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This report focuses on the current trends and challenges in addressing migration and in particular, the needs and concerns of the most vulnerable migrants regardless of their legal status in the coming decades.

(For further information about previous Movement discussions and developments on international migration, see Appendix 1).

International migration is a large and growing phenomenon that affects almost every country, be they countries of origin, transit, or destination. Many migrants move voluntarily seeking better economic opportunities and lifestyles abroad. Others are forced to flee their homes because of conflict, repression, persecution, natural disasters, environmental degradation, poverty and poor governance. Too often, migrants face significant dangers in reaching their destinations, experiencing the horrors of banditry, piracy, rape and even death on the high seas, deserts, mountains and other inhospitable environments. Exploitation and abuse are not uncommon during transit and upon reaching destinations.

With their traditional support systems removed, they contend with significant socio-economic and legal challenges. They may lose links with their families and communities, and be subject to people smuggling and trafficking, or be exploited in informal labour arrangements. As part of the migration process, they may be
detained and deprived of their freedom without legal recourse. There are often challenges such as cultural and language barriers, discrimination and exclusion, or even violence to overcome. Women, children and unaccompanied minors among migrant populations can be particularly at risk. A number of factors (e.g. armed conflicts and generalised violence, organised crime, including human trafficking and smuggling, tightened border controls, security policy, etc) is exacerbating the vulnerability of migrants around the globe. Migrants are directly affected by various dangerous situations during the whole migratory process, including potential forced return to their country of origin or transit. For a fuller discussion of the causes, trends and consequences of international migration, see Appendix 2.

Migrants in these vulnerable positions are the principal focus of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movements’ attention. The Movement’s core principles of Humanity and Impartiality require attention to vulnerable people in society. The Movement’s commitment to Humanity means that its “purpose is to protect life and health and ensure respect for the human being.” In the spirit of Impartiality, the Movement makes “no discrimination as to nationality, race, religious beliefs, class or political opinions.” On this basis, the Movement plays an important role in assisting and protecting migrants since its components work along the entire migratory trail, in countries of origin, transit and destination. Guided solely by their needs and

---

**Number of International Migrants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>(In Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UN Population Division

---


irrespective of their legal status, the Movement is committed to relieving the suffering of migrants. National Societies are engaged in a wide range of humanitarian assistance and protection activities to help migrants at risk of serious harm. They work with both migrant and host communities to promote respect for diversity, nonviolence, and social inclusion as an integral part of responding to migrants’ needs. Many activities stem from the role of National Societies as auxiliaries to the public authorities, as stated by the 2007 Council of Delegates Resolution: “while acting in an auxiliary capacity National Societies will be in a position to base their services strictly on vulnerabilities and humanitarian needs and maintain their independence and impartiality at all times without being drawn into debate on the political, economic and security aspects of migration.”

This reference document supplements the background paper, “Migration: Ensuring access, dignity, respect for diversity and social inclusion,” produced for the 31st International Conference in November 2011. With the background paper, it aims to identify challenges that impede the ability of the Movement to engage effectively in carrying out its humanitarian mission with regard to vulnerable migrants. It first describes the current humanitarian assistance and protection activities of National Societies, which are many and varied but not always comprehensive in approach. It is followed by discussions of challenges faced by the Movement in addressing the humanitarian assistance and protection needs of migrants, focusing on external policies and internal constraints. The paper then discusses partnerships in which National Societies are engaged in carrying out their migration related activities. Finally, the paper concludes with issues for consideration at the 31st International Conference in November 2011.
In contribution to this analysis of the role of National Societies in addressing the needs of vulnerable migrants, a survey of National Societies was conducted in June 2011 to collect information about programmes for migrant populations and the barriers to greater involvement. The results of the survey, including responses from eighty-seven National Societies (see Appendix 3), show widespread interest in the migration issue, but many challenges and obstacles to access and programming.1

The National Societies were queried on the five key themes:

1. Does the National Society have access to migrants in their country, regardless of their legal status? If not, what are the principal barriers to gaining access?
2. Does the National Society provide humanitarian and protection services to migrants within your country? If yes, please provide a list of all humanitarian and protection services offered to migrants.

---

1 National Societies were invited to submit responses and supplementary materials either through an online survey or by electronic mail. The questionnaire was made available in English, French, Spanish, and Arabic. See Annexes for an overview of the survey responses and a list of National Societies included. A small number of countries did not submit responses but were included in the survey reporting based on information about their programming from other resources, such as previous mapping exercises conducted by the ICRC.
3. Has the National Society established partnerships with other organisations (government, non-governmental organisations, migrant associations or others) to strengthen the humanitarian and protection services provided to migrants? If yes, please provide a representative list of partners.

4. Has the National Society undertaken an examination of border control policies within its country to determine if they provide adequate guarantees to safeguard the safety, well-being, dignity and, if necessary, protection of migrants? If yes, what were the principal findings of such examinations?

5. Has the National Society undertaken any specific actions to combat xenophobia and stigmatisation of migrants? If yes, please provide examples of such actions.

The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC)’s Policy on Migration underlines that National Societies shall undertake sustained efforts to ensure that migrants have access to humanitarian assistance, essential services, and legal support; and they shall strive to obtain effective and unconditional access to all migrants, irrespective of their legal status. The wording of the Policy also emphasises that humanitarian access is not limited to material assistance, but to a broad range of concerns. It states that the degree to which migrants have access to assistance, services and legal support is a key criterion in assessing their vulnerability.

The overwhelming majority of National Societies provide some form of humanitarian services to migrants but many include migrants in general humanitarian support programmes when needed rather than specifically developing targeted migrant programmes. Humanitarian services target migrants irrespective of their status and at all stages of the migration process—asylum seekers and boat arrivals in reception centres, returnees before and after return, resettled refugees, undocumented migrants in need, unaccompanied and separated minors, disaster victims, trafficking victims, and others. Help ranges from emergency basic needs assistance (food, shelter, non-food items) to health and mental health services, as well as support and counselling for voluntary return and re-integration, and legal counselling and referral. Another key program is Restoring Family Links, which assists displaced individuals in reconnecting with family members.

National Societies cope with internal and international human movement elicited by environmental disasters and internal conflict or instability, such as recent activity to assist fleeing Ivoirians into Liberia through the National Societies of Burkina Faso, Ghana, Guinea-Conakry, and Mali. The IFRC prepositioned emergency relief stocks and is carrying out water and sanitation activities through the rehabilitation and construction of water points and latrines. Volunteers were also trained to provide education on good hygiene and sanitation in the host communities in Liberia.

The Colombian Red Cross also provides humanitarian and reintegration assistance to refugees and displaced persons, as does Croatia, which has run programming since the year 2000 to cope with post-Dayton Accords returnees.
Their efforts provide humanitarian assistance and community services to vulnerable returnees in Croatia during their reintegration process. The project is focused on creating basic conditions for sustainable return as well as increasing the capacity of local communities to reintegrate the most vulnerable returnee families.

In transit states, National Societies are dealing with receiving vulnerable migrants and their short-term humanitarian needs, as well as informing migrants about conditions in receiving states and their legal rights to international protection and other benefits. Malta, for example, is located at a major crossing point for Sub-Saharan African migrants seeking safety and a better life in the European Union (EU). In Malta, the National Society organises English courses for asylum seekers and helps them access services as well as assists them in the job search. In Belize, the national society has actively stepped in to protect vulnerable migrants in detention. With UNHCR’s help, the National Society supported the international protection rights of a group of Cuban families being held by Belize police forces by going to the defence forces camp where the detention was taking place, and ensuring that migrants were given adequate medical attention, food, water, and contact with family. The Mexican Red Cross, supported by the ICRC is also actively assisting migrants in border zones and those injured in the migration process, notably by providing medical services and advice through mobile clinics. A similar medical clinic project supported by the ICRC is being run by the Guatemalan Red Cross on the Mexican border. The ICRC also coordinates the “cadena humanitaria” (humanitarian chain), an ambulance service with the National Societies of the region, to assist sick or injured migrants stranded at the borders. The ICRC also supports a project for amputee migrants by giving raw material and expert training for orthoprotesists. The ICRC is working with the families of missing migrants in Thiaroye sur Mer, close to Dakar in Senegal, to address the consequences of migrants disappearing in their attempts to reach Europe. The ICRC assists family members who are left behind to rebuild
their lives and secure death certificates for their loved ones, and works with North African National Societies to search for missing migrants.

In destination states, many programmes seek to assist migrants and refugees in their reception, often in partnership with national governments. European National Societies have agreements with national governments to run asylum seeker reception and/or resettlement services, such as in Denmark, Belgium, Austria and Iceland.

For over 10 years, the Austrian Red Cross has been operating ACCORD, the Movement’s only Country of Origin and Asylum Research and Information Service. The purpose of this activity is to provide all parties of the asylum procedure with objective, relevant, up to date and independently researched information about the countries of origin of asylum seekers, thereby improving the quality and efficiency of the asylum procedure and the decisions. In addition to answering individual requests from asylum authorities, asylum seekers, their representatives and NGOs, ACCORD also operates www.ecoi.net, an internet platform which currently contains detailed country of origin information about more than 160 countries.

Some National Societies such as Spain, Sweden and Switzerland are also assisting vulnerable migrants in returning to their home countries, either by providing travel assistance, providing consultation and counselling, and/or following up in the home country, sometimes in partnership with National Societies there.

Sometimes assistance may be temporary in response to a sudden arrival of migrants, such as the Romanian Red Cross’ support of thirty-eight Burmese refugees resettled from Malaysia, while other National Societies have established long-term projects and developed strong ties to national governments as auxiliary providers of much needed services.

An activity that spans the entire migratory trail is Restoring Family Links (RFL). The 2007 RFL Strategy for the Movement reiterates the commitment of the Movement’s components to undertake RFL activities whenever required.

Kenya Red Cross Society is working in the host community in and around Dadaab, an area where the number of refugees outnumbers the locals. The camp is at this time giving refuge for some 440,000 people, and every day 1200-1600 new refugees arrives. ICRC and KRCS running a Family Links-service (tracing service) in the Dadaab-camps. Many refugees loose contact with their families when on the move.
Melania Tumaini and Helena Ntamakiriro, with her son Niyonyishu Ezekiel, are reunited in Melbourne, Australia. The two sisters hadn’t seen each other since they were separated in the violent civil war that tore through Burundi in 1993. Melania spent 11 lonely years in a Tanzanian refugee camp, before migrating to Australia in 2005. Through Red Cross’ tracing service, Melania recently found her mother, three brothers and two sisters living in another Tanzanian refugee camp.

and for as long as needed, to help people whose loved ones are unaccounted for or who are separated from their families as a consequence of specific situations involving population movement such as international migration. The need for a more uniform and systematic way of carrying out migration-related RFL activities in the countries of origin, transit and destination led to the development by the ICRC of new guidelines on the matter (Guidelines on providing RFL services to persons separated as a result of Migration (2010)).

A recent example of the humanitarian value of tracing involved a boat with a group of irregular migrants that capsized while crossing the river Tisa on the border between Serbia and Hungary. A number of bodies were recovered but some of the passengers remained unaccounted for. Shortly afterwards, relatives of one of the missing migrants requested the Netherlands Red Cross for help in ascertaining his fate. With the assistance of the Hungarian Red Cross and the Red Cross of Serbia, the Netherlands Red Cross established the migrant’s whereabouts and communicated the information to his family in the Netherlands.

In April 2009, a number of migrants from Bangladesh, hoping to reach Thailand and a better life, were found stranded on small boats in the Bay of Bengal. They were taken by the Indian Navy to the Andaman Islands in India. During the long period spent at sea, they could not contact their families who had remained in Bangladesh. The Bangladesh Red Crescent Society collected Red Cross Messages (RCM) from the migrants’ families; the Indian Red Cross Society, together with the ICRC, managed to visit the migrants and distribute the RCMs. With the assistance of the Family Links Network, the families in Bangladesh were able to send official documents, such as copies of identity cards, birth records and citizenship certificates.

The relevance of the Movement’s Family Links network was clearly demonstrated at the onset of the 2011 Libya crisis, when tens of thousands of foreigners, mainly migrant workers and unregistered migrants fled violence and conflict. RFL services were put in place to help migrants restore and maintain
family contacts. Often, RFL services were combined with other humanitarian services offered to migrants such as camp management, health services, transportation, food security interventions, and water and sanitation activities. The National Societies of Tunisia, Egypt, Algeria, Chad and Niger and the ICRC offered over 120,000 telephone calls to persons arriving at their border.

Similar services were offered by National Societies and ICRC delegations of several countries of origin (Philippines, Indonesia, Guinea, Gambia, Turkey, among others), receiving migrants chartered back home by their authorities or the International Organization for Migration (IOM). As an example, the Bangladesh Red Crescent, with the support of the ICRC, established a Service Centre with Medical & RFL teams at Dhaka International Airport in March 2011, for Bangladeshi returnees from Libya. Supported by volunteers, the Dhaka Service Centre provided medical/ambulance services to about 1700 returnees, mobile phone service to more than 12,500 returnees, and 12 were persons located following request for tracing received from families in Bangladesh.
Through a presence at the Libyan border, the ICRC and the Egyptian Red Crescent helped consular missions establishing travel documents for 3225 persons and the ICRC established directly travel documents for 27 persons. In reaction to the crisis, the Maltese Red Cross stepped up its tracing services for migrants reaching the Island. The Italian Red Cross started offering RFL services in Lampedusa and in Crotone.

In some cases, RFL is a bridge to engaging in other assistance and protection activities for migrants. For example, the British Red Cross signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the UK Border Agency to provide RFL in Immigration Removal Centres. From the British Red Cross’s perspective, the MoU “also allows for a constructive and confidential dialogue between UK Border Agency officials and the British Red Cross in respect of issues of humanitarian concern affecting individual and broader policy issues.” RFL services are also combined with other humanitarian services offered to migrants such as camp management, health services, transportation, food security interventions, and water and sanitation activities in reception centres.
In 1990 Isha Munya fled war-torn Somalia with her husband and five children. In a heartbreaking separation she had to leave her eldest daughter Faduma in Somalia with her own mother, Akrabo. For eight years Isha lived in neighbouring Kenya moving between four different refugee camps. In 1998 she, her husband and their children, set off for Australia to start a new life in Adelaide, safe from conflict. However, Isha bore the burden of being separated from her daughter and mother. In 2006, Isha contacted Red Cross in Adelaide and a case was opened to trace her daughter and mother. Through the Red Cross global network people all over the world who are torn from loved ones by war, conflict or disaster can access the Red Cross International Tracing Service to try and locate and send messages to people. Isha’s search was successful. Through Red Cross’ tracing service, she found her mother, and daughter, and they were able to send each other messages. Eventually, in 2009, Faduma migrated to Australia and was reunited with Isha. “It was the happiest day,” says Isha. “It was so emotional, you could feel it in the air. I saw Faduma come off the plane. I couldn’t hold my tears back.” Isha continues to communicate with her mother through Red Cross and hangs on to the hope that she might one day see her again.
Although many National Societies are engaged in a range of activities on behalf of vulnerable migrants, few National Societies have comprehensive programs to address all humanitarian needs. They and the migrants they serve face significant barriers to establishing programmes of assistance and protection that reach all vulnerable migrants at all stages of the migratory experience. The following sections are organised around four principal challenges: access of National Societies to migrants; gaps in humanitarian assistance and protection related to governmental policies; issues of discrimination, exclusion and violence; and partnerships between National Societies and other organisations working with or on behalf of vulnerable migrants. Each section discusses barriers to effective action and presents examples of programmes undertaken by National Societies to overcome these barriers.

Access of National Societies to vulnerable migrants

The IFRC Policy on Migration underlines that National Societies shall undertake sustained efforts to ensure that migrants have access to humanitarian assistance, essential services, and legal support; and they shall strive to obtain effective and unconditional access to all migrants, irrespective of their legal
status. The Policy also emphasises that humanitarian access is not limited to material assistance, but to a broad range of concerns. Despite the wide range of activities described above, National Societies often have limited access to provide social, health and education services to migrants in destination and transit countries, with those labelled as ‘illegal’ or ‘irregular’ often lacking access to even the most basic humanitarian assistance.

Barriers resulting from legislation or administrative decisions by government authorities restrict the eligibility of migrants for many services. In some countries there are legal provisions which penalise the provision of humanitarian aid to such individuals or groups. Barriers resulting from legislation or administrative decisions by government authorities restrict the eligibility of migrants for many services. In some countries there are legal provisions which penalise the provision of humanitarian aid to such individuals or groups. Even when there are no specific legal provisions that specifically bar National Societies from providing humanitarian assistance or protection activities, more general policies that limit eligibility to provide assistance pertain to National Societies along with other actors. For example, Section 120 (3) 2 of the Austrian Aliens’ Police Act includes administrative fines for anyone who consciously facilitates the residence of an unauthorised foreigner on the territory of an EU member state. Several US states and localities have also passed legislation that makes it illegal to harbour or transport persons who are illegally in the United States. Several country survey responses noted that they have access to migrants, but access is often mediated by government forces and their discretion to permit Red Cross intervention. Access may be limited in terms of when or how often the Red Cross staff can access detention facilities, or at what stage in the migration process they have access to individuals.1

In other cases, migrants are not informed by authorities that they can seek services from National Societies where these are available. Even when access is allowed, resources and information may be limited, and it may be illegal to spend public funds on support for migrants. The fiscal crisis in many countries has led to cuts in social protection programs affecting particularly vulnerable populations, including migrants. Migrants, irrespective of their legal status, may have serious need for assistance in order to cope with low incomes, health problems, poor housing, educational barriers and other problems they encounter as they migrate. Some of these needs may be acute, particularly if migrants have been victimised by smugglers or traffickers, have pre-existing health, mental health or nutrition problems related to conflict, food insecurity or other conditions they fled, or have endured long and dangerous journeys to reach their destinations. The potential exposure of migrants to tuberculosis, HIV/AIDS and other diseases makes it particularly important to ensure appropriate screening and treatment in reception facilities and detention centres as well as in communities, though this type of screening should not be used as criteria for their removal. Migrants may also be in need of help in finding family members separated by the events precipitating their departure or during migration itself.

Some National Societies are using their privileged access to governments to advocate for change and improved institutions and laws to regulate immigration and asylum seeking, as a form of humanitarian diplomacy. The Norwegian Red Cross was instrumental, for example, in advocating for a change in national legislation that decriminalised humanitarian assistance.

---

1 A number of these laws are under court review at present.
to all migrants regardless of legal status. The Austrian Red Cross regularly takes part in consultation procedures concerning revisions of Austria’s asylum and aliens’ legislation, advocating in favour of migrants’ rights and issuing public statements on behalf of vulnerable migrants if necessary.

Many National Societies do not have sufficient funds, however, to organise migration-oriented programming, though they attempt to serve migrants as part of their humanitarian work, or organise emergency responses to crises and inflows (such as Somali Red Crescent providing first aid to Ethiopian refugees following a bomb blast). National Societies in Cyprus, Indonesia, Nepal, Guinea, Zimbabwe, Mauritania, and the Ivory Coast all report providing some programming targeted to migrant needs but requiring more funding to support efforts. The Ivory Coast Red Cross made a similar note about the support of the Spanish and French Red Cross for projects to improve social cohesion and decrease intergroup tensions. Funding was cited as a barrier by National Societies in Hungary, Ukraine, and Greece, the latter of which notes that delays in receiving funds from the European Union hamper their work to support unaccompanied minors and refugee integration.

Another major barrier to accessing migrants is gaining their trust to seek out help. Fear of deportation, fear of public authorities, and fear of discrimination and violence keeps many vulnerable migrants in the shadows rather than seeking assistance. Many survey responses mentioned this issue, including the Central Asian project report which noted that “Often in the country of destination irregular migrants are reluctant to contact the Red Crescent for fear of being discovered, detained, deported or returned by state authorities, and because of language barrier. To overcome this problem, the National Society of Kazakhstan has continued wide public campaigns, the staff [has] visited places where migrants presumably were employed and distributed leaflets about the Red Crescent activities to raise awareness among beneficiaries and partners.” This sort of proactive outreach to migrants, at their places of work and recreation, and cooperation with trusted organisations and migrants is essential to accessing hard-to-reach populations.

The Portuguese Red Cross reported successfully surmounting this challenge, noting that their projects in an expanding number of cities to inform, to advise and to assist migrants have gained the trust of the community in contrast to border services or the police, which migrants view with great suspicion. This reflects Red Cross’ special position in being able to access vulnerable populations that may otherwise go untreated and ignored.

Gaps in assistance and protection of migrants

Barriers to migrants’ access to humanitarian assistance and protection exist at each phase of the migration cycle and along the entire migratory trail. Many of these barriers emanate from governmental policies that seek to avert or deter irregular movements of people across international borders. All countries have the right and responsibility to determine who can enter their territories. They also have obligations to ensure that these decisions are made in a manner that is consistent with international human rights and refugee law. International migration, particularly what is referred to as ‘mixed migration’ of asylum seekers and economic migrants, presents challenges to States that have a dual policy aim: to avert clandestine movements of people across borders and to
Protect individuals from harm, particularly those who are fleeing persecution and other serious harm. The Global Migration Group, representing UN agencies, the IOM and the World Bank, notes: “Too often, States have addressed irregular migration solely through the lens of sovereignty, border security or law enforcement, sometimes driven by hostile domestic constituencies…. The irregular situation which international migrants may find themselves in should not deprive them either of their humanity or of their rights.” This section discusses three mechanisms that pose particular problems for migrants and affect the ability of National Societies to provide humanitarian and protection services: interception policies to avert the arrival of persons, including asylum seekers that are looking to gain entry to the territory of a state; detention of those who reach the territory; and inappropriate or premature repatriation.

Policies to Avert or Intercept Migrants

Governments often anticipate departures, particularly during conflict, natural disasters or other crises, and establish policies to deter or intercept migrants leaving countries of origin or transit. A common response has been to impose visa requirements when there is potential for large scale departures. Visas are used to screen out those who purport to be coming as tourists or business travellers but who intend to stay for longer periods. Air and other carriers have the responsibility to check that international travellers have proper documentation before they are permitted to board the plane or ship. Imposition of visa requirements and carrier sanctions generally affect would be economic migrants and refugees alike.

In the absence of legal alternatives that would allow them to gain access to the territory of potential transit and destination countries, migrants may attempt to gain entry clandestinely, across land borders and by sea. In turn, governments often seek to deter the clandestine movements and prevent the migrants from reaching their territory. The United States, Australia and countries in the European Union have intercepted boats that were headed for their shores. Interception is not limited to the developed countries. In 1996, for example, Cote d’Ivoire officials denied entry to a boat, the Bulk Challenge, carrying several thousand Liberian refugees.

In many cases, intercepted boats are unseaworthy and pose a danger to the migrants. This issue has arisen in stark form in response to boat departures from North Africa towards European shores. According to the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), about 20,000 Libyans and 24,000 Tunisians reached southern Europe, with most landing in Malta and Italy. As stated by UNHCR, “the number of lives lost at sea will never be known.” The question arises, however, as to what happens to those who are intercepted on the high seas or at borders. In its recommendations to the European Union, UNHCR has noted, “That migratory flow needs to be addressed, but should not be allowed to deflect attention from the obligation of EU Member States to provide international protection to those in need of it. Nor should the reality of mixed flows deflect from the fundamental obligation to rescue those in distress at sea, and to disembark them in a place of safety where their need for international protection can be properly assessed.”

---


3 UNHCR, UNHCR’s Recommendations to Poland for its EU Presidency, available at http://www.unhcr.org/4df8d00f9.html
One option that governments have used in trying to balance deterrence and protection is to establish off-shore reception/detention facilities for those who are intercepted. The United States, for example, used Guantanamo Naval Base in the 1990s to house Haitians and Cubans, rather than returning them into unsettled conditions or permitting them to enter U.S. territory. Most Haitians returned home after President Aristide was restored to office. Most of the Cubans eventually entered the United States but only after the negotiation of a migration agreement between the US and Cuba that restricted boat departures and established some new mechanisms to apply for admission to the US directly from Cuba.

Australia enacted legislation that designated Christmas Island as an ‘excised offshore’ location for processing boat arrivals. Under current policy, “People who arrive unauthorised at an excised offshore place and seek to engage Australia’s protection obligations under the Refugees Convention are prevented by the Migration Act 1958 from lodging a visa application. They are, however, able to have their protection claims examined by the [Department of Immigration] under the non-statutory Refugee Status Assessment (RSA) process.” Migrants are provided legal representation in helping them prepare their claims and are able to appeal a negative finding to an independent reviewer who advises the minister, but they do not have access to the judicial appeals process available to those who apply for asylum on the mainland.4

---

In other cases, governments attempt to deter arrivals by establishing agreements with third countries. In 2010, the European Union signed an agreement with Libya aimed at deterring movements of irregular migrants across the Mediterranean. Under the agreement, the EU would support “Libya in its efforts aimed at establishing a protection system able to deal with asylum seekers and refugees in line with international standards and in good cooperation with the competent international organisation.” The EU would also assist Libyan authorities “in screening migrants in order to identify those in need of international protection and in addressing the burden represented both by the recognised refugees and the unsuccessful asylum seekers, and which would consist in resettling some of the recognised refugees towards EU Member States, in supporting the voluntary return of some of the unsuccessful asylum seekers back to their country of origin, as well as in enhancing the reception capacities offered in Libya to asylum seekers and refugees.”

Building reception capacity in third countries by no means guarantees protection to migrants, particularly those seeking asylum. As early as 2005, the European Council on Refugees and Exiles (ECRE) raised serious concerns about shifting responsibility for refugee determinations to a country that was known to have committed massive human rights violations and had no track record of refugee protection: “Libya is not a signatory to the 1951 Refugee Convention, it has no adequate system for dealing with asylum seekers and refugees, UNHCR has no official status, groups of illegal immigrants are expelled without any

---

5 Some governments have also entered into agreements with countries of origin and transit to promote economic development and provide technical cooperation to help manage migration flows. See Appendix B for additional information about the linkages between migration and development.
individual assessment of any asylum claim, and conditions in reception centres are extremely poor.”

Many countries have adopted the general principle in their asylum laws that the first country to which a refugee flees should be the one in which he or she seeks asylum. This is often qualified when an asylum seeker is trying to join family members in a particular safe country. This principle was initially developed by EU member states to prevent asylum seekers from “shopping” for asylum: being denied in one country, trying again in another European state. The Dublin Regulation and Schengen Implementation Treaty established rules to identify the country responsible for proceeding to the one and only asylum determination on behalf of all signatories, a determination that all other signatories then pledge to respect. The United States and Canada have negotiated a country of first asylum agreement as well. A variation on these practices is the safe third country principle under which a destination country may remove an asylum seeker to a country in which he or she would find protection from refoulement to the country of origin.

Although such agreements do not necessarily violate the letter or spirit of the Refugee Convention, as a report prepared for UNHCR indicated, “UNHCR has repeatedly stressed that the 1951 Convention prohibits not only direct refoulement to the country of origin, but also indirect, or “chain,” refoulement to third countries that in turn will refoule to the country of origin. The European Commission, the Council of Europe, and the U.K. House of Lords have all endorsed that proposition.” UNHCR has established a minimum set of criteria

---

to determine whether removal to a country of first asylum or safe third country
is in accordance with international law: “These included the third country’s
ratification of, and compliance with “the international refugee instruments”
(especially non-refoulement) and “international and regional human rights
instruments,” as well as the third country’s willingness to “accept returned
asylum seekers and refugees,” provide a fair asylum determination with sus-
pensive effect, “and provide effective and adequate protection.”9

These are very minimal criteria, however, that do not necessarily mean that
a refugee will have the same access to protection in the third country as
in the country from which he or she is removed. The assumption of these
policies is that all of states involved in a country of first asylum or safe third
country agreement use the same standards in their refugee determination
procedures. However these agreements often mask significant differences in
national practice, especially with regards to assessing asylum claims. A recent
European Court of Human Rights case involving transfer of an asylum seeker
from Belgium to Greece held Greece to be in “violation […] of Article 13 taken
in conjunction with Article 3 of the Convention because of the deficiencies
in the asylum procedure followed in the applicant’s case and the risk of his
expulsion to Afghanistan without any serious examination of the merits of his
asylum application and without any access to an effective remedy.”10 Moreover,
even if the countries use the same standard for their refugee determination
procedures, they may differ in the type of complementary protection that is
provided to persons who do not meet the 1951 Convention definition but have
other grounds to fear return.

Some National Societies have engaged with governments in finding solutions
within their own territory that better balance migration management and
migrant protection. The Norwegian Red Cross, for example, has examined
and raised issues of border control policies with Norwegian authorities. A cen-
tral issue has been the government’s requirement that asylum seekers must
present documentation upon arrival. The Norwegian Red Cross has argued
that asylum seekers and refugees must not face the same documentation
requirements as other migrants. The Belgian Red Cross (BRC) has also advo-
cated on behalf of migrants, in September 2010, by sending a white paper to
the Belgium government to denounce the lack of reception structures and
the absence of social help for the asylum seekers that have been left on the
streets or in hostels without any counselling. The BRC has asked successfully
for the creation of reception places in Belgium. The BRC runs fifteen reception
centres for asylum seekers (Francophone) with 3,098 slots, a special centre for
asylum seekers facing psychological difficulties, and three emergency centre
“camps” with 1,295 slots. The Belgian Red Cross, together with a group of NGOs,
participates in regular meetings with the authorities in charge of migrants to
analyse and comment on the latest developments.

Other National Societies provide important services to asylum seekers and
vulnerable migrants whom governments admit into their territory. The Danish
Red Cross has been running reception centres for asylum seekers for 20 years.
All asylum-seekers in Denmark are accommodated in seven centres run by
the Danish Red Cross national branch asylum department (under State fund-
ing) and two municipalities. National Societies can also take over when state
funding ends. This is the case of the Bulgarian Red Cross which, in partnership

9  Ibid.
10  CASE OF M.S.S. v. BELGIUM AND GREECE available at http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/topic,4
565c2251d,459e72562,4d39bc7f2,0.html
with the state refugee service, assists refugees leaving state’s reception centres by helping them find housing, which is usually difficult to access due to landlords’ stigmatisation of migrants. The Swedish Red Cross programme focuses on the psycho-social health of victims of torture, and the French, Austrian and Hellenic Red Cross programmes focus on the particular needs of unaccompanied minors (UAMs).

The Swedish Red Cross has developed a project, largely funded by the European Refugee Fund, which is seeking to improve the asylum process through a focus on gender sensitivity, targeting migration officials, border police, and immigration lawyers to increase awareness of gender-specific phenomena in determining refugee status. The project uses workshops and training kits as methodological tools. The main goal of the project is to improve the refugee status determination process for women and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) individuals. Furthermore, the project is seeking to create and/or strengthen gender networks in each of the partner organisations.

The Hellenic Red Cross is advocating for access to education through a large-scale research project. The study focuses on the access of asylum-seeker youths (15-18 year olds) to public education. The project includes collection of information and best practices, development and implementation of a methodological tool to reach minor asylum seekers, and workshops and dissemination of the findings to participants in the three countries as well as the European Commission.

The Icelandic Red Cross published a report in 2010 mapping human trafficking in Iceland. The Spanish Red Cross conducted a study with the Mauritanian Red Crescent to interview 5,700 migrants intercepted on the Mauritanian coast and seeking to reach Europe. The study disproved many of the most common expectations of immigrant youths who arrive illegally in Spain by sea.

Detention

Detention of migrants is used globally. It is a mechanism to ensure that migrants do not abscond while steps are taken to verify their identity and determine if they are deportable, but also as a mean for deterring future arrivals onto the territory of a state. Detention of non-citizens is generally considered to be an administrative matter. Most governments set a specific limit on the number of days that people can be administratively detained but they may specify exceptions. Mexico, for example, limits administrative detention to 90 days but provides exceptions for 1) those involving criminal prosecution; 2) when authorities are unable to identify the person; 3) when it is impossible to secure travel and identification documents; 4) when more time is necessary to secure documents from the relevant consulate; 5) when there are no available itineraries for deporting the person; 6) when a third country prohibits the transit of foreigners; 7) in cases involving a legal challenge to the deportation; 8) when the person suffers from specified mental or physical disabilities or disease.11

As an enforcement tool, detention has been critiqued on a number of fronts, including on both practical and humanitarian bases. The cost of detention is significantly higher in financial and human costs than alternatives that enable

---

11 The 2001 Acuerdo por el que se emiten las normas para el funcionamiento de las estaciones migratorias del Instituto Nacional de Migración (Agreement to Establish Norms for the Functioning of the Migration Centres of the National Migration Institute (Executive Order))
migrants to be released into the community. A US-based study comparing various models designed to ensure that migrants adhere to the rules of their release, including their appearance at hearings determining the necessity of their removal, found a high level of compliance in programs that set clear rules and reporting requirements, while highlighting that such options have lower costs than detention.\textsuperscript{12} UNHCR has identified a number of potential alternatives, including the use of bonds or assurances, community-based supervised release or case management, designated residence at a particular accommodation centre, electronic tagging or reporting, or satellite tracking, and home curfews.\textsuperscript{13}

Conditions in detention are a significant area of concern. A 2011 study by Médecins sans Frontières (MSF) of Greek detention centres found that “inhumane living and hygiene conditions in migrants’ detention facilities in Evros region are causing major health concerns for detained migrants. According to MSF medical data, more than 60 percent of the medical problems faced by detained migrants are directly caused by or linked to the degrading conditions in which they are being held.”\textsuperscript{14} Such problems amplify as time in detention increases. A 2011 report of the Inter American Commission on Human Rights on detention in the United States reported: “There are two main causes of the chronically inadequate medical care of immigration detainees: a medical system designed for treatment of short-term emergencies; and the fact that the clinics of the detention centres are not adequately staffed and constantly up against the problem of retaining sufficient qualified personnel, due in part to the remote location of a number of the detention centres.” In 2009, the National Human Rights Commission of Korea (NHRCK) concluded that South Korea was in violation of several international treaties\textsuperscript{15} during the arrest and detention process of irregular migrants in South Korea (NHRCK 2009).

Detention also impinges on the ability of migrants to contest orders of removal, including through the asylum system. A recent report by Human Rights Watch noted the high number of transfers of detained migrants in the United States from one facility to another. While recognising that operational factors might require some transfers (for example, when migrants must appear at their proceedings), the report raised serious questions about the impact on the ability of migrants to find and retain representation: “Many volunteer or pro bono attorneys must withdraw from a case because representation across such large distances becomes impossible. In addition, many detainees cannot find an attorney prior to transfer. Their chances of securing representation are often worse in their new locations: the largest numbers of interstate transfers go to Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas, states that collectively have the worst ratio of transferred immigrant detainees to immigration attorneys in the country (510 to 1).”\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{15} Article 9 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 9 Paragraph 2 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and Article 10 of the U.N. Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment
The use of jails and prisons to confine migrants and asylum seekers is another problem. A number of human rights groups in South Africa have reported “abuses being committed at police station lock ups, including summary deportation of asylum seekers, physical abuse, long term detention, the detention of minors, inadequate food provisions, among other allegations,” according to the Global Detention Project. The mixing of migrants and asylum seekers with individuals who have been incarcerated on criminal grounds is a further concern when these facilities are used for immigration related detention. Corruption also prevails in some detention facilities; Human Rights Watch reported that in some countries, migrants have paid bribes of around USD $500 to officials to be released. According to one detainee, “The police said they would deport us, but then they took us to pay money to smugglers to take us to Tripoli. Those without money stayed in Kufra. I paid. Everything depends on money.”

The detention of children is an issue of significant concern. Unaccompanied and separated minors as well as children apprehended by immigration authorities with their parents are subject to detention in a number of countries. In Malaysia, for example, the Global Detention Project reports, “Immigration Regulation leaves the segregation of detainees according to age or sex to the discretion of the officer in charge of the immigration detention depot. While immigration detention regulation foresees that children under 12 may remain with a parent in detention, no special provisions exist for adolescents or unaccompanied minors. In June 2007, a government delegation reported that 360 children were being held in immigration depots with their mothers.”

Even in countries that have official bars on detention of children, finding acceptable alternatives has proved to be challenging. In 2010, the United Kingdom announced it would no longer detain children, but critics have noted that the alternative, “pre-departure accommodation”, appears to serve the same function as detention.

A number of National Societies have reached agreement with their governments which allow visits to detention centres for the purpose of identifying vulnerabilities and needs. National Societies in transit and receiving states provide humanitarian assistance and legal advice to detainees and advocate for their protection. The Australian project on Community Detention is a notable example of the above mentioned services (see sidebar). The Croatian Red Cross is providing psycho-social support and humanitarian aid to vulnerable asylum seekers and irregular migrants through visits to the detention centre, as are the Ecuadoran Red Cross, the Norwegian Red Cross, and the Estonian Red Cross. The Bahamas Red Cross pays a weekly visit to the Detention Centre to provide basic needs such as hygiene kits, books, clothing and footwear, bedding, etc. The Armenian Red Cross is monitoring border crossing points and the airport and providing training for border guards on the Law on Refugees and Asylum. The French Red Cross presence at Roissy Charles de Gaulle airport also seeks to ensure that international protection is provided at transit points. As part of the Canadian Red Cross’ Detention Monitoring Programme, the

**NATIONAL SOCIETY HIGHLIGHT**

**Australian Red Cross: Detention-Related Activities**

- Memorandum of Understanding with the Australian Government gives access to all people in immigration detention.
- Monitoring of all Immigration Detention facilities
- Humanitarian assistance to asylum seekers and people with unresolved visa status, who meet certain eligibility criteria related to their vulnerabilities (mental or physical health issues, issues with children etc)
- Under the Community Detention Program, with Red Cross as the Lead Agency, working with 25 partners in the not-for-profit sector to provide support services to clients. Partners are primarily providing assistance for 24/7 care for unaccompanied minors, including day to day care (but excluding guardianship).

---

20 [http://www.globaldetentionproject.org/countries/europe/united-kingdom/introduction.html](http://www.globaldetentionproject.org/countries/europe/united-kingdom/introduction.html)
National Society has access to all persons (regardless of their status) detained under the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act at detention facilities under the control and management of the Canadian Border Services Agency.

Inappropriate and premature repatriation

The principle of return in safety, dignity and with prospects for the future is central to all return activities.21 “Return in safety” means that return takes place in conditions of legal safety and physical and material security. “Return in dignity” means that return is undertaken, as a rule, without the use of force (any use of coercive measures must be kept to a minimum and undertaken in a manner consistent with internationally recognised human rights standards); that no one is arbitrarily separated from family members; and that returnees are treated with respect and full acceptance by their national authorities.22 Guidelines developed by the Platform for European Red Cross Co-operation on Refugee and Migrant Affairs (PERCO) also emphasise that attention should be given to the returnee’s prospects for the future, which means that authorities instituting return should also ensure that effective reintegration measures are in place. Too often, however, repatriation is neither safe nor dignified and returnees have few prospects for future economic or social reintegration.

The decisions in late 2010 and early 2011 made by the United States, Dominican Republic and other government authorities to resume deportations to Haiti despite continuing devastation from the 2010 earthquake and outbreak of cholera raised serious concerns about the safety of the returnees. The UN High Commissioner for Refugees and UN High Commissioner for Human Rights launched a joint appeal in June 2011 asking governments to cease such returns.

Repatriation in central and southern Africa is a further case in point. Since September 2009, authorities from Angola and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) have engaged in the expulsion of thousands of the other’s nationals from their respective territories, including migrants with irregular status, refugees and asylum seekers. Findings from the Angola Red Cross (CVA)23 rapid assessment team indicated that returnees “were precipitously apprehended and expelled, thus leaving them destitute and separating families, many of whom have lived as refugees in the DRC since the colonial war of 1961 and through the internal conflict in Angola that ended in 2002.”24 In some cases, repatriation is triggered by violence against migrants that government authorities may not adequately control. Xenophobic attacks on migrants in South Africa led many Zimbabweans to repatriate precipitously in 2008 and again in 2010 even though conditions in their home country remained problematic.

The mechanisms for return are also problematic. Reports of earlier abuse of returnees led EU Commissioner for Home Affairs, Cecilia Malmström, to recommend “Safeguards [should be] put in place to make sure that return operations are carried out in full respect of fundamental rights. For example,

---

22 Platform for European Red Cross Cooperation on Refugees, Asylum Seekers and Migrants, Return: Policy and Practice: A guide for European National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, 2008
23 Cruz Vermelha de Angola
24 DREF Operation Final Report
an independent monitor shall be present during such operations and report [...] on compliance with EU law.”

Access to returnees is also a problem. Even when migrants have exhausted all avenues of appeal against removal, and there is not a protection issue, there is often little coordination or cooperation among countries of origin, destination and transit in ensuring that returnees are reintegrated into their home communities. National Societies may be unaware that return has taken place. When they are informed, they may not have the capacity to provide assistance. These return cases are particularly problematic when involving especially vulnerable populations such as trafficking victims, unaccompanied or separated minors, and persons with medical conditions or physical or mental handicaps.

Discrimination, Exclusion and Violence

Despite many initiatives and serious attempts from different stakeholders, discrimination, exclusion, and violence remain major humanitarian challenges that cause suffering for millions of people across the world today. Xenophobia and stigmatisation of migrants render it difficult for migrants to gain access to needed assistance and for National Societies to take action on their behalf. Migrants may additionally be subject to various forms of violence throughout their journey.

In a critical report on the disparity between anti-discrimination norms and actual practice in Europe, Amnesty International concluded: “Even three generations down the line, and long after the acquisition of citizenship, millions of members of visible ethnic minorities still face discrimination, disadvantage and exclusion in all areas of life.” The report articulated a number of areas of concern: “discrimination on the grounds of ethnic origin remains widespread in the fields of housing, employment and the access to services, particularly in the private sector. Racist attacks by non-state actors, including by organised nationalist and neo-Nazi groups, continue to be a problem in western Europe.”

and have started occur with alarming frequency in Russia and the Ukraine in the recent years. Racism within law enforcement agencies manifests itself both in the inadequate service and protection extended to members of ethnic minorities who are victims of crime, and in racially motivated abuse and ill-treatment.”30

The European Network against Racism provided examples of policies and practices that often involve the use of racial profiling especially affecting immigrants. These policies are common throughout the world and include:

- “General policing: identity checks, stops and searches of pedestrians on the street, stops and searches of vehicles, disproportionate use of force (such as handcuffing or drawing of weapons) during a stop, sweeps of buses or trains, dispersal of groups of youths on the street, issuing of citations or arrests for petty offences after stops, disproportionate police focus on particular areas or certain types of crimes
- Security and counter-terrorism: mass stop and search, identity checks outside of places of worship (e.g. mosques), raids on places of worship, raids on places of business, surveillance, data-mining based on ethnic or religious criteria, anti-radicalisation policies, arrest and detention, deportations
- Immigration control and asylum decision-making: questioning, searching and detaining of persons at airports and ports, pre-screening and removal of persons from flights, pre-screening and screening of immigration applications, screening of asylum applications, decision-making about immigration and asylum applications, stops aimed at rounding up people for deportation
- Customs: stopping and searching of people and baggage in airports and ports.”31

Stigmatisation of migrants is fuelled when anti-immigrant rhetoric becomes part of political campaigns. As Amnesty International points out: “The rise of

30  Ibid.
31  “Racial Profiling” Fact Sheet 40, Brussels: European Network Against Racism (Oct 2009)
far-right political parties (to positions of power in many countries), and the ubiquity of xenophobic discourse is just the visible tip of the prejudice affecting the daily lives of both long-established ethnic minorities and recent immigrants.32

Xenophobic attacks have also been linked to perceptions of competition between natives and foreigners over scarce resources. The UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Migrants described the 2008 violence against migrants in South Africa as stemming from such concerns: “The tensions were fuelled by the economic crisis, which affected the most vulnerable, and the fierce competition for employment between South African nationals and foreigners, who were seen as “stealing” the few jobs available by accepting lower wages and poor working conditions.”33 Violence becomes a response to competition over resources in the absence of policies that address the needs of all vulnerable populations - local communities and immigrants alike.

Violence, discrimination, stigmatisation, intolerance and exclusion are often a refusal to accept the other’s difference based on fear, ignorance, bias or prejudice. In other cases, they may be a result of tension caused by the uneven distribution of resources among different members of the community. The key to creating social inclusion is to develop an ability within communities and among individuals to deal with these differences, to respect and appreciate diversity rather than reject it, and, importantly, find solutions together to the challenges. Local communities and migrants need to approach differences with an open perspective, i.e. seek to understand where others come from and respect the right to think differently.34

Many National Societies are investing in programmes and campaigns to combat xenophobia and racism, and raise social awareness in the host communities about the migration process, migrants and the challenges they face, and the benefits of diversity and interculturalism. As a best practice example, many National Societies are now implementing the Youth as Agents of Behavioural Change (YABC) initiative which empowers youth to work towards non-discrimination and respect for diversity; violence prevention, mitigation and response; inter-cultural dialogue, gender and social inclusion. Youth do this by developing skills such as active listening, empathy, critical thinking, dropping bias and non-judgement, and non-violent communication. The YABC initiative has recently been used by several National Societies in North Africa in their programmes on migration. The Bulgarian Red Cross also targets children, providing lessons in Sofia schools by which Bulgarian children can meet migrant children and discuss what it means to be a migrant, what difficulties migrant children and their parents face in the host country, and the rights of children.

Some National Societies are working jointly to develop educational tools for children, such as in the Belgian project (in collaboration with the National Society in the Democratic Republic of the Congo) to sensitisie the public about the consequences of return to the country of origin through the creation and dissemination of an educational comic book. The project was an opportunity to open a debate about the multiple consequences of migration, and to raise attention to the vulnerability of migrants and their families. The goal was

34 The IFRC approach to promoting a culture of nonviolence and peace (forthcoming), www.ifrc.org.
above all to begin a debate in the school context and inform the youth about the realities, in the sending and receiving countries. With the help of 10,000 volunteers, 125,000 copies were distributed in the DRC. In Belgium, the comic was used as a teaching tool in the “Neighbourhood Initiatives” such as “Voyage to the other’s country.”

The Austrian Red Cross is also actively working to improve the education as well as the integration of children and youths with migratory background. The newly established ‘Learning Houses’ project aims at supporting migrant children with their homework, to facilitate informal contact with the majority population and to increase the opportunities of young migrants in the Austrian job market.

The Finnish SPIRIT project is one example focused on training authorities at the municipal level, local inhabitants, school personnel and children, to be tolerant of resettled refugees in their communities. The project aims to raise awareness at the community level on refugee reception, both asylum and resettlement, and to make municipalities more open to the reception of refugees. This includes changing negative attitudes towards refugees and dispelling fears of diversity, and increasing tolerance and respect. Government authorities together with Red Cross staff organise trainings in municipalities for decision-makers and local authorities, school personnel, and Red Cross personnel. Another example draws directly on migrants and their potential to foster inclusion: the Netherlands 1001 Strengths programme actively involves migrant women and pairs them with local elderly individuals to encourage social interaction that promotes intercultural dialogue and social inclusion.

The Canadian Red Cross is also investing in a number of public awareness activities related to migrants such as “Story to Tell and a Place for the Telling” speaker series, “Bridges of Hope” refugee events, and the “24-Hour Exile” programme. These activities are aimed at raising awareness about the realities of the lives of refugees to debunk myths and stereotypes. The British Red Cross has led the Positive Images Project with other European partners; this project works with young people to promote greater understanding of needs and contribution of refugees. There is also sensitisation work to improve views of migrants by National Societies in Cape Verde, Mauritania, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, and others.

Using information as an advocacy tool to advance the rights of vulnerable migrants seeking international protection, the British Red Cross recently produced a report on destitution among asylum seekers in the UK and set out a number of proposals as to how this issue could be addressed. The Australian Red Cross did a similar project, entitled “Forgotten Migrants,” seeking to sensitise the public about the tremendous vulnerability of migrants, who not only face challenges in fulfilling basic needs but also live with uncertainty, instability and in constant stress due to the unresolved nature of asylum applications.

Austrian Red Cross together with the Austrian Youth Red Cross is actively supporting the integration and public acceptance of migrants by supporting and implementing projects which aim at presenting positive examples of well-integrated migrants to young people at schools. These activities are supposed to achieve a more favourable public perception of migrants in Austria and to encourage migrant children and youths to take a more active part in Austrian society.

35 “Not gone, but forgotten: the urgent need for a more humane asylum system,” British Red Cross (2010).
National Societies support integration of migrants and refugees to assist them not only in securing their basic needs but also full incorporation and integration - socially, linguistically, and economically - in receiving societies. The Spanish Red Cross Integration Plan for Immigrants, co-financed by the European Social Funds through the Pluri-Regional Operative Programme for the Struggle against Discrimination, as well as different public and private organisations, includes different programmes and projects that share the objective of promoting access to and maintenance in the job market of immigrants both self-employed and employed. All the projects share a common methodology: integral work plans, in which Red Cross specialists work with participants in three large areas: labour orientation, training and preparation, and mediation with firms and employers. Some programmes are directed specifically to immigrant women.

The Finnish Red Cross is taking an innovative approach to addresses the needs of migrants in a non-urban setting in its YES project. The Red Cross Häme district/ Ruovesi Reception Centre for asylum seekers runs the YES project, funded under the European Refugee Fund. The YES project targets asylum seekers living and waiting for decisions at a reception centre and people with residence permits living in a reception centre waiting for a residence in a municipality. The rural environment, new to the phenomenon of immigrant diversity, can prove to be challenging for migrants and asylum seekers, and the project aims to develop a 4-step programme for better integration, increased employment and intensified settlement in rural areas and to create a general model to be used in other similar reception centres. The project aims to prevent marginalisation, improve cultural exchange and interaction using the individual’s own resources to facilitate active citizenship at an early stage of the individuals’ stay in Finland.

Other examples include the Austrian Red Cross’ ‘Integration Flats’ project for refugees, German language courses for migrants, the project ‘Integration through Volunteering’ for young Muslim migrants, the ‘integration buddies’ programme for reunited families and integration counselling for reunited refugee families, a project forthcoming in 2011.

Partnerships in carrying out work and overcoming barriers

In an era of growing complexity and financial constraints, and with ever increasing migratory flows, no one actor has the capacity to engage effectively in protecting vulnerable migrants. In the June 2011 survey taken of Movement activities, National Societies in all parts of the world report providing some programming targeted to migrant needs, but partnerships have been critical to this activity. The survey showed almost universal participation in partnerships, many with national governments, international organisations such as UNHCR, IOM, and others, other non-governmental organisations, and other National Societies, Red Cross networks like PERCO as well as IFRC.

It is recognised internationally that the National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies are auxiliaries to their public authorities in the humanitarian field. While best articulated in conflict situations, and specifically outlined in the Geneva Conventions, this auxiliary role can also extend to a broad range of humanitarian activities including the impact of migration. The 2007 Council of Delegates, attended by all Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, the ICRC...
and the IFRC, reaffirmed the auxiliary role of National Societies in the context of migration.

[The Council of Delegates] Invites National Societies to utilise their capacity as auxiliaries to the public authorities in the humanitarian field to engage in a dialogue with their public authorities to clarify their respective roles relating to the humanitarian consequences of migration, noting that while acting in an auxiliary capacity National Societies will be in a position to base their services strictly on vulnerabilities and humanitarian needs and maintain their independence and impartiality at all times without being drawn into debate on the political, economic and security aspects of migration.36

Many National Societies have good working relationships with ministries within their national governments that have responsibility for migration policies, including Border, Asylum and Immigration Ministries, Foreign Ministries, Interior Ministries, Employment/Labour, Social Protection and Health Ministries, and Human Rights bodies. There is also direct contact with (and sometimes training of) security and border forces as well as immigration and asylum officials. National Societies have relationships with local and provincial governments as well as federal governments, in order to target particular situations, such as the Ecuadoran Red Cross work in the Loja Province to address the migratory flows from Peru on the Ecuadoran border, as well as the arrival of refugees and asylum seekers from Colombia. The Ecuadoran Red Cross in the Loja province is conducting a sensitisation campaign for the native population in the province and plans to create a legal assistance centre. The British Red Cross works in partnership with the police and other voluntary agencies to provide emergency support to victims of trafficking who are discovered through police raids.

Many official contracts and funding channels exist between National Societies and national authorities to manage asylum seeker reception, and humanitarian aid to migrants. These opportunities give the National Societies access to vulnerable populations and funding to support services.

Almost all National Societies report working with either international organisations, most often the UNHCR or IOM. Many National Societies also report working with INGOs (Caritas, Jesuit Refugee Services) and/or domestic NGOs working on human rights, refugee and migrant issues. The Spanish Red Cross highlighted the effectiveness of participation in NGO networks, noting its participation in the ANTIENAS Network since its establishment in July 2011. The network is an assistance service to victims of ethnic-racial discrimination, and its work consists of detection of discrimination, assistance to the victims, and development of training and sensitisation programmes. Eight entities make up the network.

Fewer National Societies reported explicitly partnering with migrants or migrant associations, though this may be quite widespread practice. Contact through migrant organisations provides access to hard-to-reach or fearful migrant populations. This is the case in, for example, Cape Verde, which reports working with various immigrant associations representing migrants from Sao Tome et Principe, Sierra Leone, Guinea Bissau, and others. The German Red Cross established a pilot programme to increase the participation of migrants and migrant associations into Red Cross activities. Local Red Cross branches approached migrants and migrant organisations, sought to include migrants in their voluntary work, and generally improve their social cohesion.

Given the global presence and network of the Movement, the potential for cooperation between National Societies is tremendous. Though there are significant collaborative efforts, more cooperation between the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and governments, as well as collaboration among National Societies, is necessary to fully address the humanitarian challenges of global migration. There has been some successful collaboration on return assistance, which the National Societies have identified as a programming area of special complexity. As of yet, few National Societies in destination countries have sustained contacts with National Societies in the countries of return. As exceptions, the Swedish Red Cross, the Luxembourg Red Cross, and the Spanish Red Cross have implemented or are implementing re-integration or return projects in countries of return. The projects are usually developed by or in consultation with the international co-operation department of the respective National Society. The Mali Red Cross has as main partners the Spanish, the Swiss and the Danish Red Cross Societies and the International Federation. Voluntary return is an option that is considered only in cases where international protection possibilities are not possible or have been exhausted and return is the desired and humanitarian option. National Societies are cognisant that there are sizeable risks if they are seen to be part of government policies to promote or encourage return. They risk losing credibility and trust with migrants’ communities and may reduce their capacity to assist and protect those in need.

There are small-scale or temporary types of collaboration between National Societies, such as Colombia’s working with National Societies in Venezuela, Ecuador, Haiti, Nicaragua, and Panama in reaction to particular events or crises, but there are also many examples of extended cooperation. The Ubuntu Project to collaborate in Southern Africa in response to anti-migrant violence in South Africa in 2008 is seeking to integrate activities regionally in southern Africa – South Africa, Swaziland, Lesotho, and Zimbabwe - to increase the capacity of communities and leaders to cope with the social cohesion problems raised by migration, respond effectively to health emergencies, increase
disaster preparedness, response, and recovery operations, and reduce vulnerabilities in the migrant population.

In the North African region, cooperation between the National Societies in Algeria, Libya, Morocco, and Tunisia is seeking to assist individuals in transit, irregular and clandestine deportees, and migrant-producing communities. The International Federation and National Society partners are implementing integrated regional action, focusing on strengthening cross-border cooperation between Red Crescent Societies in North Africa itself but also on increased dialogue with the National Societies in Sub-Saharan Africa. Efforts will focus on advocating on the issue of migration in communities to foster humanitarian values, supporting targeted responses to migrants in need, and advocacy for protection and integration of those most vulnerable, regardless of immigration status.
Ensuring that the most vulnerable migrants receive assistance and protection, irrespective of their legal status, is an imperative that is in keeping with the humanitarian principles of the Movement and the IFRC Policy on Migration adopted in 2009. The Movement has a special role to play in this regard, given its presence along the migratory routes and the auxiliary role of the National Societies. There is much to celebrate in the wide range of activities in which National Societies are engaged in providing humanitarian assistance, restoring family links, advocating for humane and effective policies, combating xenophobia and stigmatisation of migrants, and promoting respect for diversity, nonviolence, and social inclusion. Nevertheless, much more needs to be done to ensure the safety and security of migrants, many of whom are in extremely dangerous — even life threatening — situations.

Of paramount importance is ensuring that migrants have access to humanitarian assistance and protection, regardless of their legal status. Governments have the right to control their borders. Their actions to manage migration must be consistent with international law, in particular international human rights and refugee law. All parties have an obligation to ensure that the rights of migrants are upheld and to implement policies in a manner that ensures the safety and dignity of migrants.
Despite some progress within some States and National Societies to address the humanitarian needs of vulnerable migrants and to take action against xenophobia and stigmatisation of migrants, there are reasons to be concerned that too many vulnerable migrants live outside conventional health, social and legal systems and for a variety of reasons still do not have access to processes which guarantee respect for their fundamental rights. Few National Societies have comprehensive strategies for addressing these problems, sufficient access needed to respond to the needs of vulnerable migrants, nor the resources to put in place effective programming.

Access to migrants, irrespective of their legal status, is a necessary pre-condition to ensure that National Societies are able to provide humanitarian assistance and, where applicable, protection to vulnerable migrants in their countries. While National Societies are engaged in a range of activities to provide that assistance and protection, there are also significant barriers that impede the humanitarian work of the Movement. It is essential that States, in consultation and cooperation with the National Societies, take further steps to ensure that all laws and procedures are in place to enable National Societies to have effective access to all migrants, irrespective of their legal status.

Problematic border policies and procedures, especially those that might result in denial of access to international protection, unjustified deportation or detention, undermine the safety and security of migrants and impede access to humanitarian assistance and protection. Migrants’ access to conventional health, social, and legal systems within a number of countries and at borders is hampered by certain administrative and legislative measures. Examples include border procedures which compromise and place at risk safety and well-being, procedures which pose difficulties for lodging an asylum application, as well as procedures which do not facilitate fair and efficient status determination resulting in detention of migrants. Within the framework of international laws and norms, States need to do more to ensure that border control procedures include adequate safeguards to guarantee the safety, well-being and dignity of those persons.

Migrants may continue to face a myriad of problems along the whole migratory cycle, i.e. not only upon arrival in the country of destination but also in countries of transit as well as in countries of origin (when they seek to leave or are returned). The prevalence of discrimination, exploitation, exclusion, and violence calls for more intensified and innovative action. Ongoing dialogue between National Societies and their governments on these issues is essential in order to create an enabling and supportive environment for lasting positive social change.

Numerous National Societies have implemented programs to address racism, xenophobia and marginalisation of migrants and promote social cohesion, with some focus moving forward on the incorporation of values and skills based education in formal educational curricula and in non-formal education, as well as the engagement of local and migrant populations (especially youth) in voluntary service or community programmes aimed at increasing community cohesion. Cooperation between Governments, at all levels, and the National Societies would help promote greater respect for diversity, non-violence and social inclusion of migrants and in improving relations between migrant and host communities.
More generally, partnerships are essential to ensure effective responses to the humanitarian needs of vulnerable migrants. States, National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, the International Federation and the ICRC need to continue to build partnerships which strengthen the humanitarian assistance and protection activities for persons negatively affected by migration, respecting the Fundamental Principles of the Red Cross and Red Crescent, and ensuring that such partnerships extend to local, national and international organisations, the private sector and non-governmental organisation.
As early as 1991, the Council of Delegates acknowledged that “migration was a phenomenon that needed to be further addressed by the Movement.” The Council of Delegates returned to the issue in 2001 acknowledging the need to address the vulnerabilities of migrants, particularly those “who did not fall into any of the previously recognised categories (for example, asylum seekers, refugees and internally displaced persons).” Resolution 4 of the 2001 Council of Delegates requested, \textit{inter alia}, that National Societies and their Federation investigate migration. Following on from that resolution, the 6th European Regional Conference, held in Berlin the following year, adopted a comprehensive Plan of Action on migration. The 6th Asia-Pacific Regional Conference (also in 2002) included population movement as a key topic in its Manila Plan of Action as did the 10th Mediterranean Conference, 7th European Conference and the 18th Inter-American Conference. These various meetings reaffirmed the commitment to alleviate the plight of migrants.

In 2007, the Secretary General of the Federation appointed a Special Envoy for Migration. The objective of this appointment was to strengthen the role and position of the International Federation in the field of migration. The 16th Session of the General Assembly, Geneva, Switzerland, 20 – 22 November 2007 requested that the Governing Board establish a Reference Group to provide leadership and guidance and to develop a Federation Policy on Migration.
The Council of Delegates welcomed this decision and highlighted the Movement-wide importance of the humanitarian consequences of migration. The 30th International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent also underlined the humanitarian concerns generated by international migration. Its declaration Together for Humanity elaborated on the issue, acknowledging the role of National Societies in providing humanitarian assistance to vulnerable migrants, irrespective of their legal status.

The Reference Group on Migration, consisting of 17 National Society experts and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), with the support of the Special Representative on Migration and a small team at the Secretariat, held its first discussions on 24 September 2008. A first formal draft of the policy was established, and then reworked at a meeting of the Reference Group on 9 and 10 February 2009. The resulting second draft was shared with all National Societies and Federation zone offices. Some 30 National Societies provided substantive feedback. In parallel, the Special Representative undertook field visits to check the policy against the operational realities. A third draft incorporating the feedback received from National Societies was discussed, amended, and endorsed as the final draft by the Reference Group on 31 March 2009. The Policy on Migration was approved by the Governing Board in its session of May 2009 and endorsed by the IFRC General Assembly in November. Migration issues were included in workshops on Relations with External Actors organised for the whole Movement at the Council of Delegates in November 2009.

The Policy on Migration - developed in close consultation with the ICRC and welcomed by the Council of Delegates in November 2009 - is based on a concept of migration that allows for a direct and consistent focus on humanitarian concerns. This Policy provides guidance for the National Societies on how to most effectively support vulnerable migrants, and the components of the Movement pledged to work together on its implementation. IFRC has also adopted the strategy on violence prevention, mitigation, and response,1 which provides a useful tool to National Societies working with vulnerable migrants who may be subject to various forms of violence.

---

Appendix 2

Causes, Trends and Impacts of International Migration of Relevance to the Work of the Movement

Treguine Refugee Camp, Chad, November 2006.

The number of long-term international migrants (i.e., those residing in foreign countries for more than one year) has grown steadily over the past four decades to an estimated 214 million in 2010.1 The nature of migration dynamics is complex and poses unique challenges for the systems and organisations seeking to ensure human rights and international protection for the most vulnerable. Migration can take place within and across national borders, within regions, and between developing and developed regions. This paper focuses specifically on those who cross international borders but many of the factors contributing to international migration pertain to internal movements as well.

Nature of Migration

International migrants come from all parts of the world and they go to all parts of the world. In fact, few countries are unaffected by international migration.

---

1 UN Population Division, International Migration Stock, see http://esa.un.org/migration/p2kdata.asp. Even with the numbers of international migrants large and growing, it is important to keep in mind that only about three percent of the world’s population has been living outside of their home countries for a year or longer. The propensity to move internationally, particularly in the absence of compelling reasons such as wars, is limited to a small proportion of humans.
Many countries are sources of international flows, while others are net receivers and still others are transit countries through which migrants reach receiving countries. Countries like Mexico experience migration in all three capacities, as source, receiving and transit countries. Overall, the top 10 destination countries are the United States, the Russian Federation, Germany, Saudi Arabia, Canada, the United Kingdom, Spain, France, Australia and India. The top 10 countries of origin for all migrants include Mexico, India, the Russian Federation, China, Ukraine, Bangladesh, Pakistan, the United Kingdom, the Philippines, and Turkey.

The geographic composition is very different for the 16 million international migrants who are officially counted as refugees or asylum seekers by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees or the UN Relief and Works Administration for Palestinian Refugees. Undoubtedly, as discussed below, a larger number of refugees have fled their countries but they have not been so designated by UNHCR or national governments. The leading countries of origin for refugees are: Afghanistan, Iraq, Somalia, Myanmar, Colombia, Sudan, Vietnam, Eritrea and China. The leading countries that host refugees and asylum seekers are Pakistan, Iran, Syria, Germany, Jordan, Kenya, Chad, China, the United States and the United Kingdom.

A disproportionately large impact of hosting refugees is borne by countries in the developing world. According to UNHCR, in 2010, “three quarters of the world’s refugees were residing in a country neighbouring their own.” More specifically, “more than one-third (38%) of all refugees were residing in countries covered by UNHCR’s Asia and Pacific region, with 2.9 million or three-quarters of them being Afghan. Sub-Saharan Africa was host to one-fifth of all refugees, primarily from Somalia (482,500), the Democratic Republic of the Congo (442,200) and Sudan (351,600). The Middle East and North Africa region hosted 18 per cent of the world’s refugees, mainly from Iraq (almost 1.5 million according to Government estimates), while Europe hosted 15 per cent.”

Countries with relatively higher levels of security receive refugees (recognised and otherwise) from nearby countries with lower levels of human security. Oftentimes, however, migrants flee from conflict-ridden and failed states, only to find themselves in almost equally unstable situations, as witnessed by Afghans in Pakistan, Iraqis in Syria and Somalis in Yemen.

A great deal of other migration also is what is referred to as South to South movements. At present, according to the World Bank, “more than 43 percent of the migrants from developing countries are believed to be residing in other developing countries.” The Persian Gulf states and the “economic tigers” of East and Southeast Asia are major destinations for international migrants. Some of the destination countries with the largest share of migrants can be found in this region, including Qatar (with a population that is 86.5 percent foreign-born), the United Arab Emirates (with 70.0 percent foreign-born), and Kuwait (with 68.8 percent foreign-born). Economic hubs in sub-Saharan Africa, such as South Africa and Nigeria, also attract migrants as do such emerging economies of South America as Argentina, Chile and Brazil. Many of these countries have had little experience in hosting migrants. They do not necessarily have policies

or mechanisms in place for protecting refugees and asylum seekers or for ensuring that labour migrants do not face abuses in the labour market. Often, there is a weak civil society with few institutions willing and able to monitor conditions in detention, provide emergency aid to vulnerable migrants, assist migrants in their integration (to the extent that integration is even permitted), or to combat xenophobia and stigmatisation of migrants.

Migrants cross international borders for a broad range of interlocking reasons. Many migrate to find livelihoods to support themselves and their families. Their livelihoods may be imperilled because of poor economic conditions generated by years of political instability and poor governance. A recent study of migrants from Bangladesh and Pakistan who have worked in the Gulf Cooperation Council countries found that many were in especially vulnerable situations prior to migration, noting “The sickness of a spouse, or the death of the main family income earner, family breakdown and unemployment were ... cited” as reasons for migration. Often, the international migrants are hired to perform jobs that natives would not do, particularly for the low wages or poor working conditions offered. Migrants are frequently in dirty, dangerous and demeaning jobs throughout the world, though there are diverse migrant experiences and migrants can also fill privileged positions in some contexts. Large numbers of migrants, however, are often employed in sectors, such as domestic work, that are poorly or not at all regulated and in which exploitation and abuse are common. The chance for full time employment and wages that are significantly higher than those available at home makes these jobs attractive to migrants who are willing to risk much in order to provide for their families.

For a significant number of international migrants, factors precipitating migration in their countries of origin are significantly greater than the prospect of better economic opportunities elsewhere in generating migration. Many leave life-threatening situations that include persecution, human rights violations, repression and/or conflict. In a growing number of cases, they are driven from their homes by governments and insurgent groups intent on depopulating or shifting the ethnic, religious or other composition of an area. In other cases, migrants are forced to move by environmental degradation, climate-related processes that undermine livelihoods and habitat, and natural and human-made disasters that make their homes uninhabitable for at least some period. Food insecurity propels others to migrate, particularly in cases where drought combines with political instability, repression and poor governance to cause famine. As discussed above, only a fraction of these forced migrants are granted refugee status or even appear in the statistics of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees or national governments, which tend only to consider those fleeing persecution as meeting the refugee criteria.

5 It is important to keep in mind, however, that most economic migrants are not the poorest of the poor. Migration is an expensive undertaking, which only those with some financial resources are able to do. Research indicates that even refugees fleeing conflict are subject to financial pressures when migrating. Those with the least resources are most likely to be internally displaced, those with somewhat larger resources may be able cross into a neighbouring country, and those with greater resources who are able to generate assistance from networks of relatives and friends are able to get furthest from harm’s way. See Nicholas van Hear, “I went as far as my money would take me”: conflict, forced migration and class,” Working Paper 04-06, Centre for Migration Policy and Society, Oxford University, at http://www.compass.ox.ac.uk/publications/working-papers/wp-04-06/

As the causes of migration have grown well ahead of the legal avenues for admission to other countries, so too have human smuggling and human trafficking operations that prey on migrants and render them highly vulnerable. In 2000, recognising the growth in trafficking and smuggling, states adopted two Protocols that supplement the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime: The Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children and the Protocol against Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air. Both entered into force in 2003. The defining elements of trafficking are the activity, the means, and the purpose, where: (1) The activity refers to some kind of movement either within or across borders; (2) The means relates to some form of coercion or deception, and (3) the purpose is the ultimate exploitation of a person for profit or benefit of another. Smuggling does not require coercion or deception or the intent to exploit. It is defined 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 or a permanent resident.” Smuggling can turn into trafficking, however, particularly when a migrant is forced into bondage in order to pay off the smuggling fees. Moreover, as one study concluded, “The means of transport used by migrant smugglers are often unsafe....

the services of smugglers, many migrants have drowned at sea, suffocated in sealed containers or have been raped and abused while in transit."8

Even migrants that migrate through legal channels may find themselves in highly vulnerable situations. Labour recruiters often charge exorbitant fees for access to jobs and visas, causing many migrants and their families to go deeply into debt. The wages promised in labour contracts may not be those that are actually provided in the destination country. In one survey, fully a quarter of the total sample, and 40 percent of the women migrants, did not receive the agreed upon sum.9 Those migrating through labour contracts generally are tied to a specific employer; if they complain about wages and working conditions, the migrants may find themselves not only out of a job but also returned to their home countries. Migrants working in domestic settings are particularly at risk since labour laws often do not include domestic workers and government agencies that regulate labour markets are usually unwilling or financially unable to monitor conditions inside households.10

Future trends in international migration11

Because of disparities among countries in wealth, demography and human security, international migration can be expected to grow further in the decades ahead. The following sections discuss the factors that will likely precipitate this increased mobility.

Demographic Factors

While population growth has been slowed in many parts of the world, the momentum from past and present fertility means that the world's population will continue to grow even as fertility falls. About 82 percent of the world's population—6.9 billion in 2010—is in developing countries; about 18 percent of the world's residents live in developed countries.12 In developed countries, women average 1.7 children each; in developing countries (excluding the least developed) fertility rates are 2.7; and in least developed countries, they are at 4.5. The fastest growth is in Africa, whose population is projected to more than double, and the sharpest decline in Europe, where the population is projected to remain stagnant or even decline. Without immigration, these very different

8 Khalid Koser, "Strengthening Policy Responses to Migrant Smuggling and Human Trafficking," Background paper prepared for Civil Society Roundtable 2.2 at the 2008 Global Forum on Migration and Development, Manila, 27-30 October 2008. Note that the definition of ‘trafficking’ and ‘smuggling’ and they way they have been differentiated in the international conventions constitute a problematic area among researchers, policy makers and legislators in combating this emerging activity. Thus, while trafficking includes the unclear concepts of exploitation and coercion (both are relevant in many other situations such as poverty), smuggling deals with people who have rationally and voluntarily chosen to take part in the deal. In other words, while the convention puts the burden on brokers and facilitators in the trafficking industry, it condemns migrants under the protocol of smuggling. The repercussions will eventually differ in the way the two groups are handled upon arrival to the intended destination.

9 Plant, Temporary Contract Labour in the Gulf States.

10 Recognizing these challenges, the ILO adopted the Convention Concerning Decent Work for Domestic Workers in June 2011.

11 This section is adapted and updated from Philip Martin, Susan Martin and Patrick Weil, Managing Migration: The Promise of Cooperation (Lantham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield (Lexington Books Division), 2005).

fertility gradients mean that the population shares or weights of the world’s continents will change radically.\textsuperscript{13}

In 2000, the UN Population Division (UNPD) issued a controversial report, \textit{Replacement Migration: Is it A Solution to Declining and Ageing Populations?}\textsuperscript{14} In the report, “replacement migration refers to the international migration that would be needed to offset declines in the size of population, the declines in the population of working age, as well as to offset the overall ageing of a population.” Noting extremely low fertility and increased longevity in many developed countries, the report cites immigration as the principal contributor to any population increase. In the absence of immigration, most developed countries would experience population decline.

Population decline and, particularly, ageing would in turn pose challenges for governments in terms of maintaining a tax base to support already stretched pension and medical systems; addressing gaps in the labour force, particularly in sectors that older workers are unlikely to fill (e.g., construction); and meeting demands for new labour market sectors, particularly those related to care for the elderly, to name just a few implications of population ageing. The replacement migration report advised governments to reassess policies and programs relating to international migration, in particular replacement migration, and the integration of large numbers of recent migrants and their descendants.

The report reinforced the view that international migration must be an important part of any strategy to combat population decline and aging. Many high-income countries have social welfare systems based on contributions from those currently employed, so that immigration could help to stabilise their labour forces and pension systems. While population decline in developed regions has been slowed by positive net immigration\textsuperscript{15}, the debate continues about what role immigration can and should play in addressing demographic changes in the future. As the Population Division report pointed out, “maintaining potential support ratios at current levels through replacement migration alone seems out of reach, because of the extraordinarily large numbers of migrants that would be required.”\textsuperscript{16} Opposition to immigration remains strong in many countries, and public opinion may well restrict any policy options that require substantial increases in admission. During the past decade, however, even countries with little tradition of immigration have acknowledged that they have sizeable immigrant populations and are likely to continue to admit immigrants.

Regardless of whether governments commit to large scale increases in overall migration, growth is projected in the demand for services aimed particularly at elderly populations, including gerontologists, nurses, home health aides and other caregivers. Immigrants already represent large shares of the workforces in these sectors in many countries. With population ageing, immigration may well be an important avenue for meeting this increased labour demand. Since


\textsuperscript{14} UN Population Division, Replacement Migration. Is it A Solution to Declining and Ageing Populations? (New York: UNPD, 2000).

\textsuperscript{15} See UN Population Division, Replacement Migration, which cites statistics on the major contribution that positive net migration has made to the population growth of countries such as Austria, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Spain and Switzerland; as well as in North America.

\textsuperscript{16} UN Population Division Replacement Migration.
many of the caregivers will likely be working at low wages in private homes that are difficult to regulate, it will be particularly important to ensure that the migrants providing services are not exploited or vulnerable to abuses.  

Wealth Factors

Differences in income and wealth are widening, increasing the likelihood of migration. The world’s GDP was $70 trillion in 2009, making the average per capita income $10,400 a year, but the range was from $120,000 in Qatar to $300 in the Democratic Republic of Congo and Burundi. When countries are ranked by their per capita GDPs, it is apparent that the gap between high-income countries, with $11,906 or more per person per year, versus low- (below $975 or less per person per year) and middle- (between $976 and $11,905) income countries has been widening, and very few low- and middle-income countries have been able to climb into the high-income ranks over the past quarter century.

The world’s labour force was an estimated 3.179 billion in 2009, and it is growing faster in developing than in developed countries. Since many low-income countries have more workers than formal sector jobs, and more new entrants into the labour force than additional jobs created, there is already widespread unemployment and underemployment and more can be projected.

17 It will also be important to ensure appropriate mechanisms are in place to protect elderly clients from potential abuses.
19 For example, Portugal and South Korea moved from the middle- to the high-income group between 1985 and 1995, while Zimbabwe and Mauritania moved from the middle- to the low-income group. See World Bank, World Development Report (Washington, DC: World Bank, various years).
Almost 40 percent of the world’s workers are employed in agriculture, usually as small farmers or hired workers. In 28 of the poorest countries, more than 75 percent of workers are in agriculture. In many of these poorer countries, farmers are taxed, while subsidies are common in rich countries where farmers represent a small share of workers.20 This means that farmers in poor countries generally have lower-than-average incomes. Low farm incomes encourage migration off the farm. Ex-farmers with few transferable skills and great need for income support are likely to accept dirty, dangerous and demeaning jobs in urban areas, either inside their countries or abroad.

Changing gender roles also affect migration. Women who migrate are able to take advantage of increased access to wage employment in other countries, even if maintaining highly gendered roles. The so-called domestic care chain is an example. As women in developed countries enter the labour force in higher and higher numbers, the demand for migrant women to perform domestic work and child and elder care services has been increasing as well. Women may migrate through official contract labour programs that match workers and employers, or they may obtain such employment after migrating irregularly, often through informal networks. As discussed above, some of the most vulnerable migrants in the world today perform domestic work in irregular settings outside legal frameworks and without any legal protection. Employed in private homes, these migrants seldom fall under the regulatory frameworks or enforcement mechanisms that governments use to protect labour standards. Even when contracts specify hours and wages, monitoring that employers are in compliance is very difficult. In worse case scenarios, domestic workers may be subject to sexual abuse and forced labour with few avenues for escape. In this respect, they are in situations similar to those experienced by trafficking victims who have been coerced or deceived into migrating for the purposes of exploiting their labour. Another important dynamic is the increasing connectivity that facilitates global communications and networks, sustained by effective and accessible technology that makes transport and communication easier and more affordable.

Human and Environmental Security

Rising demographic and economic differences combine with a third set of major differences among countries: human and environmental security. In recent years, civil conflicts have erupted in many areas, leading to physical and political instability, separatist movements, new nations, and more migrants. Failed states, ethnic cleansing and genocide produced millions of refugees and displaced persons who were unable to remain safely in their home communities. Violence, kidnappings, rapes and other manifestations of insecure societies induced still more people to migrate in search of safety.

Human security is also a factor in labour migration. While migrants may be attracted to higher earnings, they may also be motivated by finding living and working conditions that are more secure than what they can find at home. One study of South African nurses, for example, showed that higher wages and better working conditions were principal reasons for considering migration,

---

20 In the United States, for example, less than 1 percent of workers are employed in farming, forestry and fishing and the federal government provides more than $20 billion in direct farm subsidies. In the European Union, about 5 percent of workers are engaged in agriculture and farm subsidies have been in the $50 billion range.
but more than 40 percent cited concerns about security, crime and violence as important factors.\textsuperscript{21}

Climate change presents new challenges in terms of human security in general and migration in particular. As early as 1990, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) warned that significant levels of migration could occur as a result of changing climatic conditions.\textsuperscript{22} It appears that there are four paths, in particular, by which environmental change may affect migration, either directly or, more likely, in combination with other factors: 1) intensification and frequency of natural disasters, such as hurricanes and cyclones that destroy housing and livelihoods and require people to relocate for shorter or longer periods; 2) increased warming and drought that affects agricultural production, reducing people’s livelihoods and access to clean water; 3) rising sea levels that render coastal areas uninhabitable; and 4) competition over natural resources that may lead to conflict, which in turn precipitates displacement.\textsuperscript{23}

Vulnerability or resilience to these situations—that is, the capability to cope or adapt to them—will determine the degree to which people are forced to migrate. The availability of alternative livelihoods or other coping capacities in the affected area generally determines the scale and form of migration that may take place. Extreme natural hazards, such as hurricanes, cyclones and typhoons, and conflict and heightened insecurity, generally lead to abrupt

displacement, usually within State borders but sometimes across them. In slow-onset situations, such as intensified drought and rising sea levels, the urgency to migrate may be less pressing since the environment and the harms associated with it change more slowly. But, if alternative livelihoods or humanitarian assistance are not available within a reasonable timeframe, then migration may be the best or even only option available, as witnessed by large scale flight from parts of Somalia affected by famine and conflict.

Human Development Factors

The Human Development Index published annually by the UNDP gives a useful picture of the conditions which can constitute push and pull factors relevant to international migration. Its core indicators for health, education and income provide a good basis for considering future population movement scenarios, and for considering where development assistance might make a difference for people who might otherwise feel that they have no option but to migrate.

Impacts of Migration

Migration can have both positive and negative consequences for the affected populations and the communities from which and to which they migrate as well as through which they transit. Negative impacts stem particularly from emergency mass movements, generally those related to rapid-onset natural disasters, conflict and political instability. These movements often require large scale humanitarian assistance, particularly when people flee into countries with limited resources of their own. Negative impacts may be more extreme if receiving communities, particularly urban areas, are unprepared to absorb large numbers of spontaneous migrants. The more positive impacts occur when migration is a voluntary process that allows people time to weigh alternatives and use migration as a way to reduce household risk and improve their and their new host communities’ economic opportunities. Understanding these impacts is essential to understanding the risks that migrants often take in migrating, particularly when there are no legal channels, as well as the reasons that they often find themselves in highly exploitable and vulnerable situations.

Impacts on Migrants and their Families

Migrants are the principal winners and losers in migration processes. Whether migration is a benefit or a cost depends on many factors. First, those who are able to migrate through legal channels will generally see greater benefits from migration although these benefits may be reduced substantially if they experience high transaction costs (for example, in recruitment fees) or if their employment sectors are unregulated and workers are susceptible to high levels of abuse. Those who migrate through irregular channels face even greater costs, not only the financial costs of high smuggling fees but also threats to their safety and security. Those attempting boat crossings in crowded unseaworthy vessels face additional dangers, as do migrants attempting to cross through mountainous areas and desert terrains or in shipping containers in order to enter countries clandestinely. When migrants who are labelled as ‘illegal’ are able to safely reach their destinations, they may still face dangers that arise from their illegal status. They are more subject to exploitation and abuse, fearing to call upon government authorities to protect them, and often unable to access health and social services designed for those with low incomes.
Even with these significant risks, many migrants see themselves as benefitting from migration if they are able to earn sufficient money in destination countries to support their families. Nevertheless, there are considerable social costs to immigration, particularly when workers leave their families behind when they migrate. While migration may contribute to the economic well-being of the family, children may be left with the psychological burden of long separations from one or both parents.24 The migrant’s parents or older siblings may find themselves with responsibilities for younger children in these cases. The literature shows mixed results, however, as to the severity of the social costs. Some studies show that children in migratory households do better and remain longer in school than their counterparts, largely because their families are able to pay for the fees and other costs associated with education and are in less need of their children’s earnings to support the household.25 The positive impacts are particularly noted with regard to girls’ schooling. Other studies show, however, that boys in communities with strong migratory traditions drop out of school as soon as possible since they believe that they will earn more by migrating than completing their education.26 Since they are eligible only for low-wage, low-skilled jobs as a result of their low levels of education, this process may lead to a vicious cycle of poverty and exploitation. Another important issue arises from the emigration of mothers from communities, the children left behind who are raised by other relatives or community members, and the impacts this has on family life.

25 See, for example, Pablo Acosta, School Attendance, Child Labour, and Remittances from International Migration in El Salvador, Journal of Development Studies, 47:6, 913-936
Impacts on Source Countries

There is growing interest among governments and civil society in increasing the benefits of migration by linking it to economic growth and social and human development. The migration-development nexus incorporates two elements: ways in which development aid and processes can reduce pressures for emigration, particularly those that result in movements by necessity rather than choice, and ways in which migrants can be a resource for the development of their home communities.

Improving the economic opportunities for people in source countries is the best long-term solution to migration that is by necessity, not choice. Academicians caution, however, that emigration pressures are likely to remain and, possibly, increase before the long-term benefits accrue: “The transformations intrinsic to the development process are at first destabilising. They initially promote rather than impede migration. Better communications and transportation and other improvements in the quality of life of people working hard to make a living raise expectations and enhance their ability to migrate.”27 Several researchers posit what economist Philip Martin refers to as an “immigration hump.” As levels of income rise, emigration would at first increase, then peak and decline.28 The experience of such countries as Italy and Korea in transitioning from emigration to immigration countries gives credence to this theory.

At the same time, mobile populations can contribute to economic development through their financial resources as well as their skills, entrepreneurial activities, and support for democratisation and human rights. Individual remittance transfers continue to be an important source of income for many families in developing countries. As of 2010, by conservative estimates, international remittances to developing countries exceeded $325 billion per year.29 Considering that Official Development Assistance (ODA) seldom exceeds $100 billion per year, migrants are contributing three times more financial resources to their home countries than do the wealthy countries’ development agencies.30

Most remittances purchase consumer items needed by families at home. Although sometimes derided by economists as “non-productive,” consumer use of remittances contributes to economic development, particularly when households spend their remittances locally. The multiplier effects of remittances can be substantial, with each dollar producing additional dollars in economic growth for the businesses that produce and supply the products bought with these resources. Expenditures on education and healthcare also stimulate human development. Remittances may have profound impacts on gender roles and remittances, particularly when they give women (both those

---

30  Ibid. In 2009, the top 5 remittance recipients in the developing world were: India ($55.0 bn), China ($51.0 bn), Mexico ($22.6 bn), Philippines ($21.3 bn), and Bangladesh ($11.1 bn). Top 5 remittance recipients as a percentage of GDP were: Tajikistan (35.1 percent), Tonga (27.7 percent), Lesotho (24.8 percent), Moldova (23.1 percent), and Nepal (22.9 percent). The top 5 remittance senders were: the United States ($48.3 bn), Saudi Arabia ($26.0 bn), Switzerland ($19.6 bn), Russian Federation ($18.6 bn), and Germany ($15.9 bn). As a percentage of GDP, the top remittance senders were: Luxembourg (20.1 percent), Lebanon (17.0 percent), Oman (9.9 percent), Maldives (8.9 percent), and Kuwait (8.2 percent)
receiving and sending money) new opportunities to determine how household income will be used. Moreover, a World Bank report found that remittance flows are a more stable source of revenue for many countries than foreign trade, foreign direct investment and foreign aid.\(^{31}\)

The diaspora can play an important role in promoting economic development. Migrants often form associations to raise and remit funds for infrastructure development and income generation activities in their home communities. Migrant groups as dissimilar as Malians in France and Mexicans in the United States have supported health clinics, built schools, repaired roads, and invested in small business enterprises in their home communities.

Remittance flows are especially important in reducing poverty, particularly among the women-headed households and older persons receiving this form of support. According to research conducted for the World Bank, “international remittances—defined as the share of remittances in country GDP—has a strong, statistical impact on reducing poverty. On average, a 10 percent increase in the share of international remittances in a country’s GDP will lead to a 1.6 percent decline in the share of people living in poverty.”\(^{32}\) The impact on rural households is particularly strong as are the effects of remittances in countries experiencing conflict and other crises. In the absence of livelihoods that may have been disrupted by fighting or extreme natural hazards, remittances often become a lifeline for households that would otherwise face high levels of food insecurity or loss of housing. In countries such as Somalia, remittances may be the only prevention against famine for many households that are unable to receive international aid.

While remittances hold promise for development and poverty reduction, they are by no means a substitute for Official Development Assistance. Although remittances may help alleviate poverty in families with migrants, remittances do not reach everyone in need and may thus increase inequality. Loss of the highly skilled, or what is referred to as brain drain, may also impede development, particularly when the departure of health professionals undermines the ability of a country to achieve the type of health goals (e.g., reducing high mortality rates) outlined in the Millennium Development Goals. Moreover, remittances depend on contributions from people who may themselves be living in poverty; women migrants, in particular, are often the poorest residents of their host countries but they are responsible for a significant portion of remittances. Migrants may not be able to invest in their own living conditions, health care, nutrition and education in order to continue to send money home. This in turn makes them more vulnerable and exploitable.

While the economic impacts may be largely positive, the social effects of migration on source countries are less clear. As discussed above, migration may pose serious challenges for families left behind by migrating parents. There may be positive impacts, however, through what are termed ‘social remittances.’\(^ {33}\) These are the values and norms that migrants send home. Some studies show that migration can have profound impacts on gender roles and relationships, not only for migrants but also source communities. Female migrants often expect a greater role in decisions on household spending,


Nikuze Aziza’s son, David Pataule (11), eats a meal in his family’s home in Kiziba Camp, Kibuye District, Rwanda on March 25, 2011. Rwandan small farmers are partially responsible for providing food aid for the refugee camp through the Gates Foundation’s Purchase for Progress initiative.
particularly when their remittances are an important component of income. Women left behind by male migrants generally take on new responsibilities within households and make important decisions in the absence of their husbands or fathers. Male migrants and men left behind by female migrants may have taken on responsibilities for household chores that had previously been solely the responsibility of women within the household. Through social remittances, they often communicate these new gender roles and relationships to other members of their community.

Impacts on Transit and Receiving Countries

Migration also poses costs and benefits for transit and receiving countries. Although they often describe migration as a burden, the economic gains of migration for wealthier destination countries have been described by the World Bank: “Destination countries can enjoy significant economic gains from migration.” These include “increased labour-market flexibility, an increased labour force due to lower prices for services such as child care, and perhaps economies of scale and increased diversity.”34

Harder to calculate are the social and cultural gains and losses from international migration on receiving countries. International migration often brings diversity to communities that had previously been more homogeneous in terms of religion, race and ethnicity. Adapting to such societal change can be challenging. There are fiscal costs associated with providing help to newcomers and existing communities to adapt to their new environment, including orientation, education, health and social services. Tensions may arise as a result of language barriers and unfamiliar cultural and religious practices.35 On the other hand, the diversity produced by international migration can also spark innovation. For example, a study of patents in the United States found: “a one percentage point rise in the share of immigrant scientists and engineers in the workforce increases patenting by at least 41 percent.”36

When migrants move without authorisation, the impacts can be harmful to the rule of law in source, transit and destination countries. Corrupt government officials may be complicit in the illegal activities of smugglers and traffickers. Moreover, a vicious circle may develop: legal immigration policies are restrictive or inefficient, not meeting the needs of employers nor interested migrant workers, and asylum and refugee resettlement policies fail to provide safety for people fleeing conditions in their home countries; would-be migrants instead attempt to enter using irregular means; a perception grows that migration is beyond the control of government authorities, undermining efforts to develop more effective and humane immigration policies; which leads in turn to still more irregular migration and more risk to vulnerable migrants.

34  Ibid.
35  For example, migrants may retain cultural activities such as female genital mutilation or underage marriages, despite the illegality of these practices in many destination countries.
Appendix 3
Survey of National Society Activities

Countries included in the Online Survey
- Anguilla
- Australia
- Bosnia-Herzegovina
- British Virgin Islands
- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cyprus
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Egypt
- Estonia
- Ethiopia
- Finland
- France
- Gambia
- Germany
- Hong Kong
- Kyrgyzstan
- Latvia
- Lesotho

Solomon Islands: Village children play around the RC water in Malaita island.
- Monaco
- Namibia
- Nepal
- Netherlands
- Norway
- Philippines
- Portugal
- Saint Lucia
- Serbia
- Sierra Leone
- Switzerland
- Tajikistan
- Timor Leste
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Turkey
- United States
- Uzbekistan
- Vietnam
- Zimbabwe
- Central Asian Red Crescent Labour Migration Network (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan)
- British overseas islands (British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Montserrat, and Turks & Caicos Islands, excepting Anguilla as no specific information was provided on Anguilla)

**Email Survey**
- Armenia
- Aruba
- Azerbaijan
- Bahamas
- Barbados
- Belgium (in addition to online survey)
- Belize
- Bulgaria
- Colombia
- Costa Rica
- Croatia
- Denmark
- Dominica
- Ecuador
- El Salvador
- Ghana
- Greece
- Guinea Conakry
- Hungary
- Iceland
- Indonesia
- Iran
- Ireland (in addition to online survey)
- Ivory Coast
- Kazakhstan
- Luxembourg
- Mauritania
- Qatar
Saint Eustatius
Saint Maarten
Somalia
Spain
Sweden
United Kingdom (in addition to online survey)
Ukraine

Additional Information from European Mapping Project and other materials
- Algeria
- Austria
- Czech Republic
- Italy
- Libya
- Malta
- Morocco
- Romania
- South Africa
- Swaziland
- Tunisia
The Fundamental Principles of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement

**Humanity** The International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, born of a desire to bring assistance without discrimination to the wounded on the battlefield, endeavours, in its international and national capacity, to prevent and alleviate human suffering wherever it may be found. Its purpose is to protect life and health and to ensure respect for the human being. It promotes mutual understanding, friendship, cooperation and lasting peace amongst all peoples.

**Impartiality** It makes no discrimination as to nationality, race, religious beliefs, class or political opinions. It endeavours to relieve the suffering of individuals, being guided solely by their needs, and to give priority to the most urgent cases of distress.

**Neutrality** In order to enjoy the confidence of all, the Movement may not take sides in hostilities or engage at any time in controversies of a political, racial, religious or ideological nature.

**Independence** The Movement is independent. The National Societies, while auxiliaries in the humanitarian services of their governments and subject to the laws of their respective countries, must always maintain their autonomy so that they may be able at all times to act in accordance with the principles of the Movement.

**Voluntary service** It is a voluntary relief movement not prompted in any manner by desire for gain.

**Unity** There can be only one Red Cross or Red Crescent Society in any one country. It must be open to all. It must carry on its humanitarian work throughout its territory.

**Universality** The International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, in which all societies have equal status and share equal responsibilities and duties in helping each other, is worldwide.