse initiative is sustainable if the initial investment is recuperated and used in the construction of more greenhouses by other participating families.</p> <p>Above all, greenhouses are sustainable because they are profitable and, therefore, they can access funds from other</p> |

Demonstrated Impact

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>public or private sources (for example, the Agricultural Bank, PROMIPYME - Small and Micro-Enterprise Support Programme).</p> <p>Attitudinal change amongst the communities, local authorities and other key actors also contribute to the sustainability of the practice.</p> <p>The practice is currently used in the area.</p> |
| Does the practice contribute to environmental sustainability and ecological soundness, and how? | <p>The good practice limited the use of land in hills, which is one of the main causes of erosion.</p> <p>In a controlled environment, fewer inputs are required.</p> <p>The good practice also limits the use of land in hill areas, which is one of the main causes of erosion</p> <p>The coffee production area in San José de Ocoa is located in an environmentally protected zone as it is one of the three main water basins. These water basins feed three hydroelectric dams and the aqueduct supplying the city of Santo Domingo. Therefore, the agricultural production is controlled and the greenhouses represent an economically viable option, in accordance with established environmental standards.</p> |
| Does the practice promote human rights (state which ones) and comply with ILO labour standards? | <p>The practice promotes children rights to education, health and play time (UN Convention on the Rights of the Child) and elimination of worst forms of child labour as per Convention No. 182 on the worst forms of child labour, (1999).</p> <p>Furthermore, it promotes decent work for adults and youth, including the right to work in a safe environment. Non discrimination at work is also promoted through women's participation in decision-making and empowerment</p> |
| Does the practice contribute to social dialogue (between government, workers' and employers' organization) and collective bargaining negotiations? | N/A |
| Which were the problems and challenges (risks and obstacles) faced within the process? | <p>Resistance to change among some small farmers.</p> <p>Lack of solidarity amongst farmers (each farmer wanted his own greenhouse).</p> <p>Insufficient land in some cases, preventing families to install a greenhouse.</p> <p>Some difficulties in finding common agreement among small farmers on minimum price to sell their products to buyers.</p> |
| Lessons learned | <p>Risk of loss of agricultural production and risks of disease and / or attack by insects and microorganisms is reduced by producing in a protected environment.</p> <p>Labour-saving technologies reduce need and cost for labour.</p> <p>A greenhouse of 640 m² can be handled by a person with an investment of time of 2 to 4 hours per day.</p> |
| Quotes from direct beneficiaries of the practice | See: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jljm0QTX0aU |

Replicability

| | |
|---|--|
| Is this a practice that might have applicability in some way to other situations or settings? What are the elements that make the practice replicable? | Yes, the practice could be replicated because of: The simplicity and affordability of the greenhouse technology The proven impact on productivity that considerably reduce the demand for child labour |
| Key political, economic, demographic or cultural dynamics that favored or impeded the transformation process | The commitment of the Ministry of Labour and active participation of extension workers to set up and monitor the initiative |
| Critical success factors for development/replication of the good practice (for a comprehensive list of Critical factors see Annex1) | Ownership and consensus Early involvement of national actors |
| Resources and inputs needed to implement the practice, including physical (e.g. land, fertilizers, seeds), labour, financial and monetary inputs, and management capacity | Resources and inputs include the following categories: Labour inputs (local representatives from the Ministries of Labour, Education, and Agriculture, agriculture extension workers) Financial and monetary inputs (from the IPEC Programme- in cash, from the Ministries of Labour, Education, Health- in kind). At the time of implementation of the project, the cost of construction of greenhouses per square meter was of US\$12. Additional costs for training and technical monitoring, were covered by the Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources Institute (INDRHI) and the Project "PROMATREC" of the World Bank. |

General Information

| | |
|---|--|
| Organization / Institution promoting the practice | ILO-IPEC |
| Programme / Project | Prevention and Progressive Elimination of Child Labour in the Coffee Industry in the Dominican Republic |
| Overall objective | Prevent child and adolescent agricultural labour, and promote return to the educational system for child labourers. |
| Time frame | First phase: 1999-2004 Second phase: 2004-2006 |
| Implementer(s) | Asociación para el desarrollo de San José de Ocoa, inc. (ADESJO) |
| Source of information | Series of good practices developed as part of the Time Bounq Programme -phase I: <i>"Colección de buenas prácticas para la prevención y erradicación de las peores formas de trabajo infantil en República Dominicana"</i> - <i>"San José de Ocoa: Erradicando el trabajo infantil agrícola e incrementando los ingresos familiares: Una transferencia tecnológica para el cambio de modelo productivo."</i> Additional information and details have been provided by Carlos Feliz, Consultant, former National Coordinator of the Sub-regional programme against child labour in the agriculture |

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| | (2000-2006), Programme Officer (2007-2009) |
| Relevant contacts | Carlos Feliz, Consultant, former National Coordinator of the Sub-regional programme against child labour in the agriculture (2000-2006), Programme Officer (2007-2009) cmfeliz@gmail.com Dabeida Agramonte, National Coordinator, IPEC-RD agramonte@ilo.org |
| Practice edited by | Valentina Bianco with inputs from Carlos Feliz |

4. DOMINICAN REPUBLIC: Social dialogue to prevent and progressively eliminate child labour in the tomato sector

Keywords

Tomato plantation, social dialogue, education, vocational training.

Abstract

To address the high demand of child labour in the tomatoes production system, which is an openly accepted traditional practice, the Project focused on the involvement of employers and workers in negotiating better marketing agreement and prohibiting the use of children in tomato production. If children were found working, the processors would not buy the production. This helped overcoming resistance from the business and public sectors to incorporate the problem of child labor in agriculture into their agendas, where the production system is based on the contracting of small farmers, with prices that do not reflect the actual production costs. The practice was complemented by awareness raising of community leaders, representatives from local authorities and government institutions (city council, labour inspectors, extension workers, health authorities, and teachers), parents, local media, associations of small producers, main tomato producers, and tomato processing companies on the negative consequences of child labour.

| Context: Information on the Area of Implementation | |
|--|---|
| Country | Dominican Republic |
| Province, District, Village | Province of Azua Municipalities of Azua, Sabana Yegua and Tabara Abajo |
| Population under the poverty line (% total population) | 40,4 % of the population lives below the poverty line ¹⁷ |
| Agricultural land (% of total land area) and other key natural resources | 53.4% of land area is agricultural land 26% of land area in Azua is agricultural land or forest 8% of arable land is used for tomato production |
| Main agricultural products, including from farming, fisheries, livestock, forestry | Sugarcane Banana Rice Industrial tomato |
| Employment in agriculture, including farming, forestry, fisheries and livestock (% of total employment) by subsector if available | 21.78% of total employment is in agriculture, including crop production, fisheries and aquaculture, forestry and livestock |
| National legislation on child labour in agriculture (including minimum age, hazardous work list, minimum age for light work, age for compulsory education and on labour inspection in agriculture) | Labour code of the Dominican Republic – Law No.16-92; Principle XI, Title II on Child Labour (from Art. 244 to Art. 254) Minimum age: 14 years (light work: 12 years; hazardous work: 18 years) Resolution 52-2004 on the prohibition of hazardous activities for children under 18 |

¹⁷ United Nations Statistic Division, 2011, National Source (Oficina Nacional de Estadística) Encuesta Nacional de Fuerza de Trabajo; April and October average; Moderate Poverty Line (individuals): <http://data.un.org/Data.aspx?d=MDG&f=seriesRowID%3A581>.

Context: Information on the Area of Implementation

General Education Law – No.66-97
Age for compulsory education: 6 years, during 8 years
Labour inspection in agriculture: the Dominican Republic has not ratified the Labour Inspection (Agriculture) Convention, 1969 (No.129)

Characterization of Child Labour in Agriculture

| | |
|--|---|
| Number of child labourers in agriculture and % of total child labour (by subsector or crop, if available) | At national level child labourers in agriculture are 88,000, namely 23% of total child labour (423,000) |
| Percent of child labourers in agriculture that are aged 5-14 and percent that are aged 15-17. | 64.7% of children are between 5 and 14 years old (21% between 5 and 9 and 43.7% between 10 and 14) 35.3% of children are between 15 and 17 years old |
| Percent of child labourers in agriculture that are girls and percent that are boys. | 92% are boys 8% are girls |
| Percent of girl child labourers working in agriculture and percent of boy child labourers working in agriculture | According to the Project baseline survey on child labour conducted in 2001, 25% of girls and boys child labourers were working in agriculture. |
| Typical hours spent by boys and girls in agriculture and the tasks undertaken (for a comprehensive list of Tasks see Annex1) | Hours: the children that were interviewed were working between 7 and 10 hours/day during the tomato harvest season. Tasks: preparation of land; transporting and planting; seedlings to farm, weeding, harvesting. |
| Main hazards faced by these children (for a comprehensive list of Hazards see Annex1) | Physical: long hours of work, strenuous labour, repetitive movement, heavy loads, lighting and temperature. Ergonomic: inadequate tools, lack of protective equipment for adolescent workers. Chemical: working children do not manipulate agro-chemical products themselves but are regularly exposed to them (through skin absorption). Biological: bacteria (contaminated waters). Psychological: structural wage discrimination (children are less paid than adults, girls are less paid than boys, children are less paid than adolescents), exposure to unhealthy behaviors (smoking, alcohol drinking, promiscuity). |
| Describe the specific causes of child labour in agriculture in the area | Parents lack information on the adverse consequences of child labour. Openly accepted traditional practices. Community and civil society representatives are not aware of the problem and its potential risks. Therefore, there is a resistance from the business and public sectors to incorporate the problem of child labor in agriculture into their agendas. High demand of child labour because of its low cost Production system based on the contracting of small farmers (" <i>colonato</i> ": tripartite agreement between the |

| Characterization of Child Labour in Agriculture | |
|---|---|
| | government, major tomato producers and small farmers on the selling price, which never reflects the actual production costs). |

| The Good Practice | |
|--|--|
| Time frame of the practice | 2002-2006 |
| Specific objective of the practice | Prevent child and adolescent agricultural labour and promote return to the educational system. |
| Why was the practice implemented? | Under the pressure of local media and organizations in Azua, with massive participation of children and adolescents, the government was asked to support initiatives to eliminate child labor in the area. Days of labour inspection and campaigns were organized by the Ministry of Labour between 1999 and 2000. |
| Partners involved | Ministry of Labour Ministry of Education Ministry of Agricultural Grupo ambiental Habitat – local ONG Asociación Dominicana de Profesores (Teachers’ Union) World Vision Dominican Republic |
| Agricultural subsector addressed by the practice (crop production, farming, fisheries or aquaculture, forestry, livestock) | Crop production |
| Specific issues addressed | Policy development and social dialogue |
| Description of the approach followed (including specific steps and activities carried out) | <p>The practice followed four specific steps, with the purpose of involving in a progressive and strategic way all key actors in the process, namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Intervention strategy developed and agreed by the various partners: the project sensitized community leaders, representatives from local authorities and government institutions (city council, labour inspectors, extension workers, health authorities, and teachers), parents, local media, associations of small producers, main tomato producers, and tomato processing companies. These awareness raising activities favored the change of behaviors and practices that helped preventing and eliminating child labor in the tomato production in the province of Azua. 2. Involvement of local authorities: the project facilitated the creation of a local monitoring system through the setting up of local committees against child labour in the agriculture sector (tomato) and the strengthening of local labour inspectorate and agriculture extension workers. The provincial committee created in Azua served as a model that was been replicated by the Ministry of Labour to combat child labour in other provinces. To date, 30 committees have been set up |

The Good Practice

(one in each province).

3. Involvement of workers and employers: within the provincial committee, representatives from workers' and employers' organizations promoted the elimination of child labour. In particular, they agreed to introduce a specific **clause in the contract between the tomato processors and small farmers** that formally prohibited the use of children in tomato production. If children were found working, the processors would not buy the production. It was the first time ever that the private sector got directly engaged in the prevention and elimination of child labour in the country, thanks to the strong support and commitment of the Ministry of Labour.

4. Involvement of communities and families: the association of small producers in Azua (Federación campesina Mama Tingo) integrated the fight against child labour in its agenda, and reached an agreement with the tomato industry to increase the price of the tomato for 100 pounds (from RD\$57 to RD\$105).

Demonstrated Impact

| | |
|---|---|
| Indirect beneficiaries – number and categories | 1,500 parents of working children or children at risk Children enrolled in schools, teachers, community leaders, local authorities, members of associations of tomato producers (small farmers), social agents |
| Direct beneficiaries – number and categories | 1,000 children under 14 years working in tomato plantations 2,500 children under 14 years at risk of being exploited and/or at risk of dropping school 2,800 children under 14 years enrolled in schools, who participated in awareness raising activities 200 adolescents between 14 and 17 years, who received vocational training |
| What was the impact of the practice in reducing child labour in agriculture? Can the impact of the practice be documented in some way, through a formal programme evaluation, impact assessment or other means? | 140 families got access to microcredits. 50 families received training on setting up and managing micro-businesses. Attitudinal change regarding child labour practices were registered. Based on the findings on an investigation on the perception of child labour by the Dominican society (Percepción de la sociedad dominicana sobre el trabajo infantil, OIT-IPEC, 2006), Azua is the second province where tolerance against child labour is the lowest, from all the areas where IPEC has implemented action programmes. Labour inspections were carried out in tomato plantations on a regular basis during the implementation of the project (labour inspections carried out before 2003: 0; 2003: 115; 2004: 215; 2005: 102). |

| Demonstrated Impact | |
|--|---|
| | Social dialogue in the agriculture sector was enhanced in a very concrete and substantial way. |
| Improvements in beneficiary livelihood derived from the practice | Parents of working children gained access to micro-credit through the Banco Agrícola Leveling classes ("salas de tareas") were established School attendance increased during the production season and basic education indicators improved (e.g. the drop up rate during the tomato harvest was reduced from 50% to 2% (at the end of the project). Also school performance improved. Adolescent workers got access to vocational training (IT, English) |
| Is the practice and/or its benefits likely to continue in some way, and to continue being effective, over the medium to long term? Is the practice still used? | Yes, since the beginning the sustainability of the practice was ensured through: Analysis of the needs by local actors (participatory design) Ownership and responsibility of the project by local partners Attitudinal change amongst the communities, local authorities and other key actors Commitment from government institutions at all levels (local, provincial, national) Identification and capacity building of strong community leaders Current coordination of the policy against child labour by the government with support from the provincial committee. |
| Does the practice contribute to environmental sustainability and ecological soundness, and how? | N/A |
| Does the practice promote human rights (state which ones) and comply with ILO labour standards? | The practice promotes the right to equality of treatment and non discrimination at work, as per Convention No 100 and 111 on Non Discrimination and Equal Pay; it also promotes children rights to education, health and play time (UN Convention on the Rights of the Child) and elimination of worst forms of child labour as per Convention No 182. |
| Does the practice contribute to social dialogue (between government, workers' and employers' organization) and collective bargaining negotiations? | The essence of this practice was based on dialogue. A committee was established to monitor and coordinate the elimination of child labour. This committee was represented by more than 25 organizations and government institutions, trade unions, NGOs and community-based organizations and associations. |
| Which were the problems and challenges (risks and obstacles) faced within the process? | Some resistance to engage by the communities at the beginning of the project Lack of knowledge on child labour issues from various actors Absence of social protection systems for children engaged in hazardous work at the beginning of the project Inter-institutional coordination inexistent at local level |
| Lessons learned | The educational approach combined with income generation opportunities has proved to be very effective in discouraging parents to send their children to work. Children and youth who attended technical and skills training and continued to go to school became aware of the importance of education for their |

| Demonstrated Impact | |
|--|---|
| | future and became more informed about their rights. Parents also understood that child labour only perpetuates the cycle of poverty where they were trapped. The involvement of children and their families, of community leaders, teachers, etc from the early stage of the Project and throughout the whole implementation has been crucial for achieving ownership and support against child labour. |
| Quotes from direct beneficiaries of the practice | See: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jjlm0QTX0aU |

| Replicability | |
|---|--|
| Is this a practice that might have applicability in some way to other situations or settings? What are the elements that make the practice replicable? | Yes, the practice could be replicable by: Creating provincial/local committees against child labour, which involve all key actors that previously received awareness raising and capacity building. Bringing representatives from the industry and farmers' association around the same table and trying to reach concrete objectives. |
| Key political, economic, demographic or cultural dynamics that favoured or impeded the transformation process | Good dialogue and coordination between governmental and civil society for the elimination of child labour. |
| Critical success factors for development/replication of the good practice (for a comprehensive list of Critical factors see Annex1) | Ownership and consensus Early involvement of national actors |
| Resources and inputs needed to implement the practice, including physical (e.g. land, fertilizers, seeds), labour, financial and monetary inputs, and management capacity | Resources and inputs include the following categories: Labour inputs (local representatives from the Ministries of Labour, Education, and Agriculture, agriculture extension workers, Banco Agrícola) Financial and monetary inputs (from the IPEC Programme, Banco Agrícola- in cash, from the Ministries of Labour, Education, Health- in kind) Management capacity (Grupo Ambiental HABITAT, Ministry of Labour, ILO-IPEC) |

| General Information | |
|---|--|
| Organization / Institution promoting the practice | ILO-IPEC |
| Programme / Project | Prevention and Progressive Elimination of Child Labour in the Tomato Producing Sector in the Province of Azua, the Dominican Republic. |
| Overall objective | Prevent child and adolescent agricultural labour and promote return to the educational system. |
| Time frame | First phase: 1999-2004 Second phase: 2004-2006 |
| Implementer(s) | Grupo Ambiental HABITAT |

General Information

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Source of information | Series of good practices developed as part of the Time Bound Programme -phase I: "Colección de buenas prácticas para la prevención y erradicación de las peores formas de trabajo infantil en República Dominicana" - "Azua: capacitación e integración de actores locales contra el trabajo infantil" Additional information and details provided by Carlos Feliz, Consultant, former National Coordinator of the Sub-regional programme against child labour in the agriculture (2000-2006), Programme Officer (2007-2009) |
| Relevant contacts | Dabeida Agramonte, National Coordinator, IPEC-RD Carlos Feliz, Consultant, former National Coordinator of the Sub-regional programme against child labour in the agriculture (2000-2006), Programme Officer (2007-2009) cmfeliz@gmail.com |
| Practice edited by | Valentina Bianco with inputs from Carlos Feliz |

5. INDONESIA: Addressing hazardous work of children in Jermal fishing

Keywords

Fisheries and aquaculture, child labour monitoring, income generations.

Abstract

In North Sumatra many children are employed in jermal platforms, constructed for fishing from piles of wood implanted at the bottom of the sea. They are exposed to fatal and life-threatening accidents, drowning and violence. They receive low wages and work for long hours. Projects' interventions aimed to establish a sustainable mechanism to withdraw and prevent children from hazardous work in jermal fishing. In particular, the practice focused on establishing an Integrated Monitoring Team (IMT), with participation of government agencies at provincial and central level, labour inspectorate, and NGOs. Active monitoring of jermal platforms, social protection sites, families, and the children themselves contributed to the outcome. Complementary activities included strengthening the capacity of national and community level agencies and organizations to plan, initiate, implement and evaluate action to prevent and progressively eliminate child labour in jermal fishing and to improve the income earning capacity of adult family members, particularly women, through social protection schemes.

Context: Information on the Area of Implementation (Ref: National Population Census – 2010)

| | |
|--|---|
| Country | Indonesia |
| Province, District, Village | North Sumatra (the district of Langkat, Deli Serdang, Simalungun, Asahan, and Labuhan Batu) |
| Population under the poverty line (% total population) | Indonesia – 237,556,363 people (total) 12% of the total population is below the poverty line, according to the data collected through national sources by the United Nations Statistic division in 2012 |
| Agricultural land (% of total land area) and other key natural resources | According to the National Statistical Bureau (1998), total agricultural land use in Indonesia - paddy fields, household gardens and orchards, rained uplands and drylands, open grass, brackish and freshwater fishponds, swamps, state and private plantations - is about 66 million ha. According to FAO ¹⁸ : Land area (1000 ha): 181 157 Arable land (1000 ha): 22 000 Permanent crops (1000 ha): 15 100 Pastures (1000 ha): 11 000 Irrigated land (1000 ha): 6 722 Share in total water use by agriculture: 91.3% industry: .7% domestic: 8% Forest area (1000 ha): 94 432 |

¹⁸ FAO Quick country facts, as of October 2011.

Context: Information on the Area of Implementation
(Ref: National Population Census – 2010)

| | |
|--|--|
| Main agricultural products, including from farming, fisheries, livestock, forestry | Rice Plantation, including palm oil and rubber Forestry Agriculture |
| Employment in agriculture, including farming, forestry, fisheries and livestock (% of total employment) by subsector if available | 41,494,941 workers (38.42%) in agriculture (including forestry, agriculture, fishing) |
| National legislation on child labour in agriculture (including minimum age, hazardous work list, minimum age for light work, age for compulsory education and on labour inspection in agriculture) | National Law No. 20 Year 1999 – Basic Minimum Age to Employment (Ratification of ILO Convention 138) National Law No. 1 Year 2000 – Prohibition and Immediate Action to Eliminate Worst Forms of Child Labour (Ratification of ILO Convention 182) The National Action Plan on Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour --- Presidential Decree No. 59 Year 2002 Labour Law --- No. 13 Year 2003 List of Jobs that Jeopardize the Health, Safety or Morals of Children ---- The Decision of the Minister of Manpower and Transmigration of The Republic of Indonesia Number: KEP. 235/ MEN/ 2003 |

Characterization of Child Labour in Agriculture

| | |
|--|--|
| Number of child labourers in agriculture and % of total child labour (by subsector or crop, if available) | 4.052 million of children are engaged in hazardous work in Indonesia. By sector: Agriculture-forestry-fishing industry = 57.2% Manufacturing Industry = 10.4% Wholesale trade, retail, restaurant and hotels = 19.0% Community , social and personal services = 5.4% Others = 7.9% |
| Percent of child labourers in agriculture that are aged 5-14 and percent that are aged 15-17. | 5 – 17 years old group = 57.2% 5 – 14 years old group = 47.2% 15 -17 years old group = 53.8% |
| Percent of child labourers in agriculture that are girls and percent that are boys. | Girls = 36.8% Boys = 63.2% |
| Percent of girl child labourers working in agriculture and percent of boy child labourers working in agriculture | In jermal platforms, all child labourers are boys (100%) |
| Typical hours spent by boys and girls in agriculture and the tasks undertaken (for a comprehensive list of Tasks see Annex1) | Hours: jermal platforms are constructed for fishing from piles of wood implanted at the bottom of the sea. These are typically found along the eastern coast (between 6 to 19 miles from the coastline) in four districts of North Sumatra and can be reached in four hours by boat. Before the project addressed the issue, children used to live in jermal platform for three months, working more than 12 - 13 hours a day. |

Characterization of Child Labour in Agriculture

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>Tasks: in fisheries and aquaculture children are involved in: fishing; diving; handling and repairing nets; herding fish into nets; crewing on fishing vessels; shoveling ice; cooking; working as porters; loading and unloading fish; sorting fish; cleaning and salting fish; smoking/drying fish; peeling shrimp; drying, boiling and shelling various types of seafood.</p> |
| <p>Main hazards faced by these children (for a comprehensive list of Hazards see Annex1)</p> | <p>All hazards are in this industry.</p> <p>Accidents: fatal and life-threatening accidents include bites by poisonous sea snakes, wounds caused by work tools, stings by jellyfish that cause itch and allergies. During the rainy season (November –January) strong winds may cause damage and destruction to the jermal. Other dangers include being struck by lightning.</p> <p>Drowning: Most child workers on jermal cannot swim. The risk of falling into the sea is high when they raise the nets, especially at night or when it rains. If they fall, they are easily swept away by the current.</p> <p>Isolation: children on a jermal are isolated for three months from their family and their hometown, which can have a negative psychological effect.</p> <p>Low wages and long working hours</p> <p>Poor hygiene and cleanliness, and unfulfilled basic needs.</p> <p>Violence: There have been a number of reports of violence on jermals, including emotional, verbal, physical and even sexual violence. Other reports indicate that abuse through rough language and even physical violence such as beatings often happen if a worker does not do exactly as he is told. Such violence results in a loss of their rights to learn, play and develop.</p> <p>The children working on jermal platforms are exposed to the worst form of child labour. The working conditions are extremely poor with risk of fatal or life threatening accidents, including bites from sea snakes, net and equipment injuries. There is also a risk of drowning, especially considering that many children working on Jermals cannot swim. (No statistics are available on the injuries).</p> <p>The living environment in terms of hygiene, basic necessities and facilities on the platforms is very poor and there are no sanitary facilities, clean water is limited, areas for rest and recreation are cramped etc. Children are exposed to three months of isolation from their families and place of origin, which can have negative psychological effects. There are reports of physical and sexual abuse.</p> |
| <p>Describe the specific causes of child labour in agriculture in the area</p> | <p>1. High poverty. In line with this, very few parents of the jermal children are connected to the fishing industry. Instead, the majority of the fathers of children working on jermals are peasants, hired plantation workers, stone crackers, or have other temporary jobs with an average income of 25-45 US\$/per month. While most of the mothers are housewives or</p> |

Characterization of Child Labour in Agriculture

- work on the family farm, some of them are plantation workers or employed as housemaids.
2. High number of school drop-out, due to limited number of education facilities. Policy on compulsory education was adopted quite late in the country.¹⁹ The policy was not followed by supporting interventions on establishment of new schools and provision of school's facilities. High schools (at the time) were prevalently located in the capital cities of the sub districts. As a result, children from poor families (especially from plantation communities) could not afford to go to school, and they were forced to work instead.
 3. Low employment opportunities. Especially in the past, adult people faced difficulties in getting decent jobs and children were forced to contribute to household income, and they were recruited by jermal owners/operators.
 4. Tradition which considers child as an asset. Work for a number of families in Indonesia is not considered a strange thing. Some families even consider it as compulsory, and are proud of children who help them.
 5. Limited information about working conditions in jermal platform. Jermal workers could only visit their home after working for three months. This is one of the reasons contributing to prefer children in Jermal platform – as they do not have family responsibilities and can be flexible to work away from home.

The Good Practice

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Time frame of the practice | 1999 – 2004 |
| Specific objective of the practice | The project had three objectives: (1) To establish a sustainable mechanism to withdraw and prevent children from hazardous work in jermal fishing; (2) To strengthen the capacity of national and community level agencies and organizations to plan, initiate, implement and evaluate action to prevent and progressively eliminate child labour; and (3) To remove all children involved in hazardous work from jermal fishing; to prevent children at risk from entering such work; and to improve the income earning capacity of adult family members, particularly women, through social protection schemes. |
| Why was the practice implemented? | Response to a country's request; and also based on findings of the rapid assessment on child labour in fishing sector conducted by the ILO in 1999. |
| Partners involved | National Government Office: Ministry of Manpower and |

¹⁹ Compulsory education was launched in 1994. First jermal was considerably established in 1970s, and there was no clear information regarding what it about. People just knew that it was a place where fishery and aquaculture industry operated.

The Good Practice

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>Transmigration Provincial and District Government Offices Manpower and Transmigrations; Social Office Education Office; Fishery Office; Statistic Office Legal Bureau; Women's Empowerment Bureau; North Sumatra Navy Provincial and District Trade Unions: Fishery Trade Union; Transportation Trade Union North Sumatra Employers Association NGOs Media University of North Sumatra</p> |
| Agricultural subsector addressed by the practice (farming, fisheries and/or aquaculture, forestry, livestock) | Fisheries and aquaculture |
| Specific issues addressed | <p>International Labour Standards, national legislation Occupational safety and health Policy development and social dialogue Community mobilization Others: awareness raising activities capacity building child labour monitoring livelihoods diversification income generation activities research and documentation</p> |
| Description of the approach followed (including specific steps and activities carried out) | <p>Summary: Strong focus on Monitoring Additional activities included prevention and systematic removal of working children from hazardous work; Awareness raising for attitudinal and behavioral changes; Capacity building and networking; increasing participation and ownership of stakeholders; direct assistance.</p> <p>Child labour monitoring: the Fishing Programme had a positive experience, as an Integrated Monitoring Team (IMT) was established, with active participation of government agencies at provincial and central level, labour inspectorate, and NGOs. Active monitoring of jermal platforms, social protection sites, families, and the children themselves contributed to the outcome. The databases developed under the project was regularly updated with information about child labourers and their status, children at risk and their families, as well as other beneficiaries.</p> <p>Awareness raising: an intensive interaction and work with families and their respective communities have been promoted, providing for a broad and grass-root based awareness of the negative effects of child labour, which generated visible behavioural and attitudinal changes. Some</p> |

The Good Practice

of the highlights under the project included focused group discussions with formal and informal leaders at village level, as well as with the parents of working and at risk children, and an extensive radio campaign through local radio stations.

Capacity building: one component of the project focused on building capacity of relevant stakeholders so that they could better address child labour's issues. Training on design, management and evaluation of action programmes, as well on technical knowledge on child labour have been conducted for key partners, including training on fundamental **monitoring** principles and ILO Conventions No. 138 and No. 182. Regular stakeholder meetings have proved to be an excellent way to ensure that the ownership of the project remains with the implementing agencies. The project also regularly invites journalists to the so-called *Coffee Mornings* with interesting topics that attracted media attention at local as well as national level.

Demonstrated Impact

Indirect beneficiaries – number and categories

A total of 1,500 children at risk of becoming involved in hazardous work in the fishing sector (whereof app. 200 younger siblings) have been prevented from entering, by direct participation in social protection activities implemented under the programme.

A total of 571 adult family members in the fishing sector, particularly women members of heads of families of the working children withdrawn, have been provided with community-based services, livelihood assistance, and micro finance.

Direct beneficiaries – number and categories

The project successfully: removed 255 child labourers during four years; and prevented 1,723 children (70% were boys) to enter into child labour

What was the impact of the practice in reducing child labour in agriculture? Can the impact of the practice be documented in some way, through a formal programme evaluation, impact assessment or other means?

1. Changes in attitudes and behaviours at the community level through awareness-raising: an external evaluation concludes that "...a strong sense of awareness against child labour has been created among the concerned children, parents and within the often remote villages. The activities of the projects have broken this silence and created a broad alliance against the use of child labour in the hazardous practices. There is visible evidence of the change of attitude and behaviour among the concerned groups of people..."
2. Improved capacity and forged partnerships: the project was successful in generating support from all key-stakeholders including relevant governmental departments, workers and employers' organizations, business associations, academic institutions, media, teachers, NGOs, the local community, the

Demonstrated Impact

working children and their families as well as other members of the community.

3. Establishment of child labour monitoring mechanism: the project facilitated the establishment of a child labour monitoring team called Integrated Monitoring Team (IMT). The main role of the team was to ensure that children were removed from hazardous work, that the workplaces remained child labour free, and that children stayed out of other forms of hazardous work when being removed or prevented.

4. Enabling policy environment for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour in North Sumatra: the Project advocated for an enabling policy environment in North Sumatra aiming to eliminate child labor in Jermal. With technical assistances from the Project, North Sumatra was the first province in Indonesia to establish a Provincial Action Committee under a Provincial Decree on the 7 October 2002. The Provincial Committees performed and executed their mandates to eliminate the worst forms of child labour based on their Provincial Action Plan. North Sumatra Province also passed the North Sumatra Provincial Decree no. 5/2004 on the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour.

5. Decrease in number of children in hazardous work: the first monitoring round in 1999 to all jermals (157) found a total of 185 children working during the time of the visit. The last monitoring round to all jermals conducted in February 2004, found only 22 children. The team also notes that the number of operational jermals continues to decrease and by the end of the project there were only 68 jermals in 3 costal regencies (Deli Serdang, Asahan and Labuhan Batu).

In 2010, there were only eight children found working in 33 jermals.

Improvements in beneficiary livelihood derived from the practice

Increased income of families of working children which were supported through micro-finance, livelihood assistance and income generation activities.

School attendance as well as youth participation in vocational and skills training also increased as a result of linking the project with already existing educational programmes. Drop-outs from school were extremely frequent and therefore the program supported non-formal education activities, with the aim of bringing children back into the formal schooling system at junior and senior high school levels.,

Is the practice and/or its benefits likely to continue in some way, and to continue being effective, over the medium to long term? Is the practice still used?

Clearly, there are two main advantages of establishing an integrated monitoring team consisting of provincial and national organizations where the jermal are located. Firstly, these organizations know the local situation very well and will continue to be present and play an active role against child labour in North Sumatra (whereas ILO-IPEC is an outside organization). Secondly, the integrated monitoring team that

Demonstrated Impact

visits the jermal includes labour inspectors who have the authority to halt the work on the jermal if it is against the labour law.

The integrated monitoring team has initially operated with funds from the ILO-IPEC jermal project component. Starting in 2004 to 2009, the implementation of monitoring activities were included into the operating budget (APBD) of North Sumatra province as well as that of several regencies in the province where efforts to eradicate child labour have become part of the regency programme. The integration of child labour monitoring into the budget was proposed by the Labour Departments of several regencies and was accepted by BAPPEDA, the provincial planning agency. This happened especially because of the participation of BAPPEDA in workshops and other project activities from the beginning, which enabled the agency to learn about the importance of monitoring child labour.

The child labour monitoring system is now being tackled by the North Sumatra Provincial Action Committee on the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour (NSPACWFCL) since 2005.

Meanwhile, the four districts where the project was implemented also established the District Action Committee on the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour. They are also actively involved in the child labour monitoring.

Does the practice contribute to environmental sustainability and ecological soundness, and how?

Does the practice promote human rights (state which ones) and comply with ILO labour standards?

Yes. It is fully coherent with the right to education for children and youth and with the ILO Convention 182 on Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour.

Does the practice contribute to social dialogue (between government, workers' and employers' organization) and collective bargaining negotiations?

The NSPACWFCL was established in 2004, and it consists of a number of provincial government offices, trade unions, employers' association, media; universities, and NGOs.

Which were the problems and challenges (risks and obstacles) faced within the process?

Families of working children, communities and other stakeholders initially lacked awareness about children rights and harmful practices associated with child labour. Initially, the ILO conducted advocacy initiatives to promote and raise awareness on children rights and child labour through four action programmes during the period 1993 – 1996. After this initial period, additional efforts have been necessary under the period of implementation of the practice (1999-2014) to fully tackle this issue.

Lessons learned

This project demonstrated how Child Labour Monitoring can be applied by local partners.
The combination of different approaches and methodologies to progressively eliminate child labour, such as research and

Demonstrated Impact

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>documentation, child labour monitoring, social protection, capacity building and awareness raising, was crucial. Media also played a very effective role in contributing to an increased public and political awareness on the existence of hazardous work for children.</p> |
| Quotes from direct beneficiaries of the practice | <p>“This project helped the North Sumatra Provincial Government to progressively eliminate child labour in Jermal. It became a good initiative and a starting point to support the elimination of other worst forms of child labour”. - Governor of North Sumatra, Tgk. Rizal Nurdin (RIP).</p> <p>“A number of adult workers of Jermal asked me to work again in Jermal. But, I did not want to. I benefited from skills training on motor cycle repair from the project in 2002. I found better work and established a motor cycle workshop with Jafar and Sularso, who also worked in Jermal. I do not think working in jermal was good. That is why I am eager to enlarge this entrepreneurship as a part of efforts to get better job and better life.”- Rahmad, who benefited from vocational skills training, fund assistance from the project, and started motor cycle repairing workshop in Abdullah Lubis in Medan altogether with Jafar and Sularso.</p> |

Replicability

| | |
|--|--|
| Is this a practice that might have applicability in some way to other situations or settings? What are the elements that make the practice replicable? | <p>The enabling policy environment have since then triggered initiatives on provincial and regency level by the executive and legislative branches of the government entities supported by sectors of the civil society. Such examples include the development of various action committees in ten districts/municipalities in North Sumatra Province. As the provincial action committee, the district/municipality level committees perform and execute their mandates to eliminate worst forms of child labour based on their District/Municipality Action Plans.</p> |
| Key political, economic, demographic or cultural dynamics that favoured or impeded the transformation process | <p>The dynamics that favoured the transformation process: Political commitment was a necessary condition for mainstreaming the issue of child labour into development planning and securing matching funds for its implementation. People easily understood the situation. Child labour practice in jermal represented all kind of exploitations, such as: trafficking; slavery; hazardous work; sexual exploitation (among the boys). This helped ILO and social partners to promote this issue. It worked when people got aware of those exploitative practices.</p> <p>Media played a very effective role in contributing to an increased public and political awareness on the existence of hazardous work of children.</p> <p>Three dynamics impeded the process:</p> |

Replicability

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>(1) In North Sumatra the travel distances to both child labour working places and villages are considerable;</p> <p>(2) A number of implementing partner's did not play an active role</p> <p>(3) The time-frame for the implementation of the action programmes was too short to expect the development of genuine partnership relations, which need to be nurtured and fed with knowledge.</p> |
| Critical success factors for development/replication of the good practice (for a comprehensive list of Critical factors see Annex1) | Mix of modalities of intervention. This impressive multitude of activities created a critical mass of government and civil society organizations aware of child labour issues; some of them also had the potential to contribute to the effective prevention of child labour. It is obvious that such a wide-oriented programme provided an excellent opportunity to test out many different strategies from many different angles. A BIT TOO VAGUE BUT OK |
| Resources and inputs needed to implement the practice, including physical (e.g. land, fertilizers, seeds), labour, financial and monetary inputs, and management capacity | In total, the project needed \$ 350,000. Integrated monitoring team needed less than \$165,000, including costs for project staffs. |

General Information

| | |
|---|--|
| Organization / Institution promoting the practice | International Labour Organization |
| Programme / Project | Fishing and Footwear Sectors Programme to Combat Hazardous Child Labour in Indonesia (Phase II) |
| Overall objective | This programme aimed to contribute to the progressive elimination of child labour in the fishing and footwear sectors in Indonesia, by removing children from hazardous employment and working conditions and preventing more children from entering workplaces. |
| Time frame | Phase 1: 1 December 1999 – 31 August 2002 Phase 2: 1 September 2002 – 31 July 2004 |
| Implementer(s) | ILO Jakarta |
| Source of information | International Labour Office – Jakarta |
| Relevant contacts | Peter van Rooij, Director (vanrooij@ilo.org) Abdul Hakim, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist (ahakim@ilo.org) |
| Practice edited by | Valentina Bianco with inputs from Abdul Hakim |

6. PHILIPPINES: The WIND towards safety: reducing occupational safety and health (OSH) hazards in family farming

Keywords

WIND²⁰ (Work Improvement in Neighbourhood Development), OSH, small scale farming.

Abstract

School-aged children are involved at different level in the production of sugarcane, especially for land preparation and planting. They work in the farms especially during weekends and school days. The practice aimed to ensure the right to proper OSH to working farmers and their families by use of the WIND approach and a safe working environment for youth above the minimum age for employment. Activities focused on strengthening community knowledge of OSH through training on topics such as health, household management and child labour. In addition to general trainings, selected community representatives were chosen to receive specific OSH trainings in different focus areas in order to ensure sustainable action against child labour within family farms.

Context: Information on the Area of Implementation

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | The Philippines |
| Province, District, Village | The following provinces were selected for the implementation of the OSH WIND program per crop: 1. Isabela for rice; 2. Quezon II for Coconut; 3. Davao del Norte for Banana; and 4. Iloilo for sugar cane. The project was implemented in agrarian reform areas where small farmers often have limited access to social protection programs, and in sugar land areas. |
| Population under the poverty line (% total population) | 32.9% |
| Agricultural land (% of total land area) and other key natural resources | Land area (1000 ha): 29 817 Arable land (1000 ha): 5 300 Permanent crops (1000 ha): 5 000 Pastures (1000 ha): 1 500 Irrigated land (1000 ha): 1 520 Sugar land areas covered under Agrarian Reform Program (229,747 ha) |
| Main agricultural products, including from farming, fisheries, livestock, forestry | Rice, coconut products, sugarcane, corn, pork, bananas |
| Employment in agriculture, including farming, forestry, fisheries and livestock (% of total employment) by subsector if available | 31.42 million individuals involved in agriculture – 33% of total employment 2.495 million represent agrarian reform beneficiaries as of December 2010 data. An estimated 114,874 agrarian reform |

²⁰ WIND is an Occupational Safety and Health programme developed by the ILO and stands for Work Improvement in Neighbourhood Development

Context: Information on the Area of Implementation

| | |
|--|---|
| | beneficiaries are in sugar land areas. |
| National legislation on child labour in agriculture (including minimum age, hazardous work list, minimum age for light work, age for compulsory education and on labour inspection in agriculture) | Act prohibiting the employment of children below 15 years of age in public and private undertakings, amending for this purpose Section 12, Article VIII of R.A. 7610 (R.A. No. 7658). Act providing for the elimination of the worst forms of child labour and affording stronger protection for the working child (Republic Act No. 9231). Special Protection of Children Against Child Abuse, Exploitation and Discrimination Act (Act No. 7610). Governance of Basic Education Act, 2001 (No. 9155), compulsory age of elementary schooling age 12. In agrarian reform program, 15 years old farmers who are actual tillers of the land can qualify as beneficiaries of the program. |

Characterization of Child Labour in Agriculture

| | |
|--|--|
| Number of child labourers in agriculture and % of total child labour (by subsector or crop, if available) | 58.5 % of working children are found in agriculture. Agriculture, hunting and forestry = 91.1% Fishing = 8.9% |
| Percent of child labourers in agriculture that are aged 5-14 and percent that are aged 15-17. | 61.3% of 5 – 9 years old are involved in agriculture, 64.2% of 10-14 year olds, and 52% of all working 15-17 year olds are in agriculture Based on the result of Household survey for the development of OSH-WIND manual for sugarcane, the average age of working children is 13 years old and above. |
| Percent of child labourers in agriculture that are girls and percent that are boys. | Of child labourers in agriculture, 73.1% are boys and 26.9% are female |
| Percent of girl child labourers working in agriculture and percent of boy child labourers working in agriculture | N/A |
| Typical hours spent by boys and girls in agriculture and the tasks undertaken (for a comprehensive list of Tasks see Annex1) | Hours: Based on the household survey for OSH-WIND sugarcane manual, school-aged children of ARBs are involved in varying degrees in the production of sugarcane. They are encouraged to work in the farm especially during weekends and school days (generally in rural areas, the school hours is 6:00 am to 4:00 pm). Children walk to and from the school for about one hour. The common age of children helping in the farm is 7-10 years old. Tasks: Children under 10 years old and above are allowed to use the "bolo or spading". When reach the age of -18 years old, they are allowed to lift heavy loads (such as 40 kilos of sugarcane). On land preparation/planting - perform the selection of cane points and distribution to planting spots; on plant/farm |

Characterization of Child Labour in Agriculture

| | |
|---|--|
| | management - weeding; on harvesting to hauling – bundling of harvested canes (children are paid P2 per bundle) ²¹ . |
| Main hazards faced by these children (for a comprehensive list of Hazards see Annex1) | Use of sharp tools and machinery (using bare hands); work at tall heights; long working hours (children under 12 walk long distances to school after working hours from the farm); chemical exposures to agrochemicals and pesticides; biological hazards such as animal and insect bites, exposure to bacteria and parasites, extreme environmental exposures; and ergonomic hazards due to wrong positioning or manner of body motions such as the inappropriate arrangement of workplace, awkward posture, or prolonged body curvature. |
| Describe the specific causes of child labour in agriculture in the area | <p>Rural agricultural enterprises in the Philippines are characterized by extremely limited income revenues. This is specifically the case in rice and sugar cane enterprises where the limited income from the crop produced is not sufficient to hire external workers. For this reason, children are often the sole source of labour for many family-based agricultural enterprises in the Philippines. In addition, alternative incomes activities are limited or non-existent throughout rural areas in the targeted provinces.</p> <p>Due to the small scale nature of many of these enterprises, much of the work is un-mechanized and involves the extensive use of sharp tools and working for long periods of time. This situation may present numerous risks and hazards for children.</p> <p>This situation is compounded by the country's lack of programmes for occupational health and safety for informal sectors, including the small farm holders in the agricultural sector. Regulation and supervision in enforcing this type of programme to the farmers in the Philippines is nonexistent. As living and working conditions in these enterprises is often overlapping, farming may affect the health of the farmer's family and the community to which they belong.</p> <p>Child labour on family farms in the Philippines is extremely common,, and therefore, many families do not consider that children who are working are deprived of schooling or of rest and play. Children are often not properly remunerated and are not able to go to school as they make up a critical part of the labour force which is required for production output.</p> |

The Good Practice

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Time frame of the practice | March 1, 2005 to October 30, 2007 |
| Specific objective of the practice | Improve the health and safety for families and children working on family farms towards a higher level of productivity. |
| Why was the practice implemented? | The Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR) and the |

²¹ Conversion rate: 1P (Philippine Peso) = 0.02 USD.

The Good Practice

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>International Labour Organization – Sub-Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific work hand-in-hand in implementing Occupational Safety and Health through Work Improvement in Neighborhood Development (WIND) for Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries This programme was developed as a reaction to the low OSH standards in rural agrarian communities in the regions. Through this Programme, DAR and ILO expected that farmers may consider the importance of proper, healthy and safe conditions in the household and farms towards a higher level of productivity.</p> |
| Partners involved | <p>ILO-IPEC, in conjunction with the Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR). At the local level: Local Government Units, Cooperatives where agrarian reform beneficiaries are members/involved; and State College Universities</p> |
| Agricultural subsector addressed by the practice (crop production, farming, fisheries or aquaculture, forestry, livestock) | <p>Forestry: Coconut, banana Crop production: rice, sugar cane</p> |
| Specific issues addressed | <p>Occupational safety and health and hazardous work of children in agriculture Availability of crop-based OSH manuals and tools with specific concerns on women and children, that can be used by program implementers, state college and universities and even farming household in minimizing risk and hazards.</p> |
| Description of the approach followed (including specific steps and activities carried out) | <p>WIND is a programme aiming at promoting practical improvements in agricultural households by the initiatives of village families. The WIND approach was used to uphold the right to proper OSH for working farmers and their families and to ensure a safe working environment for youth above the minimum working age. Activities focused on strengthening community knowledge of OSH and developing appropriate methodologies for hazard mitigation. This was accomplished by offering trainings on topics that are usually ignored like health, caring for one's self while at work, household management, and child labour. With the support of the OSH-WIND manual, simple, practical and low-cost strategies were shown to and discussed with farmers and their families, in particular with the beneficiaries of the agrarian reform, who cultivate traditional crops such as rice, corn and coconut. In addition to general trainings, selected community representatives were chosen to receive OSH trainings in specific 40 areas in order to ensure sustainable action within</p> |

family farms. These included:

- **OSH-WIND champions and paratechnicians**²²- these special community representatives learned the skills necessary to host their own technical workshops and sessions on specific matters related to OSH. Together, they formed the OSH-WIND **Help Desk** to ensure an effective mechanism of advocacy and accomplishment of the OSH action plans in their community.

- **Couples**- these were **husband and wife heads-of-household** who were jointly selected to receive special guidance on implementing OSH checklists on their family farms and in their households. Training both husband and wife ensured a comprehensive understanding of OSH standards within the home and promoted a gender equitable feeling of responsibility to make health and safety improvements.

Specific Steps included:

1. Conduct Focused Group Discussion with selected agrarian reform beneficiaries household profiling.
2. Translation and cultural adaptation of OSH-WIND manual, including OSH measures on handling fertilizers and pesticides and the job hazards analysis on farming processes adopted for each crop.
3. Action guide and training materials developed.
4. Selection of community members and community training sessions on WIND technique, including training on safe farm and home checklist.
5. Selection and training of OSH-WIND champions and paratechnicians.
6. Help desk implemented and served by selected champions and paratechnicians.
7. Selection and training of couples.
8. Production of educational materials e.g. flyers, flipchart, brochure, comics and teaser as reinforcement to trainings.
9. Implementation of broader community OSH-WIND learning sessions as part of social marketing to spread knowledge of WIND approach.
10. Preparation of guidelines for awards and recognition and corresponding evaluation tool.
11. Selection of farms to receive award and distribution of prizes.

Specific achievements:

1. Developed three OSH-WIND Manual for three crops including OSH measures on handling fertilizers and pesticides and the job hazards analysis on farming

²² OSH-WIND champions and paratechnicians provided the technical support at the help desk.

The Good Practice

processes adopted for each crop.
2. Produced and distributed 5 relevant educational materials e.g. flyers, flipchart, brochure, comics and teaser for community members.
3. Conducted OSH-WIND caravan and learning sessions as part of social marketing.
4. Prepared guidelines for awards and recognition and corresponding evaluation tool.

Demonstrated Impact

Indirect beneficiaries- number and categories

Communities indirectly benefited from protective legislation that was introduced during the implementation of this project. DAR entered into Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with local government units to help eliminate hazardous work of children on family farms. These MOUs resulted in long-term support from government units for at-risk and impoverished communities.

Direct beneficiaries – number and categories

Members of 7 agrarian reform communities in three provinces directly benefited from this program.
Trained 145 OSH-WIND Champions and 93 Paratechnicians
Trained 377 OSH-WIND Couples

What was the impact of the practice in reducing child labour in agriculture? Can the impact of the practice be documented in some way, through a formal programme evaluation, impact assessment or other means?

Families and community members sensitized on the hazards for children to work in agriculture and the need to provide safe and decent working conditions for youth above working age.
Hazards remediated for children above working age based on WIND strategies and approaches.
Inclusion of gender and development concerns enhanced the participation of both men and women in development process .

Improvements in beneficiary livelihood derived from the practice

Simple and low cost WIND techniques improved the health and safety of family enterprises and increased level of household productivity.
Decreased numbers of hours worked to maintain meet OSH standards.
Communities were trained to organize and plan their expenses related to their farming enterprise.

Is the practice and/or its benefits likely to continue in some way, and to continue being effective, over the medium to long term? Is the practice still used?

Training local community members to be OSH-WIND “champions” and paratechnicians will ensure that the foundations of the WIND approach will continue to be shared with community members over the long term, as well as the establishment of an “Help desk” implemented to aid community members with OSH questions and concerns.
Monitoring and evaluation phase after implementation of OSH-WIND training to ensure long-term success. An important part of the OSH-WIND Program is the participatory monitoring and evaluation in the implementation of plans to

Demonstrated Impact

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>improve the living and working conditions. It is the objective of monitoring to supervise the changes to be done or yet to be done by the participants of the OSH-WIND Technical Session. The OSH-WIND Champions and Paratechnicians will conduct the monitoring and evaluation.</p> <p>Involvement of local partners were considered at the onset of the project as part of the sustainability mechanisms e.g.; local government units can issue local ordinance; farmers' cooperative for advocacy; state college and university for possible inclusion in their curriculum, and the farming households.</p> <p>Although this ILO supported project has technically ended, the trainings on behalf of OSH-WIND champions and paratechnicians is still occurring within these communities.</p> |
| Does the practice contribute to environmental sustainability and ecological soundness, and how? | <p>OSH-WIND manual and training teaches the hazards associated with pesticide use and methods for reduced use and safer handling techniques to improve immediate and long-term community health.</p> <p>It also introduced waste elimination management for sanitation; e.g. discourage throwing of pesticides containers in the field or bodies of water like river, lake, install fences for animals and remove stagnant water.</p> |
| Does the practice promote human rights (state which ones) and comply with ILO labour standards? | <p>Yes: adherence to Conventions No. 138, Minimum Age of Employment, No. 182, Worst Forms of Child Labour and No.184, Safety and Health in Agriculture and to ILO-OSH standards</p> |
| Does the practice contribute to social dialogue (between government, workers' and employers' organization) and collective bargaining negotiations? | <p>N/A: the majority of the beneficiaries targeted were small-scale rural farming families instead of traditional employers and workers stakeholders.</p> |
| Which were the problems and challenges (risks and obstacles) faced within the process? | <p>Rural and informal agricultural sector, often hard to reach and isolated locations.</p> <p>Initially the community feared that the project was an inspection mechanism.</p> <p>Giving out initial cash prizes to families farms who were able to institute change eventually created conflicts and an unhealthy level of competition among families, which impacted negatively on the Project. . One of the lesson learned is that incentives for enforcing OSH standards should be non-monetary. Change of local officials/administration due to election affected the continuity of project. Most of the time, newly elected officials have different program priorities.</p> <p>Explaining the benefits of OSH, since the targeted beneficiaries (direct and indirect) expect activities that will enhance income generation..</p> |

Demonstrated Impact

| | |
|--|---|
| Lessons learned | Promotion of the culture of safety among farmers and their family members is easier to introduce as this responds to the needs of their everyday life, however it is difficult to generate the desired impact as this requires behavioural change. Need for non-monetary incentives to encourage long-term behavior change and discourage unhealthy competition between families. |
| Quotes from direct beneficiaries of the practice | Based on the result of Formative Evaluation done by Dr. Batangan. On House Management: "Our house has become neater and it's now safer inside. The fence around the house is also better set up while our body became healthier." - Community member On OSH related changes: "We have become more careful in storing our farm tools and substances - we have a separate storage now for the chemicals." " We have learned the importance of wearing gas mask when spraying in the field" - Community members |

Replicability

| | |
|--|--|
| Is this a practice that might have applicability in some way to other situations or settings? What are the elements that make the practice replicable? | Availability of OSH-WIND training materials and technical assistance for translation and adaptation to local language and culture Training of local communities members who are concerned about the health and well-being of their community |
| Key political, economic, demographic or cultural dynamics that favoured or impeded the transformation process | Small scale, rural farming families and communities, trust among community members Existence of OSH Center that could adopt and promote the implementation of OSH for informal sectors Committment of the Department of Agriculture in integrating the OSH processes in their programs and projects. |
| Critical success factors for development/replication of the good practice (for a comprehensive list of Critical factors see Annex1) | Committment of identified OSH-WIND champions and paratechnicians to lead the rest of the community. Identification and training of couples to ensure comprehensive understanding and gender equity in household and farm changes. Ownership and consensus- Committment and capacity of beneficiaries to run the "Help desk" to answer questions and concerns of community members related to OSH in farming enterprises. Willingness of the institutional partners for adaptation and inclusion of the OSH resources into curriculum, ordinances, and mandates. |
| Resources and inputs needed to implement the practice, including physical (e.g. land, fertilizers, seeds), labour, financial | Labour inputs: Technical capacity to translate and adapt ILO-WIND materials to local communities Trainers to conduct community training |

Replicability

| | |
|--|--|
| and monetary inputs, and management capacity | Community volunteers to serve as champions and paratechnicians to assist with help desk Financial/monetary: Production of training materials Cash prizes for community members who demonstrate OSH-WIND use |
|--|--|

General Information

| | |
|---|--|
| Organization / Institution promoting the practice | ILO-IPEC Philippines |
| Programme / Project | Time-Bound Programme on the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour in the Republic of the Philippines |
| Overall objective | Eliminate the worst forms of child labour in the Philippines |
| Time frame | September 2002 – December 2006 |
| Implementer(s) | ILO-IPEC, in conjunction with the Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR) |
| Source of information | IPEC Evaluation: Supporting the Time-Bound Programme on the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour in the Republic of the Philippines http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_083447.pdf |
| Relevant contacts | Jesus Macasil macasil@ilo.org Senior Programme Officer ILO-IPEC Philippines |
| Practice edited by | Halshka Graczyk |

7. TANZANIA: Labour saving technologies and corporate social responsibility in tobacco production

Keywords

Tobacco, labour-saving technologies, ox-carts, corporate social responsibility.

Abstract

Tobacco is a labour intensive crop, and farmers often prefer to employ children as they are a cheaper (and often unpaid) labour force. In order to prevent and eliminate child labour in tobacco production, the practice focused on promoting corporate social responsibility and public-private partnership involving tobacco companies, government and farmers associations. The project encouraged tobacco companies to introduce labour saving technologies, by providing a package which includes a pair of trained oxen, plough, cart, and other equipment on credit to farmers; it also included training modules on child labour.

| Context: Information on the Area of Implementation | |
|--|---|
| Country | Tanzania |
| Province, District, Village | Region: Tabora District: Urambo Villages: Usinge, Kaliua, Vumilia, Imalamakoye, Ukondamoyo, Songambebe, Muungano, Kapilula and Itundu. |
| Population under the poverty line (% total population) | 39% |
| Agricultural land (% of total land area) and other key natural resources | According to FAO ²³ : Land area (1000 ha): 88,580 Arable land (1000 ha): 9,600 Permanent crops (1000 ha): 1,350 Pastures (1000 ha): 24,000 Irrigated land (1000 ha): 184 Share in total water use by agriculture: 89.4% industry: 5% domestic: 10.2% forest area (1000 ha): 33,428 Out of 291,144Ha which are suitable for agriculture only 150,000Ha are cultivated. Urambo district is a fertile agricultural area where 90% of the land is used for agriculture. |
| Main agricultural products, including from farming, fisheries, livestock, forestry | Main agricultural products in the country are: ²⁴ Bananas 906,570 Indigenous Cattle Meat 668,096 |

²³ FAO Quick country facts , as September 2011.

²⁴ International commodity prices are used in the ranking of commodities and countries. They are applied in order to avoid the use of exchange rates for obtaining continental and world aggregates, and also to improve and facilitate international comparative analysis of productivity at the national level. Source: <http://faostat.fao.org/site/339/default.aspx>.

Context: Information on the Area of Implementation

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Cassava 565,771 Cow milk, whole, fresh 500,586 Beans, dry 398,102</p> <p>Farming and animal husbandry constitute about 50-95 % of the Urambo district GDP. Other sectors include: fishing, forest activities and bee keeping. Tobacco is the leading cash crop. Other cash crops include cotton, sunflowers, ground nuts and paddy. Main food crops grown are maize, rice, beans, millet, cassava and potatoes.</p> <p>Livestock production is very low due to poor genetic potentials of local breeds found in the district.</p> <p>Fishing is done on small scale for domestic consumption and local informal trade.</p> |
| Employment in agriculture, including farming, forestry, fisheries and livestock (% of total employment) by subsector if available | Agriculture employs 80% of the work force at country level. In Urambo district employment capacity is distributed between the main socio-economic activities, which are agriculture (60%), livestock keeping (22%), and fishing (10%). |
| National legislation on child labour in agriculture (including minimum age, hazardous work list, minimum age for light work, age for compulsory education and on labour inspection in agriculture) | The 2004 Employment and Labour Relations Act set minimum employment age of 14, and stipulates that children between 14 and 18 may only undertake light duties that do not interfere with schooling or vocational training. Furthermore, children under 18 must not be employed in agriculture if their working conditions are hazardous. According to a 2008 report by the U.S. Department of State, the Tanzanian Ministry of Labour has found difficult to enforce child labor laws, due to an insufficient number of inspectors. |

Characterization of Child Labour in Agriculture

| | |
|---|---|
| Number of child labourers in agriculture and % of total child labour (by subsector or crop, if available) | The baseline survey ²⁵ conducted in Urambo district by Urambo Tobacco Sector Programme (UTSP) in 2008 estimated that 63% (15,600) out of a total child population (25,000) aged 5-17 years were economically active. Out of 26% (4,603) doing some type of agricultural work, 12% were involved with tobacco growing. According to a survey carried out by the Association of Tanzania Tobacco Traders (ATTT) children make up 45% of the labour force in tobacco growing in the district, and out of the total population of children aged 5-17 years, approximately 26% of children were engaged in tobacco farming. |
| Percent of child labourers in agriculture that are aged 5-14 and percent that are aged 15-17. | The percentage of child labourers in agriculture for the children aged 5-14 is estimated to be 43%, while for the age between 15-17 is estimated to be 28%. |
| Percent of child labourers in | 58% are boys and 42% are girls |

²⁵ Figures taken from Tables 3.13 and 3.7 in Baseline Survey Report, March 2008.

Characterization of Child Labour in Agriculture

| | |
|--|---|
| agriculture that are girls and percent that are boys. | |
| Percent of girl child labourers working in agriculture and percent of boy child labourers working in agriculture | The 27% of girls are child labourers who work in agriculture. The 38% of boys are child labourers who work in agriculture. |
| Typical hours spent by boys and girls in agriculture and the tasks undertaken (for a comprehensive list of Tasks see Annex1) | Hours: the majority of boys and girls aged 15-17 spent over six hours a day in agriculture doing their tasks. Tasks: children involved in tobacco growing are responsible for digging, tilling and making ridges, weeding, watering seed beds, transplanting seedlings, picking leaves, carrying them for curing and collecting firewood for the curing. |
| Main hazards faced by these children (for a comprehensive list of Hazards see Annex1) | Use of pesticides and fertilizers and sharp tools, carrying heavy loads of fuel wood and leaves, and long hours of work with insufficient and/or inadequate meals. |
| Describe the specific causes of child labour in agriculture in the area | Poverty, large household size, social-cultural factors, orphanage, family problems and ignorance of risks associated with child labour. Tobacco is a labour intensive crop, and farmers often prefer to employ children as they are a cheaper (or even unpaid) labour force. The work is lowly and irregularly paid and is often negotiated individually and orally. The employer deducts payments for food, medical expenses, fines and made-up expenses. The payment is made to the children themselves (<i>Masoud et.al, 2007</i>). The long working hours prevent children from going to school or make them drop out of school at a young age. Tenancy contract is only applied for adults. |

The Good Practice

| | |
|--|---|
| Time frame of the practice | January 2007 – December 2010 |
| Specific objective of the practice | Promoting corporate social responsibility and public-private partnership involving tobacco companies, government and farmers associations. |
| Why was the practice implemented? | The source of objective for good practice to eliminate child labour came from the stakeholders' technical committee under the UTSP I in 2004. The idea of using oxens was emphasized by the Ministry of Agriculture for increasing production areas and productivity. During the implementation period tobacco stakeholders, particularly tobacco companies, observed in deep insight that the use of oxen contributed to reducing child labour. |
| Partners involved | Tobacco growers through their unions, tobacco companies, district council through department of agriculture and the cooperative department. |
| Agricultural subsector addressed by the practice (crop production, farming, fisheries or aquaculture, forestry, livestock) | Crop production (tobacco) |

The Good Practice

| | |
|--|--|
| Specific issues addressed | <p>Agricultural practices and techniques Education (formal and non-formal) Social dialogue</p> |
| Description of the approach followed (including specific steps and activities carried out) | <p>Introduction on labour saving technologies: tobacco companies have introduced labour saving technologies, by providing a package which includes a pair of trained oxen, plough, cart, and other equipment on credit to farmers. Neither collaterals nor interests are charged. This is affordable only to farmers who farm 1 hectare or more. Smaller farmers can access to it through their cooperative. Training on manufacturing oxcart: having realized high demand of oxen the tobacco companies through the Association of Tanzania Tobacco Trader, (ATTT) and Tanzania Leaf Tobacco Company (TLTC), have formulated workshops (photo attached) for manufacturing oxcart and provided training to local artisans on repair and maintenance in various project areas.</p> <p>Insertion of a child labour module within the training programme of tobacco leaf technicians: tobacco leaf technicians (LTs) were trained in tobacco husbandry to ensure that farmers produce tobacco which meets buyer quality. On top, the LTs are also trained on combating child labour. While carry out their job as extension agents, if LTs identified child labourers in tobacco production, they offered to the farmer the opportunity to receive a pair of oxen and some equipment, as a way of releasing children to school.</p> <p>Monitoring of school attendance by LTs: during the entire tobacco growing season, LTs monitored children school attendance by keeping records and reporting drop out cases to farmers and primary school head teachers. When meeting parents, they informed them about the importance of regularly sending their children to school and the risk of being excluded from tobacco companies in case they do not comply with child labour free requirements.</p> <p>Complementary actions included: Supporting social responsibility projects: funds were provided for the construction, renovation and equipment of classrooms and dispensaries, and rehabilitation of teachers houses.</p> <p>In addition, the ATTT produced a colorful leaflet in Swahili about preventing child labour in tobacco and distributed 7,500 copies to tobacco farmers.</p> <p>ATTT social responsibility office carried out spot checks during the farming season to identify child labour cases. These were reported to the primary societies and to the District Child Labour Committee (DCLC). In addition, they sponsored a weekly radio programme on Radio Free Africa to raise awareness about the hazards and problem of child labour, and films and dramas on the issue. They finally</p> |

The Good Practice

produced a farmers' calendar including a message about child labour.

Demonstrated Impact

Indirect beneficiaries – number and categories

350 tobacco growers are using oxen for land preparation
Over 80% of tobacco growers are using YAMAOTEA SUPER, a chemical that inhibit sucker growth and hence the child labour reduced to a great extent because before the introduction of chemicals, suckers were mostly removed by children.

Direct beneficiaries – number and categories

Children under 15: 900 boys and 800 girls prevented/withdrawn and supported with scholastic materials.
Children between 15-17 years old: 473 in totals (boys 276; girls 197) who attended vocational training and received working tools.
300 children (boys 182; girls 118) placed on complementary basic education. (17 primary school classrooms were constructed and 5 classrooms out of 17 were equipped with furnitures-desks and tables. 1 modern girls dormitory for secondary school constructed).
300 vulnerable families supported with skills and equipments for income generating activities (9 primary school establishing income generating activities).
A total of 900 farmers and 45 Leaf Technicians trained to identify and report on child labour.

What was the impact of the practice in reducing child labour in agriculture?
Can the impact of the practice be documented in some way, through a formal programme evaluation, impact assessment or other means?

The tobacco companies now own initiatives to improve productivity through the introduction of labour saving technologies, such as the ox plough, which have had great impact on reducing labour input and hence contributed to reducing child labour. Farmers report that digging 1 acre by hand used to take 4 man-days; with a pair of oxen it takes 1-2 hours. Thus labour demand has been reduced by a factor of 16 and this is enormously positive for child labour.
According to ATTT (based on observations and reports by Leaf Technicians) child labour has halved in the district from 26% in 2004 to 13% in 2009. This figure is supported by the Seed Farm Manager who estimates that oxen/mechanisation has contributed a 50% decrease in child labour.
Two tobacco companies have inserted anti-child labour clauses into their policies and contracts.
As the LTs trained at Urambo seed farm are working in all tobacco areas in Tanzania, the impact of UTSP II is beyond the project area. LTs are passing on the information to the contact farmers they work with, and are actively monitoring child labour in the field and reporting cases to the primary

Demonstrated Impact

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>societies.</p> <p>Furthermore, the use of YAMAOTEASUPER (a chemical that inhibits suckers' growth) also contributed to the reduction of child labour because before the use of this chemical, children were involved in cutting suckers about three to four times. Currently only one person (adult) is involved in cutting the suckers and applying chemical (YAMAOTEASUPER) at the same time.</p> |
| Improvements in beneficiary livelihood derived from the practice | <p>Reduction of labour requirement and labour time, parallel with the improvement of tobacco quality and yields, and family income.</p> <p>The average school attendance increased from 75% to 84%. 12 Classrooms (12) and one dispensary (1) were built, renovated and equipped, attracting more children to school and reducing their chances to be involved in child labour.</p> |
| Is the practice and/or its benefits likely to continue in some way, and to continue being effective, over the medium to long term? Is the practice still used? | <p>The use of oxen for land cultivation is still going on and many tobacco growers are requesting loans for buying oxen. Furthermore, when the intervention was developed (December 2010) the Government of Tanzania and IFAD were developing a project on sustainable rangeland management to be implemented in Kondoa, Kiteto, Bahi and Chamwino District Councils. This project involved all stakeholders from the funding agency and the pastoralists who are beneficiaries.</p> |
| Does the practice contribute to environmental sustainability and ecological soundness, and how? | N/a |
| Does the practice promote human rights (state which ones) and comply with ILO labour standards? | <p>Yes, the practice promotes the fundamental right of children to be protected from economic and social exploitation as per International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Part III of the Article 10, section 3. It also complies with Article 15, section 1b, which states the right of everyone to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its application. The above human rights comply with ILO standards particularly on the elimination of child labour and protection of children and young persons through Convention no. 138 Minimum Age of Employment (1973) and Convention no. 182 on the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour (1999).</p> |
| Does the practice contribute to social dialogue (between government, workers' and employers' organization) and collective bargaining negotiations? | <p>The practice contributed to social dialogue by involving the ILO tripartite partners (government, workers and employers organizations) and thus public and private sector..</p> |
| Which were the problems and challenges (risks and obstacles) faced within the process? | <p>Tobacco companies are currently unable to meet the increased demand for the oxen package.</p> <p>The oxen package is largely benefiting better-off farmers; a</p> |

Demonstrated Impact

vulnerable-friendly project or credit scheme is needed to enable smaller farmers to benefit in equal measure. There is now a drive to provide tractors on credit to the bigger primary societies and this should also help reducing child labour, but this will carry a higher environmental cost. As the demand for child labour in the tobacco fields falls, a small minority of the most vulnerable children and their families may be challenged for a means to earn their livelihood. The village child labour committees (VCLCs) need to be vigilant to ensure that child labour does not move sideways. Greater effort at alternative income generation is needed.

Availability of resources affects implementation of the project and attainment of its intended goals. The funding agents, donors or government, should be more responsive and flexible to local situations on the ground by reforming the bureaucratic processes and training project coordinators/field officers on resource and budget management to ensure timely disbursement of funds.

Lessons learned

The tobacco companies have responded well in supporting the oxenization programme as an internal strategy to enhance the efficiency of tobacco transportation. This has resulted in a reduction of losses per unit area, from 40% before oxenization, to 20% after oxenization. In this regard, both farmers and the tobacco companies are showing signs of benefiting, with the farmers benefiting through improved household income and the tobacco companies through increased revenue arising from improved quality and quantity. However, there is need for an impact assessment to quantify the actual increase in income accruing to both parties, i.e. farmers and the tobacco companies.

Quotes from direct beneficiaries of the practice

“People are changing now. We used to employ many children; now we no longer do so. The Leaf Technician advised me to send my children to school and he has helped me with many improvements”.

A leaf technician (LT) in Imalamakoye Ward came across a tobacco farmer who was employing his grandchildren in the tobacco fields. The LT discussed the matter in a friendly way with the farmer and learnt that the farmer was very interested in getting an oxen plough which would reduce his labour needs. The LT facilitated the farmer to get the oxen plough loan package.

The farmer labour needs have been greatly reduced. Previously he was able to farm 5 acres of tobacco with the help of his grandchildren; now he can farm 10 acres with his oxen.

His grandchildren have re-enrolled in school and are continuing their education. His tobacco income has gone up so that he has now bought a second pair of oxen which he

Demonstrated Impact

hires out to other farmers. He has also built a house in town and has set funds aside for the secondary education of his grandchildren.
Now there is high demand of oxen and ox carts. For example in 2009/10 demand was 130 pairs compared to 120 pairs which were available. In 2010/11 demand was 194 pair as compared to 180 pairs available.

Replicability

Is this a practice that might have applicability in some way to other situations or settings? What are the elements that make the practice replicable?

The oxcart scheme can be replicated elsewhere and on various commodities, crops and areas intensively involving child labour such as mining and commercial agriculture. The introduction of a training module on child labour for leaf technicians can be replicated with agriculture extension workers.
Private-public partnership can be used in other development projects, and in the area where government is not capable the private sector can work properly if environment is made conducive and supported by all parties.

Key political, economic, demographic or cultural dynamics that favoured or impeded the transformation process

The National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (MKUKUTA) favours the use of labour saving technologies for the purpose of increasing productivity and income to the households and, parallel to that reducing/eliminating child labour. In the tobacco growing areas where livestock is prevalent the use of animals in agriculture is widely promoted.

Critical success factors for development/replication of the good practice (for a comprehensive list of Critical factors see Annex1)

Mix of modalities of intervention:
Effort through extension agents on sensitization to tobacco growers using oxens for increasing productivity and reducing child labour going parallel with the opening of oxen training and manufacturing oxcarts centres.
Commitment of tobacco companies for provision of loans to tobacco growers for the purchase of oxens with its equipments.

Resources and inputs needed to implement the practice, including physical (e.g. land, fertilizers, seeds), labour, financial and monetary inputs, and management capacity

On technical resources and support: ILO/IPEC and local staff.
On financial resources: Elimination of Child Labour in Tobacco Foundation – ECLT and ILO/IPEC:
Supports amount to USD 120,000 for the practice described above.
The cost of a package which includes a pair of trained oxen, plough, cart, and other equipment is 1.4 million TSH equivalent to 875\$, supplied on interest-free credit.
On human resources: Government - District Council (DC), Implementing Agencies (IAs), the community, and a manager. The manager is competent on the tobacco sector and knowledgeable of procedures and protocol of District Authority is located in the project area. The project manager

Replicability

provided technical support to stakeholders and organized various workshops which brought them together. It was through these workshops that sharing of experience was done, operating at economy of scale while sharing similar activities and avoiding duplication of efforts. Currently (December 2010) there is one LT for every 350 farmers aimed to be increased to one LT for every 180 farmers in the near future.

General Information

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization / Institution promoting the practice | ILO |
| Programme / Project | Combating Hazardous Child Labour in Tobacco Farming in Urambo Phase II (URT/06/02/ECT) |
| Overall objective | Reducing the incidence of child labour in the tobacco production through capacity building of community and partner agencies in Urambo district, so as to capacitate them to eliminate and prevent hazardous work of children. |
| Time frame | January 2007 – December 2010 |
| Implementer(s) | Alfred Karugendo (Africa 2000 Network) Festo Ndonde and Consolata Manimba (Caritas) Alfred Msengi (Care for the Child) Paul Oleah (Hope Farming Group) Bumijaeli Msuya and Dick Mlimuka (Tabora Development Foundation Trust) |
| Source of information | Combating Hazardous Child Labour in Tobacco Farming in Urambo Phase II: IPEC Evaluation (February 2011) Complementary document to the final evaluation (December 2010) |
| Relevant contacts | Jacob Lisuma (ILO/IPEC – UTSP II National Project Coordinator) <jbulenga@gmail.com> Omari Mzirai (national consultant)<omzirai@irdp.ac.tz> Alexandre Soho (Desk Officer UTSP ILO Geneva) |
| Practice edited by | Valentina Bianco with inputs from Jacob Lisuma |

8. THAILAND: Owning up to safe work: how employers learned the value in protecting young employees

Keywords

Seafood, occupational safety and health, social partners, employer's organizations, young workers.

Abstract

The fish-processing sector is one of the major industry in Thailand and attracts many workers, in particular migrant workers, including children. The nature of child labour ranges from hazardous work to cases of forced labour and slavery-like conditions of children working alongside adults in shrimp and seafood processing factories. Main objective of the practice was to establish cooperation with employers to remove children too young to legally work and protecting older children from hazardous conditions in the workplace. In particular, interventions focused on promoting occupational safety and health for young employees in fishing and seafood operations and prevent hazardous work of children below the minimum age.

| Context: Information on the Area of Implementation | |
|--|--|
| Country | Thailand |
| Province, District, Village | Samut Sakhon, Songkhla, Pattani, and Tak provinces |
| Population under the poverty line (% total population) | 13.2 % ²⁶ |
| Agricultural land (% of total land area) and other key natural resources | Land area (1000 ha): 51 089 Arable land (1000 ha): 15 200 Permanent crops (1000 ha): 3 650 Pastures (1000 ha): 800 Irrigated land (1000 ha): 34 |
| Main agricultural products, including from farming, fisheries, livestock, forestry | Rice, paddy, natural rubber, cassava, sugarcane, tropical fruits, meat, palm oil, pineapples, bananas, maize, coconuts, fish and seafood, woodfuel, industrial roundwood |
| Employment in agriculture, including farming, forestry, fisheries and livestock (% of total employment) by subsector if available | 41.7% officially employed in agriculture |
| National legislation on child labour in agriculture (including minimum age, hazardous work list, minimum age for light work, age for compulsory education and on labour inspection in agriculture) | Labour Protection Act, B.E. 2541 (1998) defines minimum age of employment from 15 years including hazardous work for children. Child Protection Act, B.E. 2546 (2003). National Education Act, B.E. 2542 (1999). Provides for the education system structure, from primary to vocational |

²⁶ National Source, Office of National Economic and Social Development Board, calculated from Thailand Household Socio-Economic Survey 2011. The entire series is updated based on revised national poverty line in 2013, in UN Data, <http://data.un.org/Data.aspx?d=MDG&f=seriesRowID%3A581>.

Context: Information on the Area of Implementation

education. Compulsory education is from grade 1 to grade 9 or by age, from 7 to 15 years.
Prevention and Suppression of Human Trafficking Act B.E. 2551 (2008).

Characterization of Child Labour in Agriculture

| | |
|--|--|
| Number of child labourers in agriculture and % of total child labour (by subsector or crop, if available) | 300,000 children aged 15-17 years legally employed in registered establishments in 2005 (60% male and 40% female). This official figure is compounded by illegal work by children under 15, and especially by non-registered or falsely registered migrant children. Approximately 40% of child labourers (from a sample size of 2,600 in six study areas) were found to be in agriculture ²⁷ . |
| Percent of child labourers in agriculture that are aged 5-14 and percent that are aged 15-17. | 24 % (80,000 children) between the ages of 15-17 work in the agricultural sector. |
| Percent of child labourers in agriculture that are girls and percent that are boys. | N/A |
| Percent of girl child labourers working in agriculture and percent of boy child labourers working in agriculture | N/A |
| Typical hours spent by boys and girls in agriculture and the tasks undertaken (for a comprehensive list of Tasks see Annex1) | Hours: The exact numbers are unknown; however, working students commonly work outside school hours during the week and full days during weekends. Full time child labourers (those who do not attend school), work half or full day varied by types of agriculture products. Tasks: Primary processing of seafood and shrimp, including peeling, de-veining and de-heading Fish sorting on the docks Small-scale family based fishing |
| Main hazards faced by these children (for a comprehensive list of Hazards see Annex1) | Injuries attributed to overwork, heavy work, and lack of sleep; ergonomic hazards; wounds; skin infections; use sharp tools; exposure biological hazards in raw seafood; violence, drowning and life-threatening accidents |
| Describe the specific causes of child labour in agriculture in the area | Poverty in neighbouring countries forces adults and children to migrate- often illegally- to Thailand to look for better opportunities. In fact, the shrimp industry is one of the labour-intensive export industries in Thailand that attract migrant workers, including children, from neighbouring Myanmar, Cambodia and Lao PDR. Among Thai communities, child labour is thought to be more common among 15 to 17 year olds working in hazardous conditions than among children under 15. In addition, in regional fishery and seafood processing areas employment |

²⁷ ILO-IPEC Child Labour Survey, 2006.

Characterization of Child Labour in Agriculture

opportunities are limited and the conditions of work in small-scale processing enterprises and in family based fishing are poorly inspected and monitored by the labour inspectorate under the Department of Labour Protection and Welfare (DLPW). Child labour is accepted as a common practice in particular in small and mostly informal enterprises.

The Good Practice

| | |
|---|---|
| Time frame of the practice | October 2007 to March 2010. |
| Specific objective of the practice | Establish cooperation with employers to remove children too young to legally work and protecting older children from hazardous conditions in the workplace |
| Why was the practice implemented? | The Employers' Confederation of Thailand (ECOT) became an active ally of the ILO during the drafting of the National Policy and Plan to Eliminate the Worst Forms of Child Labour (2009-2014). ECOT is also a member of the hazardous work list subcommittee and proved its dedication to improving OSH standards in work facilities by reaching out to local employers. |
| Partners involved | ILO-IPEC, in conjunction with Employers' Confederation of Thailand (ECOT), Federation of Thai Industries (FTI) Pattani Chapters, provincial committees, local NGOs (Planned Parenthood and the Mae Sot Civil Society), Academic institutes (Asian Research on Migration Center, and the Research and Development Institute). |
| Agricultural subsector addressed by the practice (crop production, farming, fisheries or aquaculture, forestry, livestock) | Fishing: fish and seafood processing |
| Specific issues addressed | Occupational safety and health and hazardous work of children in agriculture/fisheries, community mobilization, social dialogue |
| Description of the approach followed (including specific steps and activities carried out) | <p>The practice aimed at increasing protection from hazardous work of children above minimum age for employment, by focusing on improving occupational safety and health, while children below minimum age were withdrawn from child labour.</p> <p>The approach adopted to improve OSH in fishing and seafood operations focused on strengthening collaboration with the employers and encourage them to ensure their workplace facilities are conducive to children's development, including access to health services and OSH protection. The practice also expand employers' general awareness on child labour laws and rights and the unacceptable conditions that</p> |

The Good Practice

children work in.

Implemented activities included:

1. Seminar for NGOs, worker and employer organizations on national child labour laws and regulations and the impacts of child labour in the seafood/shrimp processing sector.
2. Adaptation and translation of training materials into Thai: ILO's *Eliminating Child Labour: Guides for Employers* for employer's trainings. *Working with youth: Tips for small business owners* specifically designed for employers who employ 14-17 year olds (Songkla province)
3. On-site trainings on child labour law and regulations for 300 employers in the seafood/shrimp processing sector (Samut Sakhon province)
Physical examinations and blood testing to check child workers level of harmful substances (including HIV) and dispense relevant OSH health information. Of those tested, removal of children too young to work or working in hazardous conditions. (Songkla and Tak province)
4. Memorandum of Understanding signed between employers organizations and the Pattani provincial committee to eliminate the hiring of children for seafood processing work and provide education and vocational training centers for former child labourers.
5. Seminar on safe-work checklists for family-based and private seafood processing enterprises on how to reduce OSH hazards in the workplace for children (Songkhla and Pattani province)
6. "Good Farm" competition created to award employers who have improved OSH conditions for child workers (Tak province)
7. "Dream Factory" contest executed to award shrimp peeling sheds that met OSH conditions and welfare provision for child workers (Samut Sakhon province)

Demonstrated Impact

| | |
|--|---|
| Indirect beneficiaries – number and categories | Communities indirectly benefited from protective legislation that was introduced during the implementation of this project. Local employer's organizations signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between local government units to ensure that children below the minimum age would not be hired to work in fishing or seafood enterprises. These MOUs resulted in long-term impacts towards the elimination of hazardous work for children. |
| Direct beneficiaries – number and categories | Child Labourers: 1,415 received physical and blood testing and OSH information; 161 attended weekend workshop on OSH and decent work. Employers: 180 attended child labour and OSH training |

Demonstrated Impact

| | |
|---|--|
| | workshops; 128 (87 women) attended safe-work checklist workshop Household enterprises: 180 received safe work checklists |
| What was the impact of the practice in reducing child labour in agriculture? Can the impact of the practice be documented in some way, through a formal programme evaluation, impact assessment or other means? | Children who received a physical examination and/or blood testing and were found to be too young for work or working in hazardous conditions were removed from work. The program also educated and trained employers to understand national child labour laws and OSH regulations to either eliminate the practice of employing children, or ensure a safe and decent work environment for children above the minimum working age. Employer's organizations in Pattani province signed an MOU to stop employing children and provide education and vocational training centers for former child workers. |
| Improvements in beneficiary livelihood derived from the practice | Child Labourers receive better salaries and work in a safer and healthier environment. Children and youth who attended vocational training have more opportunities to find decent jobs. Employers: improved reputation among consumers of their products; safer work conditions improve workers health and improve productivity Household enterprises: safer working conditions improve workers health and improve productivity |
| Is the practice and/or its benefits likely to continue in some way, and to continue being effective, over the medium to long term? Is the practice still used? | The MOU that was signed into law between local provincial government and workers organizations will ensure long-term compliance to eliminate the practice of hiring child labourers as well as hazardous work environments. The Provincial Labour Protection and Welfare office in Pattani province oversees this MOU that is still in place. |
| Does the practice contribute to environmental sustainability and ecological soundness, and how? | Seminars and workshops included information on proper water drainage and disposal of seafood remains in small scale enterprises. |
| Does the practice promote human rights (state which ones) and comply with ILO labour standards? | Yes: engagement of social partners, adherence to Conventions No. 138 and No.182, and ILO-OSH standards as well as the UN Child Rights principles. |
| Does the practice contribute to social dialogue (between government, workers' and employers' organization) and collective bargaining negotiations? | Yes, the practice involves the direct collaboration between national and local governments and employers organizations. The MOU signed between the government and the employer's organizations promotes social dialogue between the two stakeholder groups while producing a legislative foundation for reducing child labour in local districts. |
| Which were the problems and challenges (risks and obstacles) faced within the process? | Initial resistance of some employers; many workplaces remain isolated and it is difficult to monitor the employment of children; long distance between the worksite and the learning centre makes difficult for children to reach the centers without pre-arranged transport. Security of these children also remains a concern once they are removed from |

| Demonstrated Impact | |
|--|---|
| Lessons learned | <p>hazardous work, since they may shift to a different sector with major risks.</p> <p>A health related approach is a workable entry point to gain access to hard-to-reach target groups. It is also an appropriate approach to gain positive support from stakeholders.</p> <p>Having a local organization acting as a catalyst to mobilize key agencies to provide OSH services to targeted beneficiaries was effective in all participating provinces. While there are many forms of hazardous child labour in each locality, a sector approach can focus common efforts among collaborators to develop applicable methods and tools in mitigating child labour problem constructively. If withdrawing children from a work situation is not a possible option, removing them from the hazardous portion of the work or improving the work condition can be the next best strategy.</p> |
| Quotes from direct beneficiaries of the practice | <p>"I used to work and received 100 baht per day. I don't like working the middle of the sun. It is very hot. I sweat a lot and become very exhausted. Studying at school is much better. People come to visit us. They bring along snacks and organize fun games for us. This is very good. I like it a lot. I want to be here. I also got vaccines and blood test." -hi Ha Jor, 15 in Tak province</p> <p>"Large companies in Pattani do not accept workers who are younger than 15. There are some workers who are between 15 and 18 years old. They are taken care of by the Pattani Provincial Office of Labour Protection and Welfare. The only concern we have so far is most employers are not familiar with the labour laws. They may not recognize that workers aged 15-17 are considered child labourers. We focus on how to improve the subcontractors, the micro and small facilities that carry out fish sorting at the ports. They employ women and children. If we want to enforce the laws, we certainly can do it. The law is already in place. However, this approach will not yield a good result. It is by force and not by a voluntary commitment. Instead, we developed a labour guideline for micro and small facilities. This guideline will tell them how to administer the labour issues in a correct way." Adisorn Klinpikul, the Human Resources Manager in a fish-processing factory and a member with the Federation of Thai Industry - Pattani Chapter.</p> |
| Replicability | |
| Is this a practice that might have applicability in some way to other situations or settings? What are the elements that make the practice | <p>Presence of employer's organizations and desire to maintain reputation</p> <p>Availability of ILO materials and technical assistance for translation and adaptation to local language and culture</p> |

Replicability

| | |
|---|--|
| replicable? | Long-term legislative power and efficacy of MOUs and similar legal instruments between stakeholder groups Engagement of local NGOs and organizations that will work in the area Good farm awards offer incentives for employers to continue to maintain OSH standards |
| Key political, economic, demographic or cultural dynamics that favoured or impeded the transformation process | Active involvement of all key stakeholders including community leaders and responsible public agencies favoured the transformation process. |
| Critical success factors for development/replication of the good practice (for a comprehensive list of Critical factors see Annex1) | Commitment of local stakeholders: Building capacity of local resource persons, including teachers, community leaders and health volunteers, academic and public institutes create effective outcomes. Collaborative employer's organizations willing to make a change in their enterprises to protect child workers |
| Resources and inputs needed to implement the practice, including physical (e.g. land, fertilizers, seeds), labour, financial and monetary inputs, and management capacity | Labour and Management inputs: Medical organizations willing and capable to perform physical and blood testing for working children Trainers and workshop leaders with relevant experience in labour relations, child labour, and OSH standards |

General Information

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization / Institution promoting the practice | ILO/IPEC, Bangkok |
| Programme / Project | Support National Action to Combat Child Labour and Its Worst Forms in Thailand |
| Overall objective | Eliminate child labour and its worst forms in Thailand |
| Time frame | October 2007 to March 2010 |
| Implementer(s) | ILO-IPEC in conjunction with Employers' Confederation of Thailand (ECOT), Federation of Thai Industries (FTI) Pattani Chapters, provincial committees, local NGOs (Planned Parenthood and the Mae Sot Civil Society), Academic institutes (Asian Research on Migration Center, and the Research and Development Institute). |
| Source of information | http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---asia/---ro-bangkok/---sro-bangkok/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_142101.pdf |
| Relevant contacts | TANEYYA RUNCHAROEN Programme Officer - Thailand taneeya@ilo.org +662 288 2242 |
| Practice edited by | Halshka Graczyk |

9. NICARAGUA: Good practices on education and social dialogue for the prevention of Child Labour among seasonal coffee plantation workers

Keywords

Coffee farming, coffee producers, education, youth employment, social dialogue

Abstract

Temporary workers who harvest coffee migrate from various regions of the country towards coffee growing areas with their entire family, and as part of their cultural practice their children also harvest coffee to increase the volume of coffee collected and therefore their household income. The owners and/or administrators of the coffee businesses hire adults as harvesters, whom they provide with food. This is not the case, however, for children who have to share the food with their parents. Adolescent coffee harvesters older than 14 working long hours are at serious risk of pesticide intoxication and/or are exposed to dangers involved in heavy lifting of sacks on steep slopes. Interventions aimed to reach a consensus on labour protection of adolescent workers and protection of children as individuals with rights. Focus of the practice was to improve access to education and school attendance in the coffee plantations where children work through social dialogues and thus the direct involvement of employers and workers, and by strengthening the collaboration between the Ministry of Labour and the Ministry of Education. Interventions also supported income generation for families of working children through microcredit schemes and promoted corporate social responsibility among exporting companies.

Context: Information on the Area of Implementation

Please specify if data refers to the country or the specific area of the practice and indicate the most recent available data

| | |
|--|--|
| Country | Nicaragua |
| Province, District, Village | Jinotega, Matagalpa, San Juan de Rio Coco y Carazo, |
| Population under the poverty line (% total population) | 42.5% (2009, National Source (INIDE)) National Household Survey on Living Standards; Moderate Poverty Line (individuals) |
| Agricultural land (% of total land area) and other key natural resources | |
| Main agricultural products, including from farming, fisheries, livestock, forestry | Coffee, Cotton, Corn, Cane Sugar and Banana |
| Employment in agriculture, including farming, forestry, fisheries and livestock (% of total employment) by subsector if available | 31% of the active population of the country. |
| National legislation on child labour in agriculture (including minimum age, hazardous work list, minimum age for light work, age for compulsory education and on labour inspection in agriculture) | The Labour Code The Code of Childhood and Adolescence in the Republic of Nicaragua I |

Characterization of Child Labour in Agriculture

Please specify if data refers to the country or the specific area of the practice

| | |
|--|---|
| Number of child labourers in agriculture and % of total child labour (by sub-sector or crop, if available) | In 2005, 238,827 children and adolescents were active workers, which represented 13.2% of the total population of this group. The total percentage of adolescents in agricultural activities is 56.6% |
| Percent of child labourers in agriculture that are aged 5-14 and percent that are aged 15-17. | Percentage by age group: 5-9: 2.4% 10-14: 14.7% 15-17: 32.4% |
| Percent of child labourers in agriculture that are girls and percent that are boys | |
| Percent of girl child labourers working in agriculture and percent of boy child labourers working in agriculture | Girls: 27.9% Boys: 68.4% |
| Typical hours spent by boys and girls in agriculture and the tasks ¹ undertaken | Hours: 48 hours per week for children under 14 50-60 hours per week for adolescents between 14 and 17 Tasks: Typical of coffee growing culture such as cutting and harvesting coffee, fumigation, selection of grain, planting and processing of coffee. |
| Main hazards ² faced by these children | Environmental and Physical Risks (Noise, vibrations, solar radiation, irregular topography of the terrain) Chemical Risks (Agrochemicals and chemicals in different forms and states) Biological Risks (Insects, worms, wild and working animals and various other risks from national flora and fauna) Mechanical Risks and Sanitation (Use of tools such as machetes, knives, motorised machinery and use of infrastructures without basic sanitation or water suitable for human consumption) Organisational Risks, Psychological and Ergonomic hazards (Physical and verbal abuse, standing, kneeling and squatting work, extended work day, high rate of isolation, abuse and intimidation) |
| Describe the specific causes of child labour in agriculture in the area | Poverty is one of the causes of Child Labour, making it necessary that all members of a family work to improve or secure their own maintenance. Temporary workers who harvest coffee migrate from various regions of the country towards coffee growing areas with their entire family, and as part of their cultural practice their children also harvest coffee to increase the volume of coffee |

Characterization of Child Labour in Agriculture

Please specify if data refers to the country or the specific area of the practice

and therefore their household income.

The Good Practice

| | |
|--|--|
| Time frame of the practice | 2007-2008 / 2009-2010 / 2011-2012 |
| Specific objective of the practice | To achieve a consensus on Labour Protection of adolescent workers and protection of children as individuals with rights. |
| Why was the practice implemented? | The practice was implemented as a follow up to the interventions against child labour initiated by the inter-institutional commission on child labour composed by representatives of different institutions, including agricultural trade unions, local and national NGOs and created in 2007 |
| Partners involved | Coffee Producers, Agricultural Exporting Companies, Coffee Associations, Trade Unions, Community Leaders, Ministry of labour and Ministry of Education |
| Agricultural subsector addressed by the practice (farming, fisheries and/or aquaculture, forestry, livestock) | Coffee Growing |
| Specific issues addressed | Education and youth employment, social dialogue |
| Description of the approach followed (including specific steps and activities carried out) | <p>The practice aimed at preventing and reducing the use of child labour among seasonal coffee workers, by focusing on improving access to education in the coffee plantations through the direct involvement of line Ministries, coffee producers and workers, including promotion of CSR among exporting companies.</p> <p>Implemented activities included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Education for child labourers: activities were supported by coffee producers and State institutions such as the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Labour through the program 'Puentes Educativos' (Educational Bridges), focusing on care and development of educational and recreational activities during school holidays. The producers invested in paying teachers, purchasing educational supplies, food for children, improving the infrastructure of schools located on the plantations, thus contributing to the prevention of child labour.2. Social Dialogue: Follow-up of the activities were carried out by the joint committee on child labour in each coffee plantation in which representatives of the employers and agricultural trade unions (ATC) participated. Exporting companies guaranteed an economic incentive in terms of purchasing price of coffee to producers who carried out |

The Good Practice

actions to prevent and eliminate child labour.

3. Awareness raising: activities were organized directly on the site with plantations workers to raise awareness of and respect for labour legislation.

4. Promotion of gender equality/equity: girls and adolescent women who carried out domestic work (cooking, taking care of children, etc.) were specifically targeted with educational and income generating interventions.

Demonstrated Impact

| | |
|---|--|
| Indirect beneficiaries – number and categories | Association of Coffee Plantations of Jinotega Community and Trade Union Leaders |
| Direct beneficiaries – number and categories | 5,000 children and adolescents between the ages of 5 and 7 benefited from this initiative in a total of 43 coffee plantations farms. Mothers and fathers of working children gained knowledge and awareness about the issue of child labour, health and nutrition among other themes. In addition, they benefited from microcredits scheme to create small farms and businesses which increased their income. |
| What was the impact of the practice in reducing child labour in agriculture? Can the impact of the practice be documented in some way, through a formal programme evaluation, impact assessment or other means? | The impact was documented in the report of the program of action in the 2009 coffee harvest, Jinotega, Nicaragua. (Resumen de Resultados) |
| Improvements in beneficiary livelihood derived from the practice | Children targeted by the practice gained access to education and improved schools attendance. Families of working children increased their income as a result of credit received through microfinance programmes. |
| Is the practice and/or its benefits likely to continue in some way, and to continue being effective, over the medium to long term? Is the practice still used? | Since 2007, this experience has been repeated in every coffee harvest (November to February) in the region of Jinotega, adding every year other producers and cooperatives; agricultural export companies, coffee plantation associations, trade unions and community leaders. Furthermore, it has extended to other regions of the country such as Matagalpa, Carazo, San Juan de Río Coco. |
| Does the practice contribute to environmental sustainability and ecological soundness, and how? | |
| Does the practice promote human rights (state which ones) and comply | Yes: adherence to Conventions No. 138 and No.182 as well as the UN Child Rights principles |

Demonstrated Impact

| | |
|--|--|
| with ILO labour standards? | |
| Does the practice contribute to social dialogue (between government, workers' and employers' organization) and collective bargaining negotiations? | The practice focused specifically on social dialogue. The joint committee on Child Labour in each coffee plantation is promoted by the Ministry of Labour and composed by representatives of employers and workers. It creates a space for social dialogue in order to address the issue of child labour in coffee plantations and also to find a solution to both productive and social issues affecting workers. |
| Which were the problems and challenges (risks and obstacles) faced within the process? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of human resources in public institutions and Ministries to follow-up the practice. • Lack of infrastructures and basic resources such as water and electricity in some coffee plantations to set up the schools. • Parents and coffee producers' lack of awareness about risks and negative effects of child labour. |
| Lessons learned | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is key to include teachers and school directors from the beginning of the whole process. Coordination between Ministries of Labour and Education is therefore a must. • It is also crucial to include in the whole process and awareness raising efforts all staff of the coffee plantations, not just the managers of the plantations. |
| Quotes from direct beneficiaries of the practice | |

Replicability

| | |
|--|--|
| Is this a practice that might have applicability in some way to other situations or settings? What are the elements that make the practice replicable? | Yes, this has been replicated in coffee harvesting, adding other producers and cooperatives every year, agricultural export companies, coffee plantation associations, trade unions and community leaders. |
| Key political, economic, demographic or cultural dynamics that favoured or impeded the transformation process | There is a political interest of the government to comply with and fulfil international commitments, national legislation and the Roadmap to making Nicaragua a country free of child labour. |
| Critical success factors ³ for development/replication of the good practice | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment of national stakeholders involved. • Successful coordination between coffee producers, Ministries and other stakeholder. • Commitment of coffee producers who traditionally had not worked on child labour prevention because it was culturally accepted. • Coffee producers included the practice in their social responsibility programs which ensures sustainability. • Gradual involvement of trade unions, NGOs, community leaders which has increased social dialogue and led to the signing of an inter-institutional agreement. |

Replicability

| | |
|---|---|
| Resources and inputs needed to implement the practice, including physical (e.g. land, fertilizers, seeds), labour, financial and monetary inputs, and management capacity | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Parents were supportive and involved in the process. <p>'Los Puentes Educativos' (Educational Bridges) focus on the development of educational and recreational activities. It was necessary to invest in paying teachers, purchasing educational supplies, food for children, improving the infrastructure of schools located on the plantations and carrying out specific activities with the workers to raise awareness of and respect for the country's labour legislation.</p> |
|---|---|

General Information

| | |
|---|--|
| Organization / Institution promoting the practice | ILO |
| Programme / Project | Program for the prevention and elimination of child labour in Nicaragua. |
| Overall objective | Comprehensive care for children in coffee plantations |
| Time frame | 2007-2008 / 2009-2010 / 2011-2012 |
| Implementer(s) | |
| Source of information | |
| Relevant contacts | Noortje Denkers ILO/IPEC coordinator for Central America, Panama, the Dominican Republic and Haiti Tel 506 2207 8700 Ext. 248 denkers@ilo.org |
| Practice edited by | Noortje Denkers |

Notes:

¹ Include the source used for the data in the list.

² **Types of Tasks:** Types of tasks vary according to the each agriculture subsectors, some examples include:

- **Crop production:** preparing land; transporting and planting seedlings; weeding; applying fertilizers, pesticides or herbicides; harvesting; drying; carrying heavy loads.
- **Fisheries and aquaculture:** fishing; diving; draining boats; handling and repairing nets; herding fish into nets; crewing on fishing vessels; shoveling ice; cooking; working as porters; guarding fishing vessels in docks, piers and harbours; loading and unloading fish; sorting fish; cleaning and salting fish; smoking/drying fish; painting; fish marketing; harvesting shellfish; lifting heavy nets of fish using hand cranes; sorting, boiling and drying fish; peeling shrimp; drying, boiling and shelling various types of seafood.
- **Forestry:** climbing trees or using punting poles to harvest fruits, oils and nuts; insect raising; collecting honey from beehives; draining rubber; planting; logging; carrying heavy loads; harvesting wood and non-timber forest products, such as wild berries, bananas, nuts, oil palm, mushrooms, maple syrup, vines, ginseng, oils, resins, ferns, tree boughs, coconuts, cones, moss and cascara bark.
- **Livestock:** herding; shepherding; milking; handling livestock; leading livestock long distances to water and pastures; construction of corrals or poultry sheds; feeding, cleaning or treating poultry.

³ **Types of Hazards.** A hazard can be any work material, substance, equipment, plant, work method or practice that has the potential to cause harm, injury or disease to people, and/or damage to the environment. Hazards can be:

- **Physical:** long hours of work, strenuous labour, repetitive movements, heavy loads.
- **Ergonomic:** factors affecting worker comfort and health such as lighting and temperature, noise and vibration, tools, adequacy of machinery and workstation design to height, shape, adequacy of protective equipment, work organization.
- **Chemical:** pesticides, fertilizers, herbicides and other chemicals used in agriculture.
- **Biological:** diseases caught from birds or other animals, asthma and other lung diseases for example from biologically contaminated dusts, infectious diseases, bacteria, body fluids, sexual abuse.
- **Psychosocial:** violence and harassment, discrimination, exposure to unhealthy behaviours (e.g. drug use), sexual abuse, isolation.

Annex 1. List of tasks, hazards and critical factors

Types of Tasks

Types of tasks vary according to the each agriculture subsectors, some examples include:

- **Crop production:** preparing land; transporting and planting seedlings; weeding; applying fertilizers, pesticides or herbicides; harvesting; drying; carrying heavy loads.
- **Fisheries and aquaculture:** fishing; diving; draining boats; handling and repairing nets; herding fish into nets; crewing on fishing vessels; shoveling ice; cooking; working as porters; guarding fishing vessels in docks, piers and harbours; loading and unloading fish; sorting fish; cleaning and salting fish; smoking/drying fish; painting; fish marketing; harvesting shellfish; lifting heavy nets of fish using hand cranes; sorting, boiling and drying fish; peeling shrimp; drying, boiling and shelling various types of seafood.
- **Forestry:** climbing trees or using punting poles to harvest fruits, oils and nuts; insect raising; collecting honey from beehives; draining rubber; planting; logging; carrying heavy loads; harvesting wood and non-timber forest products, such as wild berries, bananas, nuts, oil palm, mushrooms, maple syrup, vines, ginseng, oils, resins, ferns, tree boughs, coconuts, cones, moss and cascara bark.
- **Livestock:** herding; shepherding; milking; handling livestock; leading livestock long distances to water and pastures; construction of corrals or poultry sheds; feeding, cleaning or treating poultry.

Types of Hazards

A hazard can be any work material, substance, equipment, plant, work method or practice that has the potential to cause harm, injury or disease to people, and/or damage to the environment. Hazards can be:

- **Physical:** long hours of work, strenuous labour, repetitive movements, heavy loads.
- **Ergonomic:** factors affecting worker comfort and health such as lighting and temperature, noise and vibration, tools, adequacy of machinery and workstation design to height, shape, adequacy of protective equipment, work organization.
- **Chemical:** pesticides, fertilizers, herbicides and other chemicals used in agriculture.
- **Biological:** diseases caught from birds or other animals, asthma and other lung diseases for example from biologically contaminated dusts, infectious diseases, bacteria, body fluids, sexual abuse.

- **Psychosocial:** violence and harassment, discrimination, exposure to unhealthy behaviours (e.g. drug use), sexual abuse, isolation.

Critical Factors

Some examples of broad categories of critical factors include:

- **Opportunity arising from interconnected national/international factors,** e.g. land reform programmes or international pressure to reduce child labour in a specific value chain.
- **Ownership and consensus,** e.g. ownership in the country derived from policy changes or reform processes initiated within countries or from the motivation of an institution or an individual.
- **The identification of champions,** e.g. a national/sub-national institution, a civil society or community-based organization that has the skills and/or motivation to guide/support capacity development in the country.
- **Early involvement of national actors,** e.g. the involvement of national actors for the definition of methodologies, work-plans, needs assessments creates important conditions for a strengthened leadership and ownership.
- **Needs assessments,** e.g. a national strategy development on education for rural people rooted in an in-depth assessment of the educational needs in rural areas.
- **Medium to long-term time horizon,** e.g. continued work for 10 years in a country/region through a series of interventions that build on each other.
- **Mix of modalities of intervention** e.g. the combination of research activities, training and the creation of formal or informal networks; or the combination of community monitoring systems with improved educational opportunities and livelihood strategies.
- **Customization of training materials** to local situation and languages with the support of national/sub-national actors.
- **Stable/strategic resource allocations,** a key to highlight a country's commitment and the future sustainability of certain approaches or programmes.
- **Empowerment,** e.g. targeted interventions at the community level that change capabilities, lead to a more active role at local level and give a voice to the poor.

Annex 2. Format to identify and document good practices on child labour in agriculture (English)

Keywords

Max 10 keywords.

Abstract

(Short description, objectives)

| Context: Information on the Area of Implementation Please specify if data refers to the country or the specific area of the practice and indicate the most recent available data | |
|--|--|
| Country | |
| Province, District, Village | |
| Population under the poverty line (% total population) | |
| Agricultural land (% of total land area) and other key natural resources | |
| Main agricultural products, including from farming, fisheries, livestock, forestry | |
| Employment in agriculture, including farming, forestry, fisheries and livestock (% of total employment) by subsector if available | |
| National legislation on child labour in agriculture (including minimum age, hazardous work list, minimum age for light work, age for compulsory education and on labour inspection in agriculture) | |

| Characterization of Child Labour in Agriculture Please specify if data refers to the country or the specific area of the practice | |
|---|--|
| Number of child labourers in agriculture and % of total child labour (by subsector or crop, if available) | |
| Percent of child labourers in agriculture that are aged 5-14 and percent that are aged 15-17. | |
| Percent of child labourers in agriculture that are girls and percent that are boys | |
| Percent of girl child labourers working in agriculture and percent of boy child labourers working in agriculture | |
| Typical hours spent by boys and girls in agriculture and the tasks* undertaken | |
| Main hazards** faced by these children | |
| Describe the specific causes of child labour in agriculture in the area (for example: specific agricultural techniques and practices, labour availability, land tenure systems, employment relationships, and other relevant information) | |

Notes:

* **Types of Tasks.** Types of tasks vary according to the each agriculture subsectors, some examples include :

- **Crop production:** preparing land; transporting and planting seedlings; weeding; applying fertilizers, pesticides or herbicides; harvesting; drying; carrying heavy loads.
- **Fisheries and aquaculture:** fishing; diving; draining boats; handling and repairing nets; herding fish into nets; crewing on fishing vessels; shoveling ice; cooking; working as porters; guarding fishing vessels in docks, piers and harbours; loading and unloading fish; sorting fish; cleaning and salting fish; smoking/drying fish; painting; fish marketing; harvesting shellfish; lifting heavy nets of fish using hand cranes; sorting, boiling and drying fish; peeling shrimp; drying, boiling and shelling various types of seafood.
- **Forestry:** climbing trees or using punting poles to harvest fruits, oils and nuts; insect raising; collecting honey from beehives; draining rubber; planting; logging; carrying heavy loads; harvesting wood and non-timber forest products, such as wild berries, bananas, nuts, oil palm, mushrooms, maple syrup, vines, ginseng, oils, resins, ferns, tree boughs, coconuts, cones, moss and cascara bark.
- **Livestock:** herding; shepherding; milking; handling livestock; leading livestock long distances to water and pastures; construction of corrals or poultry sheds; feeding, cleaning or treating poultry.

** **Types of Hazards.** A hazard can be any work material, substance, equipment, plant, work method or practice that has the potential to cause harm, injury or disease to people, and/or damage to the environment. Hazards can be:

- **Physical:** long hours of work, strenuous labour, repetitive movements, heavy loads.
- **Ergonomic:** factors affecting worker comfort and health such as lighting and temperature, noise and vibration, tools, adequacy of machinery and workstation design to height, shape, adequacy of protective equipment, work organization.
- **Chemical:** pesticides, fertilizers, herbicides and other chemicals used in agriculture.
- **Biological:** diseases caught from birds or other animals, asthma and other lung diseases for example from biologically contaminated dusts, infectious diseases, bacteria, body fluids, sexual abuse.
- **Psychosocial:** violence and harassment, discrimination, exposure to unhealthy behaviours (e.g. drug use), sexual abuse, isolation.

| The Good Practice | |
|---|--|
| Time frame of the practice | |
| Specific objective of the practice | |
| Source of the objective (for example: response to a country's request; preceded by an assessment; result or follow-up of a previous good practice to eliminate child labour) | |
| Partners involved | |
| Agricultural subsector addressed by the practice (farming, fisheries and/or aquaculture, forestry, livestock) | |
| Specific issues addressed Agricultural practices and techniques (production, processing, marketing) Education (formal and non-formal) Gender International Labour Standards, national legislation Occupational safety and health Policy development and social dialogue Community mobilization Others (e.g. livelihoods diversification; value chain development; income generation activities; youth employment promotion; social and economic standards and corporate social responsibility) | |
| Description of the approach followed (including specific steps and activities carried out) | |

| Demonstrated Impact | |
|---|--|
| Indirect beneficiaries – number and categories (for examples, farmers' organizations, cooperatives, | |

| Demonstrated Impact | |
|---|--|
| district agricultural/labour offices, community, etc.) | |
| Direct beneficiaries – number and categories (for example, boys under 15, girls under 15, boys 15-17, girls 15-17, male/female youth (15-24), households etc.) | |
| What was the impact of the practice in reducing child labour in agriculture? Can the impact of the practice be documented in some way, through a formal programme evaluation, impact assessment or other means? | |
| Improvements in beneficiary livelihood derived from the practice (e.g. regarding household income, number of working hours, school attendance, access to vocational training and apprenticeships) | |
| Is the practice and/or its benefits likely to continue in some way, and to continue being effective, over the medium to long term? Is the practice still used? | |
| Does the practice contribute to environmental sustainability and ecological soundness, and how? (e.g. promotion of Integrated Production and Pest Management, organic agriculture, conservation agriculture, agroforestry, crop rotations/associations, integrated crop livestock production systems, and water harvesting systems) | |
| Does the practice promote human rights (state which ones) and comply with ILO labour standards? | |
| Does the practice contribute to social dialogue (between government, workers' and employers' organization) and collective bargaining negotiations? | |
| Which were the problems and challenges (risks and obstacles) faced within the process? | |
| Lessons learned | |
| Quotes from direct beneficiaries of the practice | |

| Replicability | |
|---|--|
| Is this a practice that might have applicability in some way to other situations or settings? What are the elements that make the practice replicable? | |
| Key political, economic, demographic or cultural dynamics that favoured or impeded the transformation process | |
| Critical success factors* for development/replication of the good practice | |
| Resources and inputs needed to implement the practice, including physical (e.g. land, fertilizers, seeds), labour, financial and monetary inputs, and management capacity | |

* **Critical factors.** Some examples of broad categories of critical factors include:

- **Opportunity arising from interconnected national/international factors**, e.g. land reform programmes or international pressure to reduce child labour in a specific value chain.
- **Ownership and consensus**, e.g. ownership in the country derived from policy changes or reform processes initiated within countries or from the motivation of an institution or an individual.

- **The identification of champions**, e.g. a national/sub-national institution, a civil society or community-based organization that has the skills and/or motivation to guide/support capacity development in the country.
- **Early involvement of national actors**, e.g. the involvement of national actors for the definition of methodologies, work-plans, and needs assessments creates important conditions for a strengthened leadership and ownership.
- **Needs assessments**, e.g. a national strategy development on education for rural people rooted in an in-depth assessment of the educational needs in rural areas.
- **Medium to long-term time horizon**, e.g. continued work for 10 years in a country/region through a series of interventions that build on each other:
 - **Mix of modalities of intervention** e.g. the combination of research activities, training and the creation of formal or informal networks; or the combination of community monitoring systems with improved educational opportunities and livelihood strategies.
 - **Customization of training materials** to local situation and languages with the support of national/sub-national actors.
 - **Stable/strategic resource allocations**, a key to highlight a country's commitment and the future sustainability of certain approaches or programmes.
 - **Empowerment**, e.g. targeted interventions at the community level that change capabilities, lead to a more active role at local level and give a voice to the poor.

| General Information | |
|---|--|
| Organization / Institution promoting the practice | |
| Programme / Project | |
| Overall objective | |
| Time frame | |
| Implementer(s) | |
| Source of information | |
| Relevant contacts | |
| Practice edited by | |