Roundtable on Managing Cross-border Movements of People
19–20 November 2012

Organised by the RSIS Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies

CENTRE FOR
NON-TRADITIONAL
SECURITY STUDIES

PONDER THE IMPROBABLE

ROUNDTABLE ON MANAGING CROSS-BORDER MOVEMENTS OF PEOPLE: PROMOTING CAPACITY AND RESPONSE FOR IRREGULAR MIGRATION

ORGANISED BY
THE RSIS CENTRE FOR NON-TRADITIONAL SECURITY (NTS) STUDIES

19–20 NOVEMBER 2012
SINGAPORE

S. RAJARATNAM SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES (RSIS)
NANYANG TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
2013

Photo credits:
Cover: (arrows on left) Xiaming, Bartlomiej Magierowski, IHH Humanitarian Relief Foundation, Asian Development Bank, all from flickr; (arrows on right) P.K. Hangzo / RSIS Centre for NTS Studies, WongKC2012 / flickr.

This report summarises the proceedings of the Roundtable as interpreted by the rapporteurs and editors of the RSIS Centre for NTS Studies. This report adheres to a variation of the Chatham House Rule.

This publication is also available online at:
www.rsis.edu.sg/nts
Alternatively, access the website using the QR Code on the left.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Globalisation, coupled with exponential growth in communication and transportation technologies, has contributed to an acceleration of migratory movements. The total number of international migrants as of 2010 is estimated to be 214 million or 3.1 per cent of the world's population. This is projected to increase to 405 million by 2050. While most migration takes place within official legal and policy frameworks, between 10–15 per cent of all international migration is believed to be irregular (or undocumented), that is, they occur outside the regulatory structures of countries of origin, transit or destination.

Irregular migration covers a broad range of situations. A migrant may be in an irregular situation because his or her visa or residence permit has expired, or because the employer has arbitrarily withdrawn an authorisation to work that is tied to immigration status. The term is also used for situations where migrants are deceived by recruiting agents, smugglers or traffickers into believing that they are entering a country in a regular manner. Asylum seekers denied refugee status may also end up staying in a country irregularly.

There is general consensus that irregular migration needs to be carefully managed as it could threaten the security of states as well as migrants. When destination countries tolerate high levels of irregular migration, they undermine their own legal immigration systems. Also, irregular migration, if unchecked, could lead to public perception that the government has no control over who is admitted into the country, creating resentment not just against irregular migration but also against regular migration. Migrants themselves are also put at risk: since irregular workers are unlikely to complain to the authorities, unscrupulous employers may violate labour laws with relative impunity.

Such problems have led to irregular migration being increasingly presented as a threat to peace, harmony and economic progress on the national and international fronts. Recognising this, the Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), Nanyang Technological University, organised a closed-door roundtable discussion on Managing Cross-border Movements of People: Promoting Capacity and Response for Irregular Migration. Held on 19–20 November 2012, the workshop brought together researchers, policymakers and representatives of international and regional organisations as well as civil society from across the Asia-Pacific region for wide-ranging discussions founded on research as well as on-the-ground experience. The following are the major themes that emerged over the course of the meeting.

- **Responses to migration should move from a state-centric approach emphasising law enforcement to a framework based on human security that upholds the principles of development and human rights.**

Migration, when carefully managed, brings important benefits to countries. It is a powerful force for economic growth in destination countries, helping them to overcome human resource shortfalls. Origin countries benefit from the inflow of remittances from their citizens overseas. As such, responses that rely primarily on law enforcement and criminalisation of irregular migrants are no longer suitable. What are needed are solutions that leverage on the benefits of migration for countries of origin and destination (a development-friendly approach) while also upholding the human rights of migrants, both regular and irregular (a rights-based approach).

The development-friendly approach sees migration as a phenomenon whose positive impacts in development terms can be substantial, provided that appropriate policies are in place. Although the specific conditions under which migration has positive or negative effects on development remain a matter of dispute, there is broad agreement and evidence that migration does on balance have a positive impact on development. For

example, there is growing evidence that migration, and particularly low-skilled migration, can help reduce poverty. Thus, it could be argued that insofar as migration policies help determine migration flows, these policies also affect development.

Development-friendly approaches to managing migration include measures that enable faster, cheaper and safer remittance transfers through cooperation between banks of both origin and destination countries. Those who have migrated could also be encouraged to invest in the home country. This could be done through extending financial and technical assistance to diaspora organisations and businesses. The growing demand for highly skilled migrants by destination countries may lead to a brain drain from countries of origin. This could be mitigated through, among others, ethical codes of conduct to limit active recruitment, joint migration management through bilateral agreements between origin and destination countries, and institutional partnerships in the area of higher education.

The rights-based approach to migration takes on the issue of the tension between the sovereign rights of states and the human rights of migrants, irrespective of whether they are regular or irregular. States as sovereign authorities have the right to control their borders. This includes the right to determine who may reside within their borders, under what conditions they may reside and what rights they may enjoy. Within this context, those without citizenship or other legal residence status often find their basic human rights – freedom of movement, association, speech, etc. – not recognised by states.

The rights-based approach argues that immigration policy ought to respect the human rights of migrants. The portable and transcendent nature of these rights implies that when migrants cross borders, destination states are obliged to protect their rights. The rights-based approach thus suggests the need to shift mindsets from a strictly state-centric approach, to one that is migrant-centric and rights-based.

- **Greater priority must be given to climate change-induced migration, particularly since migration could itself be a key adaptive response to climate change.**

The impact of climate change on population distribution and mobility is attracting growing interest, as well as heated debate. According to the International Organization for Migration (IOM), environmental or climate change-induced migrants are 'persons who, for compelling reasons of sudden or progressive change in the environment that adversely affects their lives or living conditions, are obliged to leave their habitual homes, or choose to do so, either temporarily or permanently, and who move either within their country or abroad'.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) noted as far back as 1990 that the greatest single impact of climate change could be on human migration. There are no reliable estimates of climate change-induced migration but 200 million environmental migrants moving either within their countries or across borders, on a permanent or temporary basis by 2050, remains the most widely cited estimate.

Despite such dramatic projections, international capacity for, and interest in, dealing with the problem continues to be limited; and there is a lack of structural capacity in the international system to support climate change-induced migration. Such type of migration is not recognised as an issue in any binding international treaty, nor is there an international body charged with providing for those who migrate due to climate change-related factors or, for that matter, counting them. This is because 'climate refugee' remains a problematic and controversial notion – problematic because it has no legal standing under existing international refugee and asylum law, and controversial because there is little agreement as to what to do about the problems it presents.

The need to conceptualise climate change as an additional factor among an array of existing factors driving migration (wars, internal conflicts and poverty for example) was highlighted; as was the observation that migration can

be a key adaptive response to, and a principal method for coping with, climate change. It was argued that migration can help reduce risks to livelihoods, contribute to income diversification and enhance the overall capacity of households and communities to cope with the adverse effects of environmental and climate change. Recognising these would be important, as they imply the need for policies that integrate migration into national development frameworks, urban planning and disaster risk reduction; and also a need to boost assistance for populations of vulnerable countries.

New Zealand's policy on migration from the Pacific island states warrant attention. The Pacific region is without a doubt one of the world's most vulnerable regions when it comes to risk of disaster due to climate change. While all Pacific island states are expected to lose land, states like Tuvalu and Kiribati, which are made up entirely of atolls, face possible extinction. Some components of New Zealand's immigration policy could be leveraged to assist with the climate change adaptation needs of its neighbouring Pacific countries. For example, New Zealand has a yearly allocation for citizens of Kiribati, Tuvalu and Tonga (including their partners and dependent children) to settle in the country under the Pacific Access Category. It also offers them temporary work visas through the Recognised Seasonal Employer (RSE) Work Category. Furthermore, New Zealand's refugee and asylum policies are increasingly being adapted to cater to those migrating owing to climate change-induced environmental damage.

- **The various regional instruments have been largely ineffective, suggesting the urgent need to review them and address their shortcomings.**

Southeast Asia has a number of instruments to address irregular migration. The key ones are the 2004 ASEAN Declaration against Trafficking in Persons Particularly Women and Children and the 2007 ASEAN Declaration on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers, which calls for origin and destination states to cooperate to resolve cases of migrant workers who become undocumented and to initiate the regularisation of such workers.

Also noteworthy is the 2002 Bali Process on People Smuggling, Trafficking in Persons and Related Transnational Crime (Bali Process). The aims of the Bali Process are broad. It promotes improved cooperation among regional law enforcement agencies to deter and combat people smuggling and trafficking networks. States are also encouraged to cooperate on border and visa systems to detect and prevent illegal movements. The Bali Process also focuses on the need to provide appropriate protection and assistance to victims of trafficking, particularly women and children. It suggests that it is important to tackle the root causes of illegal migration, and that part of the solution could be to increase opportunities for legal migration between states. The Bali Process also advocates assisting countries to adopt best practices in asylum management in accordance with the principles of the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees.

The subregional Coordinated Mekong Ministerial Initiative against Trafficking (COMMIT) – made up of countries of the Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS), namely, Cambodia, China, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand and Vietnam – is another major mechanism. It typically implements its plans through partnerships between relevant government departments and non-governmental entities, whether UN agencies or non-governmental organisations (NGOs). A wide range of multisectoral partners also contribute to the COMMIT process, including intergovernmental organisations, donor organisations and academia.

While there are many regional instruments, they have thus far not been very effective. Their operationalisation has proceeded at a slow pace, with observers pointing out that states often fail to live up to their obligations. An

important constraint on the ability of these instruments to tackle the various forms of irregular migration has been the fact that they are not legally binding. New migration trends such as mixed migration flows – a situation where refugees and other migrants move alongside each other, making use of the same routes and means of transport and engaging the services of the same smugglers – increase the complexity of the task at hand, and also affect the effectiveness of the various instruments.

Conclusion

Migration, and irregular migration, will not disappear. To the extent that wealth and economic opportunities are unequally distributed and that environmental and other forms of insecurity persist, migration will continue to occur. However, to deal with the problem, governments have increasingly turned to criminal law – which imposes fewer responsibilities on states to protect non-citizens – to provide a framework within which to control or manage migration. This NTS Issues Brief suggests that this approach is not optimal for countries in the region, as they in fact benefit from migrant flows in various ways. Thus, there is a need for a shift from a state-centric, law enforcement-oriented approach to a human security approach based on the principles of development and human rights.

A version of this Executive Summary was published as an NTS Issues Brief (No. IS13-02) in February 2013.

Overview: Understanding the Evolving Forms of Movements of People

A key focus of this session was the nature and drivers of regular and irregular migration in the Asia-Pacific region. The complex interaction between migration and development, especially the notion that migration can be a powerful force for economic growth and innovation if properly managed, was explored. The challenges of managing migration, and in particular, irregular migration and migrant smuggling, were also discussed.

Trends in Cross-border Movements of People

Professor Richard Bedford
Director
National Institute of Demographic and Economic Analysis
University of Waikato
New Zealand

for

Professor Graeme Hugo
Director
Australian Population and Migration Research Centre
University of Adelaide
Australia

Migration is expected to grow in importance in Asia over the next decades for several reasons, one of which is the change in the demographic profile of developed countries as fertility and mortality rates decline. With working-age populations in developed nations becoming smaller and older, their economies are increasingly turning to migrant workers to meet the labour shortfall. As of 2010, Asia is home to an estimated 28.7 per cent of the world's migrant population.

States have however been slow to recognise that migration is a long-term structural feature of the economy, and have imposed restrictive measures against temporary migration. Until the 1990s, migration was often thought to have a negative impact on development, expressed in concerns such as 'brain drain'. Targeted initiatives to stem migratory pressures were thus a focus during that period.

When it became apparent that such efforts (initially, at least) trigger rather than dampen outflows, interest in the relationship between migration and development quickly diminished.

A more positive outlook emerged towards the end of the 1990s when the international community began to recognise the contribution of migrants to development in both countries of origin and countries of destination – in the case of the former, through the transfer of money (remittances) or of skills and expertise (commonly referred to as social remittances); and in the latter, through an injection of human capital at varying skill levels. The 2000s saw several international forums being established, including the UN High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development in 2006, and the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) in 2007. These established the issue firmly on the international agenda.

Today, most stakeholders in the region are aware of the benefits of international migration for countries of origin, and migrants are regarded as potential agents of development. According to the World Bank, remittance flows to developing countries amounted to USD381 billion in 2011, and that is just the officially recorded total. Beyond the remittances that they send home, migrants help promote trade ties and skills sharing. Some have also assisted in efforts to rebuild their countries after a period of conflict.

However, a number of challenges remain if countries are to maximise migration's beneficial impacts. The development potential of migration is closely tied to the ability of countries to facilitate migration through regular channels; manage integration and reintegration; and curtail irregular migration flows that increase the vulnerability of migrants to exploitation and abuse. It is therefore imperative that countries adopt more development-friendly migration policies and that they focus on effective governance of migration.

To maximise the benefits of migration, there is a need to address the current lack of capacity and infrastructure for managing migration. Providing appropriate, secure and well-managed channels for migration could also help reduce the incidence of irregular migration.

Persisting and Emerging Challenges of Cross-border Movements of People

Mr Andrew Bruce
Regional Director
International Organization for Migration (IOM)
Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
Thailand

Irregular migration represents a significant share of the migratory flows in Southeast Asia today, posing a challenge to the capacity of states to effectively manage migration. Irregular migration issues are highly politicised and are often depicted negatively in the media, skewing public perception and undermining support for migration. This often compels countries in the region to take a stronger stand against irregular cross-border movements. However, as their economies need these migrant workers, they are doing so by looking at ways to regularise the stay of those already working in their countries. Another reason for concern over irregular migration is that it too often leads to human trafficking for labour and sexual exploitation. Challenges associated with irregular migration in the region include: statelessness, the migration of children, cross-border marriages and mixed migration.

Statelessness is both a cause, and a consequence, of irregular migration. Certain ethnic populations, because of being stateless, have limited socioeconomic opportunities available to them, and are thus inclined to migrate. However, such stateless persons find it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to obtain international travel documents. They are thus forced to resort to irregular migration channels, which increase their vulnerability to traffickers. Statelessness can also result from migration itself. Second-generation migrants who have not been registered at birth due to their parent's irregular status become stateless or are at risk of statelessness.

The migration of unaccompanied and separated minors is another challenge. Children may leave their home countries due to conflict, human rights abuse, poverty, or lack of educational or economic opportunities. Some children may, encouraged by their families, make the journey on their own in order to gain residence status in the destination country more easily, often by declaring themselves to be orphans, but with a view to facilitating future family reunions. Achieving a balance between, on the one hand, ensuring the best interests of the child in terms of appropriate protection, care and treatment, and on the other, preventing pull factors, is an increasingly significant issue for the region.

Cross-border marriages – between men from the more developed economies of East Asia and women from the less developed economies of Southeast Asia – are also a concern as the phenomenon can result in trafficking. This type of migration is still understudied.

Mixed migration is also seen in the region. Mixed migration refers to a situation where persons – in the absence of viable, affordable and legal migration options – seek to enter countries through the asylum channel even though they do not have any legitimate claim to asylum. Generally, refugees and asylum seekers account for only a small proportion of the global movement of people. Meanwhile, increasing numbers of economic migrants, particularly those arriving in Australia, are applying for entry based on asylum procedures. It is difficult to distinguish these migrants from other asylum seekers, as they engage the services of the same smugglers, and use the same routes and means of transport.

The persisting and emerging challenges of cross-border movements of people are multifaceted in nature and require solutions geared towards the specific characteristics of each movement type. Also, due to the cross-border nature of migrant movements, increasing the level of cooperation between regions and countries is the only effective way to address the issue.

The Different Faces of Migrant Smuggling in Southeast Asia

Mr Sebastian Baumeister
Project Coordinator, Migrant Smuggling
UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)
Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific
Thailand

While migration has greatly contributed to human progress and development, it is also associated with serious cases of exploitation, particularly by people smugglers. In Southeast Asia, migrant smuggling continues to be a problem, with the smuggling generally corresponding to labour flows from lower-income countries (such as Indonesia, the Philippines, Vietnam and Myanmar) to countries with labour shortages and higher wages (such as Japan, the Republic of Korea, Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand).

The Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, supplementing the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (Smuggling of Migrants Protocol) defines smuggling of migrants as 'the procurement, in order to obtain, directly or indirectly, a financial or other material benefit, of the illegal entry of a person into a State Party of which the person is not a national'.

Migrant smuggling is by nature a transnational crime, often involving criminals operating as part of organised networks spanning a number of countries. For migrants, the process of being smuggled is often fraught with danger; and when they arrive at their destination, they are vulnerable to human trafficking. Such threats should be addressed. Even if the migrants had consented to being smuggled, that should not be seen as consent also for what they were subjected to over the course of the process.

However, the ways that countries have responded to migrant smuggling have generally been ineffective. Increasing border controls may simply result in alternative smuggling routes being used, or in demand shifting towards riskier ways of migrating – unless the controls are implemented as part of a holistic approach. Returning migrants to their countries of origin could create even greater problems. Unless the root causes of their migration have been addressed, they may just decide to migrate again – under even more dangerous conditions.

Also, many countries do not have any legislation to address migrant smuggling – or the laws that they do have are inadequate – a situation which has allowed people smugglers to operate with little to no fear of being brought to justice. In light of this, it is imperative that states adopt international standards as laid down by the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).

The UNODC is the guardian of the Smuggling of Migrants Protocol as well as the Trafficking in Persons Protocol (formally known as the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children). As such, the UNODC's primary goal with respect to combating the smuggling of migrants is to promote global adherence to the Smuggling of Migrants Protocol and to assist states in their efforts to effectively implement the Protocol while at the same time protecting the rights of smuggled migrants. States need consistent and comprehensive policies in these areas, such as increasing affordable, accessible, safe and legal migration channels, and improving monitoring and enforcing of labour standards.

Discussion

The discussion centred firstly on the gaps in research on irregular migration in general and migrant smuggling in particular. The observation was made that migrant smuggling has not attracted a critical degree of attention within the research community. Accurate data on the extent of migrant smuggling is either rare or inaccessible to researchers. Also, the available literature on irregular migration is able to contribute only in a limited way to a better understanding of irregular migration and migrant smuggling due to a lack of clarity in terminology. Labels such as 'illegal migrant', 'broker', 'agent' and 'recruiter' are commonly used, but without being defined in precise terms. Such ambiguities make it more difficult to build a clear picture of the extent to which migrant smugglers facilitate irregular migration and how they do so.

On the question of how to better coordinate regional responses to migrant smuggling, it was noted that efforts to combat migrant smuggling should be comprehensive (addressing protection needs alongside the imperatives of criminal justice and migration control), collaborative (ideally regional) and consistent. Also, regional efforts to combat migrant smuggling should be underpinned by a strong knowledge base, and draw on relevant and reliable information. It is also important that research on migrant smuggling not be pursued in isolation but alongside broader related issues, such as protection needs. As migrant smuggling is a transnational phenomenon, it is imperative that states develop a consultative process with law enforcement and immigration officials from all corners of Asia (Southwest, South, Southeast and East), the Pacific, North America and Europe.

The effectiveness of the growing trend of managing labour migration through bilateral labour agreements such as that between Malaysia and Bangladesh was questioned. Control of migration channels by governments could push more migrants underground as government agencies may lack the capacity to process as many people as recruitment agencies. Government-to-government arrangements are therefore seen to offer no ultimate solution.

Caution was also urged over the glorification of remittances which have tripled in the last decade to record levels. While governments derive huge benefits from their migrant workers, their investment in migration management and migrant protection remains small. Prioritising budgets and investing more resources towards managing migration would help alleviate many of the problems currently encountered by both governments and migrants.

Preventing irregularisation was a major topic of concern. A range of measures were suggested: introducing more legal migration channels, including legal access for family members and asylum seekers; keeping immigration regulations flexible and allowing for some discretion in legal/administrative decisions; allocating adequate resources to immigration or permit-issuing authorities; increasing incentives for regular employment and eliminating barriers for foreign workers so as to move migrants away from the informal economy where they are more vulnerable to exploitation; and improving enforcement measures.

Session 1: From Regular to Irregular Migration
(Human Trafficking, Human Smuggling and Undocumented Labour)

Efforts to address irregular migration were a focus in this session, with three key issues being highlighted: empowerment of migrant workers, strengthening of institutional and legal frameworks, and coordination and cooperation. The session featured a critical perspective on anti-trafficking initiatives in the region, and reviews of national efforts against trafficking and on victim protection in Singapore, the Philippines and Malaysia.

Rethinking and Re-scaling Human Trafficking in the Asia-Pacific

Dr Sallie Yea
Senior Research Fellow
Faculty of Law
Monash University
Australia

Human trafficking is one of the most serious of transnational crimes. Not only is it a violation of human rights, it also has a range of social and economic costs for countries and individuals. As a result, significant attention has been given to the problem and combating human trafficking has become an increasingly important political and policy priority for many governments.

There has been an increase in anti-trafficking policies and initiatives by governments as well as non-governmental organisations (NGOs) since the signing of the UN Protocol to Prevent, Suppress, Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children (Trafficking in Persons Protocol) in 2000. These initiatives focused on areas such as rescue and repatriation of victims; education and awareness campaigns; development programmes in origin countries; and improvement of border controls. However, their effectiveness has been questioned.

Anti-trafficking campaigns have often been derailed by factors such as corruption in the enforcement ranks, and arbitrary and discretionary application of anti-trafficking regulations. Competition among different stakeholders for funding and clients could also negatively impact campaigns, as such competition could lead to fragmentation of efforts and overlaps in missions. Also, there is still limited understanding of the phenomenon of human trafficking due to factors such as lack of academic research. Many of the existing studies on trafficking in the Asia-Pacific region have been by international and local NGOs and governmental agencies, either directly or through commissioned research. Such studies may however have certain biases.

There is thus a need to rethink approaches to human trafficking. Critical questions – such as whether or not anti-trafficking measures empower trafficked persons, or the extent to which the current framework of responses is able to reduce the scale of trafficking – should be asked. Lack of clear answers to these questions signals a lack of clarity in understanding the needs, wishes and desires of the trafficked persons themselves.

Re-scaling human trafficking research and modes of inquiry can yield new insights into the above questions and will enable a review of the efficacy and thrust of the current anti-trafficking framework and interventions. In particular, the nature and role of various stakeholders should be studied with more vigour because they vary in their intervention measures. Both intervention measures and counter-trafficking programmes should also be assessed. The evaluation should consider the impact of counter-trafficking programmes – whether they are able to reduce trafficking among the groups targeted, and whether they empower or re-victimise those affected by trafficking.

Singapore's Anti-TIP Strategy for the Next Four years

Ms Cheryl Chong
Assistant Director (Operations Policy)
Joint Operations Division
Ministry of Home Affairs
Singapore Inter-agency Taskforce on Trafficking in Persons
Singapore

Singapore has long argued that it does not have a serious human trafficking problem. However, increasing attention is being given to the phenomenon and there is a growing appreciation of the threats it poses to the country. Singapore has been consistently identified as a destination country for both sex and labour trafficking. Although it is not easy to enter Singapore illegally given its small territory and strict border controls, human trafficking still occurs through legitimate channels such as tourist visas and short-term social visit passes.

In order to improve its anti-trafficking efforts, Singapore established the Inter-agency Taskforce on Trafficking in Persons in 2010. The Taskforce is co-chaired by the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Ministry of Manpower, and includes representatives from the Singapore Police Force; the Immigration & Checkpoints Authority; the Ministry of Community Development, Youth and Sports; the Ministry of Health; the Ministry of Law; the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; and the Attorney-General's Chambers. The inter-agency, whole-of-government approach is seen as vital to the success of any national strategy on human trafficking.

Following the establishment of the Taskforce, Singapore launched a National Plan of Action (NPA) on 21 March 2012. The NPA, which is for the period 2012–2015, outlined 31 initiatives grouped under the categories of Prevention, Prosecution, Protection and Partnership, also known as the 4Ps strategy.

The aim of 'prevention' is to reduce the incidence of human trafficking through early detection and reporting of potential cases and through raising awareness of the problem. The initiatives under 'prosecution' aim to enhance the effectiveness of the investigation and prosecution of trafficking cases; as well as provide for commensurate criminal penalties and deterrent sentencing against perpetrators in serious cases, consistent with local laws. 'Protection' aims to enhance the management of victims through proactively identifying victims and setting up a protection and care system to support their needs. Finally, 'partnership' with foreign governments, businesses, media, academia and civil society is considered key to maximising resources in combating human trafficking.

The Taskforce is currently focused on implementing the NPA, including reviewing the adequacy of existing legislation on human trafficking. One immediate task is to build capacity in the area of victim identification (so that frontline officers can identify potential trafficking victims) and to ensure that there are appropriate processes in place to effectively handle trafficking cases.

Another challenge is that the concept of human trafficking is not widely understood in Singapore – or it is misunderstood. For a case to be classified as sex or labour trafficking in Singapore, it must involve the act, the means and be clearly for the purpose of exploitation. Even if certain elements of a case are consistent with a case of trafficking in persons (e.g., incurring high levels of debt), their presence may be deemed to be by themselves insufficient for a case to be determined as trafficking. In the face of such definitional difficulties, Singapore is working with relevant stakeholders to increase awareness of the issue among businesses and the general public.

Undocumented Labour from the Philippines

Dr Maruja Asis
Director of Research and Publications
Scalabrini Migration Center
Philippines

International labour migration has become an enduring feature of the Philippines' development efforts. According to the International Organization for Migration (IOM), there were 214 million migrants globally in 2010. Of that number, 9.45 million (4%) are Filipinos. Overseas Filipinos are found in 217 countries and territories. Forty-seven per cent (4.42 million) of overseas Filipinos are permanent migrants while another 45 per cent (4.32 million) are temporary migrants. Irregular migrants number only 704,916.

The breakdown of Filipinos overseas by continent/region is as follows: the Americas and the trust territories – 3.88 million (41%); West Asia or Middle East – 2.85 million (30%); Southeast Asia – 1.23 million (13%); Europe – 663,889 (7%), Oceania – 400,800 (4%); and Africa – 74,483 (1%). The remaining 4 per cent are sea-based workers.

The attempt by the Philippines to regulate and manage labour migration resulted in the adoption of Presidential Decree No. 442, or the 1974 Labour Code. The legislation provided for a recruitment and placement programme 'to ensure the careful selection of Filipino workers for the overseas labour market to protect the good name of the Philippines abroad' and make migration abroad for work more convenient.

From such beginnings, international labour migration has become a fixture in government policy. The country's 2001 economic development plan stated that overseas employment is a 'legitimate option for the country's work force'. The Philippines has also made it a primary state policy to promote and protect the welfare of Filipinos abroad. To that end, it has set up several agencies.

The Philippine Overseas Employment Administration (POEA) manages and regulates the processes in the lead-up to workers going abroad, and also provides relevant pre-departure services. It is also the main governmental agency involved in the recruiting process. Complementing the POEA is the Overseas Workers Welfare Administration (OWWA), which is responsible for the well-being of workers while they are abroad. There is also an institution specifically for permanent migrants – the Commission on Filipinos Overseas (CFO).

While government agencies play a significant role, private recruiters are even more important in driving the Filipino labour export market. At the same time, however, the excessive fees charged by these agents constitute one of the most common types of violations against migrant workers' rights. Thus, as part of its regulatory efforts, the Philippine government has imposed restrictions on agency fees. To further protect workers, the government has also introduced regulations on age, language and salary.

The government also provides a range of programmes and services to help labour migrants and their families. It runs training programmes to impart information on destination countries. It also conducts pre-departure orientation and provides consultation on contract issues.

Besides these pre-departure programmes, the Philippine government also follows up on the welfare of its migrants in destination countries, an important role given the difference in labour laws between labour sending and receiving countries. It was noted that there are cases of migrant workers being legally registered in Singapore but undocumented in the Philippines. By not reporting their movement as migrant labourers to the relevant Philippine authorities, those workers risk their rights not being fully protected, and also increase their vulnerability to abuse by their employers.

The experience of the Philippines in managing labour migration has been lauded for having effectively facilitated the movement of people while providing an environment of protection and welfare that not only encompasses the migrant, but also the family left behind. The country, however, cannot remain complacent as calls to reap development gains from migration while minimising the costs of such migration have grown stronger.

Undocumented Migrant Workers in Malaysia

Ms Irene Fernandez
Director and Co-founder
Tenaganita
Malaysia

Among developing countries, Malaysia is one of the major host countries for international migrants. As of 2010, 8.2 per cent of Malaysia's population of 28.2 million are classified as foreign nationals. In 2009, there were over 1.9 million legally recruited foreign workers in the country, making up 16.5 per cent of the labour force in Malaysia. In addition, there are large numbers of irregular migrant workers – an estimated 500,000 to 1.8 million in 2011. There are also 86,680 refugees, 10,937 asylum seekers and 40,001 stateless persons in the country.

Generally, foreign nationals who fall under any of the following categories are classified as 'irregular' or 'undocumented': (1) unauthorised entry and employment; (2) authorised entry but unauthorised employment; (3) authorised entry and employment but work permits invalidated; (4) refugees; and (5) children of undocumented migrants or refugees born in Malaysia but whose births were not registered with the relevant authorities.

Undocumented migrant workers in Malaysia have few or no safeguards against abuse and exploitation. Migrant workers' rights are being violated through withholding of passports and work permits, no days off, unpaid wages, physical abuse, sexual violence, arrest and detention, poor living conditions, restrictions on movement, etc.

This situation is further worsened by the fact that undocumented migrant workers are treated as a matter of 'security' rather than as a labour issue. Accordingly, Malaysia gives the leading governance role to the Ministry of Home Affairs. This arrangement has resulted in undocumented migrant workers being subjected to harsh measures including arrest, imprisonment, caning, heavy fines, prolonged detention (in overcrowded, unhygienic

immigration detention centers) and deportation. RELA (Ikatan Relawan Rakyat, or the People's Voluntary Corps), a government-backed paramilitary force, working in conjunction with immigration and police officers, routinely rounds up suspected undocumented migrants. According to reports, such raids have resulted in incidences of abuse such as physical assault, threats, humiliating treatment, forced entry into living quarters, extortion, theft, and destruction of identity or residency papers.

In order to reduce the number of illegal immigrants, Malaysia launched a large-scale legalisation and amnesty exercise called the 6P programme in June 2011. Targeted workers included those without passports, those who had previously run away from their employers, those with fake permits and fake passports, overstayers, etc. Workers who had their applications approved would be allowed to obtain a valid work permit, and those rejected would be granted amnesty from any prosecution or any fine and be allowed to return to their home country. However, this exercise suffered from serious flaws. Neither workers nor employers were clear about the programme as it lacked transparency. The registration process was also plagued by corruption, with unscrupulous companies or agents using it as an opportunity to extort money from workers. Arbitrary rejection of work permit applications was also frequently seen.

Foreign labour will continue to play an important role in Malaysia's development. As such, it is imperative that Malaysia rethink its labour policy to address labour-related concerns. As a matter of priority, it should make the withholding of passports and other identity documents an offence subject to tough penalties. It should also toughen its measures against recruitment agents and employers who engage in fraud or deception during the recruitment process. Workplace inspections must also be enhanced to reduce abusive practices in the workplace. These measures, although limited, constitute an important step forward in improving the rights of migrant workers irrespective of their status.

Discussion

It was emphasised that with irregular movements of people in the Asia-Pacific region becoming an increasingly multifaceted issue, a state-oriented, sovereignty-focused approach is no longer the most suitable, and that reorienting towards the protection of rights would likely pay greater dividends. By understanding the causes and motivations underlying the phenomenon of irregular migration, countries could more effectively tackle the problem. Furthermore, a protection of rights approach, by ensuring the well-being of migrants, could also contribute to social and economic development. Thus, in tackling irregular migration, it is vital that countries recognise that all migrants – whether documented or undocumented – are entitled to the same human rights as other people, and that these rights must be safeguarded.

Of the various forms of irregular migration, human trafficking is associated with some of the more serious violations of human rights. However, detecting cases of human trafficking and identifying victims are difficult because of the complex nature of the issue. Some cases have human trafficking elements but do not meet all the criteria. Moreover, rights abuses are not limited to trafficking victims but also affect legal migrant workers. In light of these issues, several measures were discussed, including raising public awareness to enable the public to assist in detecting trafficking cases, and sensitising officers dealing with human trafficking cases to the rights of the victims and the root causes of their predicament. Also, enforcement of anti-trafficking measures should include victim protection and their empowerment through rehabilitation and reintegration – these are essential for reducing their vulnerability.

Given that the major part of the movement of people in the Asia-Pacific is intra-regional, it is vital for the region to develop bilateral and multilateral mechanisms to provide the necessary safeguards for the protection of the rights of victims. The absence of such provisions could compromise the effectiveness of policies on migration, however well-intentioned they may be. A case in point is the Australia-Malaysia refugee swap deal signed in 2011. The deal was criticised by rights groups on the grounds that Malaysia is not a signatory to the UN Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (Refugee Convention) and has not ratified the UN Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (Convention against Torture). As such, refugees in the country could be vulnerable to mistreatment or abuse of their rights. Thus, inasmuch as bilateral and multilateral frameworks are important in addressing movements of people of the kind that involves asylum seekers and refugees, it is even more important that countries first and foremost develop the necessary safeguards by acceding to the UN Refugee Convention, the Convention on Domestic Workers and other relevant instruments.

Session 2: From Asylum Seekers to Refugees

According to the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), there were an estimated 10.4 million refugees at the end of 2011, of which 3.6 million were in the Asia-Pacific region. The issue of refugees and asylum seekers has become a sensitive and emotional issue in the region. This session discusses the response of three key countries, namely, Thailand, Indonesia and Australia, and highlights possible ways forward to enhance the protection of asylum seekers and refugees.

Refugee Protection in Thailand

Professor Dr Supang Chantavanich
Director
Asian Research Center for Migration
Institute of Asian Studies
Chulalongkorn University
Thailand

Although Thailand is not party to the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (Refugee Convention), it currently hosts some 92,000 registered refugees as well as an estimated 54,000 unregistered asylum seekers in nine camps along the Thai-Myanmar border. Thailand is however wary of such large-scale influx of refugees from Myanmar. It has declared the refugees to be 'fleeing fighting', meaning that it expects these refugees to return to Myanmar when the situation there returns to normal. Its policy therefore has been to permit them to stay on Thai soil on a temporary basis, that is, until other solutions become viable; because of that, it only started registering those refugees in 1999.

The situation of Myanmar refugees in camps in Thailand is one of the most protracted in the world. Although their lives may not be at risk, prolonged confinement in camps has created many social, psychological and protection concerns such as family violence, forced or unwanted pregnancies and abortion. The coping mechanisms of the refugees have also eroded. In addition, the restrictions imposed on them have increased their dependence on assistance. Refugees are not legally permitted to work, and those found outside designated refugee camps could be arrested and deported.

The situation improved slightly when, in 2009, Thailand introduced a policy aimed at helping the refugees become more self-sufficient, thus providing them with a better future and potentially easing the burden of having to provide assistance to them. This would be done through making available gainful employment opportunities such as weaving and small-scale farming. Also, with the refugee camps being generally located in poor, inaccessible areas, the policy was also seen as a means of bringing benefits to the surrounding Thai communities, thereby improving the economy in the sensitive border areas. Greater focus has also been placed on improving the legal aid and justice system for refugees. Effort has also gone into making their living conditions better, through improving waste management and sanitation for example.

A durable solution for refugees is one that ends the cycle of displacement or life in exile. Traditionally, that could happen in three ways: (1) voluntary repatriation where refugees return in safety and with dignity to their country of origin; (2) local integration in which the country of asylum provides permanent residency to refugees; and (3) third-country resettlement where refugees are transferred from the country of asylum to a state willing to admit them on a permanent basis.

Repatriation and local integration have not proved feasible for the refugees from Myanmar. Thus, resettlement remains the only option, and one that has been successful. The process of resettling refugees began in 2005; and by 2010, an estimated 69,000 persons have been resettled to countries such as the US, Australia, Canada as well as Finland and other European Union (EU) countries.

Indonesia's Response to Asylum Seekers

Mr Denis Nihill
Chief of Mission
International Organization for Migration (IOM)
Indonesia

People smuggling has become increasingly professional. Organised criminal syndicates provide passage and fraudulent documents and visas in exchange for large sums of money. Of concern to Indonesia is the lure of Australia for peoples from the Middle East, South Asia and Central Asia. Many of these migrants do not quite reach their destination, ending up instead in Indonesia. What are the arrangements available in Indonesia to manage these irregular migrants?

A key international agency involved in refugee issues in Indonesia is the UNHCR. For those landing in Indonesia, repatriation to their original home country or integration into Indonesia is usually not viable. This leaves third-country resettlement as the only option. Over the past five years, the UNHCR has resettled 855 people in third countries such as Australia, New Zealand and Canada, all signatories to the 1951 Refugee Convention.

The International Organization for Migration (IOM) is another major stakeholder. It has played a role in efforts to manage the impacts of movements of people in Indonesia for many years. Its relationship with Indonesia goes back as far as 1991 when the country became a formal Observer in the IOM Council. In 2000, a cooperation agreement was signed between the Indonesian government and the IOM.

Over the years, IOM Indonesia has vastly expanded its network of sub-offices, and can now reach more target populations and respond more quickly to assistance needs. It now has offices in Medan, Batam, Lampung, Pontianak, Surabaya, Makassar, Ambon, Kupang, Merauke, Rote, Maumere and Jayapura. The IOM provides a range of support services (English language courses, skills training, recreational activities) to an estimated 1,300 irregular migrants across the country.

The IOM is also part of the tripartite Regional Cooperation Model (RCM) agreement, signed in 2001 with the governments of Australia and Indonesia. The objectives of the agreement are to get irregular migrants to return voluntarily or to resettle them in third countries, and to prevent Indonesia and Australia from being used as target countries by people smugglers. Under the RCM agreement, the Indonesian authorities are responsible for identifying the intended destination of intercepted irregular migrants. Those heading to Australia or New Zealand are referred to the IOM. The organisation, with financial support from Australia, provides status assessment, basic accommodation, medical care, allowance for food, and counselling for the migrants. For those wishing to return home, the IOM helps with the arrangements. Those who wish to apply for asylum are referred to the UNHCR.

Since 2007, the IOM has had a project called Reinforcing Management of Irregular Migration (RMIM) to complement and reinforce the RCM. The project provides information on changes in irregular migration flows in Indonesia. It also engages in awareness-raising to provide relevant government officials and local communities with a better understanding of the irregular migration phenomenon. Another aspect of the project is the training of relevant law enforcement officials at both local and provincial levels.

Thus, it could be seen that while Indonesia has not ascribed to the 1951 Refugee Convention or its 1967 Protocol, various arrangements exist to facilitate the management of irregular migration occurring in its territory and provide for the support and care of irregular migrants.

International Obligations versus Domestic Security Politics: Australia's Response to Asylum Seekers 'Post-Houston'

Dr Melissa Curley
Lecturer in International Relations
School of Political Science and International Studies
University of Queensland
Australia

The issue of illegal arrival of asylum seekers in Australia by boat is a sensitive one, with politicians often playing on the fears of the electorate who believe that Australia is losing control of its borders. 'Border protection' has therefore remained a key policy battleground. Recent attempts to address the issue include the establishment in June 2012 of an expert panel headed by former defence chief Angus Houston. Some saw the panel's recommendations as 'the best way forward for Australia to prevent asylum seekers risking their lives on dangerous boat journeys to Australia' while others have called it a 'cruel return' to former Prime Minister John Howard's infamous Pacific Solution.

Howard's so-called Pacific Solution, first announced in 2001, involved interdicting vessels carrying asylum seekers and transporting them to countries like Papua New Guinea and Nauru for lengthy processing. The policy drew much flak as it was considered wrong to discriminate against asylum seekers owing to their illegal arrival by boat. Conditions at the processing centres were also criticised as poor, unhealthy and inhumane.

The plan was subsequently abandoned by Howard's successor Kevin Rudd in 2008. Rudd also cancelled the Howard-era Temporary Protection Visas (TPV) and introduced Permanent Protection Visas (PPV) to all refugees who have established a claim for protection in Australia. This resulted in a surge in boat arrivals and a corresponding increase in costs incurred by Australia.

Prime Minister Julia Gillard, in another major attempt to find solutions to the issue, signed a refugee-swap agreement with Malaysia in July 2011. Under the agreement, up to 800 asylum seekers arriving in Australia by sea would be transferred to Malaysia for assessment of their refugee claims. In exchange, Australia would expand its humanitarian programme, and would commit to resettling, over a period of four years, 4,000 refugees then residing in Malaysia.

The deal proved controversial and in August 2011, the Australian High Court ruled against it because Malaysia does not recognise the status of 'refugee'; it is not party to the Refugee Convention or its Protocol; and it has made no legally binding arrangement with Australia obliging it to accord the protections required by those instruments.

Following this, Gillard formed the aforementioned expert panel. In its report, commonly referred to as the Houston report, the panel made 22 recommendations, including the application of a no-advantage principle to ensure that no benefit is gained through circumventing regular migration arrangements; increased humanitarian intake of refugees to 20,000 per annum; development of a regional cooperation framework on protection and asylum systems; increased bilateral cooperation with Indonesia and Malaysia; and the establishment of regional processing arrangements.

Australia subsequently amended its 1958 Migration Act to authorise the transfer of those asylum seekers arriving in the country by boat to Nauru and Papua New Guinea – both of which are parties to the UN Refugee Convention – where they will remain indefinitely while their refugee claims are being processed. The Houston report has been hailed as a success for Gillard as it helped defuse a political bomb. Critics however say that it is a step backward in Australia's international obligations concerning refugees and asylum seekers. Nevertheless, the Houston report presented new opportunities for Australia to deepen its engagement with countries in Southeast Asia and beyond, and influence and support regional arrangements.

Discussion

The issue of a sustainable income for those in refugee camps in Thailand was the subject of much interest and debate. While the policy emphasising self-sufficiency provides refugees with the possibility of improved livelihoods, they still have fewer rights compared to registered migrant workers as they have to stay within the confines of refugee camps. Due to the restrictions imposed on them, most refugees have no access to employment opportunities, forest products, or external educational and occupational training opportunities. However, Thailand has taken steps to improve migrant workers' rights. For example, it has made efforts towards regularising undocumented foreign workers and increasing their minimum wage.

The discussion of issues facing Thailand also brought up the problem of the increase in the number of refugees and asylum seekers who live outside designated camps. Many of them can be found in urban areas. This presents specific challenges since there are no legal provisions to recognise right to asylum in urban areas. The phenomenon is found to be under-researched (compared to the research available on those living in designated camps in the border areas). Although Bangkok is now home to thousands of refugees and asylum seekers, Thailand regards them as illegal migrants as they do not have valid passports and visas. In the face of this problem, international agencies like the UNHCR and the Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS) are increasingly stepping in to provide help. For example, the JRS runs an Urban Refugee Programme that focuses on providing needs assessments and identifying extremely vulnerable individuals in need of support services.

A major point arising from the discussion session was the importance of regional institutions playing a more effective role in addressing irregular migration. It was suggested that all member states of the Bali Process on People Smuggling, Trafficking in Persons and Related Transnational Crime (Bali Process) should adhere to the two protocols supplementing the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, namely, the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children (Trafficking Protocol) and the Protocol against Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air (Smuggling of Migrants Protocol). These protocols offer the first internationally accepted definitions of human trafficking and migrant smuggling, and are the primary international legal instruments for addressing these criminal activities.

With little space for the discussion of refugee rights on the ASEAN agenda, focus has turned to the Bali Process, which was established in 2002 to explore methods of dealing with the movement of refugees and asylum seekers in the region. In March 2011, during a Bali Process conference, ASEAN ministers agreed to a regional cooperation framework to reduce irregular movement, and to address concerns related to the protection of asylum seekers and refugees arising as a result of mixed migration flows. As a step towards implementing that framework, the UNHCR drafted a proposal in October 2011 to establish a Regional Support Office to facilitate information and technical resource sharing, capacity building and support among member states.

Session 3: Emerging Trends in Movements of People

Climate change-induced migration or 'climate refugees' is a relatively recent phenomenon compared to refugee movements arising out of conflict situations. Nevertheless, it is gaining in importance as environmental changes such as sea level rise and extreme weather events start having more of an impact on countries and peoples. This session explores how climate change affects countries such as Bangladesh and Papua New Guinea. It also looks at how New Zealand is responding to climate change-induced migration from the Pacific Islands.

Climate Change-induced Migration in Bangladesh

Professor Tasneem Siddiqui
Chair
Refugee and Migratory Movements Research Unit
University of Dhaka
Bangladesh

Bangladesh is extremely vulnerable to the impacts of climate change as a large part of the country is characterised by flat, deltaic topography with low elevation and it experiences high climate variability. In particular, the country is highly vulnerable to sudden environmental events such as floods and cyclones. Floods occur with such regularity that a quarter of the country gets inundated in a normal year, and their frequency has intensified in the last 25 years. Cyclones are also a major concern with 26 cyclones striking the country since 1970; cyclones have also increased in frequency since 1990. Sea level rise – a slow-onset change – is projected to significantly increase coastal erosion, saline intrusion, flooding, waterlogging and storm surge. Compounding these are socioeconomic factors such as high population density and poverty.

Affected communities in Bangladesh have adapted to these challenges through vulnerability assessment exercises, disaster risk reduction, and education and awareness campaigns. While such measures are important, migration is increasingly seen as an attractive adaptation strategy. It is viewed as a logical and legitimate livelihood diversification strategy for that part of the population who are at risk, or have been displaced or lost their livelihood sources, due to environmental changes.

Migration has long played a key role in Bangladesh's development, with many moving within the country, and some venturing beyond the country's borders. Each year, 500,000–600,000 Bangladeshis officially migrate abroad as contract workers. In 2011, such migrants sent an estimated USD12 billion as remittances. This is equivalent to 56.1 per cent of the total export earnings of the country, 12 times more than the total Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) and 6 times more than the foreign aid received. Migration for the purpose of labour has contributed to Bangladesh's development. There has been a decline in those classified as poor, and an increase in the country's Human Development Index (HDI). This suggests that the country and its people would benefit from internal and international migration being treated as part of the range of possible adaptation strategies. Alongside that, there should be a review of the amount allocated by adaptation funds for human resource development.

Despite this, migration has yet to receive formal recognition as an official strategy. Official declarations and plans such as the 1995 National Environment Management Action Plan, the National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA) and the Bangladesh Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan have yet to include migration as one of the key adaptation strategies. It is imperative that climate change-induced migration be seen as a useful adaptation tool and not as a threat to the state, and for greater emphasis to be given to better management of migration so as to enhance its positive effects for migrants. To this end, the NAPA should give adequate consideration to migration, and the country's overseas employment policy should incorporate provisions to facilitate international migration from areas vulnerable to climate change.

Participants of the Roundtable on Managing Cross-border Movements of People: Promoting Capacity and Response for Irregular Migration

Front row (L-R): *Mr Thomas White, Ms Khine Myat Chit, Ms Irene Fernandez, Dr Herminia Francisco, Mr Sebastian Baumeister, Prof. Tasneem Siddiqui, Assoc. Prof. Mely Caballero-Anthony, Mr Rafendi Djamin, Dr Maryanne Loughry, Prof. Dr Supang Chantavanich, Mr Denis Nihill, Dr Sallie Yea.*

Second row (L-R): *Ms Gianna Gayle Amul, Ms Belinda Chng, Ms Sally Trethewie, Ms Vanessa Ho, Ms Kathryn Baer, Mr Joel Ng, Ms Debbie Fordyce, Ms Michelle Gunaselan, Ms Ratirose Supaporn, Ms Cheryl Chong, Dr Maruja M.B. Asis, Dr Melissa Curley, Dr Rebecca Miller, Ms Geraldine Ang, Asst Prof. Song Jiyoung.*

Third row (L-R): *Mr Jonathan How, Dr Anton Alblas, Dr John Jackson Ewing, Dr Johan Lindquist, Dr Alistair D.B. Cook, Mr Andrew Bruce, Mr Greg Kelly, Prof. Richard Bedford, Ms Bernadette Iyodu, Ms Cheryl Lim, Mr P.K. Hangzo, Mr Joseph Paul.*

Planning for Relocation: The Carteret Islands

Dr Maryanne Loughry
Associate Director
Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS)
Australia

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) observed in its Fourth Assessment Report in 2007 that 'by mid-century, climate change is expected to reduce water resources in many small islands to the point … where they become insufficient to meet demand during low-rainfall periods'. The Carteret Islands in Papua New Guinea have experienced this to such an extent that relocation of their inhabitants has become the only viable option.

The Carteret Islands, an atoll of six islands, are located more than 80km north-east of Bougainville (a larger island off the coast of Papua New Guinea). In all, the atoll measures 24km in diameter and encompasses a total land area of 0.6 sq km, with the highest point measuring only 1.5m above sea level. As a result of these geographic features, the islands are highly vulnerable to climate change impacts such as storm surges and high tides, which at their worst could wash away entire human settlements.

Also, the invasion of saltwater due to storm surges and high tides over the last 20 years or so has destroyed the islanders' ability to grow crops such as beans, greens, yams and swamp taro, resulting in increasing scarcity of food. In the face of the deteriorating conditions, the Carteret Islanders have, starting from the 1980s, been relocating to Bougainville – becoming the world's first 'climate refugees'.

Among those helping the islanders to relocate is the Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS) Australia. In 2012, JRS Australia identified 60 families comprising 389 individuals for relocation to Bougainville by 2013. These families were identified through a data collection process designed by JRS Australia. The aim of the process was to obtain sufficient data to help authorities in Bougainville plan the relocation. Both the quantitative and qualitative needs assessments were completed in November 2011. Data collected included household information such as their size and composition; community links among relocating families such as those related to clan and religion; and family strengths and resources. Profiles of those identified for relocation (which included their hopes and fears in moving to the mainland) were also developed.

The case of the Carteret Islands points to the need to build the capacity of vulnerable communities. Doing so would require the involvement of a range of actors, including the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the International Organization for Migration (IOM), governments, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and civil society organisations (CSOs). To address the problem of forced migration from small island states as a result of environmental changes, it would be crucial to have a needs assessment framework coupled with people-oriented planning to promote awareness of appropriate responses. This would mean boosting legal assistance for those living in vulnerable small island states and improving knowledge on the phenomenon through evidence-based, policy-oriented research.

New Zealand's Response to Climate Change-induced Migration

Professor Richard Bedford
Director
National Institute of Demographic and Economic Analysis
University of Waikato
New Zealand

The notion of establishing immigration quotas for climate refugees from the Pacific Islands has been the subject of intense debate in New Zealand as well as Australia, with the two countries currently pursuing different approaches to the problem of climate change-induced migration.

New Zealand has a well-established history of accommodating migrants from the Pacific Islands. Thus, in meeting the emerging challenge of climate change-induced migration from its Pacific neighbours, New Zealand – rather than reinventing the wheel – is making creative use of its existing policies such as the Pacific Access Category (PAC). The PAC is open to Pacific Islanders between the ages of 18 and 45 with no criminal record, subject to an annual quota of 400. (This arrangement has however been criticised for ignoring the most vulnerable, and those least able to migrate – the young and the old.)

Australia, on the other hand, favours a non-discriminatory immigration policy, meaning that it will not discriminate against, nor will it create special categories for, nationals of a particular country. Its policy is to help by improving conditions in the countries affected by climate change, rather than seeing migration as a necessary solution to the problem. However, if Kiribati and Tuvalu become uninhabitable because of environmental change, Australia would nonetheless accept the affected islanders.

Of the two countries, New Zealand may be better prepared to integrate those Pacific Islanders displaced by environmental changes. It already hosts over 3,000 Tuvaluans and 1,500 I-Kiribati, and these diaspora communities could help build links with communities in the Pacific Islands. Such connections could be important in ensuring that the needs of those who are displaced are effectively met through appropriate policies. Further cementing the special relationship between New Zealand and the Pacific Islands is the former's role in extracting phosphate from countries such as Kiribati. As a result of such activities, New Zealand has granted special privileges – visa waivers as well as temporary work and residence – to I-Kiribati and Tuvaluans since the mid-1980s.

To further improve their capacity to help those displaced by climate change, the governments of New Zealand and Australia should re-examine their existing immigration policies and make necessary amendments. Such gradual changes would likely be more effective than waiting until the situation is so dire that mass resettlement of people becomes the only choice. New Zealand and Australia should therefore determine ways to accommodate the potential increase in the number of Tuvaluans and I-Kiribati seeking refuge by extending existing annual allocations for those migrating for work, to join their families, or through special programmes. Also, investment in development initiatives in Tuvalu, Kiribati and other atoll countries remains critical. Investments targeted at improving the lives of people would help them improve their adaptive capabilities and hence their ability to cope with environmental change.

Discussion

Three themes were evident in the discussion on climate change-induced migration in relation to Bangladesh, Papua New Guinea and New Zealand. The main recommendation from these discussions is to creatively utilise migration as an adaptation strategy.

First, the discussion focused on migration, particularly climate change-induced migration, as a complex system. It was suggested that, as governments cannot opt to walk away from the complexity, they must be able to work as dynamically as the system. They must for example move away from dealing with irregular migration using the rather limiting lens of three-year plans. They must also recognise the need to constantly and creatively manipulate policies to deal with the complex onset, both slow and rapid, of migration issues. New Zealand's policy – which, while giving Pacific Islanders access to its labour market, also helps it address its own shortage of human resources – serves as an example. The methodology of complex systems came into play in the creation of its policy: not only did government agencies get involved, so did communities, employers and business owners.

Second, the relevance and usefulness of approaches that rely on response by governments and their agencies came under question. The issue of who holds the responsibility for addressing the needs of the communities that are being displaced, or will be displaced, by environmental changes is further exacerbated by factors such as challenges related to modernisation, or capacity shortfalls in the case of the governments of small island states. A state-centric, whole-of-government approach may also lead to the passing of culpability and responsibility among various governmental agencies, which could in turn slow down the ability of governments to respond to the needs of those affected by the impacts of climate change.

Encouraging collaborations among a wider range of actors could lead to more optimal results and innovative solutions. For example, there are cases of international NGOs partnering with local actors to implement experimental activities and projects. Promoting greater levels of coordination between governmental and non-governmental actors could also lead to better use of available funds and other resources – to the benefit of the targeted beneficiaries. Cases like that seen in Bougainville, where differences in the resources and capacity of churches compared to that of the local government led to tensions over authority and funding, illustrate the importance of cooperative approaches.

Third, there is a need for a shift in thinking on how to respond to climate change-induced migration. In particular, there are strong arguments for moving from state-centric approaches to needs-based approaches. When needs (rather than threats to the state) are the focus, it becomes clear that migration should be seen as one of a range of possible adaptive responses. Treating migration as one of the tools available to communities opens the door to, for example, higher funding for adaptation efforts such as preparing and raising awareness among communities receiving displaced populations.

The leverage that big and powerful states hold in determining priorities (especially through their voting capacities in international negotiations) must not be allowed to distract from the urgency of addressing problems faced by small island states. Focus must be given to achieving a greater understanding of the capacity deficits and major vulnerabilities faced by small island states, and identifying funding opportunities to meet those needs.

In conclusion, the dynamic nature of migration needs to be recognised by governments. They would need to not only plan for the short term but also for longer periods. Greater efforts must also be made to develop the ability of stakeholders to adapt to change. Evidence-based anthropological and ethnographic studies of communities vulnerable to climate change are necessary to aid policymakers, both at the local and international level, to identify and address the needs of those communities who may have to migrate as a result of climate change. An understanding of the dimensions and issues arising from both source and destination countries could help address contradictory signals on who can come to a country and who will be admitted.

Break-out Sessions:
Identifying Gaps and Responses to Cross-border Movements of People

Irregular migration has become a major policy challenge for many states and has raised concerns about the ability of states to control their borders. This session discusses the gaps in current responses to the four main forms of migration: (1) undocumented migrant workers; (2) human trafficking and people smuggling; (3) asylum seekers and refugees; and (4) climate change-induced migration.

Group 1 – Irregular Migration:
Undocumented Migrant Workers

Addressing areas of vulnerabilities for migrants in the migration process

The migration process should be reviewed and improved with the goal of ensuring orderly and safe migration and reducing irregular migration. One issue that needs to be addressed is the practice of issuing work visas tied to specific employers. Under such an arrangement, the balance of power lies with the employer. Workers experiencing poor working conditions have little choice but to live with them, or risk becoming undocumented.

Countries in the region should thus consider issuing work visas tied to sectors – for example, construction, domestic work or hospitality – rather than employers. This would give workers the freedom to change employers if they find their working conditions unacceptable. Employers would also gain greater flexibility in sourcing for workers. Going even further, countries could look into work visas that do not tie workers to a particular employer or sector.

The involvement of private actors should also be regulated. There has been a proliferation of private actors such as brokers, agents and sub-contractors; and this has had both positive and negative consequences. These actors help shorten the application process and they make migration services more accessible, particularly to those in far-flung rural areas. However, unregulated brokers and agents often perpetuate irregular migration and labour exploitation though excessive service charges, debt bondage, misinformation about the nature of work, etc. Strict oversight over agents and brokers is therefore essential.

Promoting a rights-based, migrant-centric approach

Irregular migrant workers are often regarded as a source of cheap labour. Consequently, the focus tends to be on the economic benefits they bring to countries of origin as well as countries of destination rather than on the protection of their rights. In Southeast Asia, recognition of the rights of migrant workers is still uneven and this is one of the reasons for the continued flow of irregular migration across the region. Despite ASEAN member states having signed the 1999 Bangkok Declaration on Irregular Migration, the region has not seen any notable improvement in the situation. The declaration's proclamation that irregular migrants 'should be granted humanitarian treatment, including appropriate health and other services' still remains to be implemented.

More recently, in 2007, ASEAN member states signed the ASEAN Declaration on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers. The aim of this declaration is 'to protect the fundamental human rights, promote the welfare and uphold [the] human dignity of migrant workers'. Like the Bangkok Declaration, this declaration has yet to be implemented.

There is however a growing recognition within Southeast Asia of the need to pursue rights-based, migrant-centric approaches. That recognition should be translated into action, in order to empower migrant workers and help them address the vulnerabilities and risks they face.

Strengthening bilateral and multilateral agreements

Given the transnational nature of migration, a national-level policy framework will be insufficient to meet all the challenges. Bilateral and multilateral mechanisms at the regional level are thus vital in tackling the problem of irregular migration.

In Southeast Asia, states are increasingly entering into binding bilateral agreements so as to secure the orderly flow of labour migrants. However, existing bilateral arrangements fail to account for some aspects of the current migration landscape, for example, irregularity occurring

from the point of origin as happens in some countries. There is thus a need for agreements to be reviewed to address migration as a continuum. Also, some bilateral agreements may contain conditions that contradict the policies of other countries in the region. Faced with these issues, most Southeast Asian countries are likely to opt for a mix of regional and bilateral agreements. Importantly, agreements made must be accompanied by changes in national laws and also effective implementation right down to the provincial level.

Group 2 – Irregular Migration: Human Trafficking and People Smuggling

Addressing the demand side

Efforts to combat human trafficking tend to focus primarily on the supply side, or on push factors such as poverty, organised criminal groups and corruption. While this is important, it is also vital to tackle the demand underlying all forms of exploitation of persons such as the demand for cheap labour and goods and services. Sustainably addressing human trafficking necessitates measures that look at the whole chain of human trafficking, from supply to demand.

Destination countries should thus examine the demand-side factors that make them attractive to human traffickers and organised criminal groups and address those in a multifaceted way. To this end, three levels of demand related to human trafficking are identified: (1) employer demand (employers, owners, managers or sub-contractors); (2) consumer demand (from clients in the sex industry, corporate buyers from the manufacturing sector and household members when it comes to domestic work); and (3) parties involved in the process (recruiters, agents, transporters and others who participate knowingly in the movement of persons for the purposes of exploitation).

Improving public awareness

Campaigns to increase public awareness on human trafficking are important in preventing and tackling the crime. Human trafficking could find fertile ground where there is misinformation and ignorance on the issue. In particular, awareness campaigns should target would-be migrants in their home countries as well as in destination countries.

Given that urban areas are generally a source of demand for trafficking, reaching urban youths is also key to any effort to address human trafficking. However, concerns were raised over campaigns such as MTV EXIT (End Exploitation and Trafficking) that aim to reach this group. It was argued that such campaigns, which normally take place in urban areas and are carried out through musical events and concerts, glamorise the issue and does little to help increase awareness among urban youths. A counterpoint to this argument was that urban youths would likely not be attracted by traditional campaign tools such as workshops and public speeches. Rather, concerts would be more effective at sensitising youths to the issue.

Enhancing implementation of international instruments

To increase the effectiveness of anti-trafficking efforts, it is imperative that states sign and ratify the UN Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children (Trafficking Protocol) adopted by the UN General Assembly in 2000 and entered into force in 2003. The purposes of the protocol are to prevent and combat human trafficking; to protect and assist victims; and to promote cooperation among states in tackling the issue. The protocol is significant as it is the first instrument to provide a working definition of trafficking in persons. It is also the only international legal instrument addressing human trafficking as a crime, with ratifying states required to criminalise human trafficking.

In Southeast Asia, seven countries have either signed, ratified or accepted the Trafficking Protocol, and most of them have instituted laws to specifically address human trafficking. At the regional level, human trafficking has also been the subject of several major policy documents such as the ASEAN Declaration on Transnational Crime (1997) and the ASEAN Declaration against Trafficking in Persons, Particularly Women and Children (2004). Despite this progress, much of the implementation has centred on addressing the supply side of human trafficking. Progress in addressing demand remains slow.

Group 3 – Forced Migration:
            Asylum Seekers and Refugees

Acceding to international standards

The Asia-Pacific is home to some of the world's largest refugee situations. The region accounts for 55 per cent of the world's refugees in 2010. However, because of the complex and politically sensitive nature of the refugee issue, there is still no effective framework for dealing with it.

The protracted refugee situation is made even more complicated by the fact that a number of countries in the region are not signatories to the 1951 UN Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (Refugee Convention) and its 1967 Protocol. These states continue to view refugees as illegal migrants, and thus subject to deportation. Regional initiatives that could have major implications for refugees and asylum seekers such as the Bali Process on People Smuggling, Trafficking in Persons and Related Transnational Crime (Bali Process) have also not been able to bring about substantial changes to the situation because of their non-binding nature.

If countries in the region are to succeed in managing the refugee situation, a significant first step would be for them to accede to the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol, and work towards meeting the standards for the protection of human rights set out in the two instruments.

Addressing negative public opinion against refugees and enhancing their integration

Refugees and asylum seekers are often seen as a threat to the socioeconomic security of host societies through, for example, increased competition for scarce resources and employment. Such concerns have played a key role in hardening public perceptions, and this has in turn underpinned states' rationale for tougher policies against asylum seekers and refugees. Left unchecked, such perceptions can result in discrimination, xenophobia and racism. It is therefore important to counter such misconceptions in the interest of the security of asylum seekers and refugees.

A shift in mindset would be required: asylum seekers and refugees should be seen not as a burden, but as an important capital that can significantly enhance the host countries' economy. To this end, the 1951 Refugee Convention outlines the socioeconomic and legal rights needed for successful integration. These include, among others, freedom of movement, access to education and the labour market, access to public relief and the possibility of acquiring property and citizenship. Adhering to these principles would enable asylum seekers and refugees to achieve self-reliance and hence facilitate their future integration.

Shifting towards a protection-oriented approach

Refugees and asylum seekers often do not enjoy the basic rights and physical security that governments provide to their citizens as they are considered a burden or even a threat by states. However, protecting the rights of this vulnerable group offers the only durable and sustainable solution to the issue. This is because criminalising refugees and asylum seekers and repatriating them back to their country regardless of the conditions there may not be effective; they may just flee again.

An important first step would be to recognise their right to safe asylum and to ensure their physical safety. Economic and social rights are also important. This can be achieved through greater cooperation and burden-sharing among transit and destination countries and also through the active participation of international organisations such as the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and ASEAN.

Also, addressing drivers such as internal and cross-border conflicts was seen as key to addressing the vulnerability of people to refugee situations. This would require a redoubling of international efforts to increase peace and security in countries of origin and greater investment in their socioeconomic development.

**Group 4 – Emergent Migration:
Climate Change-induced Migration**

Overcoming conceptual impasse over climate change-induced migration

With extreme weather events increasing both in intensity and frequency, climate change-induced migration is a serious, long-term concern. There is however disagreement over the terms used. While 'environmental refugees' and 'climate refugees' have been widely used both by the media and scholars, international organisations such as the UNHCR argue that their use could undermine efforts to address the problems faced by traditional political refugees.

This lack of conceptual clarity has hampered international efforts in areas such as establishing international standards and safeguards. As a result, the kind of support that affected communities would receive once they flee to neighbouring countries remains unclear. In the absence of international frameworks that explicitly recognise their legal status, they would most likely be considered illegal migrants and hence would face legal limbo. In light of this, overcoming the conceptual impasse over climate change-induced migration is essential.

Moving beyond securitisation of climate change-induced migration

Projections of large numbers of people, estimated at 150 million or more by 2050, who could be forced to move as a result of climate change have caused much international consternation. The impacts that such movement of people would have on the security of potential destination countries have been widely debated. Despite this, there has been no significant progress in thinking on how the issue can be addressed.

There is a need to reconceptualise climate change-induced migration, from being largely seen as a security threat, to emphasising its potential role as an important

and inevitable adaptation strategy. Furthermore, the reality is that populations will become increasingly diverse over time as people move, and that such movement will be due to not only climate change but also to other economic and political drivers. Securitising the issue in the face of such trends could mean greater instability rather than less.

Countries should instead look at rights-based approaches, and introduce policies to recognise and protect the socioeconomic rights of climate change-induced migrants and ensure their legal status. In addition, governments and international non-governmental organisations (NGOs) should support community-based adaptation strategies for groups and communities affected by climate change.

Strengthening institutional governance

The international community is yet to come up with effective strategies to deal with climate change-induced migration. Few states have accounted for this type of migration in their national climate adaptation or development plans. Given the urgency of the issue, particularly for countries such as Papua New Guinea and other islands in the Pacific, states need to start looking beyond international mechanisms. They need to instead explore regional and national solutions to specific challenges.

Localised solutions are already being implemented at the national level as evidenced in Papua New Guinea's policy of relocating the Carteret islanders to Bougainville and New Zealand's long-standing policy of receiving migrants from Tuvalu and Kiribati under its Pacific Access Category (PAC) programme. Such efforts could be further enhanced by regional institutions such as the Pacific Islands Forum and ASEAN. These institutions could be leveraged to promote new governance strategies for climate change-induced migration in the Asia-Pacific region and beyond.

Conclusion

Many of the discussions have a common thread: they challenge the view of irregular migration as a threat to peace and security, social harmony and economic progress on the national and international fronts. Migration is in fact as much a benefit to destination countries as to origin countries or individual migrants. Many destinations actually have need of migrant labour to meet their development goals. Thus, rather than seeing migration solely as a security threat, there should be greater attention paid to the complex interactions of drivers and needs that characterise today's migration picture, with the goal of managing migration such that gains for the various stakeholders outweigh the costs.

Programme

Day 1
19 November 2012 (Monday)
Novotel Hotel
Singapore

09:00 **Welcome Remarks**

Associate Professor Mely Caballero-Anthony
Head
Centre for Non-Traditional Security
(NTS) Studies
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies
(RSIS)
Nanyang Technological University (NTU);
Secretary-General
Consortium of Non-Traditional Security
Studies in Asia (NTS-Asia)
Singapore

09:15 **Participant Introductions**

09:30 **Overview: Understanding the Evolving Forms of Movements of People**

Moderator

Associate Professor Mely Caballero-Anthony
Head
Centre for Non-Traditional Security
(NTS) Studies
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies
(RSIS)
Nanyang Technological University (NTU);
Secretary-General
Consortium of Non-Traditional Security
Studies in Asia (NTS-Asia)
Singapore

Presenters

Trends in Cross-border Movements of People
Professor Richard Bedford
Director
National Institute of Demographic and
Economic Analysis
University of Waikato
New Zealand

for
Professor Graeme Hugo
Director
Australian Population and Migration Research
Centre
University of Adelaide
Australia

Persisting and Emerging Challenges of Cross-border Movements of People
Mr Andrew Bruce
Regional Director
International Organization for Migration (IOM)
Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
Thailand

The Different Faces of Migrant Smuggling in Southeast Asia
Mr Sebastian Baumeister
Project Coordinator, Migrant Smuggling
UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)
Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific
Thailand

10:15 **Discussion**

11:20 **Session 1: From Regular to Irregular Migration (Human Trafficking, Human Smuggling, and Undocumented Labour)**

Moderator

Dr J. Jackson Ewing
Research Fellow
Centre for Non-Traditional Security
(NTS) Studies
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies
(RSIS)
Nanyang Technological University (NTU)
Singapore

Presenters

Rethinking and Re-scaling Human Trafficking in the Asia-Pacific
Dr Sallie Yea
Senior Research Fellow
Faculty of Law
Monash University
Australia

Singapore's Anti-TIP Strategy for the Next Four years
Ms Cheryl Chong
Assistant Director (Operations Policy)
Joint Operations Division
Ministry of Home Affairs
Singapore Inter-agency Taskforce on Trafficking in Persons
Singapore

Undocumented Labour from the Philippines
Dr Maruja Asis
Director of Research and Publications
Scalabrini Migration Center
Philippines

Undocumented Migrant Workers in Malaysia
Ms Irene Fernandez
Director and Co-founder
Tenaganita
Malaysia

12:20 **Discussion**

14:00 **Session 2: From Asylum Seekers to Refugees**

Moderator

Associate Professor Mely Caballero-Anthony
Head
Centre for Non-Traditional Security
(NTS) Studies
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies
(RSIS)
Nanyang Technological University (NTU);
Secretary-General
Consortium of Non-Traditional Security
Studies in Asia (NTS-Asia)
Singapore

Presenters

Refugee Protection in Thailand
Professor Dr Supang Chantavanich
Director
Asian Research Center for Migration
Institute of Asian Studies
Chulalongkorn University
Thailand

The Indonesian Migration Experience
Mr Denis Nihill
Chief of Mission
International Organization for Migration (IOM)
Indonesia

**International Obligations vs Domestic
Security Politics: Australia's Response to
Asylum Seekers 'Post-Houston'**
Dr Melissa Curley
Lecturer in International Relations
School of Political Science and International
Studies
University of Queensland
Australia

14:45 **Discussion**

16:00 **Session 3: Emerging Trends
in Movements of People**

Moderator

Dr J. Jackson Ewing
Research Fellow
Centre for Non-Traditional Security
(NTS) Studies
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies
(RSIS)
Nanyang Technological University (NTU)
Singapore

Presenters

**Climate Change-induced Migration
in Bangladesh**
Professor Tasneem Siddiqui
Chair
Refugee and Migratory Movements Research
Unit
University of Dhaka
Bangladesh

Planning for Relocation: The Carteret Islands
Dr Maryanne Loughry
Associate Director
Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS)
Australia

**New Zealand's Response
to Climate Change-induced Migration**
Professor Richard Bedford
Director
National Institute of Demographic and
Economic Analysis
University of Waikato
New Zealand

16:45 **Discussion**

End of Day One

Day 2
20 November 2012 (Tuesday)

09:00   **Recap of Day 1**

09:30   **Break-out Sessions**
        Identifying Gaps and Responses
        to Cross-border Movements of People

        Group 1
        Irregular Migration:
        Undocumented Migrant Workers

        Lead Discussant

        Professor Dr Supang Chantavanich
        Director
        Asian Research Center for Migration
        Institute of Asian Studies
        Chulalongkorn University
        Thailand

        Group 2
        Irregular Migration:
        Human Trafficking and People Smuggling

        Lead Discussant

        Dr Rebecca Miller
        Consultant (Migrant Smuggling Research,
        Analysis, and Reporting)
        UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)
        Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific
        Thailand

Group 3
Forced Migration: Asylum Seekers and Refugees

Lead Discussant

Dr Song Jiyoung
Assistant Professor of Political Science
School of Social Sciences
Singapore Management University
Singapore

Group 4
Emergent Migration:
Climate Change-induced Migration

Lead Discussant

Professor Tasneem Siddiqui
Chair
Refugee and Migratory Movements
Research Unit
University of Dhaka
Bangladesh

10:30   **Panel Discussion**

11:45   **Closing Remarks**

        End of Day Two

List of Speakers and Discussants

(in alphabetical order according to last names)

1. **Dr Maruja M.B. Asis**
   Director
   Scalabrini Migration Center
   40 Matapat Street
   Bgy. Pinyahan
   1100 Quezon City
   Metro Manila
   Philippines
   Tel: +63 2436 7690
   Email: marlaasis@smc.org.ph

2. **Mr Sebastian Baumeister**
   Project Coordinator, Migrant Smuggling
   UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)
   Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific
   UN Secretariat Building
   Rajdamnern Nok Avenue
   Bangkok 10200
   Thailand
   Tel: +66 2288 1415
   Email: sebastian.baumeister@unodc.org

3. **Professor Richard Bedford**
   Director
   National Institute of Demographic
   and Economic Analysis
   University of Waikato
   Hamilton
   New Zealand
   Tel: +64 7838 4770
   Email: rdb@waikato.ac.nz

4. **Mr Andrew Bruce**
   Regional Director
   International Organization for Migration (IOM)
   Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
   183 Rajanakarn Building
   18th Floor, South Sathorn Road
   Bangkok 10120
   Thailand
   Tel: +66 2343 9301
   Email: abruce@iom.int

5. **Professor Dr Supang Chantavanich**
   Professor Emeritus
   Asian Research Center for Migration
   Director
   Institute of Asian Studies
   Chulalongkorn University
   Thailand
   Tel: +66 2218 7415
   Email: supang.c@chula.ac.th

6. **Ms Cheryl Chong**
   Assistant Director (Operations Policy)
   Joint Operations Division, Ministry of Home Affairs
   Singapore Inter-agency Taskforce on Trafficking
   in Persons
   New Phoenix Park
   28 Irrawaddy Road
   Singapore 329560
   Tel: + 65 6478 7060
   Email: cheryl_chong@mha.gov.sg

7. **Dr Melissa Curley**
   Lecturer in International Relations
   Coordinator – Postgraduate
   Applied Fieldwork Experience
   School of Political Science and International Studies
   University of Queensland
   Australia
   Tel: +61 73346 9054
   Email: m.curley@uq.edu.au

8. **Ms Irene Fernandez**
   Director and Co-founder
   Tenaganita
   38 Jalan Gasing
   46000 Petaling Jaya
   Selangor Darul Ehsan
   Malaysia
   Tel: +60 3 7770 3691
   Email: irene.f@tenaganita.net

9. **Professor Graeme Hugo**

   Australian Research Council (ARC)

   Professorial Fellow

   Director

   Australian Population and Migration Research

   Centre

   University of Adelaide

   Australia

   Tel: +61 8 8313 5646

   Email: graeme.hugo@adelaide.edu.au

10. **Dr Johan Lindquist**

    Visiting Senior Research Fellow

    Asia Research Institute

    National University of Singapore

    21 Lower Kent Ridge Road

    Singapore 119077

    Email: arijl@nus.edu.sg

11. **Dr Maryanne Loughry**

    Associate Director

    Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS) Australia

    24 Roslyn Street

    Kings Cross

    New South Wales

    Australia

    Tel: +61 2 9356 3888

    Email: maryanne.loughry@jrs.org.au

12. **Dr Rebecca Miller**

    Consultant (Migrant Smuggling Research, Analysis,

    and Reporting)

    UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)

    Regional Centre for East Asia and the Pacific

    UN Secretariat Building

    Rajdamnern Nok Avenue

    Bangkok 10200

    Thailand

    Tel: +66 82 779 8210

    Email: rebecca.miller@unodc.org

13. **Mr Denis Nihill**

    Chief of Mission

    International Organization for Migration (IOM)

    Indonesia

    Sampoerna Strategic Square

    North Tower Floor

    12A Jl. Jend. Sudirman Kav. 45-46

    Jakarta 12930

    Indonesia

    Tel: +62 21 5795 1275

    Email: dnihill@iom.int

14. **Professor Tasneem Siddiqui**

    Chair

    Refugee and Migratory Movements Research Unit

    Sattar Bhaban, 4th Floor

    3/3-E, Bijoynagar

    Dhaka 1000

    Bangladesh

    Tel: +880 2936 0338

    Email: tsiddiqui59@gmail.com

15. **Assistant Professor Song Jiyoung**

    School of Social Sciences

    Singapore Management University

    81 Victoria Street

    Singapore 188065

    Tel: +65 6828 1902

    Email: jysong@smu.edu.sg

16. **Dr Sallie Yea**

    Senior Research Fellow

    Faculty of Law

    Monash University

    Australia

    Incoming Assistant Professor

    Humanities and Social Science Education

    National Institute of Education (NIE)

    1 Nanyang Walk

    Singapore 637616

    Email: salliellao@gmail.com

List of Participants

(in alphabetical order according to last names)

1. **Dr Anton Alblas**
    First Secretary
    Australian High Commission, Singapore
    25 Napier Rd
    Singapore
    Tel: +65 6836 4215
    Email: anton.alblas@dfat.gov.au

2. **Ms Geraldine Ang**
    Regional Private Sector Fundraising Officer
    UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
    Regional Office, Bangkok
    3rd Floor, United Nations Building
    Rajdamnern Nok Avenue
    Bangkok 10200
    Thailand
    Email: ang@unhcr.org

3. **Ms Kathryn Baer**
    The Trafficking Research Project, Singapore
    412 Pasir Ris Dr 6
    #13-369
    Singapore 510412
    Tel: +65 9758 8997
    Email: thetraffickingresearchproject@gmail.com

4. **Dr Alistair D.B. Cook**
    Visiting Research Fellow
    East Asian Institute
    National University of Singapore
    Bukit Timah Campus
    469 Bukit Timah Road
    Singapore 259756
    Tel: +65 6516 8334
    Email: eaicadb@nus.edu.sg

5. **Mr Rafendi Djamin**
    Representative to the ASEAN Intergovernmental
    Commission on Human Rights (AICHR)
    Indonesia's Human Rights Working Group
    Jl. Balan 3
    Kompleks AL
    Pangkalan Jati
    Jakarta Selatan
    Indonesia
    Email: rafendi@hrwg.org

6. **Ms Debbie Fordyce**
    Member, Executive Committee
    Transient Workers Count Too (TWC2)
    5001 Beach Road
    #06-27
    Golden Mile Complex
    Singapore 199588
    Tel: +65 6271 4282
    Email: member2@exco.twc2.org.sg

7. **Dr Herminia Francisco**
    Director
    Economy and Environment Program for Southeast
    Asia (EEPSEA)
    c/o IDRC
    22 Cross Street
    #02-55
    South Bridge Court
    Singapore 048421
    Tel: +65 6438 7877
    E-mail: hfrancisco@idrc.org.sg

8. **Ms Michelle Gunaselan**
    Detention Team Leader (Migration)
    Kuala Lumpur Regional Delegation
    International Committee of the Red Cross
    Unit 50-11-1, Level 11
    No. 50, Jalan Dungun
    Wisma UOA Damansara
    Damansara Heights
    50490 Kuala Lumpur
    Malaysia.
    Tel: +60 3 2084 1800
    Email: mgunselan@icrc.org

9. **Assistant Professor Elaine Ho**
   Department of Geography
   Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
   Migration Cluster
   National University of Singapore
   The Shaw Foundation Building
   Block AS7, Level 6
   5 Arts Link
   Singapore 117570
   Tel: +65 6516 3859
   Email: elaine.ho@nus.edu.sg

10. **Ms Vanessa Ho**
    Project Coordinator
    Project X, Singapore
    Tel: +65 9125 4467
    Email: projectx.sg@gmail.com

11. **Mr Jonathan How**
    Executive Director
    World Refugee (Singapore)
    #04-00
    222 Queen St
    Singapore 188550
    Tel: +65 9666 8850
    Email: jon@worldrefugee.org

12. **Bernadette Iyodu**
    Former Senior Legal Officer
    Refugee Law Project
    Faculty of Law
    Makerere University
    Uganda
    Tel: +65 9754 9488
    Email: biyodu@gmail.com

13. **Mr Greg Kelly**
    Minister-Counsellor
    Co-manager (Australia)
    Regional Support Office
    The Bali Process
    27th Floor, Rajanakarn Building
    183 South Sathorn Road
    Sathorn
    Bangkok 10120
    Thailand
    Tel: +66 2343 9471
    Email: greg.kelly@immi.gov.au;
            greg.kelly@rso.baliprocess.net

14. **Ms Khine Myat Chit**
    Senior Officer
    Security Cooperation Division
    ASEAN Political and Security Community
    Department
    ASEAN Secretariat
    70A, Jl. Sisingamangaraja
    Jakarta 12110
    Indonesia
    Tel: +62 21 726 2991 (ext. 301)
    Email: khine@asean.org

15. **Ms Karen Kok**
    Senior Programme and Professional Development
    Officer
    Family and Child Protection and Welfare Branch
    Ministry of Social and Family Development
    MSF Building
    512 Thomson Road
    Singapore 298136
    Email: karen_kok@msf.gov.sg

16. **Ms Kellyn Ng**
    Senior Manager
    Rehabilitation, Protection and Residential Services
    Policy Division
    Ministry of Social and Family Development
    MSF Building
    512 Thomson Road
    Singapore 298136
    Email: kellyn_ng@msf.gov.sg

17.Mr Kandhavel Periyasamy

Director Joint Ops Directorate

Workplace Policy and Strategy Division

Ministry of Manpower

18 Havelock Road

#07-01

Singapore 059764

Email: kandhavel_periyasamy@mom.gov.sg

18.Mr Sinapan Samydorai

Convenor and Consultant

Task Force on ASEAN Migrant Workers

P.O. Box 640

Teban Garden Post Office

Singapore 916002

Tel: + 65 9479 1906

Email: samysd@pacific.net.sg

19.Ms Ratirose Supaporn

Interim Regional Children

on the Move Programme Coordinator

Save the Children UK, Thailand Office

14th Floor Maneeya Center Bldg

518/5 Ploenchit Rd

Lumpini, Patumwan

Bangkok 10330

Thailand

Tel: +66 2652 0518 (ext. 208)

Email: ratirose@savethechildren.or.th

20.Mr Thomas White

Deputy Director

Governance and Vulnerable Populations Office

Regional Development Mission Asia (RDMA)

US Agency for International Development (USAID)

Athenee Tower

25th Floor

Bangkok 10330

Thailand

Tel: +62 2257 3226

Email: thwhite@usaid.gov

RSIS

Research Staff

1. Mr Joel Ng

Associate Research Fellow

S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)

Block S4, Level B4

Nanyang Avenue

Nanyang Technological University

Singapore 639798

Tel: +65 6790 4751

Email: isjoelng@ntu.edu.sg

RSIS CENTRE FOR NTS STUDIES

Website: www.rsis.edu.sg/nts; Secretariat of the
Consortium of Non-Traditional Security Studies in Asia:
www.rsis-ntsasia.org

Faculty

1. Associate Professor Mely Caballero-Anthony

Head

Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies

S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)

Nanyang Technological University;

Secretary-General

Consortium of Non-Traditional Security Studies in

Asia (NTS-Asia)

Block S4, Level B4

Nanyang Avenue

Singapore 639798

Tel: +65 6790 5886

Email: ismcanthony@ntu.edu.sg

2. Mr Yang Razali Kassim

Senior Fellow

Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies

S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)

Nanyang Technological University

Block S4, Level B4

Nanyang Avenue

Singapore 639798

Tel: +65 6790 6817

Email: isyangrazali@ntu.edu.sg

Research and Administrative Staff

3. **Ms Gianna Gayle Amul**
   Research Analyst
   Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies
   S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)
   Nanyang Technological University
   Block S4, Level B4
   Nanyang Avenue
   Singapore 639798
   Tel: +65 6513 2036
   Email: isgianna@ntu.edu.sg

4. **Ms Belinda Chng**
   Programme Development Manager
   Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies
   S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)
   Nanyang Technological University
   Block S4, Level B4
   Nanyang Avenue
   Singapore 639798
   Tel: +65 6790 5889
   Email: ishkchng@ntu.edu.sg

5. **Dr J. Jackson Ewing**
   Research Fellow
   Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies
   S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)
   Nanyang Technological University
   Block S4, Level B4
   Nanyang Avenue
   Singapore 639798
   Tel: +65 6592 2531
   Email: isjjewing@ntu.edu.sg

6. **Ms Lina Gong**
   Research Associate
   Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies
   S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)
   Nanyang Technological University
   Block S4, Level B4
   Nanyang Avenue
   Singapore 639798
   Tel: +65 6790 6982
   Email: lgong4@e.ntu.edu.sg

7. **Mr Pau Khan Khup Hangzo**
   Associate Research Fellow
   Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies
   S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)
   Nanyang Technological University
   Block S4, Level B4
   Nanyang Avenue
   Singapore 639798
   Tel: +65 6513 2035
   Email: iskkpau@ntu.edu.sg

8. **Ms Cheryl Lim**
   Programme Manager
   Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies
   S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)
   Nanyang Technological University
   Block S4, Level B4
   Nanyang Avenue
   Singapore 639798
   Tel: +65 6592 7521
   Email: ischeryllim@ntu.edu.sg

9. **Ms Josephine Ng**
   Adminstrative Executive
   Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies
   S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)
   Nanyang Technological University
   Block S4, Level B4
   Nanyang Avenue
   Singapore 639798
   Tel: +65 790 5889
   Email: islyng@ntu.edu.sg

10. **Ms Sally Trethewie**
    Associate Research Fellow
    Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies
    S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)
    Nanyang Technological University
    Block S4, Level B4
    Nanyang Avenue
    Singapore 639798
    Tel: +65 6316 8782
    Email: issallytrethewie@ntu.edu.sg

About the RSIS Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies

The **RSIS Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies** conducts research and produces policy-relevant analyses aimed at furthering awareness and building capacity to address NTS issues and challenges in the Asia-Pacific region and beyond.

To fulfil this mission, the Centre aims to:

- Advance the understanding of NTS issues and challenges in the Asia-Pacific by highlighting gaps in knowledge and policy, and identifying best practices among state and non-state actors in responding to these challenges.

- Provide a platform for scholars and policymakers within and outside Asia to discuss and analyse NTS issues in the region.

- Network with institutions and organisations worldwide to exchange information, insights and experiences in the area of NTS.

- Engage policymakers on the importance of NTS in guiding political responses to NTS emergencies and develop strategies to mitigate the risks to state and human security.

- Contribute to building the institutional capacity of governments, and regional and international organisations to respond to NTS challenges.

Our Research

The key programmes at the **RSIS Centre for NTS Studies** include:

1) Internal and Cross-Border Conflict Programme
   - Dynamics of Internal Conflicts
   - Multi-level and Multilateral Approaches to Internal Conflict
   - Responsibility to Protect (RtoP) in Asia
   - Peacebuilding

2) Climate Change, Environmental Security and Natural Disasters Programme
   - Mitigation and Adaptation Policy Studies
   - The Politics and Diplomacy of Climate Change

3) Energy and Human Security Programme
   - Security and Safety of Energy Infrastructure
   - Stability of Energy Markets
   - Energy Sustainability
   - Nuclear Energy and Security

4) Food Security Programme
   - Regional Cooperation
   - Food Security Indicators
   - Food Production and Human Security

5) Health and Human Security Programme
   - Health and Human Security
   - Global Health Governance
   - Pandemic Preparedness and Global Response Networks

The first three programmes received a boost from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation when the RSIS Centre for NTS Studies was selected as one of three core institutions leading the MacArthur Asia Security Initiative* in 2009.

Our Output

Policy Relevant Publications

The **RSIS Centre for NTS Studies** produces a range of output such as research reports, books, monographs, policy briefs and conference proceedings.

Training

Based in RSIS, which has an excellent record of post-graduate teaching, an international faculty, and an extensive network of policy institutes worldwide, the Centre is well-placed to develop robust research capabilities, conduct training courses and facilitate advanced education on NTS. These are aimed at, but not limited to, academics, analysts, policymakers and non-governmental organisations (NGOs).

Networking and Outreach

The Centre serves as a networking hub for researchers, policy analysts, policymakers, NGOs and media from across Asia and farther afield interested in NTS issues and challenges.

The **RSIS Centre for NTS Studies** is also the Secretariat of the Consortium of Non-Traditional Security Studies in Asia (NTS-Asia), which brings together 20 research institutes and think tanks from across Asia, and strives to develop the process of networking, consolidate existing research on NTS-related issues, and mainstream NTS studies in Asia.

More information on our Centre is available at www.rsis.edu.sg/nts

About the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), Nanyang Technological University

The S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS) was inaugurated on 1 January 2007 as an autonomous School within the Nanyang Technological University (NTU), upgraded from its previous incarnation as the Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS), which was established in 1996.

The School exists to develop a community of scholars and policy analysts at the forefront of Asia-Pacific security studies and international affairs. Its three core functions are research, graduate teaching and networking activities in the Asia-Pacific region. It produces cutting-edge security related research in Asia-Pacific Security, Conflict and Non-Traditional Security, International Political Economy, and Country and Area Studies.

The School's activities are aimed at assisting policymakers to develop comprehensive approaches to strategic thinking on issues related to security and stability in the Asia-Pacific and their implications for Singapore.

For more information about RSIS, please visit www.rsis.edu.sg