

MIGRANTS IN COUNTRIES IN CRISIS

RESEARCH

Supporting an Evidence-Based
Approach for Effective and
Cooperative State Action



RESEARCH BRIEF

MIGRANTS IN COUNTRIES IN CRISIS INITIATIVE

Actors and stakeholder involvement in crisis mitigation

BERNHARD PERCHINIG,
INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR MIGRATION POLICY DEVELOPMENT

Project funded by the European Union



Project implemented by ICMPD



In partnership with IMI



Actors and stakeholder involvement in crisis mitigation

Bernhard Perchinig, International Centre for Migration Policy Development

International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD)
Gonzagagasse 1
A-1010 Vienna
Austria
www.icmpd.org

International Centre for Migration Policy Development
Vienna, 2016

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, copied or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission of the copyright owners.

This publication has been produced with the assistance of the European Union. The contents of this publication is the sole responsibility of the author and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union.

Printed and bound in Austria.

Project funded by the European Union



Project implemented by ICMPD



In partnership with IMI



ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Bernhard Perchinig is a Senior Research Officer at ICMPD Vienna. A political scientist and sociologist by training (University Vienna, University of Strathclyde), he has more than 25 years of research and consultancy experience in the field of labour-migration, integration and citizenship studies. He is a Faculty Member of the Department for Commercial Law and European Studies of the Danube University Krems, where he teaches Migration and Minority Studies; and of the M.A. Program in Intercultural Studies at Salzburg University.

Further to his research and teaching activities he has consulted several international organizations, governments and governmental and civil society organisations on migration and integration issues. He has authored and co-authored numerous publications on migration and citizenship, minority rights and European Union migration policies.

SUMMARY

The following pages analyse the roles and best practices, which different stakeholders can adopt in disaster and crisis management, with regard to supporting migrants coping with crises.

The paper starts with the discussion of the key concepts of vulnerability and resilience in order to set a frame for stakeholder involvement. Resorting to stakeholder theory, it defines migrants as “dormant stakeholders” in crisis and disaster management, which need to be involved into crisis management in order to make use of their capabilities. Analysing the main challenges of the involvement of migrants, it defines main areas of stakeholder involvement in the different phases of a crisis. Based on examples from the dialogue meetings within the MICIC framework, it further outlines key areas of action and develops suggestions for improving stakeholder inclusion into crisis and disaster management and mitigation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2

INTRODUCTION AND KEY CONCEPTS

3

Migration and vulnerability

4

Resilience and migration

5

Stakeholdership

6

EXISTING FRAMEWORKS AND APPROACHES

6

Immediate emergency response services

- General considerations
- Pre-crisis phase
- Emergency phase
- Post-crisis phase

8

General services

- General considerations
- Pre-crisis phase
- Emergency phase
- Post-crisis phase

9

Mobility related support services

- General considerations
- Pre-crisis phase
- Emergency phase
- Post-crisis phase

10

SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES

10

Networked disaster management planning

11

Needs based support provision

11

Fostering mobility

12

Re-integration support

12

SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

12

Identify and network your stakeholders

12

Train all stakeholders in the pre-crisis phase

13

Know your migrants and reach out to them

13

Include consulates of the countries of origin

13

Provide multilingual information via multiple channels

13

Implement a sustainable firewall between crisis support and migration control

14

Develop regional migration dialogues to foster regional cooperation

15

REFERENCES

INTRODUCTION AND KEY CONCEPTS

The current international debate on disaster and disaster risk management focuses on two central concepts: Vulnerability and resilience. At the international level, the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR)'s Hyogo Framework for Action "Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters" (UNISDR 2005) has been a key document in establishing both concepts. Understanding risk from a focus on social vulnerability promotes the fostering of resilience of communities and nations as central disaster risk management strategy. The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 - 2030 (2015), which replaced the Hyogo Framework, has reiterated this stance by stressing the urgency to reduce vulnerability and foster resilience by developing all-of-society engagement and partnerships in crisis preparedness planning and disaster risk management.

In this context, a broad academic debate on different conceptions of vulnerability and resilience has developed (i.a. Birkman et al 2011, Lewis and Kelman 2010, Zhou et al 2010), which cannot be covered extensively here. Nevertheless, a short introduction into the framing of the key terms of debate will be given in order to understand their pre-eminence in DRM research and their relevance for the MICIC project.

In Disaster Risk Management (DRM) research, vulnerability is understood as a concept describing the differences in the degree of damage incurred from (natural) hazards that are manifested for an individual person, for a community, a city or an entire region. Vulnerability thus refers to the propensity of the exposed persons or systems to experience harm and suffer damages when impacted by hazard events. Understanding disasters as complex interactions between the (physical) environment and society, the concept underscores the social construction of risk: Highlighting the societal conditions, the coping capacity, the power relations and the social capital of the person or community concerned social inequality is describes as the major factor influencing vulnerability (Fekete et al 2014, 5). In this understanding, vulnerability is perceived as an interaction between the susceptibility for natural or other disasters with unsafe living conditions and limited access to resources and political power of persons or groups concerned, and not as susceptibility to

disasters alone. This approach directs attention to the ways in which the organizational, institutional and political context influences vulnerability and stresses the need of interventions at a structural, and not only at technical level. (Birkman et al. 2011, 198).

The term "vulnerability" describes the differences in the degree of damage incurred from (natural) hazards for an individual person, for a community, a city or an entire region.

The concept of resilience is intrinsically linked to the concept of vulnerability. Broadly defined as the capacity to resist and recover from loss, the concept of resilience - which has its roots in natural sciences (Alexander 2013) - has been first applied to social systems by Holling (Holling 1973). According to Holling, "resilience determines the resistance of relationships within a system and is a measure of the ability of these systems to absorb changes of state variables, driving variables, and parameters; and still persist" (Holling 1973, p. 17). Based on this understanding, resilience analysis has become the dominant approach in disaster preparedness planning (Park et al 2013), where resilience is understood as "the buffer capacity or the ability of a system to absorb perturbations, or the magnitude of disturbance that can be absorbed before a system changes its structure by changing the variables and processes that control its behaviour" (Adger 2005, 249, in Djalante et al 2011, 5). The link between vulnerability and resilience has also been stressed by the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR), which defines vulnerability as the "susceptibility to the damaging effects of a hazard", and resilience as the ability to "resist, absorb, accommodate to and recover from the effects of a hazard in a timely and efficient manner" (Fekete et al 2014, 6). Resilience is a key to individual and collective agency in crisis situations, and clearly linked to vulnerability: Vulnerability reduces resilience, strengthening resilience reduces vulnerability.

Vulnerability reduction and fostering of resilience have been defined as the key elements to DRM

policies both in the Hyogo- and Sendai frameworks for disaster risk reduction, as in the EU Action Plan on a disaster risk-informed approach for all EU policies (European Commission 2016). In this vein, the concept of resilience has side-lined the older concept of protection, which focused on the technical prevention of disasters. Although this concept still is valid in disaster preparedness planning, the concept of resilience has accepted the fact, that (natural) disasters cannot always be prevented, and has replaced the prevalent technical approach of DRM policies by a societal approach.

Although the Sendai framework includes some reflections on the role of migrants in disaster preparedness planning, it does however not focus on the specific interlinkage between migration and vulnerability. In our understanding, migration may both increase and decrease vulnerability – on the one hand, the specific legal status of migrants may lead to vulnerabilities not experienced by citizens, on the other hand it might also give access to resource – e.g. support by the country of origin – not available to other residents. This relationship deserves further attention and will be discussed below.

MIGRATION AND VULNERABILITY

As discussed above, vulnerability is a concept focusing on the effects of social inequality and power differentials on the capacity to cope with hazards. In crisis situations, different aspects of vulnerability become relevant. Whereas socioeconomic conditions and general power differentials affect all persons hidden by a crisis, migration may add two specific dimensions,: a) the power differential between citizens and foreigners, which is enshrined in the very nature of a state, and will affect all migrants who hold foreign nationality, and b) lack of or limited knowledge of the main language(s) and the legal, and institutional framework and the dominant culture(s) of the country of residence, which may serve to justify a lower status of immigrants as compared to nationals. In this understanding, vulnerability is not mainly associated with personal characteristics and traits of immigrants, but with the legal, social and systemic statuses ascribed to migrants (Bustamante 2002, 340). In the same vein, Clements et al (1999, 104) have stated: "The term 'vulnerable people' is used to refer to 'people who are stigmatized, have low social status, . . . very little power or control over their lives', and who live under damaging legal, social or institutional regimes."

Although migration - related vulnerability interacts with other dimensions of vulnerability experienced by all persons hit by a crisis, it relates to two distinct areas not relevant for citizens: a) all aspects of legal discrimination based on the fact of not holding the citizenship of the country of residence leading to exclusion from or limited access to resources and services, e.g. legal differentiations between citizens and foreigners with regard to access to e.g. the labour market, housing and social support provision, education or health; and b) all aspects related to international border crossing and residence in another country,

e.g. the restriction of mobility rights by visa regulations, or temporary or spatial limits of the right of residence.

Vulnerability is best understood as interaction between the susceptibility for natural or other disasters with unsafe living conditions and lacking or limited access to socioeconomic resources and political power, and not as susceptibility to disasters alone.

In this respect, a further differentiation between migrants holding a regular status of residence and migrants with an irregular status, is necessary (Carrera/Parkin 2011, 25ff.; Commission for Human Rights 2007 7ff): Whereas legally resident migrants may be excluded from a broad array of citizens' rights, their residence status is undisputed, and their place of residence will be recorded in population databases if they exist. Irregular residence on the contrary further aggravates migrants' vulnerability, as access to basic services may be denied. As irregular migrants often try to remain invisible to authorities – as to not to threaten their residency in the host country - so too will they remain invisible for the stakeholders involved in disaster mitigation and relief. This voluntary or involuntary invisibility, might have the effect, that rescue services are not (well) informed about their numbers and places of residence . On the other hand, an irregular status will be often instrumental as ground for discrimination and exploitation, or may be tolerated by (weak) authorities to support semi-legal economic activities they may profit from due to corruption. Migration - related vulnerability often is exacerbated by vulnerability caused by socio-cultural

factors linked to migration, in particular the lack of integration, e.g. the lack of or limited knowledge of the local language(s) or communication practices, limited knowledge of the institutional framework of the country of residence, or lack of or limited access to social networks of residents. Whereas this type of vulnerability can be overcome by the acquisition of knowledge of the local language(s) and on local ways of life, ethnic or origin-based discrimination aims at the exclusion or limitation of access to economic, social and political resources. Ethnic and origin-based

discrimination may be also an issue for citizens, but is more likely to occur with regard to migrants. The reduction of vulnerabilities stands at the heart of disaster-preparedness and mitigation. Persons suffering from vulnerabilities will have reduced access to information and resources necessary to prepare adequately for a crisis and best overcome the crisis phase. Raising stakeholders' awareness of the specific vulnerabilities migrants may face and including measures to reduce them in preparedness planning thus are central elements of good crisis governance.

RESILIENCE AND MIGRATION

The concept of resilience plays a key role in DRM research, where fostering resilience of individuals within communities and civil society have been defined as major elements for effective crisis governance (Ahrens/Rudolph 2006, 217). Resilience is supported by empowerment of individuals and participation and inclusion of communities in disaster risk management, particularly in risk assessment, mitigation planning, capacity building and -implementation (Pandey/Okazaki 2009).

Fostering resilience is the key to inclusive crisis and disaster preparedness and mitigation.

Community-based disaster management thus directly involves vulnerable people themselves in the planning and implementation of mitigation measures. Bottom-up community based disaster management is increasingly considered best-practice, as it revolves around reducing the root causes of vulnerability. Increasing communities' capacities, their resources and coping strategies by bringing together a multitude of community stakeholders for disaster risk reduction and the expansion of the resource base are the main elements of community based disaster management (Yodmani 2001, 8).

Fostering social and individual resilience is rooted in a needs-based approach to crisis governance (Zetter 2015). Needs-based, as opposed to status-based disaster management, is inherently linked to community empowerment. While it remains undisputed that governments have the primary responsibility for managing disasters and for assigning the roles to be played by different

stakeholders, the dominant top-down approach understanding of migrant communities as "victims" to be helped by the authorities has often proved insufficient and ineffective. Top-down approaches have consistently failed to meet the needs of the intended beneficiaries, in particular the needs of those lacking adequate access to infrastructure, resources and social services. Studies on the implementation of community-based disaster management highlight, that disaster risk or vulnerability reduction are the foundation for success (Yodmani 2001, 8).

With regard to migration, this understanding of resilience includes specific challenges, in particular with regard to the inclusion of regular and irregular migrants into disaster preparedness planning, outreach to migrants in crisis situations, the communication with migrants with no or limited knowledge of the main language(s) of the country of residence, and the development of culturally sensible empowerment strategies.

Fostering social and individual resilience is rooted in a needs-based approach to crisis governance. Needs-based, as opposed to status-based disaster management, is inherently linked to community empowerment.

STAKEHOLDERSHIP

References to stakeholders and the discussion of their role in various policy fields has become increasingly popular in the social sciences. This increasing popularity is reflected in the understanding that in an interconnected and globalised world, organisations, projects or policy fields cannot be steered by a single locus of control. The need to take into account for the varying interests of those related to an organisation, project or policy domain - and who have the ability to influence its objectives - is as nuanced as it is critical. This necessity is at the core of the definition of stakeholderhood, where persons and institutions are not only linked to an organisation or policy field, but also able "to make a claim on an organization's attention, resources or output or who may be affected by the organization" (Lewis 2001, 202). A definition of stakeholders as active agents with interactive capacities characterises the prevailing literature on stakeholder analysis today.

Stakeholders can be of any form, size and capacity. They can be individuals, organizations, or unorganized groups. In most cases, stakeholders fall into one or more of the following categories: international actors (e.g. donors), national or political actors (e.g. legislators, governors), public sector agencies (e.g. MDAs), interest groups (e.g. unions, medical associations), commercial/private for-profit, nonprofit organizations (NGOs, foundations), civil society members, and users/consumers (World Bank 2001). Local communities and migrant communities will most often not be institutionalised, and are thus often overlooked. Depending on the complexity of the policy field, the functions and ranges of the relevant stakeholders will vary. In any case, there has to be a differentiation between stakeholders who are already organised and have already articulated their claims in the field and dormant stakeholders, which are not yet organised and visible. Regardless of their status, there is an undifferentiated need to view all relevant stakeholders as agents with varying capacities and the power to influence policy making in a given policy field.

Migrants most often do not hold the power to influence decision makers. Policies aimed at encouraging broad stakeholder involvement should define migrants as target groups to be included into crisis preparedness planning.

Not every stakeholder is equally important in a policy field. Mitchell et al. (1997, 872) mention three important issues in determining the priority of stakeholders: power, urgency and legitimacy. These three dimensions can be defined as follows:

- **Power:** Power is described as the probability that an actor comes into a position where they are capable of implementing their own will within a social relationship, despite physical, material or symbolic resistance.
- **Legitimacy:** Suchman (1995) defines legitimacy as "a generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed systems of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions".[2]
- **Urgency:** A stakeholder is considered to be 'urgent' if his situation needs immediate attention. According to Mitchell et al. (1997) urgency exists under two conditions: when a relationship or claim is of a time sensitive nature or when that relationship or claim is important or critical to the stakeholder.

Migrants most often neither hold the power to influence decision makers, and often their legitimacy to claim-making is not accepted or challenged. Furthermore, local communities and migrant communities will most often not be institutionalised, and are thus often overlooked. They thus most often are not able to claim urgent reaction, and are best described as "dormant stakeholders", who have not yet developed an organisational framework or made their claims visible.

Dormant stakeholders often need support by power-brokers to become visible (Mitchell et al 1997, 889). As in crisis preparedness planning the inclusion of a broad set of stakeholders does not only lead to greater trust towards organisations and companies, but also helps to coordinate the actions of different stakeholders in situations characterised by uncertainty, a pro-active approach to include migrants already in the preparatory phase is of major importance. In this respect, it is crucial that power-brokers act as "mentors" of these dormant stakeholders - policies aimed at encouraging broad stakeholder involvement thus should define migrants as target groups to be included into crisis preparedness planning. In the end, the costs of "awakening" the dormant stakeholders will pay off by giving access to a broader range of resources, allowing critical information to pass through, and will help decision makers to develop a more realistic understanding of the nature of the crisis (Lewis 2001, 202).

EXISTING FRAMEWORKS AND APPROACHES

The activities of stakeholders in crisis management follow different internal logics, and different decision making procedures, depending on the task of the stakeholders and the crisis phase. There are a variety of reports and analyses of stakeholder involvement in different crises, but no reports on the specific needs of migrants and the actions stakeholders can take in this regard. The following section will discuss the relevant

approaches of the three main types of stakeholders: Immediate disaster response services, stakeholders providing general services in a region affected by a crisis, and stakeholders providing mobility related support with regard to the needs of migrants. Due to the lack of relevant studies, it is mainly based on the analysis of the reports on the regional dialogues held within the MICIC project.

IMMEDIATE EMERGENCY RESPONSE SERVICES

General considerations

Immediate disaster response concerns immediate life-saving activities, e.g. recovery operations, first medical support, provision of shelter, and the distribution food, water and emergency supplies. Disaster relief services are usually implemented following the principle of triage. Triage systems categorise victims in different categories regarding the seriousness of damages in order to provide (medical) support to those most in need first. When on scene, rescue teams usually do not differentiate according to any other criteria, thus migrant status usually does not play a role in first response rescue operations on the spot (see e.g. National Disaster Life Support Foundation 2008, Robertson-Steel 2006).

Triage approaches are also applied when deciding which locations to focus on first for disaster relief. In this respect, the number of people affected and the seriousness of disaster impacts are the main indicators for prioritisation of disaster response.

Triage can be an effective tool for levelling systemic power dynamics, which create barriers for marginalised persons to access to emergency response services; however, there are several specific challenges with regard to migration:

- a) The application of a triage – approach has to be based on a sufficient level of information about the resident population.
- b) Communication between the rescuers and the victims is essential to apply triage successfully.
- c) Basic trust between victims and rescuers has to be established.

In many cases, there is no precise knowledge about the (migrant) population resident in a certain area. In case their settlement patterns are not known to the authorities, the authorities will have not sound base for the decision about priority areas and might even overlook areas to be included into the provision of immediate emergency response measures. Whereas this issue may concern both unregistered citizens and migrants, the lack of or limited knowledge of the host country's spoken language may impede equal access of migrants to immediate disaster response services. Finally, (irregularly resident) migrants might shy away from rescue services if they are delivered by law enforcement authorities also implementing migration legislation.

In cases of a complex emergency - a major humanitarian crisis of a multi-causal nature that requires a system-wide response (Duffield 1994, 5) - immediate emergency response may be hampered by the full or partial breakdown of national institutions, the infrastructure and/or the public order. "Complex emergencies" are typically characterized by an extensive violence and loss of life, the displacements of populations, widespread damage to societies and economies, the hindrance or prevention of humanitarian assistance by political and military constraints and significant security risks for humanitarian relief workers in some areas, and need large-scale and multifaceted humanitarian assistance. These emergencies usually lead to large scale mass movements of refugees and displaced persons and often overwhelm the capacities of national disaster management structures. In these cases, the involvement of International Organisations and the cooperation with other countries is necessary to

deliver support to victims, which can be fostered by the development of cooperation agreements with international relief organisations in due time.

Pre-crisis phase

Immediate disaster response organisations can prepare for a better inclusion of migrants mainly in the pre-crisis phase. In this respect, “Know your population!” is a main imperative. A functioning and sustainable population registration system can deliver this information, if migrants are included independently of their legal status and on the same footing as citizens. In practice, often population registers are missing or lack reliability. To overcome these difficulties, administrations of population registers should communicate with migrant representatives and/or NGOs working with the population – both citizens and migrants alike – on the ground to check and complete their information. Consular services can provide important support if they collect data on the whereabouts of their citizens. Registration of citizens at consulates in the pre-crisis phase will help to collect relevant information. In order to cover all migrants, irregular migrants should be included into registration.

Measures to improve the language proficiency of migrants in the main language(s) of the host country can be seen as a key strategy in disaster preparedness. Nevertheless, first aid providers should provide information in the main migrant’s native languages and offer interpretation services to be accessible also to those with insufficient knowledge of the local language(s). In this respect, the usage of telecommunication is essential – setting up multilingual hotlines and SMS services, and informing migrants about hotline-telephone numbers and accessibility in pre-crisis time is essential. Mobile phone based and IT based multilingual information services can complete these tools. As IT based systems have not proven stable and accessible in many crises, phone and SMS services should be given priority. Consulates and embassies of the countries of origin of the resident migrants should be included into these efforts.

Rescue services are most often implemented together with the police or the military. In order to prevent irregularly resident migrants from shying away from using these services, they should be informed clearly and in a multilingual format that rescue services operate without taking into account the migration status of victims. Rescue organisations should be informed about the migrant population and their needs and encouraged to recruit migrants among their staff.

Crisis situations often lead to traumatisation of victims, who will not only need adequate medical care, but also psychological assistance. The effects

of trauma on individual behaviour are influenced by cultural traditions, thus post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) may thus take different forms (Wilson 2005). First responders need to receive adequate intercultural training to be able to cope professionally with PTSD-related behaviour unknown in their cultural context.

Emergency phase

In the emergency phase, reaching out to migrant communities and the provision of services irrespective of the legal status is a clear priority. Migrants should be addressed in multilingual formats, and there should be a clear message that authorities involved into rescue operations provide relief irrespective of legal status. Furthermore, procedure granting equal access and quality of services independently from migration status, national origin or citizenship should be established.

Post-crisis phase

Whereas in the post-crisis phase the general emergency response organisations reduce their involvement and their services are taken over by general service providers, the transfer of information about their activities and experiences, and the specific needs encountered by migrants to general providers is essential. Thus there is a need to include the issue of services for migrants into an organised hand-over to general service providers and to secure a follow-up with migrant organisations, consulates and intermediators.

GENERAL SERVICES

General considerations

The functioning of societies hinges on a broad variety of services provided to the public by public or private companies and organisations. These services include both infrastructure services e.g. local transport networks, railway or bus services, postal services, or telecommunications; as other essential services provided directly to the person that play a preventive and socially cohesive/inclusive role, like e.g. health services, child care, long-term care or social and psychological assistance services. Depending on the institutional framework of a country, these services can be provided by public institutions, by private companies, or by both. Further to these services the provision of goods by private companies and shops is a main precondition for the functioning of everyday life.

At a height of a crisis, the provision of goods and services often is restricted severely or suffers a (partial) breakdown, and immediate response services take over most of their tasks. The maintenance and/or reconstitution of these basic services is a major task of the post-crisis phase, but needs to be planned and prepared already in the pre-crisis phase. In particular countries with limited state capacities can profit from the inclusion of international organisations, like e.g. the IFRC, into contingency planning (development of memoranda of understanding, exchange of experts, exchange of good practices) already in the pre-crisis phase.

Pre-crisis phase:

Access to basic services has to be based on the principle of needs assessment and discrimination-free service delivery. In order to successfully reach out to migrants, providers should be encouraged to pro-actively reach out to migrant leaders, interlocutors and NGOs working with migrants to get information about and assess migrants' needs. Also in this field, it will be helpful to prepare multilingual information material. As migrants' vulnerabilities may lead to unequal treatment by service providers, adequate anti-discrimination policies including a revision of procedures leading to unequal access to services are necessary.

As the provider structure in this field varies from country to country, it is essential to analyse the structure and institutional set up of providers in the pre-crisis phase, in order to develop a sound stakeholder concept and set clear procedures for

access to basic services in and at the aftermath of a crisis.

Inclusive disaster preparedness planning needs clear procedures for needs-based decision making preventing any discrimination based on gender, age, ethnic origin, skin colour or migration or residence status.

Emergency-phase:

In the crisis phase, access to services – if available - should be provided to the population concerned on a needs based paradigm, including free service provision.

Information on available services should be given by all available means of communication, including multilingual information, and making use of all available channels, from personal information to social media. If possible, community leaders and interlocutors should be asked to spread the information. In any case, the provision of services should not be hindered by the migration status of the person concerned.

Provision of multilingual information material – in print and in electronic format, and proactive outreach to multipliers and contact persons to migrant communities is central.

Access to information and to communication facilities is a major issue in a crisis. This does not only concern the communication of authorities with migrants, and the distribution of information to migrants making use of different channels of communication including both personal and digital communication, but also migrants' communication needs. In this respect, access to public internet terminals or free WiFi spots, and access to a sufficient number of sockets for charging mobile phones, or the supply of cheap sim-cards for mobile phones, will help migrants to communicate with each other and with their families. As in a crisis WiFi might not function, mobile phone service providers should be encouraged to grant a

certain number of free or cheap minutes for calls and a certain number of free or cheap megabytes of data-transfer for communication with the main source countries of immigrants.

Post-crisis phase:

The re-establishment of basic services is a main task in the post-crisis phase. When re-establishing services, access of migrants has to be secured by

adequate information, and by implementation of clear antidiscrimination and equality procedures which prevent the privileging of nationals over immigrants.

MOBILITY RELATED SUPPORT SERVICES

General considerations

Providing mobility options to victims in order to remove them from areas affected by natural disasters or conflicts into safe areas often is a main element in crisis and disaster management. In this respect, relocation within a country, removal to a neighbouring country, and removal to the country of origin or to another country have to be distinguished. Whereas in cases of natural disasters relocation in the country will mainly hinge on the capacity of the state and rescue organisations to provide transportation and shelter, in cases of (armed) conflicts security issues – e.g. the unavailability of law enforcement authorities, or the lack of state control of certain areas of the country, or generalised violence, may seriously hamper mobility. These issues usually cannot be solved by rescue organisations, but need the involvement of the authorities and may be supported by international organisations. Whereas removal within a country and/or to a neighbouring country can be provided to both citizens and migrants, migrants may also have the opportunity to move to their country of origin, which will involve the authorities of these countries.

Relocation within the country mainly concerns equality of access to services and access to information about mobility options, and protection against violence and exploitation during travel and transit. Main stakeholders in this area are law enforcement authorities, public and/or private transport providers, and public and/or private providers of related infrastructure. Removal to a neighbouring country will involve the authorities of this country, which will need to grant border-crossing and (temporary) resident permits to disaster victims. Removal to the country of origin will involve both the authorities of this country, as the authorities of (potential) transit countries as stakeholders.

Migrants' vulnerabilities may increase the risk of becoming victims of violence and (sexual)

exploitation during travel. In particular irregular migrants, migrants restricted in their mobility by lack of identity documents, which might have been lost or withheld by employers, or migrants not holding a visa for countries they intend to reach for protection or of transit countries, will be confronted with increased travel risks. These risks can be mitigated by public authorities of the country of residence through the provision of provisional identity and travel documents and protection by the law enforcement agencies, and by third countries through the granting of humanitarian entry and residence visa granted independently of the legal status of the migrant, and by the organisation of safe and reliable transport facilities for migrants in transit.

Avoid any linkage of disaster support to migration law enforcement and clearly communicate that disaster support will not lead to any consequences with regard to residence status.

Both (temporary) return to the country of origin as a later remigration to the country of residence are options taken by migrants affected by a crisis in their country of residence. Both options need cooperation between the authorities and public service providers of the countries of origin and those of the crisis country, in particular if the crisis leads to mass returns of citizens challenging the reintegration capacity of the country.

Emergency phase

In the crisis phase, the consulates of the countries of origin can facilitate mobility by the smooth issuance of travel documents and by material, logistic or other support to migrants. Neighbouring countries can support mobility by granting humanitarian entry or transit visas and/or (tempo-

rary) residence permits. In case of a serious breakdown of the public order evacuation procedures for migrants, if necessary with the support of international organisations, might become necessary.

Post-crisis phase

Return of citizens will first involve authorities dealing with registration and documentation. Return of citizens will often also involve the import of money, household goods, cars, or machinery or equipment used in companies owned by the citizens abroad. To foster return, many countries have implemented tax exemption for returning citizens. Financial authorities can thus be seen as major stakeholders in the return process.

Re-integration mainly concerns housing, access to the labour market, schooling and access to health and social services. Independently from legal aspects, housing, labour market and school authorities will have to face the challenge of providing housing, recognising training certificates obtained abroad, and integrating children, who might not be fluent in the main language(s) of the country, into the education system. Particular information, orientation and language classes

may be required for spouses or children, or for returning adults born and raised abroad. These tasks might involve authorities, private companies and civil society organisations and will be akin to those required for the integration of immigrants.

Migrants returning to the country of origin will often stay connected to their previous country of residence. In immediate post-crisis situations, unpaid salaries or loan repayments might have to be claimed, or property rights might have to be secured. Migrant entrepreneurs might need to claim open payments of business partners, or solve situations regarding loans or the selling or re-opening of their business. All these activities will involve transnational legal and financial service providers, like attorneys or business agencies, but also trade unions or civil society organisations supporting migrants in the enforcement of their entitlements.

Also in this respect, regional migration dialogues can be an important venue to solve issues related to transnational payment and property claims by bringing the relevant regulatory authorities of the countries concerned together under the umbrella of improved migration and mobility management.

SUPPORTIVE PRACTICES

During the MICIC regional dialogues, several examples of good practices in relation to stakeholder involvement in crisis management have been mentioned. Most of them relate to the pre-crisis phase, only few to the crisis and post-crisis phase. They can be structured as follows:

NETWORKED DISASTER MANAGEMENT PLANNING

The development of disaster management plans and networks defining institutional responsibilities are main elements of disaster preparedness applied in many countries. Only rarely migrants are defined as specific stakeholder group in these plans, and only rarely networking nodes to the migrant population are identified and involved into preparedness planning. Good practices are often initiated by consulates of countries of origin,

which help in networking between the authorities and resident migrants. In this respect, the specific situation of irregular residents has to be taken into account: In some cases, specific outreach activities have been developed by CSOs and by consulates based on the pre-text, that data collected will not be disclosed towards migration law enforcement agencies.

NEEDS BASED SUPPORT PROVISION

The provision of support in a crisis has to be based on needs and should not discriminate with regard to residence status, ethnicity, gender, age or other factors prone to discrimination, as defined in the Humanitarian Charter, which demands that as „ action should be taken to prevent or alleviate human suffering arising out of disaster or conflict, and that nothing should override this principle.”

Clear procedures for a needs-based decision making for prioritisation have been developed in the disaster preparedness planning of many countries. Nevertheless, often stakeholders do not take into account the specific situation of migrants, often due to the lack of knowledge of the whereabouts of migrant populations and lack of access to them. Improving the outreach to migrants already in the preparatory phase can help to overcome these deficiencies.

The regional consultations highlighted a broad range of good practice examples to target the needs of migrants in disaster preparedness and mitigation. Among them are:

- **Ensuring migrants have equal access to assistance and protection in times of crisis.** In Colombia, the law regulating disaster response establishes the principle of equality as a general principle of protection, and states that all persons, regardless of nationality, should receive the same humanitarian assistance in times of crisis.

- **Including migrants in emergency and rescue services.** Integrating migrants into professional and voluntary emergency and rescue services constitutes a concrete way to better adapt communication channels and services in a way that takes into account language and culture of migrant communities and shares knowledge between relief services and migrant communities. In Ecuador, Cuban migrants have experience in the management of disasters and were involved in preparing evacuations during the eruption of the Cotopaxi volcano.

- **Ensuring migrants have access to necessary assistance in situ.** Following the 2011 floods, the Thai Ministry of Interior put in place emergency plans involving eighteen agencies to coordinate the response at the national and local levels. Special attention was paid to migrants by setting up a special team to meet their needs. In addition, specific evacuation centres were created for migrants and a Flood Relief and Assistance Centre for Migrant Workers, which provided relief aid (shelter, food, relocation assistance, temporary work) to displaced migrants, was established. During the 2011 “triple disaster” in Japan, mayors of affected cities initiated the “One-Stop Consultation Support Project for Social Inclusion” to address the specific needs of affected migrants.

FOSTERING MOBILITY

The provision of humanitarian entry and residence visa and of as safe passage including the deployment of trains, buses and other means of transport has been applied in several cases to allow victims of a crisis to move to a safe place. Direct evacuation measures by the country of origin or by international organisations is a main element of disaster support organised by countries of origin. In this respect, good practice examples include the provision of evacuation measures for non-national family members and household

personnel of expatriates, as well as the provision of consular support in the organisation of necessary visa.

Migrants in transit are susceptible to exploitation and trafficking. In this respect, good examples included specific trainings of the authorities to identify victims of trafficking and the provision of both male and female law enforcement personnel.

RE-INTEGRATION SUPPORT

Re-integration of returning migrants has been described as one of the major post-crisis management. In this respect, several countries have highlighted the need to allow return to previous country of residence and the importance to include migrants into re-construction activities. Bi- or multilateral cooperation of the relevant authorities in supporting migrants in reclaiming unpaid salaries or re-establishing their former enterprise

have been mentioned as important. States can further support migrants by allowing tax- and duty free imports of personnel goods and machinery, and by aligning tax reductions in both countries of origin and (former) residence. Several countries have also provided facilitated naturalisation for spouses and children of expatriate citizens deceased during a crisis abroad.

SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

IDENTIFY AND NETWORK YOUR STAKEHOLDERS

The quality of crisis governance hinges on the inclusion of a broad variety of stakeholders, including actors from the public sector, the private sector and civil society organisations on the local and state level. Stakeholders should not only include immediate crisis response providers, general services providers and mobility providers

in the country, but also go beyond borders and involve stakeholders from neighbouring states and regional dialogue networks to foster transnational mobility. To facilitate cooperation, sustainable network structures with clear lines of communication and responsibility need to be established.

TRAIN ALL STAKEHOLDERS IN THE PRE-CRISIS PHASE

Inclusive crisis management structures as described above allow the development of improved adaptation strategies in crises situations, but also increase transaction costs. Thus the inclusion of stakeholders in crisis management has to be well-conceived in the pre-crisis phase in order to learn ways of successful cooperation before they are needed. Only pre-established networks of cooperation breed innovation and resilience and improve the overall quality of crisis governance. In several countries crisis and disaster management networks including a broad variety of actors have already been set up. As their experience has shown, mechanisms of regular exchange of information and training are necessary to improve their functioning, and they need to be connected to a high ranking focal point within government, e.g. a ministry, to receive suffi-

cient support and be able to fulfil coordinative functions over broad range of levels of decision making.

The quality of crisis governance hinges on the inclusion of a broad variety of stakeholders, including actors from the public sector, the private sector and civil society organisations on the local and state level, including migrant organisations, stakeholders from neighbouring states, and international organisations.

KNOW YOUR MIGRANTS AND REACH OUT TO THEM

In order to successfully reach out to migrants, the inclusion of migrants' organisations, migrant community leaders and interlocutors to migrant communities is crucial already during the development of these networks. Depending on the situation in the respective country, the level of organisation migrants and the knowledge about their places of residence will differ strongly. In some countries, a well-developed registration system and well established networks of migrant organisations will exist, which will provide information on the whereabouts of the migrants, whereas in other countries registration systems might be missing, or specific groups of migrants will stay

invisible, or will fear to get into contact with the authorities. Registration fees can be a further hindrance to register. Thus it is necessary to discharge fees for registration, to collect all available information on the places of residence of migrants, and to develop contacts making use of different channels, involving i.a. respected interlocutors, representatives of religious organisations, civil society organisations, or local authority representatives having specific knowledge about and contacts to the migrant population. In this respect, consular offices of the countries of origin might offer valuable support.

INCLUDE CONSULATES OF THE COUNTRIES OF ORIGIN

A further channel of communication will be consulates of countries of origin with their tradition to reach out towards the citizens. As well as in the pre-crisis phase, cooperation during the crisis-phase involving the authorities of the coun-

tries of origin of migrants, as well as of transit countries, is essential. In this respect, consulates can have an important role as access points for information and as providers of first financial and technical support to their citizens.

PROVIDE MULTILINGUAL INFORMATION VIA MULTIPLE CHANNELS

When setting up cooperation networks, potential language barriers have to be taken into account. In many cases, migrants will not be sufficiently fluent in the language(s) of the country of resident, thus provision for multilingual information material – in print and in electronic format, and proactive

outreach to multipliers and contact persons to migrant communities - might be necessary. For spreading of information, a broad variety of channels should be used. Regarding electronic communications, SMS services have proven more stable in a crisis than internet-based services.

IMPLEMENT A SUSTAINABLE FIREWALL BETWEEN CRISIS SUPPORT AND MIGRATION CONTROL

In disaster support delivery, a broad variety of actors including law enforcement agencies and the military may be involved. Irregular migrants and/or migrants living in conditions of vulnerability might be used to refrain from contact with law enforcement agencies or the military and thus might also shy away from accepting crisis support for fear of consequences regarding their legal

status. In the case of involvement of law enforcement agencies into crisis support, it is essential to set up a sustainable firewall between migration control and disaster support, and to clearly communicate that taking up disaster support will not lead to any consequences with regard to migration and residence status.

DEVELOP REGIONAL MIGRATION DIALOGUES TO FOSTER REGIONAL COOPERATION

Crises and disasters impact not only on the country hit by the crises, but on all countries linked to it by specific migration corridors. The institutionalisation of regional migration dialogues has been

described as a key element fostering bi- and multi-lateral co-ordination of countries linked by a migration corridor in normal times and for crisis management.

REFERENCES

- Adger, N., T. Hughes, C. Folke, S. Carpenter, and J. Rockstrom. 2005. Social-Ecological Resilience to Coastal Disasters. *Science* (309), 1036–42.
- Ahrens, J., P.M. Rudolph 2006: The Importance of Governance in Risk Reduction and Disaster Management. In: *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, Vol. 14/4, 207 – 220.
- Alexander D.E. 2013: Resilience and disaster risk reduction: an etymological journey. In: *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences* 13/2013, 2707 – 2716.
- Antonovsky, A. 1987: *Unraveling the Mystery of Health – How People Manage Stress and Stay Well*, San Francisco (Jossey-Bass Publishers).
- Birkmann, J., Cardona O.D. et al. 2013: Framing vulnerability, risk and societal responses: the MOVE framework. In: *Natural Hazards* 67/2013, 193 – 211.
- Carrera, S.; J. Parkin 2011: *Protecting and Delivering Fundamental Rights of Irregular Migrants at Local and Regional Levels in the European Union*. Brussels (Centre for European Policy Studies).
- Commission for Human Rights of the Council of Europe: *The Human Rights of Irregular Migrants in Europe*. Issue Paper 2007/1. Strasbourg (Council of Europe)
- Djalante, R.; C. Holley, F. Thomalla 2011: Adaptive Governance and Managing Resilience to Natural Hazards. In: *International Journal for Disaster Risk Science* 2 (4), 1–14.
- Duffield, M. 1994: *Complex Emergencies and the Crisis of Developmentalism*. Institute of Development Studies - IDS Bulletin 25.4.
- European Commission 2016: *Commission Staff Working Document: Action Plan on the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 – 2030. A disaster risk-informed approach for all EU policies*. Brussels, 16.06.2016, SWD (2016) 205 final.
- Fekete, A.; G. Hufschmidt, S. Kruse 2014: Benefits and Challenges of Resilience and Vulnerability for Disaster Risk Management. In: *International Journal for Disaster Risk Science* 5/2014, 3 – 20.
- Fletcher, D.; M. Sarker 2014: Psychological Resilience. A Review of Definitions, Concepts and Theories, *European Psychologist* 04/2013, 12-23.
- Holling, C.S. 1973: Resilience and stability of ecological systems. In: *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 4/1973, 1 – 23.
- Lewis, D. 2001: *The Management of Non-Governmental Development Organisations. An Introduction*. London (Routledge)
- Lewis, J., I. Kellmann 2010: Places, people and perpetuity. Community capacities in ecologies of catastrophe. In: *ACME – An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies* 9(2), 191 – 220.
- Pandey, B., K. Okazaki 2005: *Community Based Disaster Management: Empowering Communities to Cope with Disaster Risks*. Tokyo (UN Centre for Regional Development).
- Park, J.; T.P. Seager et al. 2013: Integrating risk and resilience approaches to catastrophe management. In: *Risk Analysis* 33(3), 356 – 367.
- Renn, O., K. D. Walker (eds.) 2008. *Global Risk Governance: Concept and Practice Using the IRGC Framework*. Dordrecht (Springer).
- Rhodes, R.A.W. 1996: The New Governance. Governing without Government. In: *Political Studies* XLII, 652 – 667.

- Schauber, A. 2104: Light and dark – citizens and invisible city-dwellers. In: United Nations University & Alliance Development Works (ed.): WorldRiskreport 2014. Bonn (United Nations University).
- UNIDR 2015: Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 – 2030. Download: <http://www.unisdr.org/we/coordinate/hfa-post2015>, 27.3.2016.
- Wilson, J. P.2005: The posttraumatic self: Restoring meaning and wholeness to personality. New York (Routledge)
- Yodmani, S.t 2001: Disaster Risk Management and Vulnerability Reduction: Protecting the Poor - Paper Presented at The Asia and Pacific Forum on Poverty Organized by the Asian Development Bank. Communities.
- Zhou, H.J., J.A.Wang et al. 2010: Resilience to natural hazards: A geographic perspective. In: Natural Hazards 53 (1), 21 – 41.