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1. Introduction and context

1.1. Size and composition of the domestic work sector globally

Income and gender inequalities between and within countries as well as demographic changes are interacting to produce an unprecedented growth in international migration.\(^2\) The number of international migrants reached 244 million in 2015, an increase of 71 million (41 per cent) compared to 2000.\(^3\) Migration is primarily characterized by flows from poorer countries with more youthful populations to richer, often ageing, economies with significant care demands.\(^4\) Almost 61.5 per cent (150.3 million) of international migrants are in the labour market, almost half of them (66.6 million) are women.\(^5\)

Globally, there are 67.1 million domestic workers, of whom 11.5 million are international migrants. As such, migrants represent 17.2 per cent of all domestic workers and domestic workers represent 7.7 per cent of all migrant workers.\(^6\) These numbers are largely underestimated as a result of the concentration of domestic workers in informal employment and among irregular migrants. Around 8.5 million (73.4 per cent) of all migrant domestic workers are women. South-East Asia and the Pacific host the largest number of women migrant domestic workers (24 per cent), followed by Northern, Southern and Western Europe (22.1 per cent) and the Arab States (19 per cent). Male migrant workers are much less likely to be domestic workers, except in the Arab States where 10.4 percent of migrant domestic workers are men. Their presence in other regions is much lower.

![Fig. 1 - Female Migrant domestic workers as a share of all female migrant workers, by broad sub-region (%), 2013](source: ILO. 2015. Global estimates on migrant workers, Geneva, p. 18)

1.1.1. Migrant domestic workers in Africa at a glance

Only 650,000 of the 9.3 million domestic workers in Africa are migrants. They account for 5.6 per cent of the world’s total 11.5 million migrant domestic workers.\(^8\) Five per cent are in Sub-Saharan Africa and 0.6 per cent in Northern Africa. Some 300,000, a little under half of all migrant domestic workers, were employed in one country; South Africa.\(^9\)
International Migration 2015

Two thirds of all international migrants were living in only 20 countries

- India has the largest diaspora followed by Mexico, the Russian Federation and China

- The share of migrants in the global population reached 3.3%

- 62% of migrants live in Europe and Asia

- 62% of migrants come from Asia

- 20 million international migrants are refugees

- 67 million are women

- 150 million are working
There are 67.1 million domestic workers in the world, 11.5 million of whom are international migrants.

This figure represents 17.2% of all domestic workers and 7.7% of all migrant workers worldwide.

One out of six domestic workers in the world is an international migrant.

About 73.4% (or around 8.5 million) of all migrant domestic workers are women.

South-Eastern Asia and the Pacific hosts the largest share, with 24% of the world’s women migrant domestic workers, followed by Northern, Southern and Western Europe, with 22.1% and the Arab States with 19.0%.

Three-quarters (73.1%) of women domestic workers in the Arab States are migrants. The proportion is also high in Northern America (71%) and Northern, Southern and Western Europe (65.8%).

The Arab States host 51% (1.56 million) of all male migrant domestic workers. Over one in ten male migrant workers in the Arab states is a domestic worker.

Source: ILO Global Estimates
Most migration corridors are internal to one country (between poorer and richer provinces). Examples of internal migration corridors are Limpopo to Gauteng in South Africa, Jendouba and Bizerte to Sfax, Sousse or Tunis in Tunisia, Krou country to Abidjan in Côte-d’Ivoire.

International movements of domestic workers within the region are the result of (i) structural and gender changes in sub-regional employment (i.e., Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Zimbabwe to South Africa); (ii) new political crises (i.e. Somali, Uganda to Kenya); and, (iii) the revival of older corridors dating back to the 19th century (i.e., Senegal to Morocco, or Burkina Faso to Côte-d’Ivoire). At the level of the continent, men (290,000) and women (360,000) migrants are almost equally represented in this sector. Significant variations at the level of the sub-regions can be noted however; In Sub-Saharan Africa, male migrant domestic workers make up three per cent of the total male domestic worker population, whereas female migrant domestic workers make up almost five per cent of all women employed in this sector. In Northern Africa, male migrants make up 5.3 per cent of all male domestic workers whereas women migrants constitute 9.8 per cent of all women in the sector. Placement continues to be largely facilitated by informal kinship, ethnic and other social ties, rather than by formal recruiters.

A shift from employing live-in permanent domestic workers to live-out temporary and casual workers – particularly in large urban centres such as in Abidjan, Tunis, Nairobi, and Johannesburg – accompanied changes in lifestyles and the emergence of an African middle class in the 1980s. This shift coexists with live-in arrangements, especially in the case of underage or younger women (e.g., in Abidjan and Tunis).

International migration of domestic workers occurs with two main regions of destination, Europe and the Arab states, and to a lesser extent, South East Asia (Hong-Kong). It is estimated that 200,000 women leave Ethiopia annually to work as domestic workers in the GCC and Levant. The Government of Ethiopia imposed a total ban on the deployment of Ethiopian domestic workers in 2013. As such, transit migration is a key feature of women and girl migration from Africa. For travel, migrant women rely on informal networks of traders and informal financial services. Unlicensed brokers operate over land via Somalia, Djibouti and Somaliland and over sea to Yemen and then to Saudi Arabia. This has resulted in mass deportation of Ethiopians, including women domestic workers, from Saudi Arabia who were accused of crossing into Saudi Arabia illegally through its southern border with Yemen.

1.1.2. Migrant domestic workers in the Arab States at a glance

According to national statistical sources, the Arab States host the largest number of migrant domestic workers in the world, estimated at 1.6 million and accounting for 17.9 per cent of all migrant workers in the region. Human Rights Watch (2010), however, estimates that there are 1.5 million migrant domestic workers in Saudi Arabia alone and 700,000 in Kuwait. The International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) places the number of migrant domestic workers in the Gulf States at 2.5 million. The overwhelming majority (82 per cent) of domestic workers in the Arabs States are migrants. The region (primarily in Saudi Arabia and the Gulf countries) also hosts the largest numbers of male migrant domestic workers with 50.8 per cent of the global share of male migrant domestic workers.
Men perform gardening, driving and security-related functions whereas women perform cooking, cleaning and care functions in the households that employ them. Migrant domestic workers from the Philippines, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, India, and Ethiopia dominate this sector, although more recently, Nepal, Bangladesh, and Madagascar have emerged as new (and more affordable) countries of origin.

The demand for migrant domestic workers in the Arab States is only partially driven by the dual wage earners economy. Overall, the Arab region exhibits low female labour force participation rates with only one in four Arab women in the labour force (26 per cent) compared to a world average of 51 per cent. Although many national women are not in the labour force today, partly because they attend school or university, the number of national women in the labour force is expected to grow, and with it the demand for migrant domestic workers.

Employing a domestic worker reflects employers’ aspirations to a higher social status and the need to cope—in countries that have experienced rapid economic growth—with new habits and more complex household tasks. The decision to employ a domestic worker is also motivated by the Arab culture frowning upon placing an ageing relative in elderly care institutions. In Kuwait, for example, 28 per cent of households with men above 70 years of age and 58 per cent of households with women above the age of 70 hired a migrant domestic worker.

Even when care facilities are made available, households cannot afford the cost. The average cost of placing an elderly in Jordan, for example, can range from USD 1,000 to 2,000. Domestic workers are hired to substitute for the lack of affordable social infrastructure.

The admission, stay and exit of migrant domestic workers (along with the employer-migrant worker relationship) are governed by the Kafala, a private sponsorship scheme for migrant workers. Kafala results in situations where employers have unchecked control over migrant domestic workers, exposing them to greater risk of exploitation and abuse. Vulnerabilities to abuse are markedly heightened when migrant domestic workers end up in an irregular situation.

Even when improvements in the overall situation of migrant workers were noted in the Arab States, seldom did they extend to migrant domestic workers. The latter are typically excluded from national labour laws with the argument that domestic work cannot be regulated in the same manner as other work without violating the privacy of the employer’s household and the honour of his/her family.

Arab States have supported the adoption of the Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189) in 2011 but none have ratified it so far. ILO’s supervisory mechanisms rely on other conventions which the Arab States have ratified, like the forced labour conventions, to address the vulnerabilities of migrant domestic workers. All the Arab States have signed the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC). In consequence, they have responded to charges of human trafficking more proactively than to calls for improving the working conditions of migrant domestic workers.
The Labour Ministers of the Gulf States have discussed a draft standard unified contract (SUC) for migrant domestic workers. These plans were aborted in June 2015 due to disagreements over clauses such as a mandatory day off and a cap on working hours. In June 2015, the National Assembly of Kuwait passed a national law for domestic workers. Bahrain, Lebanon and Jordan\(^{20}\) adopted SUCs for domestic workers. BLAs on migrant domestic workers and the ensuing employment contracts that are set bilaterally between destination and origin countries are common practice in the other GCC countries. These agreements establish areas of mutual cooperation, including on recruitment,\(^{21}\) and support the adoption of employment contracts accepted by both parties. These BLAs, negotiated without input from employers’ and workers’ organizations, are criticized for reinforcing inequalities among workers leading to nationality-based wage differentials that reinforce biases about workers from these countries.

1.1.3. Migrant domestic workers in Asia at a glance\(^ {22}\)

Asia is the fastest growing migration corridor in the world,\(^{23}\) taking on 26 million more international migrants between 2000 and 2015. In 2015, intra-regional migration in Asia accounted for 60 per cent (62 million) of its international migration stock.\(^{24}\) In addition to the 62 million intra-regional migrants, Asia registered 20 million out-migrants to Europe and 17 million to North America. There are 8 million immigrants from Europe to Asia.\(^{25}\)

Of the 67 million domestic workers around the world, 23.7 million (35.4 per cent) are working in Asia and Pacific regions, amongst them 3.34 million (14.1 per cent) are migrant domestic workers, and over 80 per cent are women. In China alone, there are 13 million domestic workers,\(^{26}\) although most of them are internal migrants moving from rural to urban areas.

Within the region, women from South East Asian countries find employment in the care economy of richer Eastern and South Eastern countries. The five main destination countries for foreign migrant domestic and care workers in the region are Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore, and Malaysia while the key sending countries are the Philippines, Indonesia, and Vietnam.

The migration of domestic and care workers in East and South East Asia reveals three important elements. First, the recent increase in the migration of women domestic and care workers in this sub-region is the result of a combination of structural, cultural, and policy transformations: (i) rapid demographic ageing and low fertility, and increased women’s labour market participation in richer countries; (ii) growing cultural acceptance of outsourcing family care to non-family caregivers; (iii) increased economic imperatives and incentives for women from South East Asia to find employment abroad; and (iv) changes in the social, economic and immigration policies in the sending and receiving countries that together work to facilitate the migration of women to find employment in the domestic work and household care sectors.

There is a noticeable difference in the acceptance and occupational profiles of migrant domestic and care workers amongst receiving countries in East and South East Asia. This is largely due to differences in their social and economic policies, which are in turn shaped by pre-existing employment regimes and ideas about national identity and acceptability of social transformations. Broadly, Japan and South Korea have been more stringent in accepting migrant domestic and care workers, and instead, have opted to expand publicly supported
childcare and elder care services to address the care needs of their citizens. This has resulted in limited intake of migrant care workers in these countries. In contrast, the governments of Singapore, Hong Kong and Taiwan have implemented financial support, tax incentives and immigration policy reforms to help families employ migrant domestic and care workers. This has led to a large intake of migrant domestic and care workers in the three countries. Childcare and elder care policy reforms since the 1990s in China have fueled a rapid expansion of private care services that is in turn drawing a large number of rural migrant women workers into employment.

The Levant and Gulf States are host to large numbers of women migrant domestic workers from the Philippines, Indonesia, Nepal and Bangladesh.

1.2. The global care crisis and international migration

The growth in household paid care and domestic work is linked to a number of interacting patterns:

(i) working families with noteworthy regional differences, face difficulties in combining paid work with family responsibilities. This is the result of an increase in women employment and the subsequent transformation from single- to dual wage-earning families. The results are a gender gap over time use and deeper inequalities between rich and poor families;\textsuperscript{27}

(ii) rapid ageing, increasing life expectancy and lower fertility rates are putting a strain on traditional care arrangements. Tight fiscal policies and social policy budgets have weakened public care services and as a result have contrived governments to delegate care work to families via a variety of market services (including to hire household care workers and domestic workers) some of them publicly funded; and,

(iii) the increasing cost of living, as a result of structural adjustment programs, has left many women in countries of origin with no other option but to migrate. Many countries of origin also promote migration through a variety of policies and programmes.

1.2.1. Women labour force participation and unpaid household care and domestic work

There were 1.27 billion women in the labour market in 2015, 236 million more than in 2000. Nonetheless, the global female labour force participation rate is currently 26.5 percentage points lower than that for men, and has been steadily decreasing across regions. The labour force participation rate for women remains however highly differentiated by region, with the highest rates in Northern, Southern and Western Europe and the lowest in the Arab States.
The increased educational level and massive influx of women into the labour market has significantly improved countries’ ability to generate wealth, enhanced the wellbeing of households, and reduced poverty. However, time allocated by women and men to household care remains unequal. Time use surveys show that when women get a job, the intensity and total work time (to productive and reproductive tasks) increases while time allocated by men to household work does not change significantly. In fact, women now spend two and half more time on unpaid work than men. In developing countries, women work on average 9 hours and 20 minutes per day compared to 8 hours and 7 minutes for men when taking into account unpaid work. This is the equivalent of 2.8 times more working in unpaid home and care activities than men. In advanced economies, women work 8 hours and 9 minutes compared to 7 hours and 36 minutes for men. This places a considerable strain on the ability of women to focus on productive or paid employment opportunities, and furthers income inequalities between women and men, as well as reduces opportunities for career growth relative to men. The additional time spent on unpaid work is also reflected in restrictions on leisure, education, political participation and self-care. Inequalities are greater in developing countries than in developed countries. This is the result of limits on access to suitable infrastructure and labour-
saving technology, among other factors, which render tasks associated with unpaid care and household work time consuming and arduous.

Fig. 3 - Daily time spent in paid and unpaid work in developing and developed countries

A time deficit is also likely to occur when the number of hours required for personal care, household care, and income-generating activities exceed the number of hours available in a day. A study conducted in Argentina, Mexico and Chile showed that most children live in households with at least one member, mostly women, with time deficit (80 per cent of children in Argentina, 74 per cent in Mexico and 70 per cent in Chile). Also, according to data collected from 53 developing countries, 35.5 million children under the age of five were left without adult supervision for at least an hour weekly. With no other support for childcare, poor families often cope by leaving children home alone or take their children to their workplace.

Parents also rely on unexperienced care workers, like younger siblings or older relatives for the provision of childcare. In rural parts of Ethiopia, more than 50 per cent of girls between five and eight provide unpaid care work on daily basis. This has direct repercussions on the health and development of young children being cared for and on the educational and employment prospects of the young girls who leave school to care for family members.
1.2.2. Ageing, life expectancy, fertility rates, and social policies

The situation is further compounded by global population ageing, longer life-expectancy, changing morbidity patterns and decreasing fertility rates. These patterns pose new challenges to the traditional model of unpaid care provided by women and to national care and social protection policies.

Globally, in the 1980s, there were 50 youth for every 100 adults. Since then, the youth-to-adult ratio has declined steadily and is expected to reach 22 per cent (20 youth for every 100 adults) by 2050. East Asia and Europe are expected to record the lowest ratio of youth-to-adult population (11.8 and 13.6 per cent respectively), followed by North America where the ratio is expected to reach 16.8 per cent, and Latin America and the Caribbean with 17.2 per cent. In the future, the growth rate of the number of the elderly (65+) will be 12 times faster than that for children. As a consequence of this there is an increasing need of care for the elderly while the availability of family suppliers is decreasing, not only because women are in the labour market but because the ratio of the group between 45-69 years old (typically taking care of elderly and contributing to social security systems) is rapidly decreasing.

Life expectancy at birth is also increasing globally. The share of the world’s population aged over 65 will increase from 8 per cent today to nearly 16 per cent by 2050. Most people born today in a number of European countries, including Switzerland, France, Germany and Austria, will live to the age of 100, compared to 68 in 1950. This also implies that the number of people in need of long-term care (who require help with at least two activities daily) will also significantly increase between 2000 and 2050; by 127 per cent in Germany, 102 per cent in Spain, 107 per cent in Italy, and 87 per cent in the United Kingdom.

The implications of these trends are significant for the social protection policy (and its components related to care provision) and its ability to withstand this growing demand without furthering inequalities in care service delivery or putting downward pressure on the working conditions of care workers. Almost 39 per cent of the population worldwide is living without universal health coverage. In low-income countries, more than 90 per cent of the population are without health coverage and around half (48 per cent) of all pension-age people do not receive pension.
**Fig. 4 - Life expectancy and fertility rate 1950-2050**

![Bar chart showing life expectancy and fertility rate 1950-2050.](chart1)


**Fig. 5 - Ratio of elderly to total population, 1950-2050**

![Line chart showing ratio of elderly to total population 1950-2050.](chart2)

1.2.3 Women migrating in search of better opportunities

In 2015, a total of 586 million women were own-account or contributing family members. These figures are particularly high in Sub-Saharan Africa and Southern Asia, two main origin regions for migrant domestic workers. In Sub-Saharan Africa, 34.9 per cent of women work as contributing family members, while 42.5 per cent are own account workers. The figures for East Asia are 31.8 per cent and 47.7 per cent. Informal employment is the greatest source of employment for women and it represents over 80 per cent of non-agricultural employment in Southern Asia. 38

The lack of employment opportunities in countries of origin and expectations of higher earnings in countries of destination drive women migration. While domestic work may not be their first choice, they end up in this sector as there is an increasing demand for (low cost) household care and domestic work among the emerging middle class. Barriers to entry into the domestic work sector are also very low, as no particular certification or degrees are required to enter the profession.

The status of women varies widely among countries of origin; while they still face early marriage in some societies, women have greater decision-making capital in other countries. Nonetheless, women migrants generally hail from impoverished rural areas. They have little or no education and very limited access to land ownership. Dispossession, combined with traditional gender norms such as the shunning of divorcees without the basic means to support their children, contribute to women’s migration decisions.

1.3. Migrant domestic workers and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

The proportion of women migrants has not changed, rather it is the feminization of labour migration that is a new phenomenon; More women are migrating independently of family members in search of employment. 39 This has led to discussions about the contributions of women migrants to development which must be seen in the broader context of employment and social policies, not merely through the narrow lens of remittance transactions.

In that context, the United Nations Development Programme’s (UNDP) 2015 Human Development Report “Work for human development” emphasized the importance of migration for domestic work to the development of societies and migrants. 40 The work of domestic workers has a societal value beyond the gains of individual workers. It prepares children for the future and maintains the capabilities of the elderly and the disabled. Domestic worker can also empower their families in the home country when the appropriate protections are in place. 41

Despite its importance for human development, and meeting many of the SDGs, care work is not accounted for in countries’ GDP. Unpaid care work is estimated at up to 10 trillion USD yearly, or about 13 per cent of global GDP. Addressing care deficit is good for all. 42
1.3.1. Promoting coherence between migration, employment and social policies

Promoting the development potential of the sector for women migrants, countries of origin, and countries of destination entails greater coherence – anchored in gender equality principles – between migration, employment and social policies. More specifically, it requires investment in family-care friendly policies, investment in the care infrastructure, and a significant reduction in labour migration costs.

Migrant domestic workers can contribute to the development of their countries of origin by bringing new ideas, re-conceptualized as “political remittances,” and which denote knowledge and practices used to further democratisation, and the promotion and protection of rights. For example, Indonesian migrant domestic workers who participated in NGO and trade union activities in Hong Kong SAR and started up their own NGOs upon returning to Jakarta are a case in point.43

1.4.1.1. ‘Domestic work, the work that makes all other work possible’: Investing in work/family-care policies

Public policy can play an important role in recognizing the value of care work, the rights of care workers, and in transforming traditional gender roles. The migration of women for household care work and domestic work carries important implications for work-family reconciliation and social protection policies in both countries of origin and destination. Individual households in countries of destination – when they can afford it – employ women migrant domestic workers to cope with care needs. In the case of countries of origin, mothers leave children behind in the care of other women (usually relatives). In both cases there is a need to develop new care policies.

It is important to invest in family-care friendly policies, offering reliable and affordable social care services that can reconcile work with family responsibilities. Policies in the areas of childcare and health care are particularly helpful for addressing a significant amount of the concerns families have.

Developing a comprehensive social care policy, including investing and establishing an adequate social care infrastructure, skills development opportunities and adequate labour standards will not only lead to creating employment opportunities but will help workers (mainly women) transition away from informal care jobs to more formal and protected employment.

1.4.1.3. Investing in the care economy creates employment

In light of the automatization and robotization of the world of work, the future of work resides in transforming the surpluses generated by technology-intensive sectors into demand for more employment intensive work that improves the quality of life, such as in the care economy and in creative industries which makes improving the conditions in this sector all the more relevant.44
Studies demonstrate that investing in the care sector creates new jobs, even more jobs than in other sectors. Ilkkaracan et al. (2015) found that investing USD 9.5 billion (1.2 per cent of GDP in 2014) in the care sector in Turkey will generate 719,000 jobs compared to 290,000 jobs if the amount was invested in the construction and its related sectors. In addition, 85 per cent of the employment generated in the care economy will have access to social security benefits compared to only 35 per cent of new employment in construction. Antonopoulos et al. (2010) found that investing USD 50 billion in the social care sector of the United States would create around 1.2 million jobs in the economy (8 of every 10 new jobs), while investing the same amount in the construction sector will generate only 3 of every 10 new jobs.

ITUC’s (2016) recent report “Investing in the care economy: A pathway to growth” showed that if 2 per cent of GDP was invested in the care industry in the countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), increases in the overall employment ranging from 2.4-6.1 per cent would be generated – that is to say; 13 million new jobs would be created in the United States, 3.5 million in Japan, 2 million in Germany, 1.5 million in the United Kingdom, 1 million in Italy, 600,000 in Australia and nearly 120,000 in Denmark. Women employment would increase between 3.3 and 8.2 percentage points and men employment rate would increase between 1.4 and 4.0 per cent. Investing the same amount in construction and related industries would generate only half the amount of jobs that could be created in the care economy and increase the gender gap in employment. Effective care-economy policies can lead to more gender integrated labor markets.

Fig. 6 - Impact of investing 2 per cent of GDP in care economy vs construction sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of jobs generated</td>
<td>Number of FTE jobs generated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australia</strong></td>
<td><strong>387,452</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denmark</strong></td>
<td><strong>68,412</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Germany</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,040,031</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Italy</strong></td>
<td><strong>620,573</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japan</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,092,950</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UK</strong></td>
<td><strong>744,644</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>US</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,446,375</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of jobs generated taken by women</td>
<td>% of jobs generated taken by women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australia</strong></td>
<td><strong>33%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denmark</strong></td>
<td><strong>27%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Germany</strong></td>
<td><strong>28%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Italy</strong></td>
<td><strong>21%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japan</strong></td>
<td><strong>30%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UK</strong></td>
<td><strong>24%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>US</strong></td>
<td><strong>35%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: Full time employment
1.4.1.5. Reducing labour migration costs for migrant domestic workers

Migrant domestic workers incur excessive costs in their migration journey, compromising their ability to contribute to their own development and to the development of the countries of origin and destination. Reducing labour migration costs for migrant domestic workers would entail promoting policies to reduce remittance transaction costs, eliminate worker-paid recruitment costs, and eradicate the multiple forms of exploitation that limit their earning potential such as in the form of withheld, delayed and underpaid wages and/or debt bondage. Reducing migration costs would also entail policies aimed to avoid deskillin (e.g., through better labour matching) and that would promote the development and recognition of the skills of women migrants across borders.

Remittances serve to improve economic growth. They are channelled into household consumption, children’s education, investment and savings, debt payment, and housing. This is why Goal 10.c of the new United Nations sustainable development agenda aims to reduce the transaction costs of migrant remittances and eliminate remittance corridors with costs higher than 5 per cent by 2030. In 2014, remittance inflows from Argentina reached around USD 479 million, accounting for 81 per cent of total inflows. It is safe to argue that the bulk of these remittances are sent by Paraguayan domestic workers in Argentina because the majority of Paraguay migrants are women, who work mainly in domestic service jobs.

Eliminating recruitment costs for migrants, however, could yield larger benefits than reducing remittance transfer costs. Article 7 of the Private Employment Agencies Convention, 1997 (No. 181) Private employment states that “agencies shall not charge directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, any fees or costs to workers.” Almost 10 million people use regular channels to migrate in search of employment every year. At least half of them (5 million) use the services of recruiters, likely paying USD 1,000 on average each. Eliminating worker-paid fees across corridors will increase the potential of migration for development.
Further, migrants face multiple forms of exploitation that limit their earnings and ability to contribute to the development of countries of origin and destination. It is common practice among employers and recruitment agencies in Lebanon, for example, to withhold the first three salaries of a migrant domestic worker to reimburse some of the employer-paid recruitment costs. This reality is further compounded by the gap between the wages promised to migrant pre-departure and real wages.

Care drain, de-skilling and the absence of regional competency framework for domestic workers are evidence of labour market deficiencies that also have the effect of curtailing the development potential of migrants and their countries of origin and destination.

- **Care drain**: despite the significance of remittance earnings to countries of origin, the latter are growingly concerned about the potentially negative impact of migration on the country’s human capital development, generating a “brain drain”, a “care drain” and a “mismatch between skills and local jobs.”\(^49\) Date from the Philippines’ Department of Labour and Employment (DOLE) show that five out of the six first occupation categories of Overseas Filipino Workers (OFW) deployed in 2010-2014 are on the domestic hard-to-fill lists for the decade 2010-2020. Of these, nursing professionals, char workers and cleaners, and caregivers are harder to fill.\(^50\)

- **Deskill**: Skilled and highly-skilled women migrants often end up in in the domestic sector, resulting in their “deskilling” or “brain waste.” Deskill can cause loss of self-confidence which can negatively impact their career choices and career advancement.

- **Intra-regional mobility of domestic workers**: Eighty per cent of interregional migration flows are cross-border.\(^51\) The migration of domestic workers across the Indonesia-Malaysia, Ukraine-Poland, Zimbabwe-South Africa, and Argentina-Paraguay corridor is a case in point. While intra-regional mobility for unskilled workers is much higher than for skilled occupations, mutual recognition agreements (MRAs) for domestic workers, where equivalence may be hard to demonstrate, are hard to establish.

1.3.2. International cooperation to maximize the development potential of migration for domestic work

Maximizing the benefits of migration for domestic work and household care work for development requires, in addition to synergies between employment, migration and social policies, coherence in policies across migration corridors.

1.3.2.1. Framework for cooperation on migration between Africa, the Arab States and Asia

The Arab States have recently become more engaged in regional and inter-regional labour migration policy dialogues with countries of origin in Asia. In 2005, five of the six GCC countries attended, as observers, the annual meeting held under the Colombo Process.\(^52\) In 2008, the GCC countries launched the Abu Dhabi Dialogue, as an inter-regional consultative process on labour migration among destination countries in the GCC and origin countries in South and Southeast Asia. The ministerial meeting of the Abu Dhabi Dialogue in Kuwait, in November
2014, adopted a Declaration that references the ILO Fair Migration Agenda, including its Fair Recruitment Initiative.

Collaboration between trade unions in Asia and the Arab States is also gaining traction. In 2013, the South Asian Regional Trade Union Council (SARTUC) and trade unions in Lebanon, Jordan and Bahrain adopted the Kathmandu Action Plan aiming to establish migrant workers’ organizations and promote equal treatment and better working conditions for South Asian migrants who are working in the Arab States. More recently, the Arab Trade Union Confederation (ArabTUC), the Association of Southeast Asian Nations’ Trade Union Council (ATUC) and SARTUC signed a memorandum of understanding on 1-3 August 2015 to promote the ratification of the migrant worker conventions or other conventions and instruments that make explicit reference to migrant workers; establish information centers for migrant workers; address occupational health and safety and housing concerns for migrants, etc. Following the founding of the domestic workers union in Lebanon in January 2015, the National Federation of Employees’ and Workers’ Unions in Lebanon (FENASOL) concluded a bilateral agreement with the Confederation of Ethiopian Trade Unions to extend greater protections to Ethiopian domestic workers in Lebanon.

In a parallel development, the African Union Commission (AUC) and the African Regional Economic Communities (RECs) recognized the importance of migration for the development of the African continent, first through the development of the Migration Policy Framework for Africa (2006) and, more recently in January 2015, with the validation of the Framework’s implementation programme, the Joint Labour Migration Programme (JLMP). The JLMP identified the protection of migrant workers, facilitation of their mobility and easier recognition of theirs skills as priorities for the continent.

At national and sub-regional level, tripartite consultations are underway in a number of African countries and RECs (e.g. SADC, EAC, IGAD, Morocco, South Africa, Zimbabwe, and Tanzania) to design rights-based and sector-specific labour migration policies. Cooperation between African countries and the countries of the Gulf States is also proceeding as evidenced by the BLA currently considered by the Government of Uganda facilitating the placement of one million men and women in Saudi households over the next five years. Similar BLAs have already been signed by Kenya, Tanzania, Malawi, and discussions are taking place between Madagascar and the Republic of Comoros with the Gulf States. In addition, Ethiopia has also signed BLAs with Kuwait, Jordan and Qatar. Even outside BLAs, the regulation of Private Employment Agencies has become a major challenge for most of the Horn (Ethiopia in particular) and East African states. In some instances, sudden bans on PEA’s or decisions to stop immigration from certain countries (as in the case of the return of hundreds of thousands of Ethiopian domestic workers from Saudi Arabia in 2013), have led to crisis situations which governments and social partners are ill-equipped to manage. Despite this increase in workers’ departures, the foundations for an inter-regional dialogue between the Africa region and Arab States region have not yet been laid out.

However, these frameworks remain very general and do not provide guidance as to the specific situation of migrant domestic workers. Initiative addressing the specific needs of migrant domestic workers are confined to the bilateral level and have not been discussed or addressed by regional bodies and processes.
2. Key issues for a fair migration agenda for domestic workers in Africa, Asia, and the Arab States

The Member States of the International Labour Organization (ILO) overwhelmingly endorsed the Fair Migration Agenda during the 103rd session of the International Labour Conference (ILC) in 2014. This agenda takes into account labour market needs while placing the rights of all workers, including migrants, at its core. Further reinforcing the principles and guidelines of ILO’s Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration, the agenda promotes (i) decent work opportunities in countries of origin; (ii) respect for the human rights, including labour rights, of all migrants; (iii) fair recruitment and equal treatment of migrant workers; (iv) stronger linkages between employment and labour migration policies; (v) the involvement of Ministries of Labour, trade unions and employers’ organizations in migration policy making; and, (vi) genuine cooperation between countries and within regions.

2.1. Protection

In governing labour migration, all States have the sovereign right to develop their own policies. Nonetheless, international labour standards and other international instruments, as well as guidelines, should play an important role in making these policies fair, effective and coherent. ILO’s multilateral framework on labour migration promotes a rights-based approach to labour migration that builds on the 1998 ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, founded on the eight fundamental ILO Conventions, and the relevant United Nations human rights Conventions.

Countries of origin have implemented a range of initiatives to ensure the safe migration of their citizens who are seeking employment as domestic workers abroad. The initiatives range from the ratification of Convention 189 and/or other international human rights instruments with application for migrant domestic workers, adherence to sub-regional or regional governance structures, reliance on the principles enshrined in the national constitution – mostly pertaining to non-discrimination on grounds of gender or nationality, the development of foreign employment policies that cater to the protection needs of migrant domestic workers as well as the institution of national coordination mechanisms and corresponding national action plans to ensure coherence in their implementation of these policies.

Countries of destination for migrant domestic workers have also resorted to a number of measures to extend rights and protection to migrant domestic workers. These initiatives range from adhering to international norms and institutions, extending labour rights to migrant domestic workers, developing standard unified contracts to formalize the employment relationship, developing migration policies, instituting national coordination mechanisms and action plans to operationalize migration policies, and launching information and regularization campaigns.

Cooperation between origin and destination countries to ensure the protection of migrant domestic workers is also common between countries of origin and destination, often in the form of bilateral agreements and memoranda of understanding.
This section will take stock of inter-regional and binational efforts on promoting and protecting the rights of migrant domestic workers as well as examine the challenges and opportunities of addressing the particulars of domestic workers and household care workers. Further, the possibility of expanding the dialogue to Africa will also be examined. More specifically, panellists will discuss the democratic validity, coverage, enforcement and impact of regional government processes, interregional trade union agreements, bilateral agreements and memoranda of understanding (MoUs) between governments, deployment bans, union-to-union agreements, and MoUs between recruitment agencies. Finally, the complementarity of these arrangements, including with national legislation at origin and destination, and partnerships with civil society-based processes across corridors will be explored.

Questions for discussion:

1. **Inter-regional efforts:**

   In taking stock of interregional efforts between Asia and the Arab States on the protection of migrant workers to date, what are challenges and opportunities in addressing the particulars of domestic workers and household care workers in these platforms? What are the challenges and opportunities of extending these dialogue and nascent platforms to include Africa?

2. **Bilateral agreements and memoranda of understanding:**

   Are social partners involved in the negotiation process leading to these BLAs and MoUs? If yes, what are lessons learned? If not, what were the reasons behind their exclusion from the negotiation process and what can be done to encourage their participation?

   In terms of coverage, what are these BLAs and MoUs missing? Why, and what could be done to include these issues?

   To what extent are these agreements enforced? What are challenges and opportunities to the enforcement of their provisions?

   What are the gender impacts and implications of BLAs and MoUs? How can BLAs/MoUs promote gender equality and non-discrimination? What is the best way to implement and monitor implementation of gender-sensitive BLAs and MoUs?

3. **Deployment bans:**

   What prompts bans? What has their effectiveness been to date? What are alternatives to deployment bans?

4. **MoUs between trade unions:**

   Are domestic workers and their organizations represented in the negotiation of these agreements? What is the coverage of these agreements? Are these agreements gender-sensitive? Are these agreements enforced?
5. Complementarity between international cooperation instruments:

To what extent are these instruments complementary? To what extent to do they collide?

How do national policies for domestic workers in countries of origin improve (do they) the conditions of domestic workers from this country in countries of destination?

What are good practices and lessons learned in extending the dialogue to support groups for migrant workers?

What is the impact of international cooperation between human rights’ committees in origin countries and the Gulf States?

What are good practices and lessons learned in alliance-building between trade unions and NGOs?

2.2. Recruitment

More recently, the ILO has operationalized one pillar of its Fair Migration Agenda by launching a global “Fair Recruitment Initiative”, as a multi-stakeholder initiative, to: (i) help prevent human trafficking and forced labour, (ii) protect the rights of workers, including migrant workers, from abusive and fraudulent practices during the recruitment and placement process (including pre-selection, selection, transportation, placement and safe return); and, (iii) reduce the cost of labour migration and enhance development outcomes for migrant workers and their families, as well as for countries of origin and destination. The ILO is developing guidance and piloting fair recruitment intervention models across migration corridors.

While the recruitment model in the domestic work sector varies significantly depending on the country and/or individual context, the most common involves cooperation between labour recruiters in countries of origin and destination. This model puts a cap on the high transaction costs and administrative challenges associated with the operation of overseas branch offices which in turn reduces recruitment fees. This model consists in a labour recruiter in the country of origin receiving job requests, screening potential workers, processing the necessary emigration documentation and preparing workers for departure. The labour recruiter in the country of destination (often referred to as a placement agency) manages relationships with prospective employers (families seeking domestic workers), assists with job matching and is responsible for processing the necessary immigration documentation.

This cross-border industry for recruiting and placing migrant women in the domestic work sector encompasses small and micro-enterprises, public-private enterprises, mega-recruitment agencies, and multinationals. In countries of origin, domestic work seems to be concentrated in family-owned enterprises with a small staff, limited financial capital, and a local client base.

Labour recruiters in countries of origin contract out to sub-agents in villages and rural areas. While many recruiters are formal and subject to both legal and industry standards, sub-agents, may be unregistered and with limited accountability. This is why some countries, such as Nepal, have taken steps to recognize sub-agents and register them with a recruiter.
Labour recruiters and sub-agents often have to integrate social norms and practices in their business model. While the recruitment system is robust and regulated in Indonesia, for example, labour recruiters have to acquire a “village and family clearance” prior to recruiting a prospective domestic worker for employment abroad. The village head will confirm that an individual is eligible to migrate abroad for work, and the individual’s family also gives written consent. Only then, does the local authority process the request enabling the prospective migrant to sign a contract and to enrol in a pre-departure training on local customs, language, and expectations of work in the destination country.60

Where migration is intra-regional or between neighbouring countries, job matching and placement are often facilitated by social and informal networks, sometimes in conjunction with labour recruiters.

This section will explore the extent to which different recruitment arrangements (government-to-government and private end-to-end recruitment) are able to balance the competing demands of the market while maintaining their commitment to fair practices; matching employers’ preferences, maximizing profit to the recruiters, facilitating labour market access to the workers and extending necessary protections to them. Further, this session will explore innovative business models like the ability of labour recruiters to set up schemes that aim to avoid excessive fee charging practices to employers, eliminate worker-paid fees as well as intermediaries.

**Questions for discussion:**

1. How is supply and demand for domestic workers affected by (a) social and economic factors, (b) information and regulation, and (c) labour recruiter practices and cartelisation, at both source and destination?

2. What are the challenges faced by the different actors in the recruitment chain of domestic workers in your context of work?

3. How can recruitment practices ensure decent work outcomes for domestic workers? How can they reduce vulnerability to forced labour? Give examples of practices and possible solutions among different constituents and how coordination among all can be improved?

4. What are successful strategies in cutting the cost of recruitment for employers, eliminating the cost of recruitment for workers, and eliminating intermediaries?

5. How do labour recruiters match employers’ preferences to workers’ skills and competencies?
2.3. Return and reintegration

Reintegration of returnees in the socio-economic and political life of a society is one of the important stages of the migration process that needs due attention. Reintegration support should be based on the returnees' needs, combining economic, social and psychosocial support. Studies carried out in different reintegration schemes showed that programs which did not fit returnees’ needs or skills are a waste of resources and can create frustrations and undermine the perceived legitimacy of projects.

Countries where reintegration programs were implemented include Bangladesh, Indonesia, Malaysia, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand and Sri Lanka. In designing the programs for returning migrants, these countries considered some factors like, technical and vocational skills acquired, savings, experience accumulated, etc. Continuing support in the form of psychosocial counselling and therapy, health care, and mental health treatment are also packages included in the reintegration schemes of returnees.

How every country handled the return and reintegration of labour migrants depended primarily on the number of migrant workers involved and the resources available to the government. Poor coordination among reintegration service providers, mis-match of reintegration services and returnees need and limited financial and human resources are some of the challenges faced in implementing reintegration programs. Linking reintegration programs with existing development projects and aligning them with national development goals to ensure political will and avoid the starvation of funds is considered as a way forward.

Economic reintegration is especially difficult for the forcibly returned migrants as they do not have the necessary financial means upon return to sustain the families' basic needs. Returnees also undergo difficult social integration because of the weakened social networks caused by long separation from families and community members.

This section will explore opportunities, along the migration cycle, for promoting the occupational mobility of returning domestic workers. This includes modalities for proposed skills recognition for returning domestic workers, opportunities for cross-border mobilization and empowerment, socio-economic reintegration programmes, including through small and medium size enterprises and cooperatives, and arrangements for the portability of social security benefits.

Questions for discussion:

1. What are good practices and lessons learned in mainstreaming return and reintegration programmes in the foreign employment policies of countries of origin and in the migration policies of countries of destination?

2. How can countries of origin, transit and destination best cooperate to promote the occupational mobility of returning domestic workers, including in the transfer of social security benefits, cash assets and other resources?
3. How can synergies be built between the local and national authorities, social partners, and service providers to promote the occupation mobility of returning workers as well as to extend the necessary social and medical services to them?

4. What could be done to promote the development impact of return and reintegration for the returning workers, the local community, and the country?

5. How can social cohesion and collaboration between returnees and local community members be best achieved?

6. How can returnees capitalize on the skills and ideas that they have been exposed to in countries of origin to experience occupational mobility on returning to the country of destination?
## Annex: Labour force by sex and age group, globally and by region

### Total labour force (thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>2,578,165</td>
<td>2,795,762</td>
<td>3,035,275</td>
<td>3,210,493</td>
<td>3,415,542</td>
<td>3,612,960</td>
<td>3,978,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Africa</td>
<td>45,990</td>
<td>52,279</td>
<td>59,632</td>
<td>66,457</td>
<td>73,158</td>
<td>80,405</td>
<td>95,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>216,786</td>
<td>249,092</td>
<td>285,811</td>
<td>330,783</td>
<td>384,771</td>
<td>449,275</td>
<td>607,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>203,375</td>
<td>229,790</td>
<td>258,718</td>
<td>283,678</td>
<td>306,910</td>
<td>329,808</td>
<td>365,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern America</td>
<td>152,068</td>
<td>164,201</td>
<td>171,081</td>
<td>177,344</td>
<td>181,804</td>
<td>186,715</td>
<td>195,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab States</td>
<td>24,076</td>
<td>28,577</td>
<td>34,703</td>
<td>45,029</td>
<td>52,731</td>
<td>59,153</td>
<td>72,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Asia</td>
<td>814,121</td>
<td>854,974</td>
<td>886,784</td>
<td>907,928</td>
<td>932,155</td>
<td>933,034</td>
<td>907,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Eastern Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>238,608</td>
<td>267,682</td>
<td>293,861</td>
<td>321,434</td>
<td>346,182</td>
<td>369,544</td>
<td>407,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Asia</td>
<td>492,149</td>
<td>549,113</td>
<td>630,771</td>
<td>648,197</td>
<td>699,447</td>
<td>767,602</td>
<td>892,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern, Southern and Western Europe</td>
<td>191,783</td>
<td>198,413</td>
<td>206,875</td>
<td>213,641</td>
<td>216,325</td>
<td>216,395</td>
<td>213,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>147,120</td>
<td>147,022</td>
<td>148,009</td>
<td>149,549</td>
<td>148,437</td>
<td>142,952</td>
<td>134,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and Western Asia</td>
<td>52,089</td>
<td>54,618</td>
<td>59,030</td>
<td>66,453</td>
<td>73,623</td>
<td>78,077</td>
<td>85,448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Male labour force (thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>1,553,040</td>
<td>1,679,256</td>
<td>1,816,409</td>
<td>1,939,656</td>
<td>2,068,182</td>
<td>2,194,283</td>
<td>2,422,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Africa</td>
<td>35,694</td>
<td>40,573</td>
<td>46,226</td>
<td>51,053</td>
<td>55,883</td>
<td>61,135</td>
<td>72,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>120,011</td>
<td>135,576</td>
<td>153,301</td>
<td>177,152</td>
<td>206,463</td>
<td>241,594</td>
<td>327,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>128,987</td>
<td>141,783</td>
<td>154,999</td>
<td>168,337</td>
<td>180,265</td>
<td>193,502</td>
<td>214,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern America</td>
<td>83,389</td>
<td>89,460</td>
<td>92,789</td>
<td>95,465</td>
<td>98,287</td>
<td>101,089</td>
<td>106,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab States</td>
<td>20,215</td>
<td>23,660</td>
<td>28,657</td>
<td>37,191</td>
<td>43,284</td>
<td>48,182</td>
<td>58,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Asia</td>
<td>451,639</td>
<td>473,917</td>
<td>494,219</td>
<td>509,433</td>
<td>523,595</td>
<td>527,358</td>
<td>516,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Eastern Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>137,852</td>
<td>154,782</td>
<td>169,640</td>
<td>184,465</td>
<td>198,837</td>
<td>212,116</td>
<td>233,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Asia</td>
<td>353,982</td>
<td>395,910</td>
<td>447,391</td>
<td>480,442</td>
<td>521,712</td>
<td>569,792</td>
<td>657,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern, Southern and Western Europe</td>
<td>111,196</td>
<td>112,877</td>
<td>115,554</td>
<td>117,139</td>
<td>117,068</td>
<td>116,976</td>
<td>114,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>78,039</td>
<td>76,940</td>
<td>76,915</td>
<td>78,210</td>
<td>77,941</td>
<td>74,878</td>
<td>69,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and Western Asia</td>
<td>32,037</td>
<td>33,778</td>
<td>36,717</td>
<td>40,771</td>
<td>44,847</td>
<td>47,661</td>
<td>52,254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Female labour force (thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>1,025,125</td>
<td>1,116,506</td>
<td>1,218,866</td>
<td>1,270,837</td>
<td>1,347,360</td>
<td>1,418,677</td>
<td>1,555,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Africa</td>
<td>10,296</td>
<td>11,706</td>
<td>13,407</td>
<td>15,404</td>
<td>17,275</td>
<td>19,270</td>
<td>23,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>96,775</td>
<td>113,516</td>
<td>132,510</td>
<td>153,631</td>
<td>178,308</td>
<td>207,682</td>
<td>279,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>74,388</td>
<td>88,007</td>
<td>103,720</td>
<td>115,341</td>
<td>126,645</td>
<td>136,307</td>
<td>151,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern America</td>
<td>68,679</td>
<td>74,741</td>
<td>78,291</td>
<td>81,880</td>
<td>83,516</td>
<td>85,625</td>
<td>89,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab States</td>
<td>3,861</td>
<td>4,917</td>
<td>6,046</td>
<td>7,837</td>
<td>9,447</td>
<td>10,971</td>
<td>14,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Asia</td>
<td>362,482</td>
<td>381,057</td>
<td>392,565</td>
<td>398,495</td>
<td>408,560</td>
<td>405,676</td>
<td>391,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Eastern Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>100,757</td>
<td>112,900</td>
<td>124,220</td>
<td>136,970</td>
<td>147,345</td>
<td>157,428</td>
<td>173,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Asia</td>
<td>138,166</td>
<td>153,203</td>
<td>183,380</td>
<td>167,755</td>
<td>177,734</td>
<td>197,810</td>
<td>235,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern, Southern and Western Europe</td>
<td>80,587</td>
<td>85,536</td>
<td>91,321</td>
<td>96,503</td>
<td>99,257</td>
<td>99,420</td>
<td>98,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>69,081</td>
<td>70,082</td>
<td>71,093</td>
<td>71,339</td>
<td>70,496</td>
<td>68,073</td>
<td>64,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and Western Asia</td>
<td>20,052</td>
<td>20,839</td>
<td>22,313</td>
<td>25,682</td>
<td>28,777</td>
<td>30,416</td>
<td>33,194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Regional and global estimates based on 178 countries
Source: ILO, Trends econometric models, November 2015
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