

**SUMMARY RECORD OF THE**

**WORKSHOP ON THE MONITORING FRAMEWORK OF THE ASEAN ROADMAP ON THE ELIMINATION OF THE WORST FORMS OF CHILD LABOUR BY 2025**

**VIRTUAL, 3 – 4 MARCH 2021**

**INTRODUCTION**

1. The Workshop on the Monitoring Framework of the ASEAN Roadmap on the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour by 2025 was convened virtually on 3-4 March 2021. The Workshop was hosted by the ASEAN Secretariat with the support of the International Labour Organization (ILO).
2. Representatives of the ASEAN Senior Labour Officials Meeting (SLOM), Labour Inspectorates of ASEAN Member States, Senior Officials Meeting on Transnational Crime (SOMTC), Senior Officials Meeting on Social Welfare and Development (SOMSWD), ASEAN Community Statistical System Committee (ACSSC), ASEAN Inter-Governmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR), ASEAN Commission on Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Women and Children (ACWC), Senior Officials Meeting on Rural Development and Poverty Eradication (SOMRDPE) and Senior Officials Meeting on Education (SOM-ED) participated in the Workshop. Representatives of the ASEAN Secretariat, ILO, ASEAN-USAID Partnership for Regional Optimization within the Political-Security and Socio-Cultural Communities (PROSPECT), and the regional consultant were also in attendance. The agenda and list of delegates appear as **ANNEX 1** and **ANNEX** **2**, respectively.

**OPENING SESSION**

1. Ms. Rodora T. Babaran, Director, Human Development Directorate of the ASEAN Secretariat delivered remarks on behalf of H.E. Kung Phoak, the ASEAN Deputy Secretary-General for ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASCC) of the ASEAN Secretariat. Against the background of the adverse impacts of COVID-19 pandemic which have exacerbated the risk of vulnerable children falling into child labour practices, Ms. Babaran highlighted that the protection of children, as the future of ASEAN, should be put at the centre of recovery policies and measures. She further reiterated that following the adoption of the ASEAN Roadmap of the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour by 2025, the implementation needs coordinated and cohesive efforts of relevant ASEAN Bodies. She underscored that the Workshop aimed to facilitate fruitful discussion among those ASEAN Bodies on how to move forward with the monitoring framework of the ASEAN Roadmap. The data collection during in the monitoring framework is key to generate a more fine-grained picture of the nature and extent of child labour in the region and to tailor evidence-based policies towards the elimination of the worst form of child labour in the region. The remarks of Ms. Rodora T. Babaran appears as **ANNEX 3**
2. The remarks of Ms. Indah Anggoro Putri, Head of International Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Manpower of Indonesia, on behalf of the Senior Labour Officials Meeting (SLOM) Chair, underscored that child labour is one of the fundamental labour issues that requires collaboration between stakeholders. She reiterated that the ASEAN Roadmap provided a guidance to ASEAN Member States for the next five years to work together towards the elimination of the worst forms of child labour and thanked all ASEAN Member States for their involvement in the development of the Framework and invited all delegates to jointly accelerate the action to eliminate child labour in the region. The remarks of Ms. Indah Anggoro Putri appears as **ANNEX 4**.

**SESSION ON EXPERIENCES FROM OTHER REGIONS AND NATIONAL MONITORING, LESSONS ON MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS**

1. A video presentation of Ms. Laura de Franchis, Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer of ILO Geneva, highlighted the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) monitoring, and reporting and monitoring of child labour roadmaps and action plans in other regions. She outlined the principles in monitoring the progress of the SDG Alliance 8.7 and its implementation in the Pathfinder Countries.[[1]](#footnote-1) She accentuated that the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework should not only be designed for data collection but also for building and sustaining collective motivation towards the elimination of the worst forms of child labour. Building upon the Annex 2 of the ASEAN Roadmap, it is important to agree on the set of indicators that are achievable and realistic yet ambitious to maintain the urgency of the Roadmap. She also emphasised the importance of identifying available evidence that would demonstrate the achievement of the ASEAN Member States (AMS). In this regard, a baseline could help measure the improvement of AMS. Lastly, the monitoring framework should have an agreed frequency of data collection. In collecting data, she encouraged AMS to leverage existing data and to collaborate with partners and stakeholders that follows a similar framework. The presentation of Ms. Laura de Franchis can be viewed on the following link <https://youtu.be/rt77DPVlpuM>.
2. Ms. Bharati Pflug, Senior Specialist on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work of ILO, further elaborated on the Alliance 8.7 Pathfinder Countries. In the South-East Asia region, Viet Nam and Myanmar are the Pathfinder Countries actively participating in the Alliance 8.7 programmes, while Malaysia has expressed their interest to become a Pathfinder Country. As ILO continues to expand the Pathfinder Countries, Ms. Pflug encouraged other AMS who are willing to take a leadership role and commitment to accelerate the elimination of child labour to become one of the Pathfinder Countries.

**SESSION ON THE PROPOSED PRIORITISED INDICATORS FOR THE ASEAN ROADMAP**

1. This session was facilitated by Ms. Rodora T. Babaran, Director, Human Development Directorate of the ASEAN Secretariat.
2. Ms. Birgitte Krogh-Poulsen, the consultant, presented the proposed prioritised indicators in Annex 2 of the ASEAN Roadmap that are categorised into three groups of: i) A-list of fourteen indicators that were proposed as a priority for periodic quantitative data collection. These indicators would also be used for the baseline of the ASEAN Roadmap; ii) B-list of nine indicators that were proposed for periodic qualitative assessment to complement the quantitative data; and iii) C-list of nine indicators for data collection at a later stage. The presentation of Ms. Krogh-Poulsen and the list of the proposed prioritised indicators appear as **ANNEX 5** and **ANNEX 6**, respectively.
3. The delegates exchanged views on the session, as follows:
4. Statistics Division of the ASEAN Secretariat underlined the need to assess the availability and sustainability of the required data against the listed indicators in each AMS. The ASEAN Secretariat further inquired on the alternative measure in the case where certain data was not feasible to be obtained. This was further echoed by ACSS Malaysia seeking clarification on the recommendation of possible data sources and the periodicity of data collection.
5. ACWC Indonesia inquired whether there could be indicators relating to the worst forms of child labour. ACWC Indonesia also consulted ILO on the possibility to collaborate with Indonesia in their national program to implement the ASEAN Roadmap, in line with ILO’s regional programme.
6. SLOM Philippines sought clarification on the periodic qualitative assessment under the B-list of the proposed prioritised indicators. Taking the example of the indicator on the number of existing laws and regulations, SLOM Philippines inquired on to what extent the qualitative assessment should be conducted.
7. Recognising that the data collection process would require multi-sectoral coordination, SOMSWD Cambodia inquired on how to effectively connect the data and information and to ensure its quality from other sectors.
8. SLOM Viet Nam suggested to have a clear timing for each indicator and to collect data through survey for some indicators. SLOM Viet Nam also recommended a mechanism for data collection of some indicators that involve several agencies.
9. SLOM Brunei Darussalam inquired on the suitable definition of the term “acceptable” in the indicator of the proportion and number of young workers aged 14‑17 years engaged in acceptable forms of employment, by sex and age, nationality, geographical location and sector (Number 4 of the A-list).
10. Ms. Bharati Pflug informed that at that moment ILO does not have a regional child labour programme covering AMS, however, ILO had done works in relation with the Alliance 8.7 in the Asia-Pacific region. She also informed on the 5th Global Conference on the Sustained Eradication of Child Labour in 2022 to be hosted by South Africa. In the preparation of the Global Conference, ILO would convene a regional consultation in the second half of 2021 to gather inputs from the Asia-Pacific region. On this note, ILO could explore a possibility to conduct an ASEAN-specific event if there was interest from AMS for a regional communication prior to the Asia-Pacific consultation.
11. SLOM Viet Nam welcomed the idea to organise an ASEAN level meeting in the preparation for the Asia-Pacific consultation and the Global Conference. SLOM Viet Nam also thanked ILO for their technical support for Viet Nam as one of the Pathfinder Countries and further informed on the preparation of a plan of action according to the goals and objectives of the Alliance 8.7, including the development of a M&E framework on child labour prevention. Viet Nam expressed their readiness to share with other AMS their experiences, including legislation development concerning the elimination of child labour and hoped to receive support from stakeholders and partners at national and regional level.
12. Addressing the concerns on data availability, Ms. Birgitte Krogh-Poulsen demonstrated the possibility of multiple data sources for one indicator where data could be obtained from sources that are not directly related to child labour, for example, education statistics. Ms. Krogh-Poulsen also informed that data collection would depend on the data set and established system in each AMS and strongly encouraged AMS to utilise the existing system for the reporting channel. In response to the queries on periodic qualitative assessment under the B-list, Ms. Krogh-Poulsen clarified that the qualitative assessment was proposed to complement the quantitative data under the A-list and would be conducted in a less frequent periodicity compared to the prioritised indicators. Particularly to the indicator on the laws and regulations, this indicator referred only to the existence of the legal instruments, acknowledging the difficulty to measure their implementation.
13. In regard to the indicators categorised by the worst forms of child labour, Ms. Krogh-Poulsen referred to the development process of the ASEAN Roadmap where it was decided not to include the segregated data based on the worst forms of child labour considering the difficulties to collect the data.
14. Ms. Krogh-Poulsen also seconded Viet Nam’s view of the necessity of having a clear timing for each indicator and reiterated that AMS could use the already available mechanism to collect data from different agencies. However, in the absence of an existing structure for reporting mechanism, AMS were encouraged to discuss at the national level and to look at the possibility to build upon the available system.
15. Ms. Krogh-Poulsen elaborated that the definition of “acceptable forms of employment” is contained in ILO Conventions. In particular, the ILO Convention concerning Minimum Age for Admission to Employment (C138) provides specific guidance on this matter, including the minimum age. Ms. Krogh-Poulsen also underlined that some terms need to be further defined nationally, for example, the term “hazardous works”.
16. Ms. Bharati Pflug added by referring to the Convention concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour (C182) and the ILO’s Worst Forms of Child Labour Recommendation (R190) which listed the types of work categorised as hazardous works. Ms. Pflug concluded by highlighting the rule of thumb of the acceptable forms of employment is that nobody under eighteen years old should be in hazardous works.

**SMALL GROUP REFLECTIONS ON THE PROPOSED PRIORITISED INDICATOR SET FOR THE ASEAN ROADMAP**

1. The delegates were divided into groups to review the proposed prioritised indicators and discussed the following matters:
2. Identify any additional indicators from Annex 2 of the Roadmap that are missing from the prioritised indicators;
3. Identify any proposed priority indicators that might not be necessary or feasible as prioritised indicators; and
4. Identify any other issues or concerns with regard to the proposed prioritised indicators.

**SHARING OF GROUP REFLECTIONS**

1. This session was facilitated by Ms. Mega Irena, Assistant Director and Head of Labour and Civil Service Division of the ASEAN Secretariat
2. The Workshop noted that in general, AMS had no additional indicators to the proposed prioritised indicators, apart from Cambodia who suggested to add indicators related to occupational safety and health (OSH) for acceptable forms of recruitment of young workers. It was also noted that AMS has different availability of data set to report against each proposed prioritised indicators. AMS identified indicators where data collection is not feasible and proposed to move those indicators for the later stage of assessment. The proposed indicators to be removed from the A-list are as follows: Number 8 (number of cases reported online), Number 9 (number of child labour-related cases registered with courts and mediation authorities), Number 10 (number of campaign activities), Number 12 (Proportion of household with children below 18 years accessing social protection, and Number 13 (Child protection share of public expenditure).
3. The Workshop further noted the recommendation from AMS to provide operational definitions to guide the data collection. The ASEAN Secretariat proposed that reference of terms in the indicators to be made in accordance with international conventions and other surveys while allowing some flexibility for AMS in data collection and its frequency. Ms. Pflug further recommended aligning the data collection under the Monitoring Framework of the ASEAN Roadmap with the country reporting for the SDGs. The results of the group discussion appear below and as **ANNEX 7**.
4. Matrix of results of the group discussion:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| AMS | Questions of Discussion |
| 1.Any additional indicators from Annex 2 to the Roadmap that you think are missing from the prioritised indicators? | 2. Any proposed priority indicators that you think are not necessary or feasible as prioritised indicators?  | 3. Any other issues or concerns you would like to raise with regard to the proposed prioritised indicators? |
| 1. Brunei Darussalam | No additional indicators | c (1) # of whistle blower initiatives established or promoted | 1. a (8) # of cases reported online. No platform yet in Brunei Darussalam even though there is a help line operating 24 hours
2. a (13) child protection share of public expenditure
3. a (14) # of children referred to services by age, sex, nationality and geographical location – no specific or clear definition on the term “services”
 |
| 2. Cambodia | Indicators related to occupation and safety health for acceptable forms of recruitment of young workers. | 1. 1. # of resources shared online by category and country
2. Child protection share of public expenditure
3. Proportion of household with children below 18 years accessing social protection
 | 1. Numbers of child labour related cases registered with courts and mediation authorities
2. Compulsory education’s share of public expenditure
 |
| 3. Indonesia |  |  | 1. Indonesia found it hard to collect data if age range is determined. Some data was collected for Children from the age of 15, not 14. Indonesia requested for the consultant to further consider the age determination.
2. Point 3 and 4 need operational definition on each indicator because Indonesia needs also to refer to national definition.
3. On number of case reported online, data of cases reported should also include offline data as Indonesia also have hotline through phone that can be accounted for as number of cases reported.
 |
| 4. Lao PDR | None, the proposed indicators are sufficient. | 1. No. 8 Cases reported online, for Lao PDR we do not have a dedicated system in place
2. No. 13 Lao PDR have limited funding for child protection. Lao PDR cannot know the budget yet in advance.
 | No. 12 Household with children under 18 years accessing social protection: It is difficult to assess children whose parents are not member of social security to access social services. Children in Lao PDR are not required to pay tuition until high school. |
| 5. Malaysia | Nil | They are not to be taken out but need to be taken into consideration for better clarity on these items:1. Item no. 12, 13, and 14 as they are too broad2. Item no. 1-4 are available for Malaysia but baseline information only3. Existing data specific to plantation sector/forced labour | 1. Need more clarity on the definition of Social protection as well as child labour itself as it might differ across AMS
2. Data availability and cross sectoral coordination between sectoral bodies
3. Campaign. Need clarity whether it is specifically for child labour or campaign that also promote rights of children in general.
 |
| 6. Myanmar | NIL | 1. Child Protection Policy will be launch and it’s very comprehensive.
2. National Case Management Steering Unit was formed and organized each child cases.
 | 1. #8a child cases reported
2. #13a and #14a proposed data collection for all indicators on each Ministries and AMS.
 |
| 7. The Philippines | NIL | 1. #9a - # of child labour-related cases registered with courts and mediation authorities
2. request to transfer #12a to Indicators under Group C data for later stage
3. request to transfer #10a to Indicators under Group B]
 | 1. On proposed priority indicator #3a, since the age brackets used in the national survey in the Philippines are (a) 5-9, (b) 10-14, and (c) 15-17, the data that is readily available is for age bracket 15-17; data for age 14 will require special processing
2. On proposed priority indicator #4a, available data in the Philippines is only for 15-17 years old since the minimum employable age in the country is 15
3. On proposed indicator #8a - # of cases reported (online) [there are existing platforms but no reports received – might need promotion and information dissemination]
4. On proposed indicator #12a – for further validation if data is readily available
 |
| 8. Singapore | NIL | NIL | NIL |
| 9. Thailand | NIL | NIL | Definition of what is means to be "child" (age)  |
| 10. Viet Nam | NIL | 1. Indicator #6a should be “accumulated number of labour inspection” instead of “Inspectors” because Vietnamese labour inspectors will engage in multiple area of inspection
2. Indicator #12a may not be suitable as the definition of access to “social protection” is very broad and will be available to all. We would like to know is other AMS have this data available;
3. Indicator #14a: Right now the “children referred to service” is not clearly defined; it is unclear the target of this indicator whether they are confirmed child labour or children in general?
 | 1. The indicators on the share of public investment ( #13a, #5b, #8c, #9c…) are difficult to compile data because they involve many ministries, sectors and localities and without enough reports back.
2. Some indicators relating to many agencies so it's needed a mechanism for collection them; this lead to budget issue and the sustainability of data collection (i.e. #2a, #3a and #4a…)
3. Indicator #5a “number of trained person”
 |

**RECAP OF THE DISCUSSION ON PRIORITY INDICATOR SET**

1. This session was facilitated by Ms. Madyah Rahmi Lukri, Senior Officer, Labour and Civil Service Division of the ASEAN Secretariat.
2. Ms. Birgitte Krogh-Poulsen presented the summary of feedback from the group work on the proposed priority indicators during the first day of the Workshop. She noted the challenges of AMS in collecting data across ministries. She underscored the necessity of having clear coordination and mechanism and to use existing data collection system that is already available. She also reiterated the necessity of providing operational definitions to the indicators which would allow flexibility in data collection. In conclusion, she proposed to maintain all fourteen prioritised indicators under the A-list and test those indicators through baseline data collection. The baseline year of the indicators was proposed to be the year 2016, however where data of the year 2016 is not available, AMS could report the available data from the closest year to 2016. She further clarified that in the event where an indicator was reported by less than five AMS, the particular indicator would be assessed for the feasibility to be included in the B-list for qualitative assessment or to be further moved to the C-list. The presentation of Ms. Krogh-Poulsen appears as **ANNEX 8**.
3. The delegates exchanged views as follow:
4. SLOM Philippines inquired whether the baseline year of 2016 was determined with consideration of the previous Roadmap. Ms. Krogh-Poulsen confirmed that the year 2016 was proposed as the continuation of the 2016 ASEAN Roadmap.
5. SLOM Cambodia clarified whether the proposals from AMS to remove several indicators would be accepted. Ms. Krogh-Poulsen acknowledged that there was no uniform request to remove the indicators and proposed to test the indicators during the baseline data collection for further discussion on the removal of those indicators from the A-list.

**SESSION ON DATA SOURCE COMPENDIUM FOR AMS AND PROPOSED DATA REPORTING TEMPLATE**

1. Ms. Krogh-Poulsen reported the summary of available data based on the survey that had been consulted to SLOM since December 2020. She noted that several AMS had conducted child labour surveys although some surveys were carried out more than ten years ago. She shared that all but two AMS have mixed methodology sectoral studies available. She also identified common data gaps across AMS that include not up-to-date statistical data on child labour, limited in-depth studies from invisible sectors and the worst forms of child labour. Research and studies were generally conducted at the national or sub-national level and there has not been a comprehensive regional overview on the issue. She also presented the proposed data reporting template. The presentation of Ms. Krogh-Poulsen appears as **ANNEX 9**.
2. The ASEAN Secretariat reiterated that there were two proposed reporting templates for AMS discussion. The first template was designed for quantitative data collection against the fourteen prioritised indicators under the A-list, with the baseline year of 2016. The second template was proposed to be used in a flexible manner to compliment the quantitative data when necessary. AMS are welcomed to fill in the second template if there is a need for better understanding or appreciation of the statistics in the first template or if AMS wishes to provide a narrative in the absence of the quantitative data. The ASEAN Secretariat also underlined that the reporting templates were not designed to compare the performance of AMS but to track the progress of ASEAN as a whole in the implementation of the ASEAN Roadmap. The proposed reporting template for Monitoring Framework of ASEAN Roadmap on Elimination of Worst Forms of Child Labour by 2025 and the proposed reporting template for additional information appear as **ANNEX 10** and **ANNEX 11**, respectively.

**GROUP REFLECTIONS ON THE DATA SOURCES, REPORTING TEMPLATES AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT FOR THE MONITORING FRAMEWORK OF THE ASEAN ROADMAP**

1. The delegates were divided into the same groups to review the proposed reporting templates and discussed the following matters:
2. Identify any changes/additions for inclusion in the proposed templates;
3. Identify potential ministries that could contribute to the data collection of each indicator; and
4. Identify areas where AMS would benefit from additional technical support from the ASEAN Secretariat and other organisations to monitor the implementation of the Roadmap.

**Sharing of Group Reflections**

1. The group sharing was facilitated by Ms. Mega Irena, Assistant Director and Head of Labour and Civil Service Division of the ASEAN Secretariat. In general, AMS reiterated the necessity to include operational definitions of the indicators. Some AMS also proposed several changes to the indicators reflecting on the data availability in their respective country. Changes were proposed to be made to the age bracket, segregation of nationality and geographical location on indicators Number 1 and Number 11, respectively, and a broader means of reporting in indicator Number 8. AMS also initially identified several ministries that could contribute to providing data in the reporting template. The matrix of data source would be further consulted with AMS for further completion.
2. AMS also identified areas that need technical assistance in relation to the monitoring of the implementation of the ASEAN Roadmap. These include capacity building activities to measure the indicators and to monitor the implementation of the Roadmap, supervision and consultation agenda, data collection and data synchronisation mechanism to ensure the submitted data by each AMS reflects a similar situation. AMS also sought assistance for national and regional studies on child labour issues and capacity building programmes for relevant stakeholders in monitoring and addressing child labour, especially in hard-to-reach sectors. The technical assistance was hoped to come from the ASEAN Secretariat and other international agencies, i.e. ILO. The results of the group discussion appear below and as **ANNEX 12**.
3. Matrix of results of the group discussion:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| AMS | Questions for Discussions |
| 1. Identify any changes/additions you would like to see included in the template. | 2. Identify which indicators that your ministry can contribute data for. | 3. Identify areas where you would benefit from (additional) technical support from ASEC and other organisation to monitor implementation of the Roadmap. |
| 1. Brunei Darussalam | None to add | * 8,12,13 & 14 - Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sport
* 8, 10 - Ministry of Home Affairs
* 1 - Department of Economic Planning and Statistic, Ministry of Finance and Economy
* 11 - Ministry of Education
 | Technical assistance from ILO and ASEC on how to implement the roadmap |
| 2. Cambodia | 1. US Global Child Labour Report
2. TIP Report
3. Other global alliance reports
 | * Indicators A (1,2,3,4,5) – Ministry of Planning
* Indicator A (11), Indicators C (4,6) – Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport
* Indicators A (6,7,10), Indicators C (7,9) – Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training
* Indicator A (14) - Ministry of Social Affairs, Veterans and Youth Rehabilitation
* Indicators B (1,2,3,4) - National Committees for Counter Trafficking, Counter Child Labour, Early Childhood Care and Development, and Council for Children
* Indicator B (5) - Cambodia Agriculture Research and Development
 | 1. Pathfinder AMS Monitoring Experience
2. ILO and Other UN Agencies on Strengthening Child Protection (incl. Online Child Protection)
 |
| 3.Indonesia | No changes | * 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12 - BPS, Statistics Indonesia
* 6, 7, 10 – Ministry of Manpower
* 8.a, 13, 14 – Ministry of Social Affairs
* 8.b, 9 - The police Force and Ministry of Women Empowerment and Child Protection
 | 1. Training related to concept and measuring indicators
2. Routine supervision and consultation agenda
3. Workshop on data synchronisation regarding the ASEAN Roadmap on the Elimination of the Worst Form of Child Labour by 2025
 |
| 4. Lao PDR | 1. The different age brackets to one bracket of 15-17 years old, Lao PDR can only report when it carries out a labour or child labour survey
2. Data may come from other sources beside the surveys such as from the education sector.
 | * 4. Proportion and number of young workers aged 14‑17 years engaged in acceptable forms of employment, by sex and age, nationality, geographical location and sector - Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare
* 6. of labour inspectors trained by gender and geographical location – Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare
* 11. Net enrolment rates at primary education (and secondary education levels) by sex, age, nationality, and geographical location – Ministry of Education and Sport
 | Technical and financial support from the ILO to implement the NPA. |
| 5. Malaysia | 1. No 1- input by nationality to be changed to citizen/non citizen
2. Baseline data 2016 – use available data (i.e 2018/2020) (based on availability)
3. No. 11 – cannot identify based on nationality/geographical location (only administrative data)
4. A standard definition required (Metadata/dictionary) eg: services, social protection
5. To prioritise (make optional based on available national data/target)
 | * Population by age, gender NO. 1 &11 – DOSM
* No. 8 (TIP victims – offline) MWFCD (Women)Labour inspections / labour inspectors (general data) no. 6&7 – MOHR (DOL)
* Other indicators still need to be discussed with other Ministries whether data is available and can be shared with others
 | 1. National studies on the indicators of child labour
2. Knowledge sharing session and capacity building programmes with the pathfinder countries. Not only AMS but also from other region.
 |
| 6. Myanmar  | No additional changes | * Proportion of No. of Children aged 5-17 years old engaged in child labour, by sex and age, geographical location and sector – MOLIP
* Child labour related cases registered with courts and mediation authorities- MOSWRR, Supreme Court, MOHA
* Existing laws and regulations reviewed and revised- MOSWRR, MOLIP
* Net enrolment in non formal education (NFE) program by sex, age, nationality, geographical location- MOE
* Net enrolment in TVET programes by sex, age, nationality- MOE
* Social Protection shared of public expenditure-MOSWRR
* Child Protection shared of public expenditure- each Ministries
 | 1. Data collection of AMS
2. Case study on worst forms of child labour by AMS
 |
| 7. The Philippines | * There is a need to operationalise the rpogress levels, how do we define/measure significant progress, strong progress, limited progress, no progress
* #1 - to clarify the universe for the % (of what); the age brackets used in the Philippines are (a) 5-9, (b) 10-14, and (c) 15-17; child is defined as a person below 18 years of age (17 and below); thus age 18 should not be included; on terms of geographical location there is a need to clarify if this will be determined by each country
* #2 and 3 (by age) - same comment as #1 on age bracket used
* #4 (by age) - age 14 is not captured under the LFS since the minimum employabable age is 15
* #7 - to clarify significant differences in the definition of "child labour indicators", "other child labour tools" and "child labour inspection guides"
* #8 - it might be necssary to also include the mode of reporting e.g. via website, hotline (calls and/or SMS) , social media, email
 | * #1 and 14 - Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE), Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD)
* #2,3,4 - Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA)
* #5 - Philippine National Police (PNP), National Bureau of Investigation, DOLE, other law enforcement agencies
* #6, 7- DOLE
* #8 - PNP, Department of Justice (DOJ), DSWD, DOLE
* #9 - Courts, DOJ
* #10 - National Council Agaisnt Child Labour (NCACL) Secretariat, Council for the Welfare of Children, Natioanl Youth Commission, Philippine Information Agency
* #11- DepED
* #12- DSWD, NEDA, PSA, DILG, Local Government Units (LGUs)
* #13- CWC, DBM, DILG, LGUs

Note: the NCACL through its Secretariat may provide data for indicators captured under the Philippine Program Against Child Labor Strategic Plan 2020-2022 | 1. Harmonisation of different data collection mechanisms - how to easily and efficiently collect data from different ministries/agenceis/oganisations
2. Specialized tranings (soft skills) fo labour inspectors relative to the identifitication of child labour and its worst forms
3. Study on an existing document on the conduct of labour inspection covering child labour in the informal sector
4. Capacitating different stakeholders,especially those at the community/local level, in monitoring and addressing child labour
 |
| 8. Singapore | NIL | NIL | NIL |
| 9. Thailand | NIL | * #1,2,3,4- NSO
* #5-Ministry of Labour (MoL)
* #6,7 – MoL
* #9- Ministry of Justice
* #11-Ministry of Education
* #12,13 - Ministry of Social Development and Human Security and Settlements
 | 1. Statistical capacity in data collection/data analysis/data dissemination of child labour
2. Sharing child labour data among AMS
3. Technical support for training labour inespectors especially in hard-to-reach sectors
 |
| 10. Viet Nam | NIL | * 1- GSO
* 2,3,4 - MOLISA but need to clarify on parameter esp. geographical data
* 5,10 - MOLISA but will need information from other Ministries
* 6,7 - MOLISA can provide on number of inspector
* 8 - Reported case available , no online report data
* 9- Need cooperation with courts, Ministry of Justice
* 11 - GSO (nationality data not available) and MOET
* 12,13 - No available data
 | Need to synchronise with other AMS so the indicators reflect the same thing |

1. In addition, Thailand inquired about the frequency of the reporting. On a similar note, Viet Nam also shared that some data might not be available for annual reporting as data collection depends on the funding to conduct survey. ASEAN Secretariat proposed non-mandatory annual data collection in which AMS would be welcomed to report the data annually, if any. However, acknowledging different data availability across AMS, ASEAN Secretariat stands guided by AMS on the periodicity of reporting.

**GROUP REFLECTIONS ON GOOD PRACTICE AND SUPPORT NEEDED FOR THE MONITORING FRAMEWORK OF THE ASEAN ROADMAP**

1. The delegates were assigned to the same groups to discuss the following matters:

1. Identify an initiative to monitor child labour in their respective country that might be useful for others; and
2. Identify an issue or area related to monitoring child labour to learn from other AMS

**SHARING OF GROUP REFLECTIONS**

1. The sharing of group results was facilitated by Ms. Mega Irena, Assistant Director and Head of Labour and Civil Service Division of the ASEAN Secretariat. It was highlighted that almost all AMS had taken initiatives to monitor and eliminate child labour in their country and were ready to share their good practices with other AMS. AMS pointed out several areas to learn from each other, namely the data collection, monitoring and reporting, capacity building and inter-agency cooperation. AMS also expressed interest to receive more practical sharing of knowledge and experience on online case reporting system in particular during the time of the pandemic, referral mechanism system, labour inspection in informal and hard-to-reach sectors, and the interconnection between child labour and the local culture. The results of the group discussion appear below and as **ANNEX 13**.
2. Matrix of results of the group discussion:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| AMS | Questions of Discussion |
| 1.Please identify an initiative to monitor child labour in your country that might be useful for others (it can be big or small, new and innovative or well established, tried-and-tested good practice) | 2. Please identify an issue or area related to monitoring child labour where you would like to learn from other AMS |
| 1. Brunei Darussalam | None | 1. Training for Inspector; Protection;
2. Identification of Child Labour related issue;
3. Data Collection and ReportingOperational Procedure (Inter-agency cooperation)
 |
| 2. Cambodia | 1. Child Labour Monitoring System (CLMS)
2. Self Reporting of labour inspection System 2021 (Online Registration)
3. Other communal judicial police report (MoWA)
4. National Indicator Reporting Platform (CamStat-Online)
 | 1. Hard-to-reach sectors/ Highly-Vulnerable
2. Profession Monitoring System in AMS
3. Result Bases of Referral Mechanism System in AMS.
 |
| 3.Indonesia | 1. Collaboration with NGO to identified and monitoring availability the child labour and reported to labour inspectors for handling those issues together
2. Sudden direct inspection to the company based on cases reported by society
 | How to do inspection in the informal sectors where the children work for informal and household activities (children domestic workers) |
| 4. Lao PDR | 1. Child labour protection prioritizing in prevention of worst form of child labour, and promoting children physical health and mental development (involving all key stakeholders);
2. Set-up central and provincial steering committees on Child Protection and Assistance (CPAC); and also at districts level and growing;
3. Establish more than 1,000 child protection networks at the local level (village).
 | 1. Defining child labour and children working to assist their parents;
2. Good practice from other countries on prevention and elimination of child labour;
3. Indicator 8 Cases reported online
4. Other AMS’s experience.
 |
| 5. Malaysia | Children initiatives in Malaysia that also cover child labour:1. Awareness programmes (prevention)
2. Additional assistance for vulnerable children (eg: school nutrition programme)
3. Child Act 2011 – no exploitation on children
4. Children and Young Persons (Employment) 2019 amendment – hazardous work and permitted work for Children and Young Persons
5. Dedicated hotline for reporting on cases including child labour case (called Talian Kasih)
 | 1. Capacity building from pathfinder countries.
2. How do we have clear demarcation between customs and child labour? For example in Malaysia, it is customary for children to help their parents after school hours to assist their family/parents.
3. How can Malaysia leverage from various existing enforcement efforts already ongoing in the area of eradicating child labour vis-à-vis upholding rights of children (CRC)?
 |
| 6. Myanmar | 1. National Case Management Steering Unit by DSW
2. Child Rights Law (By law) was drawing (draft)
3. Recognized hazarded work for children (MOLIP)
4. Discussing light work for children (MOLIP)
 | 1. We learned good practice from other countries on elimination of child labour
2. We liked online reported system from AMS
 |
| 7. The Philippines | 1. Institutionalisation of the National Council Against Child Labour and existence of different structures on children
2. Inclusion of child labour indicators in the country’s labour inspection checklist; during conduct of routine inspections, if there are child labour violations found, appropriate agencies are immediately notified
3. Inclusion of a rider module on child labour in the Labour Force SurveyProfiling of child labourers to locate and identify the children who will be referred, provided with services, and removed from child labour
4. Development of a Child Labour Local Registry System, supported by ILO. This system to used to determine what services had provided to child labourersInstitutionalization of the Community-Based Monitoring System
5. Availability of Electronic Freedom of Information (eFOI) platform
 | 1. Identification of child labour in the informal sector in other countries -- Is this also being subjected to labour inspection? How do they conduct inspection?
2. Collection of data on other worst forms of child labour
3. Collection of data on child labour during a pandemic
4. Mechanism to promote/ensure accountability among different stakeholders in addressing child labour
 |
| 8. Singapore | NIL | NIL |
| 9. Thailand | Thailand has developed a web application for labour officers to record and enquire result of labour inspection, notification of employment of young workers under 18, including child labour statistics from inspection and prosecution cases of employers. | 1. The coordination among the relevant agencies in order to compile child labour statistics
2. To learn how to collect child labour data which not in the system (informal, migrant, non-registered)
 |
| 10. Viet Nam | Viet Nam is testing the integration of M&E with child protection services so when there is case in the community with problem, the system will activate child protection service and refer to an appropriate service. | 1. How to collect the missing data and operate the hotline effectively.
2. How to detect & handle child labour cases especially in the informal sector as there are no detected case in the formal sectors but the informal sectors are hard to reach and we will benefit from the regional experiences especially the information network to support the inspectors to detect child labour in the community.
3. Sharing of actual effective tools and procedures instead of policies and target.
 |

**WAYS FORWARD**

1. Ms. Mega Irena presented the proposed next steps and indicative timeline of the implementation of the ASEAN Roadmap. Ms. Irena noted suggestions from several AMS to move the indicators in the A-list to the B-list or C-list. In this regard, the ASEAN Secretariat proposed to proceed with the data collection for all fourteen indicators in the A-list. Upon the collection, indicators with data obtained from less than five AMS would be consulted with SLOM for their deliberation whether those indicators should be moved to the other Lists. She further reiterated that to complement the quantitative data, a qualitative assessment would be conducted based on the B-list with the technical support from the ILO.
2. In parallel with the discussion of the Monitoring Framework of the ASEAN Roadmap, Ms. Irena reminded the delegates of key activities to implement the ASEAN Roadmap as stipulated in Annex 1 of the ASEAN Roadmap. As those key activities require cross-sectoral cooperation, the ASEAN Secretariat proposed to conduct a follow-up workshop in the third quarter of 2021 which will involve SLOM, Labour Inspectorates, SOMTC, SOMSWD, ACSSC, AICHR, ACWC, SOMRDPE and SOM-ED. The presentation of Ms. Irena appears as **ANNEX 14**.
3. Matrix of the ways forward appears as below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Activities | Indicative Timeline |
| * Refinement of the template for data collection with technical support from Ms. Birgitte Krogh-Poulsen and the ILO
* Consultation with SLOM and other contributing Sectoral Bodies for further inputs
 | March – April 2021 |
| Data collection for the 14 indicators in A-list | May – August 2021 |
| Deliberation of SLOM on the indicators with data from less than 5 AMS | September 2021 |
| Inter-sectoral Workshop on the Implementation of ASEAN Roadmap on Elimination of Worst Forms of Child Labour by 2025 | 28 September 2021 |
| Capacity Building Workshop on Monitoring Framework of ASEAN Roadmap on Elimination of Worst Forms of Child Labour by 2025 | 29-30 September 2021 |
| Qualitative Assessment (indicators in B-list) with technical support from the ILO | 1. – 2022
 |

**CLOSING**

1. The ASEAN Secretariat expressed appreciation to all delegates of ASEAN Sectoral Bodies for their active participation and information sharing during the two-day Workshop which provided abundant inputs to the Monitoring Framework of the ASEAN Roadmap.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Alliance 8.7 is an inclusive global partnership committed to achieving target 8.7 of the 2030 sustainable development goals, which calls for immediate and effective measures to eradicate forced labour, end modern slavery and human trafficking and secure the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labour, including recruitment and use of child soldiers, and by 2025 end child labour in all its forms. Further information on Alliance 8.7 can be accessed in the following link: <https://www.alliance87.org/the-alliance/> . [↑](#footnote-ref-1)