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<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
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<tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRM</td>
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<td>ECHO</td>
<td>European Commission’s Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCC</td>
<td>Gulf Cooperation Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFDRR</td>
<td>Global Facility for Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFA</td>
<td>Hyogo Framework for Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRC</td>
<td>Higher Relief Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>Integrated Border Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRC</td>
<td>International Committee of the Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCPR</td>
<td>International Convent on Civil and Political Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICERD</td>
<td>International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICESCR</td>
<td>International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRMW</td>
<td>International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDMC</td>
<td>Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally Displaced Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labor Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>The International Organization for Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAF</td>
<td>Jordanian Armed Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>League of Arab States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMRA</td>
<td>Labour Market Regulatory Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>Middle East and North Africa region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICIC</td>
<td>Migrants in Countries in Crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMD</td>
<td>Africa-EU Migration and Mobility Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPC</td>
<td>Migration Policy Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTM</td>
<td>Mediterranean Transit Migration Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO</td>
<td>North Atlantic Treaty Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAMA</td>
<td>The National Arab American Medical Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIC</td>
<td>Organization of Islamic Cooperation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PDNA  Post Disaster Needs Assessment
PHAP  Professionals in Humanitarian Assistance and Protection
RAVEL Regional Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration for Stranded Migrants
TCN  Third Country Nationals
UN  United Nations
UNHCR United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNISDR United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction
UNOCHA United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
UNRWA The United Nations Relief and Works Agency
UN TIP Protocol of Trafficking in Persons
USD United States Dollar
WHO World Health Organization
WFP World Food Programme
Introduction

This paper is the fifth in a series of regional discussion papers prepared for the Migrants in Countries in Crisis (MICIC) regional consultations. The regional discussion papers are annexes to the [MICIC Initiative General Background Paper](http://bit.ly/1PdzE61) published in February 2015. The General Background Paper sets out the history, purpose, and scope of the Initiative, while the regional discussion papers provide information that is especially relevant for a particular regional consultation. This paper relates to the Regional Consultation for the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) ¹ region.

The purpose of this paper is to frame and provide input to the MENA MICIC Initiative Regional Consultation, in particular notable practices on how relevant stakeholders from within and outside the region have assisted and protected migrants caught in countries within the MENA region experiencing conflicts or natural disasters. “Migrants are defined broadly by the MICIC Initiative to include all non-nationals/non-citizens who are present in the country affected by a crisis and who do not benefit from international protection as refugees” ².

International migration is a major phenomenon in Middle East and North Africa. According to the latest World Bank estimates, based on the latest available census data, in 2014, of the world’s 247 million migrants, over 37 million were residing in the MENA region. The majority of migrants living in the region come from outside the region, mostly from India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Indonesia and the Philippines. ³ At the same time more than 19 million ⁴ MENA nationals live outside their countries of birth, of which about 9.7 million ⁵ still live either in the Middle East or in North Africa. ⁶

Migrants are particularly at risk of becoming vulnerable when there is conflict or a natural disaster within a country in which they are residing or, increasingly, through which they are transiting. The MENA region has experienced several conflicts and civil unrests, with significant implications and ramifications for migrants. Among the most recent are the 2006 Israel-Hezbollah war in Lebanon, the 2011 internal conflict in Libya, the ongoing conflict in Syria and the ongoing crisis in Yemen. Due to the sudden massive outflow of migrants fleeing conflict, the Libya crisis represents one of the largest “migration crises” in modern history. ⁷ Although not covered in detail in this paper, the 1990-91 Gulf War, and the current crisis situation in Iraq are also relevant examples. In the former case, the conflict is arguably the first major manifestation of migrants caught in a country in crisis in the region, where hundreds of thousands of labour

---

¹ There is no standardised definition of the countries included in the MENA region and different organisations define the region as consisting of different territories. For the purpose of this paper and related calculations, the following 16 countries are considered: Algeria, Bahrain, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, and Yemen.

² Frequently Asked Questions About the Migrants in Countries in Crisis Initiative, Section 2, 8 May 2014.


⁴ This figure refers to migrants born in MENA region and living outside the region.

⁵ This figure refers to intra-regional MENA to MENA migration.


migrants and Palestinian refugees were displaced from both Kuwait and Iraq. In the latter situation, the current conflict poses a number of challenges for Iraqi returnees (e.g. from Syria) that are also relevant in the framework of the MICIC Initiative.

Natural disasters are also a significant threat in the MENA region. Over the past 30 years, disasters have affected more than 40 million people in the region and have cost their economies about USD 20 billion. Moreover, from 1980–2010, over 90 percent of disaster events in MENA were concentrated in just five countries: Algeria, Egypt, Tunisia, Morocco, and Yemen. Among these countries, given the time period of the events and the presence of migrants implicated, the 2008 floods in the governorates of Hadramout and Al-Mahara in Yemen and the 2003 earthquake in Algeria are likely the most relevant examples of natural disasters with major implications for migrants and the MICIC Initiative.

The MICIC Initiative is a global initiative and each region brings particularities to the fore with regard to crises, stakeholders, practices, and other issues that need to be understood in light of the scope and purpose of the Initiative. Within the scope of the MENA region the following issues are most relevant due to their cultural, historical and contemporary significance, and should therefore be borne in mind:

- Labour migration is an important phenomenon in the region. As such, a number of instruments upholding the human rights of migrant workers have been adopted at the national, regional and international levels, which offer a basis to strengthen the protection of migrant’s rights in times of crisis. Nevertheless, the crises, which have occurred across the MENA region, have negatively impacted migrants and served to increase migrants’ vulnerabilities to risks such as exploitation and trafficking. In particular, where there are limited legal frameworks designed to protect the rights of labour migrants in pre-crisis situations, negative impacts of crises on migrants can compound their vulnerabilities.
- Conflicts represent the most prominent form of crisis impacting migrants in the MENA region. Indeed, whilst natural disasters are a considerable risk, with the average number of natural disasters in the MENA region having almost doubled since the 1980s, conflicts have arguably had a greater impact on migrants in this region and represent the main focus of this paper.
- Among the several differences characterizing the countries in the region, the availability or lack of hydrocarbon resources and the size of the national population are among the

---

10 Author's calculations based on a 16 countries MENA region and the data from GFDRR, 2014.
11 The reports describing the impact of these crises on the population do not provide an indication of the nationality of the people affected; therefore it is difficult to establish how many migrants were affected by the floods and earthquakes.
12 The GFDRR includes in the calculation for the MENA region also Iran and Djibouti and with these countries included the number of natural disasters in the region has tripled since the 1980s.
13 GFDRR, 2014.
14 The term hydrocarbon resources include petroleum, natural gas and coal. This has been chosen instead of the more straightforward “oil and gas” because it is more comprehensive and can be used when grouping countries reach either in oil or gas (coal) or having both. The term is also used by the OECD and the World Bank.
main factors to consider when analysing migration flows and trends in the region. Such information is useful especially when considering the important labour migration flows in the region toward oil rich countries.

- Mixed migration flows are a significant characteristic of many of the population movements in the region, which involve not only economic migrants, but also asylum-seekers, refugees and irregular migrants, moving alongside each other using the same routes and means of travel. Increased vulnerability at times of crisis can be attributed to the fact that many of those moving as part of such mixed migration flows may be in an irregular situation, and thus lack access to the support mechanisms available through the host country’s public institutions.

- As in other regions, when it comes to migration in general, and MICIC Initiative-related issues in particular, a broad range of active stakeholders are engaged in the MENA region. The closeness of its relations with the European Union (EU), partly due to its geographic proximity, but also due to the high level of asylum-seekers, refugees and migrants reaching EU shores via the Mediterranean and lately increasingly via land, has led to a rich framework of migration dialogues and processes that address migration and international protection, including migration in times of crisis.

With the above in mind, this paper is divided into two sections, covering the regional migratory context and presenting a sample of relevant practices in the region. The first section proceeds by providing an overview of the main trends in the region, both in terms of flows of people and remittances, as well as relevant regional frameworks and stakeholders. Throughout this section of the paper, a number of emblematic crises in the region – both conflicts and natural disasters – that have impacted migrants will be explored in greater detail. Four exemplary conflicts, which will inform discussions at the Regional Consultation, are further illustrated here: the 2006 Israel-Hezbollah war in Lebanon, the 2011 internal conflict in Libya, the ongoing conflict in Syria and the more recent crisis in Yemen. Additionally, a section dedicated to natural disasters, will examine the 2008 floods in Yemen and the 2003 earthquake in Algeria.

After mapping the regional context and illustrative crises in the region, section two will continue by detailing ‘notable practices’ as implemented by sending, receiving and transit countries, as well as other relevant stakeholders international organisations, civil society and the private sector. This section is organised according to the phases of a crisis and the practices implemented in the respective pre-crisis, emergency and post-crisis phases. It will draw particularly upon experiences of the four conflict crises discussed in the first section. A short concluding section aims to highlight key issues and stimulate discussions for input at the Regional Consultation. A number of annexes with more data and visualisations, as well as a bibliography, follow.

SECTION 1 - OVERVIEW OF THE REGIONAL MIGRATORY CONTEXT

This section first provides an analysis of pertinent migration trends and flows in and from the MENA region. It highlights key issues to consider when discussing how best to improve protection and assistance to migrants in countries experiencing conflicts or natural disasters. The impact of crises on remittances is highlighted given the particular importance of remittance flows in the region. The section also contemplates the role of diaspora in post-crisis (in particular conflict) recovery – considering how migrant populations in the region are particularly
vulnerable to the effects of a crisis in their country of destination. Legal frameworks, key stakeholders and regional processes on migration are presented through a MICIC Initiative lens, underlining how migrants in countries experiencing conflicts and how disasters are taken into consideration in international, regional, sub-regional and national contexts. Lastly, this section explores crises of the last decade especially relevant in the MICIC Initiative context, namely the conflicts in Lebanon in 2006 and in Libya in 2011, and the current ongoing conflicts in Syria and Yemen. Although such crises often generate refugee populations, the focus of this paper and of the MICIC Initiative is on migrants in the host country, who are affected by the crisis. Nationals from the host country who flee the crisis, including to seek asylum in another country, are thus not covered. The section also covers natural disasters, focusing on the examples of the 2009 Yemen floods and the 2003 earthquake in northern Algeria. These crises constitute the basis from which notable practices have been extracted to address the needs of migrants in times of crisis for Section 2.

1. Main Migration Trends in the Region

The Middle East and North Africa region is simultaneously an "origin," "transit" and "destination" region for migrants. In comparison to other regions, the MENA region currently has the largest volume of migration movements and refugees in the world. In addition to economic drivers, conflicts and persecution based on political, religious or other grounds are major drivers of human mobility. In particular, conflicts triggered in part by the Arab Spring, notably the Libyan and Syrian crises, have had a major impact on regional migration patterns and are important factors behind the recurrent tragedies in the central Mediterranean, as well as more recently in Europe. Natural disasters - in particular extreme weather in rural areas - can also cause migration, especially toward urban areas. Indeed, climatic factors have been argued to justify 10–20 percent of rural–urban migration in the MENA region. The combination of conflict and natural disaster can become particularly risky for migrants. When a natural hazard strikes a community that is already affected by conflict it exacerbates pre-existing inequalities and tensions, impacting vulnerable parts of the population, including non-nationals, in a disproportionate manner.

The main directions of migration in the MENA region are internally towards the Gulf countries, which attract 30 per cent of the migrants from the region, and externally toward Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries. Around 46 per cent of the migrants coming from the MENA region migrate to one of the OECD countries, mostly toward Europe (33 per cent). There are also approximately 28.9 million migrants living in the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), of which about two thirds are migrant workers. The majority of migrant workers in the GCC come from India (23 percent) followed by Bangladesh (13 percent),

17 GFDRR, 2014.
18 Ibidem.
Pakistan (12 percent), Egypt (11 percent) and the Philippines (7 percent)\textsuperscript{21}. Libya has historically been one of the main destinations for migrants in the region and it has been estimated that approximately two and a half million migrants were in Libya before the crisis, of which one million were Egyptians, 80,000 were Pakistanis, 59,000 were Sudanese, 63,000 were Bangladeshis, 26,000 were Filipinos, 10,500 were Vietnamese, in addition to large population of Sub-Saharan Africans mainly from Niger, Chad, Mali, Nigeria and Ghana.\textsuperscript{22} The “pan-African” policy pursued by Libya in the early 1990s is thought to have contributed to increasing migration flows from sub-Saharan Africa to Libya.\textsuperscript{23}

At end of August 2015 there were more than 5 five million refugees accounted for in the MENA region. This figure includes approximately 3 million Palestinian refugees,\textsuperscript{24} 2.2 million Syrian refugees\textsuperscript{26}, 175,000 Iraqi refugees, in addition to thousands of Somali, Eritrean, Afghan and Sudanese refugees.\textsuperscript{25} Aside from refugee populations, there are many internally displaced persons (IDPs) and stateless persons. About 3.8 million people were newly displaced in the MENA region in 2014, which is a nine percent increase as compared to 2013 – bringing the aggregated sum of the world’s IDP’s to 11.9 million, or 31 per cent of the global total of displaced persons.\textsuperscript{27} By the end of 2014, roughly 40 per cent of the 59 million people categorised as “displaced”\textsuperscript{28} by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), originated from the Middle East (conflicts in Syria and Iraq being the main impetus of forced displacement).

The geographical proximity of North Africa to Europe (Morocco to Spain, Tunisia to Italy, Libya to Italy and Malta) has been a determining factor in terms of the MENA region serving as a transit route to Europe for sub-Saharan migrants, asylum-seekers and refugees from Syria, Eritrea and elsewhere, in addition to being a region of destination for them.\textsuperscript{29} Migrants and refugees may not intend for their destination country to be in Europe; however, the difficult situations in transit countries such as Libya are contributing to the decisions of migrants to move onwards. Alternatively, migrants and refugees may fail to enter Europe and decide to remain in the transit country or become stranded.\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{21} Baldwin-Edwards 2011.
\textsuperscript{22} MPC, 2013a. \textit{Libya Migration Profile}. (http://bit.ly/1UoUO7w). The paper acknowledges that these figures may underestimate the real amount of migrants in country.
\textsuperscript{24} This figure includes only Palestinian refugees in Jordan, Lebanon and Syria. The total number of Palestinian refugees is estimated at 5.1 million as of 1 January 2014 (UNRWA, 2014). (http://bit.ly/1Hax7c2).
\textsuperscript{25} This figure represents those Syrian refugees registered by UNHCR in Egypt, Iraq, Jordan and Lebanon, as well as other North African states. The total global number of Syrian refugees registered reported by UNHCR in August 2015 is over 4 million. This figure includes 2.1 million Syrians registered by UNHCR in Egypt, Iraq, Jordan and Lebanon, 1.9 million Syrians registered by the Government of Turkey, as well as more than 24,000 Syrian refugees registered in North Africa (http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/regional.php).
\textsuperscript{28} The category comprises refugees, internally displaced and asylum seekers (UNHCR, 2015).
\textsuperscript{30} De Haas, 2004. \textit{North African migration systems: evolution, transformations and development linkages}. International Migration Institute. Libya on the contrary has shifted from a “destination” country into a “destination and transit” country.
In practice, different motivations for leaving one’s country often overlap, as do vulnerabilities, and they may also change during the process of migration. For example, humanitarian assistance became the primary concern for labour migrants in Libya during the crisis, an issue shared with other migrants present in Libya, such as migrants in transit. Aside from multiple and overlapping reasons for migration on the individual level, migrants and refugees, in the absence of viable legal options, might use the same means and routes in search of economic opportunities or international protection. This complexity on both the individual, aggregate and institutional level has been captured by the notion of “mixed migration flows”.

The mixed nature of flows in the region represents one of the key challenges in protecting migrants and makes some categories of migrants especially vulnerable in case of a crisis. Irregular transit migrants arguably represent a particularly vulnerable category in these flows, due to issues such as lack of documentation, which can limit the access to services and support mechanisms.

### 1.1 Migration Flows

Countries in the MENA region share several cultural, historical and geographical traits but also many marked differences; two of the most notable are the availability or lack of hydrocarbon resources (in particular oil) in their territories and the size of their native populations. These two characteristics are also strongly connected with labour migration movements and provide indications in terms of labour needs within the region.\(^{34}\) The significant labour migration flows into and within the region - in particular towards oil rich countries - provides one way to describe the direction of migration by grouping countries according to these two main characteristics. Based on this, MENA countries can be classified into three main groups:\(^{35}\)

i. **Hydrocarbon-rich, labour-abundant countries**, which are producers and exporters of oil and gas and have large national populations (Algeria, Iraq, Syria and Yemen).

ii. **Hydrocarbon-rich, labour-importing countries**, which are producers and exporters of oil and gas and have a large population of migrants (Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates and Libya).

iii. **Hydrocarbon-poor, labour-abundant countries**, which are small producers or importers of oil and gas (Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco and Tunisia).

In terms of trends in the MENA region, the most important intra-regional migration trend is from labour abundant countries toward hydrocarbon-rich, labour-importing countries. Within this broader trend two directions can be identified. The first is represented by flows between labour abundant countries, especially non-hydrocarbon economies\(^{36}\) (in particular Egypt, Yemen, Jordan and Syria) towards hydrocarbon-rich GCC countries, which attract 30 per cent of the

---


\(^{34}\) This classification is a standard way to capture key features of the political economy in the region. However, this framing cannot account for refugee flows.


\(^{36}\) This refers to countries where hydrocarbon production does not dominate the overall economy even if hydrocarbon resources are present. Syria and Yemen are resource rich countries in terms of oil reservoirs, but oil production, although important, doesn’t dominate the entire economy.
migrants from the region. The second relates to movements from labour abundant countries (Egypt, Morocco and Tunisia) to hydrocarbon-rich countries not located in the Gulf, such as (pre-crisis) Libya.

The demand for labour in the region has been met not only by regional flows especially from Egypt, Jordan and Yemen, but also increasingly since the late 1980s and 1990s by migrants coming from Asia. In GCC countries, the main labour destination area in the region, workers from the MENA region represent about 23 per cent of the total foreign workers, mostly coming from Egypt and Yemen. The other workers come mostly from Asia, in particular India, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Philippines and Sri Lanka (see Annex 1). Migrant workers are employed in different sectors and their presence by sector may vary across countries, yet the leading employment sectors are construction, wholesale and retail, and many migrants, in particular those from Asia, are also employed as domestic workers. Annex 2 provides a more detailed breakdown of employment by sector in the GCC.

As already mentioned, extra regional migration occurs primarily from labour abundant countries towards OECD countries, especially the EU. The MENA region is strongly linked to Europe both historically and geographically and EU Member States represent the most important non-MENA destination for migrants from the region. In 2014, the migrant stock in the EU originating from the MENA region amounted to 6.2 million, representing 17.8 percent of the total immigration that the EU receives from third countries. North Africa is the main transit region for Sub-Saharan migrants from Africa on the migration route towards the EU.

1.2 Remittances in Times of Crisis

The MENA region is one of the most significant contributors to remittance flows at the global level. Remittances play an important role in supporting families of migrants during times of crisis. The World Bank estimates that in 2014 approximately 18 per cent of all global remittance transfers originated from the MENA region. Of this amount, the majority (16 per cent) originates from GCC countries. In the same year, MENA countries received over USD 52 billion in remittances, corresponding to about 8 per cent of global remittances received in 2014. Countries such as Egypt and Lebanon are among the most prominent recipients of remittances in the world.

When a major country of destination for migration is affected by a crisis, the sudden loss of employment and income for migrants can negatively affect the country of origin, in particular communities hosting large numbers of returnees. In the case of the Libyan crisis, for example,

---

37 Author’s calculations using a 16 countries definition of MENA region and based on World Bank migration data.
38 O’Sullivan et al. 2011.
39 IOM, 2010b. Arab Labour Organization (ALO) Database reported in Intra Regional Labour Mobility in the Arab World.
41 Baldwin-Edwards 2011.
42 Author’s calculations (MENA region 16 countries) based on the World Bank data for bilateral migration flows 2013.
44 Ibidem.
46 Followed by Morocco (USD 7 billion), Jordan (USD 4 billion), Yemen (USD 3 billion) and Tunisia (USD 2 billion) as of 2014 (World Bank Remittance Database).
Remittance flows to Egypt decreased by about 2 per cent in the first quarter of 2011, a figure which corresponds to USD 59 million.\textsuperscript{47} The conflict in Libya has not only displaced and affected a large number of Egyptian and Tunisian migrant workers, but also resulted in the collapse of an important regional labour market for Egyptian, Tunisian and other migrant workers.\textsuperscript{48}

### 2. Legal Frameworks, key Stakeholders and Processes on Migration in the Region

#### 2.1 Legal Frameworks

To date, there is no legal framework that explicitly and comprehensively accounts for the rights of migrants during crises, nor for the responsibilities of protecting and assisting them. That being said, protecting the human rights of all migrants in times of peace and stability is crucial to strengthening their resilience in times of crisis. In this context, protecting the human rights of migrant workers is of particular importance for the MENA region given the extent of labour mobility and individuals transiting through the region. Instruments have been adopted at the national, regional and international levels in these areas. At the international level, UN human rights instruments and ILO Conventions provide a legal basis for the protection of migrants in the region. Annex 4 indicates the status of ratification by MENA country of relevant UN and ILO Conventions.

Among these, with respect to labour mobility, one of the most relevant instruments is the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of their Families (ICRMW). However, only a limited number of countries in the MENA region have ratified the ICRMW, nearly none of which have been main countries of destination in terms of migration (except Libya). The ILO Migration for Employment (Revised) Convention (1949, No. 97) and the ILO Migrant Workers (Supplementary Provisions) Convention (1975 No. 143) are considered to be important instruments covering employment standards; these have been signed by few countries in the region.\textsuperscript{49} The ILO Domestic Workers Convention (2011 No. 189) is also considered an important legal instrument for migrant domestic workers; however, none of the countries in the region have become signatories.

A number of regional frameworks are relevant within the scope of the MICIC Initiative. The Arab Charter on Human Rights, which incorporates some of the provisions included in the UN and ILO Conventions covered in Annex 4, is one example. It seeks to ensure that all individuals subject to the jurisdiction of a State Party enjoy the rights and freedoms set forth in the Charter (Article 3). It also stipulates that, in exceptional situations of emergency, States Parties to the Charter should adopt non-discriminatory emergency measures (Article 4), and no derogations shall be made from the prohibition on forced labour, trafficking in human beings and the exploitation of children in armed conflict (Articles 4 and 10 combined). Seven countries in the region (Jordan, Bahrain, Libya, Algeria, the United Arab Emirates, Palestine, and Yemen) have ratified this Charter.


\textsuperscript{48} Longer term consequences for migrant sending regions will be explored in the MICIC research coordinated by ICMPD.

\textsuperscript{49} Algeria, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Morocco signed the ILO C143 and only Algeria signed the ILO C97.
A second example is the African Union’s Convention Governing Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa.⁵⁰ Most of the African Union Member States have signed this Convention, including Algeria, Egypt, Libya and Tunisia with respect to the region covered in this report. The definition of refugee in this Convention is broader than the one in the 1951 Geneva Convention, notably as Article 1.2 details - persons displaced by events that seriously disturb public order, which can arguably be interpreted as including conflicts and natural disasters. The Convention does not specify how non-nationals in the country for short periods of time, such as transit migrants, should be protected⁵¹; it does, however, cover persons forced to leave their place of habitual residence. With respect to the MICIC initiative, long-term resident migrants and refugees, forced to leave the country of residence due to conflict and natural disaster, are protected under this Convention.

In many of the GCC countries, the majority of labour migration is regulated at the National level under the sponsorship system known as *kafala*.⁵² This system grants the migrant a temporary work permit, which is linked to a citizen stakeholder or an institution (*kafil*). The combination of the temporary, but renewable, work permit and the sponsorship system has led to other limitations for migrant workers living in the GCC countries. Exploitative and oftentimes illegal practices associated with the *kafala* system have been documented, including the confiscation of migrants’ documents by sponsors, which has been an obstacle during evacuation operations.⁵³

Some countries have started to reform the *kafala* system⁵⁴ and good practices can be noted from them, such as the case in Bahrain, where the Labour Market Regulatory Authority (LMRA) was established in 2006. The LMRA took over all the responsibilities to regulate the labour market in Bahrain and replaced the *kafala* system of sponsorship.⁵⁵ Bahrain has also signed the CEDAW in 2002, the ICCPR in 2006 and the ICESCR in 2007. Another example of improvements in the *kafala* system is reported in Kuwait. Non-nationals in Kuwait can sponsor themselves and obtain a residence permit for two to five years, provided they can support themselves financially for the duration of their stay and can produce a certificate of good conduct.⁵⁶ Progress has also been demonstrated in Saudi Arabia, where in 2004, the Saudi Human Rights Commission, which addresses and examines human rights violations of foreign workers, was created.⁵⁷ In May 2015, the Government of Saudi Arabia issued a royal decree calling on Ministries to assist Yemenis living and working in Saudi Arabia – this included provisions for extensions of visas, permissions to work, and exemptions from fines.⁵⁸ A more detailed discussion about the reform of the *kafala* system is included in Section 2 of this paper, which highlights good practices.
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⁵⁰ The African Union was still the Organization of African Unity (OAU) when the Convention was adopted in 1969; therefore the document is known as the “OAU Convention Governing Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa”. Ratified by 45 member countries (http://bit.ly/1rJOpF).
⁵⁵ IOM, 2010b.
⁵⁶ MPC, 2014.
⁵⁷ Ibidem.
2.2 Key Regional Stakeholders and Processes on Migration

MENA regional stakeholders traditionally play a key role in assisting and protecting migrants caught in countries experiencing crises by intervening at the political and/or operational levels. During recent crises in the region, both the African Union (AU) and the League of Arab States (LAS) were involved in conflict resolution at political and diplomatic levels. The Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) and the humanitarian department of the LAS have supported international humanitarian responses on the ground. Notable practices implemented by these organisations during the crisis in Libya are included in Section 2.

Regional consultative processes on migration issues between the EU and MENA countries help develop frameworks where MICIC Initiative-relevant issues are increasingly being discussed. These processes, whose contributions to migration management are widely recognised, include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EUROMED Migration Programme</th>
<th>MENA countries involved&lt;sup&gt;62&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean Transit Migration (MTM) Dialogue</td>
<td>Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Palestine, Syria, Tunisia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa-EU Migration and Mobility Dialogue (MMD)</td>
<td>Algeria, Egypt, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Syria, Tunisia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euro-African Dialogue on Migration and Development (Rabat Process)</td>
<td>Algeria (*), Morocco, Tunisia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU-Horn of Africa Migration Route Initiative (Khartoum Process)</td>
<td>Egypt, Tunisia, Djibouti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Mediterranean Forum (5+5 Dialogue)</td>
<td>Algeria, Libya, Morocco, Tunisia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budapest Process</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombo Process</td>
<td>Bahrain(<em>), Kuwait(</em>), Qatar(<em>), Saudi Arabia(</em>), UAE(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bali Process</td>
<td>Iraq, Iran, Jordan, UAE, Syria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* ) Observers.

Over recent years, the MTM Dialogue<sup>63</sup>, the Rabat Process<sup>64</sup> and the Budapest Process<sup>65</sup> have organised expert meetings on migration in crisis situations with participating countries in the
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<sup>59</sup> For an overview of the role of states of origin, transit and destination as well as international organisations, civil society organisations and the private sector, please refer to the general MICIC background Paper dated February 2015.


<sup>62</sup> The participation of Libya and Syria is currently suspended given the current situation in these countries. The countries highlighted in grey are not considered in the 16 countries MENA region that has been used for the purpose of the paper, but are part of the processes and are often included in MENA region definitions.

<sup>63</sup> MTM i-Map Expert Meeting on “Population Movements in the MTM Region resulting from Crisis Situations: Experiences, Responses and Challenges ahead”, 28-29 November 2013, Istanbul, Turkey.


region. EUROMED Migration also touched upon the issue of migrants in countries in crisis during a meeting on mixed migration flows. The April 2014, Rabat Process thematic meeting on migrants in a crisis context, addressed the impact of crises on mixed migration flows, regional responses and cooperation in emergency situations within the Rabat Process region. Heightened vulnerabilities of migrants in times of crisis were underlined at each event.

In the years to come, MICIC Initiative-related issues are likely to be further addressed in the framework of some of these processes. The Rome Programme, the strategic framework of the Rabat Process for 2015-2017, includes the consequences of environmental degradation and political instability among its priorities. In the same vein, addressing the root causes of migration, including the impacts of climate change, will be a key issue covered by EUROMED Migration until 2019. The Khartoum Process will exclusively focus on trafficking in human beings and migrant smuggling and will certainly cover crisis situations in this context.

3. Emblematic Crises in the Region from a MICIC Initiative Perspective

3.1 Recent Conflicts in the MENA Region

Among the recent conflicts in the region, crises in Lebanon, Libya, Syria and Yemen are especially relevant in the context of the MICIC Initiative given the following reasons:

i) The large scale of these crises;

ii) The numbers of migrants in these countries;

iii) The diversity of migrant profiles in these countries, including migrant workers, stranded migrants, victims of trafficking in human beings and abused smuggled migrants, unaccompanied and separated migrant children, irregular migrants, asylum seekers and refugees;

iv) The unprecedented responses that have been implemented by States and other stakeholders, especially in terms of evacuation of migrants; and

v) The complementarity natures of these crises, given that each contains a unique ability to illustrate different aspects that are important in terms of better protecting and assisting migrants caught in countries experiencing conflicts and natural disasters.

This section brings to the fore aspects of these four crises that are of particular interest for the Regional Consultation on MENA.

---

68 Some of these processes/meetings/actions use a broader definition of crisis than that of the MICIC Initiative.
69 Asylum-seekers and refugees have formed significant parts of the mixed migratory movements in the region and beyond.
a. The 2006 Lebanon – Israel – Hezbollah war

The Lebanese crisis began after an invasion from Israel against Hezbollah forces, and occurred between 12 July and 16 August 2006.\textsuperscript{70} Based on press reports, there were at least 550,000 non-nationals\textsuperscript{71} living in the country at the time of the crisis, excluding refugees and asylum seekers.\textsuperscript{72} During the crisis, about 70,000 non-nationals\textsuperscript{73} were evacuated from the country.

Lebanese officials had varying levels of successes and failures while responding to the 2006 crisis. Two positive responses to the crisis in Lebanon, which are particularly relevant for the MICIC Initiative are the importance of consular contingency planning and registries, as well as the priority that was given to addressing migrant-specific vulnerabilities – for example those of isolated domestic workers. The Lebanese experience illustrates how countries of origin, with good emergency plans and updated registries of citizens abroad, are better able to manage the protection and evacuation of their non-citizens in coordination with their respective embassies.\textsuperscript{74} When countries of origin have limited capacities for protecting and evacuating their citizens, international organisations such as IOM, UNHCR, and non-government organisations such as Caritas Lebanon and national societies of the Red Crescent needed to play a stronger role.\textsuperscript{75} During the course of the crisis, the EU provided 11 million euros to the IOM for the evacuation of 10,000 migrants originating from developing countries.\textsuperscript{76} Under IOM auspices and with the help of Caritas Lebanon and UNHCR, more than 13,000 migrants were evacuated during the crisis.\textsuperscript{77} Another noteworthy practice that can be drawn on from the Lebanese experience of crisis in 2006 is the role played by Syria in keeping its borders open to many of those fleeing the crisis and, together with the Syrian Arab Red Crescent Society, registering, accommodating and assisting the most vulnerable displaced persons.\textsuperscript{78} An estimated 20,000 migrant workers were able to leave Lebanon by land where, upon arrival in Damascus, they were given 48 hour visas, housed, and placed on charter flights to their respective countries.\textsuperscript{79}

Domestic workers were highlighted as a particularly vulnerable group during the crisis in Lebanon because their security was heavily dependent on the willingness of their employers to assist them during their evacuations. Despite several examples of employers supporting the evacuations of their domestic workers, cases were reported where domestic workers were trapped in apartment buildings or left without money and documents.\textsuperscript{80} In response to these issues, cooperation among Caritas Lebanon, embassies within Lebanon and Lebanese

\textsuperscript{70} Koser, 2014. Protecting non-citizens in situations of conflict, violence and disaster.
\textsuperscript{71} Author’s calculation based on the press reports as of 10 August 2006 as reported in Jureidini, 2006.
\textsuperscript{72} The number of Palestinian refugees in Lebanon registered with the UNRWA in June 2006 was 406,342 (about 10 per cent of the population of Lebanon). Palestinian refugees represented the majority of refugees in the country at the time.\textsuperscript{73} This figure includes the 13,000 migrants that were evacuated by IOM. It is not clear how many were dual nationals, how many were visiting, on holidays, or how many could have been classified as “migrants” (Jureidini, 2010).
\textsuperscript{74} These were mostly Governments of richer countries (OECD and Russia). Some countries with a larger population of migrants living in the country at the time of the crisis, such as Sri Lanka, Philippines and Ethiopia, did not have the financial means and organizational capacity to arrange for a large scale evacuation (Koser, 2014).
\textsuperscript{75} Koser, 2014.
\textsuperscript{76} In addition, IOM raised USD 1 million from the United States, USD 2 million from Belgium, USD 600,000 from Australia and USD 300,000 from a Qatari charity (Jureidini, 2010).
\textsuperscript{78} Jureidini, 2010.
\textsuperscript{79} Ibidem.
\textsuperscript{80} Ibidem.
The uprising in Libya began in mid-February 2011, with anti-government protests and the violent responses from Colonel Muammar Gaddafi’s regime. The civil unrest then escalated into an armed conflict between the rebels of the National Transitional Council, with air support from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and Gaddafi’s government forces, which eventually lead to Gaddafi’s overthrow in October 2011. During the peak of the crisis, from February to October 2011, displacement and evacuation of migrants took place on a size and scale unprecedented in recent years: in 2011, approximately 550,000 people were displaced and 796,915 migrants fled the country. Prior to the conflict, Libya hosted between 1.5 million and 2.5 million foreign nationals, including almost 1 million Egyptians.

Two responses to the Libyan crisis that are particularly relevant for the MICIC Initiative are the cooperation at borders and the key role played by employers in evacuating migrant workers. During the Libyan crisis, the majority of migrants fleeing violence travelled into Egypt (263,554) and Tunisia (345,238) and were facilitated by Tunisian and Egyptian policies, which kept borders open to those fleeing the conflict, under conditions of citizens transfer to third countries. Also within the context of the Libyan crisis, a largely unprecedented, ad hoc coordination effort between IOM and UNHCR helped to mitigate congestion at the borders. Employers also played exemplary roles during the evacuation of migrants. International oil companies acted promptly and started evacuating their non-nationals workers and their workers families from Libya on 21 February 2011. The oil fields in the south of the country, run by international firms, had their own airstrips facilitating evacuations. A more detailed discussion on the roles played by employers in evacuating their international staff is presented in Section 2.

The long-term implications of the crisis on migrants, including the consequences on their countries of origin and on Libya’s reconstruction, are also relevant for the MICIC initiative. Given that there were approximately 1.8 million migrant workers in Libya, and many of them lost their jobs and fled the country, such large-scale movement had significant implications for the countries of origin of migrants as well as for the post-crisis reconstruction of Libya itself. In particular, the local origin communities of migrants were forced to cope with an abrupt loss of remittances and the need to financially support returned family members, often within a country context of poverty and unemployment.
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81 Jureidini, 2010.
82 Weerasinghe and Taylor, 2015.
83 UNHCR, 2014; IOM, 2011c. Cross-border movement statistics only refer to migrants leaving Libya, it does not take into account Libyan nationals who were going back and forth into Libya.
85 This figure comprises of both Egyptian nationals and third country nationals.
86 This figure comprises of both Tunisian nationals and third country nationals.
87 Koser, 2012.
88 Ibidem.
89 The Financial Times, 21 February 2011. Oil groups prepare to close down in Libya. (http://on.ft.com/1iz8taL).
90 IOM, 2012a.
Finally, despite large-scale movements and evacuations, many migrants remained in Libya for various reasons, fear of losing jobs, shame of going home without money after years of work, lack of documentation and returning to a country where they had no longer had a home – are some examples. Among the most vulnerable non-citizens affected by the crisis in Libya were migrants whom remained trapped in Libya, for various reasons. These stranded migrants were often originating from Sub-Saharan African countries and sometimes were in detention – often arbitrarily. A major challenge in this regard was also the number of undocumented migrants (particularly those from Chad) and stateless persons (for example the Tuaregs in Libya, who lacked official documentation attesting their citizenship), making identification and evacuation procedures particularly challenging. Sub-Saharan African migrants were also targets of violence during the conflict, under the suspicion that they were mercenaries of the Gaddafi regime, which served to fuel deeply entrenched racism against Sub-Saharan Africans. Even after the fall of the Gaddafi regime, the country has endured a continuous low-level of conflict: weak rule of law and widespread insecurity has persisted, with suicide attacks, frequent abductions and clashes between rival militias throughout the country. This has had important implications for migrants who stayed in the country or who have migrated to the country since, motivated by the attractive salaries. Issues related to abuse of migrants by non-state militia groups and lack of protection measures have continuously been noted by international stakeholders. It is clear from this that on the one hand, Libya continues to be a destination country for migrant workers and yet, on the other hand, significant challenges still remain for states and other actors in ensuring their protection.

c. The ongoing civil war in Syria

The Syrian crisis began in March 2011 with peaceful anti-government protests and escalated into a full-scale civil war after the violent backlashes of President Bashar al-Assad government forces. Government forces and those opposed to President Bashar al-Assad’s rule began battling each other, and at a later date jihadist militants from Islamic State became more prominent. The situation has resulted in the largest forced displacement crisis to date in the world. At the end of August 2015, it was estimated that over 220,000 people have been killed and over 7.6 million internally displaced. Migrants are also represented in these movements, in particular migrant workers, refugees residing in Syria at the time the crisis started, and migrants transiting through Syria.

One positive aspect of responses to the crisis in Syria that is of particular relevance for the MICIC initiative is the assistance provided to migrant workers, in particular domestic workers. In 2010, there were an estimated 75,000 to 100,000 labour migrants, including domestic workers, in Syria, with the domestic worker population mainly representing women from Indonesia, the Philippines and Ethiopia. For domestic workers in Syria, an exit permit is required to leave the country and can only be obtained upon the consent of the employer and after a fee is paid to immigration officials. Some employers refused to consent to the grant of an exit permit, because
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92 Murphy, 2006.
94 Weerasinghe and Taylor, 2015
97 Weerasinghe and Taylor, 2015.
they feared losing the recruitment fee paid for migrant workers. This represented an obstacle especially for domestic workers trying to escape the conflict zone. In response, in 2013 the Philippines Government lobbied the Syrian Government to facilitate the departure of Filipino migrants (particularly domestic workers) by waiving the exit visa fees. Nonetheless, there continues to be illegal recruitment of Filipino workers to Syria, despite efforts to repatriate all Filipino nationals amid the ongoing conflict. This will remain a protection challenge in the future, also for other migrant workers remaining in the country.

A challenge particular to the context of this crisis is the large number of Iraqi and Palestinian refugees hosted by the country. Syria has been host to a large number of Iraqi refugees over the past decade, although this has decreased in recent years. At the same time, with violence flaring up in Iraq, a number of Iraqi refugees and asylum seekers have (re-)entered Syria, posing serious protection challenges. As of May 2015, of the approximately 560,000 Palestinian refugees registered with the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) in Syria, over half were estimated to have been displaced within Syria. Additionally, 12 percent of these Palestinian refugees have been displaced into neighbouring countries. The limited mandate of UNRWA, the increasingly restrictive border policies imposed by Syria neighbouring countries and the intensity of conflict that has occurred around the Yarmouk Camp in Damascus, has further aggravate the situation of Palestinian refugees in Syria.

d. The 2015 Civil War in Yemen

The Yemeni civil war is an ongoing conflict that began in January 2015 between the Southern separatists and forces loyal to the Government of President Abd Rabbuh Mansur Hadi based in Aden, on the one hand, and the Houthi forces and forces loyal to the former president Ali Abdullah Saleh, on the other. Al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) and the Islamic State have also carried out attacks, with AQAP controlling swathes of territory in the hinterlands and along the coast. On 26 March 2015, Saudi Arabia, representing a coalition of nine Arab states, began carrying out airstrikes in Yemen, responding to a request for assistance from President Abd Rabbuh Mansur Hadi. These events precipitated the current conflict situation in the country.

Yemen is a major country of transit for migrants from the Horn of Africa attempting to reach richer GCC countries. As of the end of August 2015 the country was host to approximately

100 Weerasinghe and Taylor, 2015.
105 Yarmouk is a neighbor of Damascus were about 18,000 Palestinian refugees are trapped during the current unrest, more information about it can be found at http://www.unrwa.org/crisis-in-yarmouk (UNRWA).
246,000 registered refugees,\textsuperscript{109} including 237,271 Somalis,\textsuperscript{110} 5,787 Ethiopians and 1,210 Eritreans.\textsuperscript{111} As of mid-2014, UNHCR had registered 2,000 Syrian refugees, although the number of Syrians not registered as refugees was reported to be much higher.\textsuperscript{112} Migrants from the Horn, mainly Ethiopians and Somalis on their way to Saudi Arabia and other Gulf countries, totaled more than 91,000, indicating a 40 per cent increase as compared to 2013.\textsuperscript{113} The insecurity in Yemen has been a contributing factor for migrants’ arrivals, as it is considered easier to enter and transit through the country.\textsuperscript{114} Despite the ongoing conflict, new refugees, asylum seekers and migrants continue to arrive along the coasts of Yemen. As of August 2015, an estimated 150 migrants were reported to have crossed into Yemen via Ethiopia and Djibouti every day.\textsuperscript{115} Between January and March 2015, 29,318 migrants arrived in Yemen from the Horn of Africa via the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden. From April to September 2015, the conflict severely impeded registration data entry, making it unreliable; however, it was estimated that an additional 10,500 migrants arrived in Yemen despite the crisis.\textsuperscript{116} The irregularity of their status and the lack of local support networks make migrants in crises such as these particularly vulnerable, especially to abduction, extortion, trafficking, and detention. In spite of these conditions of vulnerability, since the beginning of the conflict in Yemen large numbers of migrants and refugees have arrived into the Horn of Africa, escaping the violence in Yemen. According to IOM, from April to September 3rd, 2015, 59,230 migrants and refugees have arrived in Djibouti, Ethiopia, Somalia, and Sudan fleeing from Yemen.\textsuperscript{117} Further, Yemen’s migration situation is also shaped by the return of Yemenis from Saudi Arabia who numbered close to 500,000 at the end of the 2014.\textsuperscript{118}

Two positive aspects of the responses to the Yemen crisis that are of particular relevance to the MICIC Initiative, are related to the coordination among States during evacuations and the assistance to irregular migrants during the emergency phase. Regarding coordination, Russia and India were among the first countries to begin evacuating their nationals, and responding to requests from other governments to assist with evacuation of their respective citizens.\textsuperscript{119} Under the current crisis circumstances, almost 1,000,000 people,\textsuperscript{120} mostly Ethiopians and Somalis, are living in precarious conditions. As of August 2015, IOM has evacuated 1,413 people by sea to Djibouti and 2020 people by plane.\textsuperscript{121} Regarding the assistance to irregular migrants, the IOM’s Migrant Response Centre (MRC) in Haradh, has been providing food and medical care to migrants that have escaped situations of exploitation; these migrants try to enter Yemen.

\textsuperscript{109} Yemen is a signatory to the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol.
\textsuperscript{110} Somalis are recognized by the Government of Yemen on a “prima facie” basis as refugees without a requirement for registration.
\textsuperscript{111} UNHCR, 2015. (http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49e486ba6.html).
\textsuperscript{112} Ibidem.
\textsuperscript{114} DRC.2012.
\textsuperscript{117} Ibidem.
\textsuperscript{119} India evacuated more than 4,640 Indian citizens in Yemen along with 960 non-citizens of 41 countries from March to April 2015; in addition to the Indian operation, 11 Indian citizens were evacuated by a Pakistani ship, and India evacuated some Pakistani citizens; India Concludes Evacuation of Its Citizens From Yemen. The New York Times, April 2015. (http://nyti.ms/1lwBDqj). Russia evacuated over 600 people including 18 American citizens, six British citizens and citizens from 15 other countries in March 2015; US, UK thank Russia for evacuation of their citizens from Yemen. Reuter, April 2015. (http://bit.ly/1KY4ZIt).
\textsuperscript{121} IOM, August 2015. Situation Report No18.
irregularly and end up in the hands of profit-seeking smugglers who use torture and rape to extort money from migrants and their families in their countries of origin.\textsuperscript{122}

The above crises in Lebanon, Libya, Syria and Yemen have highlighted a number of notable practices at each of the pre-crisis, emergency, and post-crisis phases, relating to the protection and assistance of migrants caught in such situations. They bring to the fore the important roles played by a wide array of stakeholders who are involved at all stages and in a wide sphere of activities. In addition to countries of origin, transit and destination, the support and assistance provided by international organisations, private companies and civil society organisations has been considerable.

\textbf{3.2 Natural Disasters in the MENA Region}

Most of the countries in the MENA region are at risk of floods, earthquakes or droughts.\textsuperscript{123} The risk is high due to the aridity of the majority of the territory, with urbanisation concentrated along the coasts and close to the main rivers. Approximatively 60 million people (about 17 percent of MENA’s total population) live in the region’s coastal areas\textsuperscript{124} and the rapid growth of informal settlements in such areas increases their risk of exposure to floods.

The majority of the natural disasters in the MENA region so far have occurred in areas with limited migrant populations at the time of the event, namely Algeria, Egypt, Tunisia, Morocco, and Yemen.\textsuperscript{125} Among these countries, given the time period of the event and the presence of migrants, the 2008 floods in the Governorates of Hadramout and Al-Mahara in Yemen and the 2003 earthquake in Algeria are likely the most relevant example for the MICIC Initiative. Another important disaster worth mentioning – due to its large-scale impact on the population living in the area - are the floods that occurred in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, between 2009–2011. The 2009 floods in Jeddah killed more than 500 people,\textsuperscript{126} affected 10,000 people, and had catastrophic consequences for many with financial losses that amounted to an estimated USD 1.36 billion.\textsuperscript{127}

Unfortunately, there is very little information about the impact of these disasters on the migrants living in the areas affected. Nonetheless, given the number of migrants living or transiting through the aforementioned countries and areas with high predispositions to natural disasters, it has been deemed useful to include them in this paper.

\textbf{a. The 2003 Boumerdes Earthquake in Northern Algeria}

If a MENA region (excluding Iran) is taken as a reference, Algeria is considered to be the most vulnerable country in the region, with regards to seismic hazards. Ninety percent of Algeria’s infrastructure and population is located in areas exposed to seismic risk, primarily in the northern part of the country.\textsuperscript{128} The earthquake that struck northern Algeria on 21 May 2003, was the most powerful to have affected North Africa since 1980.\textsuperscript{129} According to the

\textsuperscript{122} IOM Welcomes Yemeni Crackdown on Human Smugglers, IOM Newsdesk (\url{http://bit.ly/1OeSWcm}).
\textsuperscript{123} GFDRR, 2014.
\textsuperscript{124} Ibidem.
\textsuperscript{125} GFDRR, 2014.
\textsuperscript{127} GFDRR, 2014.
\textsuperscript{128} GFDRR, 2014.
\textsuperscript{129} Algeria Earthquake Appeal No. 14/03 Final report. International Federation of Red Cross And Red Crescent Societies 24 July 2006. (\url{http://bit.ly/1LAEJHf}).
International Red Cross's final report on the disaster, more than 2,200 people died, more than 10,000 were injured and at least 180,000 were left homeless due to the disaster.\textsuperscript{130}

Since its independence in 1962 Algeria has been prevalently a country of emigration. However, as a result of economic liberalisation starting in the 2000s, Algeria has recently experienced a new type of immigration.\textsuperscript{131} Today, growing numbers of foreign firms and workers enter Algeria, especially from China (in the construction sector) and India (in the steel industry). Meanwhile, Algeria continues to play a relevant role in attracting Sub-Saharan migrants to cover labour shortages in a variety of sectors (e.g. agriculture, construction, tourism, domestic services, etc.).

Although it is not easy to identify how many non-nationals were residing in Algeria and affected by the crisis at the time of the earthquake, 10,564 work permits were issued in 2003, which gives some indication as to the amounts of documented labour migrants affected. According to 2004 data, foreign workers mainly came from China (41 per cent), Egypt (11 per cent) and Turkey (6 per cent) and worked in the construction and oil sector (respectively 53 per cent and 19 per cent).\textsuperscript{132} According to the Chinese Foreign Ministry Spokesperson's Press Conference on 22 May 2003, at least 14 Chinese citizens were affected by the earthquake.\textsuperscript{133} Algeria is also host to large numbers of Sub-Saharan irregular foreign workers employed in agriculture, construction and tourism, in the northern part of the country.\textsuperscript{134}

The 2003 earthquake in Algeria is particularly relevant for MICIC Initiative because of the strong solidarity shown by the international community and the coordination among several actors involved in the emergency phase, including international organisations, donors, civil society and the private sector. As an example, France sent two rescue teams of 60 persons, while Germany sent a team of 22 quake specialists and 10 search dogs. Further, the European Union coordinated disaster relief efforts with Belgium, Italy, Spain and Greece, sending rescuers and medical staff. Egypt flew in over 13 tonnes of food, medicine, blankets and tents for emergency relief.\textsuperscript{135}

\textbf{b. Floods in the Governorates of Hadramout and Al-Mahra in Yemen}

Floods and heavy rains on 24-25 October 2008 caused one of the most serious natural disasters in Yemen observed in the last few decades. The most affected areas were in the Governorate of Hadramout, both in the valley (Wadi Hadhramout) and the coastal areas (Sahel Hadhramout), as well as the Governorate of Al-Mahra. The floods resulted in the deaths of 73 persons and over 3,000 families were internally displaced, corresponding to approximately 20,000-25,000 persons.\textsuperscript{136} The floods caused significant damage to houses, infrastructure and the agricultural sector, destroying or considerably affecting the livelihoods of about 700,000 people.\textsuperscript{137} Yemen is highly vulnerable to risks of natural disasters, and a number of gaps have

\textsuperscript{130} Ibidem.
\textsuperscript{132} Ibidem.
\textsuperscript{135} Fox News, 2003. 'Earthquake Kills Nearly 1,100 In Algeria'. (http://fxn.ws/1VzMPlc).
\textsuperscript{136} United Nations Yemen Flood Response Plan, 2009.
\textsuperscript{137} ReliefWeb, 2015. 'USD 6 Million Project To Assist Floods Affected Areas In Hadramout And Al-Mahra Signed UNDP Yemen Focus Areas - Crisis Prevention And Recovery'. (http://bit.ly/1LNvGQr).
been highlighted following the 2008 relief efforts. Since 2007, the World Bank and GFDRR have supported the strengthening of the Republic of Yemen’s national system for Disaster Risk Management (DRM) in view of the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA)\textsuperscript{138} priorities.

As already mentioned above, Yemen is a major country of destination and transit (to Saudi Arabia and other Gulf States) for mixed migrants from the Horn of Africa. Floods are recurrent events in Yemen: in the period 1980-2010, Yemen was affected by 26 separate floods. Although data on the impact of natural disasters on migrants in the country are not available, it is important that the DRM mechanism in place is also able to assist non-nationals, as it is likely that migrants and displaced persons are among those affected the recurrent floods.

Natural hazards increase the protection risks already present for IDPs previously displaced by other causes - making them vulnerable to further displacements. Although there is no information about the impact of the 2008 floods on IDPs in Yemen, in early 2010, severe storms destroyed or damaged hundreds of IDP shelters in camps in Hajjah, further restricting the already limited resources.\textsuperscript{139} Similarly, in April 2012, flash floods inundated settlements, which affected at least 76 internally displaced families, including 200 children.\textsuperscript{140}

Yemen is a particularly interesting case for the MICIC Initiative because the risk of natural hazard is combined with the unstable political situation, described previously. Other countries' experiences illustrate how natural hazards can culminate into a disaster situation, particularly when combined with pre-existing issues and conflicts (e.g. Somalia, Darfur, etc.).\textsuperscript{141} For migrants or non-nationals present in a country, which is doubly affected by a combination of natural disaster and conflict, the level of vulnerability is particularly severe.

\section*{SECTION 2 - REVIEW OF RELEVANT PRACTICES}

This section focuses on the relevant practices implemented by countries of origin, transit and destination as well as other relevant stakeholders, such as international organisations, the private sectors and civil societies that assist and protect migrants caught in countries in the MENA region experiencing conflicts and natural disasters. It covers the pre-crisis, emergency and post-crisis phases. These practices are drawn from the crises in Algeria, Lebanon, Libya, Syria and Yemen. Examples of practices are not exhaustive and have been drawn from information that is readily available. Furthermore, these practices target areas of intervention in which States and stakeholders in the MENA region have particular experience and which were critical in addressing the needs of migrants during the above-mentioned crises.

\textsuperscript{138} The HFA is a 10-year plan to make the world safer from natural hazards. It was adopted by 168 member states of the United Nations in 2005 at the World Disaster Reduction Conference.

\textsuperscript{139} IDMC, August 2010.


\textsuperscript{141} GFDRR, 2014.
1. Pre-crisis Phase

a. Registering nationals abroad

_Tunisia:_ the Secretary of State for Tunisian Expatriates of the Ministry for Social Affairs conducted a survey with various Tunisian consulates to determine the location of Tunisian nationals overseas who fled or went missing during the 2011 crisis. Consulates are closely involved in locating and communicating with Tunisians abroad. Data on migrant outflows from Tunisia are collected by consulates abroad through registries and surveys. Additionally, exit from Tunisia is monitored by border officials. One of the main incentives for Tunisian citizens who decide to migrate and register with the consulate in the country of destination is the possibility to enjoy full citizenship rights when living abroad, in particular voting rights.\(^{142}\)

_Algeria:_ Algerian Embassies monitor Algerian citizens living abroad by offering the possibility to register with the various Algerian Embassies. The registration of nationals abroad is compulsory and allows Algerian citizens to remain on the electoral roll.\(^{143}\) The compulsory registration is an instrument to support the Government of Algeria in monitoring the number of Algerian citizens abroad.

_Egypt:_ Egyptian authorities monitor emigration through consular registration figures.\(^{144}\) The development of an integrated database on Egyptians abroad has also been highlighted as a governmental priority, in part to collect information on the Egyptian diaspora and their profiles, which could be developed as a tool to support nationals caught in countries in crisis.\(^{145}\)

_Morocco:_ Moroccan consulates and embassies gather data on the emigrant population.\(^{146}\) Managing population outflows is a priority for Morocco, and there has been a strong track record of this management. Data on Moroccans abroad is estimated combining Moroccan consular records and destination countries’ statistics (population censuses, population registers, register of foreigners, etc.).\(^{147}\) The incentive to register at the consulates is provided through the ability to enjoy full citizenship rights, in particular the right to vote.

b. Signing the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction

_Africa, Bahrain, Egypt, Jordan, Iraq, Lebanon, Morocco, Qatar, Tunisia and the United Arab Emirates_ have agreed on a “road map” for the implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 in the Arab Region in order to achieve a substantial reduction in disaster losses in November 2015 in Cairo, Egypt.\(^{148}\) A revised Arab Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction specific to the region’s needs and priorities and aligned with the targets of Sendai Framework was rolled out during the meeting.\(^{149}\) This is relevant for MICIC because the text of the Sendai Framework refers to the inclusion of migrants in DRR and goes even


\(^{145}\) Ibidem.

\(^{146}\) MPC, 2013a. _Migration Profile Morocco._ ([http://bit.ly/1IN3ad4](http://bit.ly/1IN3ad4)).

\(^{147}\) Ibidem.


\(^{149}\) Ibidem.
beyond that recognizing that “Migrants contribute to the resilience of communities and societies, and their knowledge, skills and capacities can be useful in the design and implementation of disaster risk reduction”.\textsuperscript{150}

League of Arab States: Several ministerial level regional agreements, arrangements and strategies have been developed at the League of Arab States and at sub-regional levels (e.g. the Gulf Cooperation Council) on matters related to disaster risk management.\textsuperscript{151}

c. Ensuring the protection of nationals abroad

Algeria and Egypt: During the Libya crisis both the Algerian and Egyptian Governments supported the repatriation of their citizens by asking the support of international organizations.\textsuperscript{152} The responsibility of the State to protect nationals abroad is enshrined in the Algerian constitution.\textsuperscript{153}

Morocco: In 2007, King Mohammed VI established the Council for the Moroccan Community Abroad (CCME). This is an advisory council consisting of Moroccan emigrants, which aims to advise the Moroccan government how to best defend the interests of Moroccan emigrants and how to enhance the development potential of migration.\textsuperscript{154}

Qatar: Qatar and Nepal signed a bilateral agreement focusing on reducing the number of corrupted or exploitative recruiters in Nepal and organising the recruitment of migrant workers for Qatar directly through the Nepalese Ministry of Labour.\textsuperscript{155} This aims to guarantee some minimum rights to the Nepalese workers including avoiding indebting the workers and their family back home to the recruiting agency, which might be a deterrent to fleeing violence in case of a crisis.

d. Ensuring the protection and well-being of migrants

Bahrain: In May 2006, King Hamad bin Issa al-Khalifa issued a law for the establishment of the Labour Market Regulatory Authority (LMRA) which regulates the labour market in Bahrain and replaces the kafala system of sponsorship.\textsuperscript{156} By decreasing the dependence of foreign contractual workers on their kafils and allowing foreign employees to move from one employer to another without the consent of the first employer, this significantly empowers foreign workers and their decision to flee the violence in case of a crisis even without the consent or support of their employer.

United Arab Emirates: While the United Arab Emirates still maintains the kafala system, there have been substantial reforms regarding migrant workers. Recent measures have ranged from

\begin{itemize}
  \item MPC, 2013a.
  \item Some recruiters charge the employee large fees for being put in contact with a Qatari sponsor, indebting the worker to the recruitment agency. Employees end up working to pay the recruiter, not keeping their earnings for themselves. ILO, 2004. An Overview Paper Of Overseas Employment In Nepal. See Appendix 4 on (http://bit.ly/1IN81ek).
  \item IOM, 2010b.
\end{itemize}
making the practice of confiscating worker’s passports illegal, allowing workers to transfer employer sponsorship and introducing wage protection measures. In case of a sudden evacuation the possession of legal documents/passports eases and speeds up the process of evacuation for non-nationals.

e. Including migrants into emergency and evacuation plans

**Philippines:** Contingency plans are formulated by the Foreign Service posts include mapping of nationals abroad, command and control procedures, evacuation route plans, and material and logistical resources.

**Private sector:** Hyundai Engineering Co. and Doosan Heavy Industry & Construction Co., which had both Korean nationals and a large number of workers of other nationalities, had detailed plans in place to evacuate migrant workers out of Libya in 2011.

f. Establishing a mechanism to cover emergency repatriation cost

**United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia and Qatar:** The United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia and Qatar provide emergency repatriation cost coverage for migrant workers. At the moment situations of conflict or natural disaster are not covered but given the fact that the mechanism is already in place it would only be a matter of extending its scope.

g. Establishing coordination committees to address crises

**Algeria, Lebanon, Morocco and Yemen:** Inter-ministerial steering committees on Disaster Risk Management (DRM) have been established under the prime ministers’ offices in Lebanon, Morocco and Yemen and under the Ministry of Interior in Algeria.

**Iraq:** a Policy Task Force was established by the Government of Iraq to provide a forum for ministries and agencies in the migration structure to develop coordinated policy to provide input to planning issues. In this vein, emergency committees including government agencies, non-governmental organisations and provincial governors were formed to deal with cross-border mass movements and internal displacement due to natural and man-made disasters. However, it appears that, although these committees have already been formed, they tend to respond to emergencies rather than make advance preparations. Moreover, it is unclear whether they have specific contingency plans for migrants caught in a disaster situation. IOM workshops also have been implemented in the Kurdish region of Iraq, in a move to homogenise training between officials of the Regional Government and Iraq.

---


159 Kelly and Wadud, 2012.


161 Emergency repatriation cost coverage is limited to: 1. Insurance against death, accident, illness, disability; compensation to family and transfer of body in case of death of migrant worker; 2. Assistance in forced repatriation in cases of illness, violence and physical abuse at work, contract violation, or non-existent job.

162 GFDRR, 2014.
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h. Diversifying communication channels to reach out to migrants

**Philippines**: Civil society in the Philippines invested in cultivating support networks for its nationals abroad based on the premise that they can reach and assist one another in crisis situations. This initiative, named *Balabal* (shawl or cloak), was effective in supporting civil society and the Filipino Government to assist migrant workers trapped in Syria, enabling them to reach safety and return home.\(^{165}\) The Filipino community is also mobilised through the ‘wardenship’ programme where Filipino community leaders have to take care of a number of overseas Filipinos. The wardenship system was effective in Libya where communities were well organised. Using the system was more challenging in Syria where the majority of overseas Filipino workers are undocumented workers.

i. Building capacities of civil society

**International organisations**: In 2015, IOM trained Libyan NGO staff in crisis response to assist migrants in times of crisis. These NGOs included the Libyan Red Crescent, Libyan Crisis Committee, Tahir Al-Zawi Organisation, Tamzeen Organisation and Multakana Psychosocial Centre.\(^{166}\) The purpose of this training was to increase the participants' knowledge of humanitarian responses, and the provision of psychological support, identifying vulnerable groups of migrants and IDPs, and the appropriate referral mechanism.\(^{167}\)

j. Developing coordinated responses at regional level

**Rabat Process**: The Rome Programme, which sets out the priorities of the Rabat Process for 2015-2017, calls for regional actions to take into account the consequences of environmental degradation and political instability in national strategies on migration management.\(^{168}\)

2. Emergency Phase

a. Monitoring and coordination

**Philippines**: To address the issue of migrants in the still ongoing crisis in Libya, the Secretary of Labour in the Philippines instituted in June 2014 the Libya Crisis Quick Response Team to monitor the development of the crisis and to be ready to intervene to protect their citizens where necessary.\(^{169}\) Furthermore, the Department of Foreign Affairs in the Philippines applies a four level crisis alert system, with consequent action with regard to deployment of recruited Filipino migrant workers and voluntary repatriation of workers depending on the severity of the situation.\(^{170}\) The system has been used during the crises in Iraq, Libya and Syria.

b. Engaging embassies and consulates

---

\(^{165}\) Weerasinghe and Taylor, 2015.
\(^{167}\) IOM, 2015a. *IOM Trains Libyan NGO Partners In Tunisia*.
\(^{170}\) Battistella, 2015.
Egypt: Diplomatic efforts by the Egyptian Embassies in Beirut and Damascus successfully exempted between 3,000 and 4,000 Egyptians who had irregularly entered Lebanon during the Lebanon crisis from paying a fine of USD 1,000. During the Lebanon crisis, these two embassies also coordinated the evacuation of around 14,000 people back to Egypt. In addition, a hotline and a “crisis management group” were established by these embassies.

Syria: In 2013, the Syrian Government facilitated the departure of Filipino migrants by waiving their exit visa fees, in part due to the lobbying of the Philippines government on behalf of their nationals.

c. Setting up a national emergency coordination structure

Lebanon: The Higher Relief Council (HRC) was the main body established to coordinate crisis response activities during the 2006 Lebanon war. As a result, cooperation between local and international NGOs and international aid agencies, in terms of delivering health care, food and nutrition, water and sanitation, logistics, protection, shelter and common services was significantly improved.

South Korea: In light of the number of South Korean migrant workers in Libya at the time of the crisis, the South Korea's Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport set up a taskforce to cope with the crisis and to support the evacuation of their migrant’s workers in cooperation with private companies.

Morocco: According to the website of the Council for the Moroccan Community Abroad, in response to the crisis in Libya, the CCME created a crisis unit comprised of representatives of several ministries. Morocco withdrew its diplomatic staff from Libya to Tunisia, and provided assistance to Moroccans from the Libyan Tunisia border.

d. Facilitating and coordinating evacuation and departure of migrants

Russia, Moldova and Romania: During the Lebanon crisis, coordination efforts allowed for the joint evacuation of 1,400 Russians, 1,100 Romanians, 400 Ukrainians and 150 Moldovans.

Lebanon: In 2006, the Government declared an amnesty for all irregular migrant workers on the condition that they leave the country and not return for at least five years. This helped irregular migrants stranded at the borders to leave the country, but it might have also worked as a deterrent to leave the country during the crisis because of the five years non-return clause.

---
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**Jordan:** In wake of the Yemen crisis, Jordan evacuated its nationals to Saudi Arabia. There were an estimated 500-1000 Jordanian citizens in the country amidst the ongoing crisis.\(^{179}\)

**Private sector:** In the case of the 2006 Lebanese crisis, Lebanese placement agencies contributed to the evacuation of migrant workers.\(^{180}\) Many employers called these agencies to either inform that their maids had fled, or require assistance for their passage to the embassy and further evacuation.\(^{181}\) In the case of the Libyan crisis, International oil companies were among the first to pull out their international staff. Eni, Wintershall, BP, Royal Dutch Shell, Repsol, OMV and Statoil repatriated staff as early as 21 February 2011. Others who were repatriating their staff were Polish state-owned gas company PGNiG, Canadian Suncor Energy, Arabian oil company Nafoora, Chinese state-owned China National Petroleum Corporation and others.\(^{182}\) South Korean companies such as Hyundai Engineering & Construction Co. (Hyundai E&C) and Daewoo Engineering & Construction Co. (Daewoo E&C) also pulled out migrant workers from areas most affected by the civil war in Libya.\(^{183}\)

**International organisations:** From the beginning of the Libyan crisis in March 2011, IOM and UNHCR joined forces to coordinate evacuation efforts and set up the Humanitarian Evacuation Cell at the central level. This close working relationships has been lauded as a model to be followed in allocating responsibilities during a crisis. One of the main objectives was to “decongest the borders to prevent the crisis overflowing to neighbouring countries”. The Cell is currently hosted by IOM and is in place to also deal with other crisis situations.\(^{184}\) The Governments in the region, IOM and partner agencies ensured that reception facilities and transit centres were in place for migrants. Out of an estimated 50,000 Bangladeshi citizens thought to be residing in Libya, more than 30,000 had returned home with IOM assistance by the end of March, while another 6,500 were evacuated in subsequent weeks.\(^{185}\) During both the 2011 Libyan crisis and the Syria crisis, IOM received requests from governments to assist with identification, documentation and transportation of trapped third country nationals.\(^{186}\)

**Recruitment agencies:** In the context of the crisis in Libya, over 100 Nepali migrants were evacuated and their salaries compensated by their recruitment agency.\(^{187}\)

**Civil society:** During the 2006 Lebanese crisis, Caritas Lebanon and the Red Cross played a particularly important role in facilitating the departure of migrants at departure and reception points, including in transit areas such as Cyprus.\(^{188}\)

---


\(^{180}\) Jureidini, 2010.

\(^{181}\) Ibidem.
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\(^{184}\) IOM, 2012b. The Humanitarian Evacuation Cell has also been activated with respect to the evacuation of UN/IOM staff in Yemen.

\(^{185}\) Weerasinghe and Taylor, 2015.
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**e. Keeping borders open**

*Egypt, Tunisia and Syria:* During the 2011 crisis in Libya, Tunisia and Egypt kept their borders open, despite the fact that both countries were experiencing domestic unrest at the same time. This has been considered an important factor in helping fleeing migrants to reach safety and meeting their immediate humanitarian needs.\(^{189}\) During the 2006 Lebanon crisis, Syria also kept its borders open, which has similarly been highlighted as a positive factor in assisting migrants.\(^{190}\)

**f. Providing humanitarian assistance**

*Syria:* The Government and the Syrian Arab Red Crescent Society took a leading role in registering, accommodating and assisting the most vulnerable people displaced in Syria from Lebanon.\(^{191}\)

*League of Arab States (LAS):* During the Libyan crisis, LAS has been very active in providing immediate relief and support to people fleeing the country as well as local communities.\(^{192}\) A delegation from LAS and UNHCR visited the Libyan-Egyptian and Libyan-Tunisian borders on 14-24 April 2011 to assess the situation of migrants and refugees on both sides of the borders and to study their needs and the humanitarian organisations’ responses to those needs. The mission’s work included a series of direct interviews with migrants and refugees and relief staff at the borders and in refugee camps.\(^{193}\)

*Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC):* OIC was among the first to respond to the needs of displaced people from the Libyan crisis. It produced regular situation reports from the beginning of the crisis\(^{194}\) and launched several appeals to its Member States to assist with evacuation of displaced people fleeing into neighbouring countries. On 1 March 2011, the OIC Secretary General called upon Member States to assist the Tunisian Government by providing transport to return displaced people to their countries of origin. OIC also organised a fact finding mission to assess the humanitarian conditions in affected border areas in Egypt and Tunisia, which was the basis for further appeals and action. In addition, OIC coordinated concrete evacuation operations and was involved in the distribution of relief items to people in refugee camps at the Tunisian-Libyan border.\(^{195}\)

*Civil society:* NGOs played a key role in assisting displaced people during the crises in Lebanon and Libya. Caritas Lebanon, the Red Cross and the Zakat Foundation of America provided housing, transport, food and treatment to displaced individuals.\(^{196}\) Doctors without Borders provided free medical treatment to those affected by the conflict within Libya.\(^{197}\) With regard to the ongoing crisis in Yemen, the Danish Refugee Council (DRC) registers newly arrived

---

\(^{189}\) Koser, 2012.
\(^{190}\) Jureidini 2010.
\(^{191}\) OCHA, 2006.
\(^{192}\) MPC, 2013.
\(^{193}\) More information in Regional Responses to Forced Migration: The Case of Libya. ([http://bit.ly/1gYfxxg](http://bit.ly/1gYfxxg)).
\(^{195}\) Reliefweb, 2011. OIC begins repatriating displaced people on Libyan borders to their countries. ([http://bit.ly/1L2CDiv](http://bit.ly/1L2CDiv)).
\(^{196}\) More information at: [http://www.zakat.org/country/lebanon/](http://www.zakat.org/country/lebanon/).
migrants and provides them with humanitarian assistance at seven registration and information centres in Yemen.\textsuperscript{198}

g. Calling for solutions at political level

\textbf{African Union}: On 23 February 2011 the African Union released a roadmap outlining the steps required to end the Libyan crisis. The latter called for the “protection of foreign nationals, including African migrants living in Libya”.\textsuperscript{199} Due to the rapid escalation of the conflict in Libya and the intervention of the NATO, the roadmap was not used; still it represents an important example of how in case of a conflict the African Union included the protection of migrants and non-nationals in the priority list to solve the conflict.

\textbf{h. Raising awareness of risk of trafficking in human beings}

\textbf{Lebanon}: During the conflict in 2006, the Lebanese Ministry of Justice and Caritas Lebanon produced a trilingual booklet in Sinhalese, Amharic and Tagalog to caution domestic workers against possible traffickers. These booklets were distributed to migrant workers at the borders as they left Lebanon.\textsuperscript{200}

\textbf{International organisations}: Events have been organized by international organisations, in particular IOM, to raise awareness about trafficking in human beings in times of crisis, including migrants. The Professionals in Humanitarian Assistance and Protection (PHAP) presented a live online briefing and consultation in “Trafficking in persons in times of crisis” on 18 June 2015. In this occasion IOM presented the findings of their research on the manifestations and responses to trafficking in human beings in times of crises in the MENA region, with a focus on Iraq and Libya, and Caritas presented the findings of their research on trafficking in human beings.\textsuperscript{201}

\textbf{i. Releasing emergency funds for humanitarian assistance}

\textbf{United Kingdom (UK)}: The UK provided funding through the Department for International Development (DFID) to the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), which supplied humanitarian assistance to people affected by the conflict in Libya, including migrant workers.\textsuperscript{202}

\textbf{International organisations}: The majority of contributions to IOM during the 2011 Libya crisis came from the United States (USD 28 million), the Directorate General for Humanitarian and Civil Protection (ECHO) of the European Commission (USD 27 million) and Bangladesh (USD 12 million). The majority of funds went to providing transportation.\textsuperscript{203} In 2012, following lessons learnt from the Libya crisis, the Migration Emergency Funding Mechanism was established to facilitate IOM’s rapid response and intervention during natural or man-made crisis situations.\textsuperscript{204}


\textsuperscript{199} Twinomugisha, 2013. \textit{The African Union’s Response to the Libyan Crisis of 2011} (Doctoral dissertation, Faculty Of Management, University Of The Witwatersrand).


\textsuperscript{201} For more information please see https://phap.org/newsletters/2015/june/whs-trafficking.


\textsuperscript{203} Kelly and Wadud, 2012.

**Bangladesh:** The Government of Bangladesh obtained a World Bank loan of USD 40 million to reimburse IOM for its expenses in repatriating 10,000 Bangladeshi migrants from Libya.\(^{205}\) The majority of the loan was allocated to providing livelihood support and reintegration assistance for returnees.\(^{206}\)

**CERF:** At the end of June 2015, the UN Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) provided USD 8 million to the World Health Organization (WHO) to deliver life-saving medicines. This disbursement is part of a larger USD 25 million allocation to support life-saving assistance for people affected by the crisis in Yemen without distinction in terms of status. Other CERF-funded assistance includes providing fuel, emergency supplies, clean water, sanitation services and nutrition programmes.\(^{207}\)

### 3 Post-crisis Phase

**a. Registering returning migrants**

**Lebanon:** At the end of April 2015, the Lebanese High Relief Commission (HRC) launched a project in cooperation with IOM to register and profile Lebanese returnees from Syria. During the first week, 3,708 individuals were registered at eight different centres across the country. The first phase of registration for these returnees showed that they had material assistance needs. Most had been living in Syria for decades and came with few belongings.\(^{208}\)

**Chad:** Local or regional authorities set up welcome committees for returnees from Libya and were carrying out registration as a prelude to other activities. However, registration was not consistent. In some regions (i.e. Ouaddai), there was no welcome committee. The Government worked with IOM at the transit centre to register returnees, but not all returnees remained in the region.\(^{209}\)

**b. Providing immediate assistance to returnees**

**International organisations:** At the Somali ports of Bossaso and Berbera, the World Food Programme (WFP) biometrically registers vulnerable Somalis and Yemenis returning from Yemen and provides them with electronic transfer cards known as System for Cash Operations (SCOPE) cards, which have a cash value that can be redeemed in shops across Somalia. The biometric data acts as their personal signature, validating each transaction. The SCOPE cards will also enable vulnerable people to be enrolled in WFP’s programmes, including in-kind transfers and nutrition interventions, once their needs have been assessed.\(^{210}\)

\(^{205}\) IOM, 2011a.


\(^{209}\) IOM, 2012b.

**Bangladesh:** The Government of Bangladesh provided returnees from Libya one-time cash assistance in the amount of 50,000 Taka (USD 600).\(^{211}\)

c. **Offering return and reintegration support**

**Senegal:** The Government instituted, with the help of IOM and other agencies, a national committee to organise the reception of Senegalese workers returning from Libya. This involved meeting returnees at international airports or at land border crossings, providing them with basic assistance, and organizing transport back to home localities.\(^{212}\)

**Niger:** The Government issued an order for support to be provided to returnees from Libya in the form of food distribution, seed supply, distribution of livestock, and the transfer of money. However, the degree of implementation at the local level varied.\(^{213}\)

**International organisations:** The Regional Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration for Stranded Migrants (RAVEL) programme run by IOM provided return and reintegration assistance to 715 stranded migrants in Libya and Egypt and assisted 841 migrants from Niger, Mali and Ghana.\(^{214}\) IOM Ghana has initiated projects to support returnees from Libya, aimed at income-generation and increasing awareness on the hazards of migration.\(^{215}\) In 2012 ILO supported the re-integration of 1,000 Ethiopian female domestic migrant workers returning from Saudi Arabia into the labour market, while preparing awareness raising programmes to avoid stigma and discrimination for these returnees. In addition to providing financial support, an integrated plan of activities which includes business and entrepreneurship training, capacity building, mentorship and coaching was launched to help the returnees so that they can sustain their families and contribute to the development of the country.\(^{216}\) In January 2015 the European Union has granted 10 million euro to support the reintegration of returnees and the management of labour migration in Ethiopia, with a focus on Ethiopian migrants who returned from Saudi Arabia.\(^{217}\) The reintegration support is carried out by ILO (launched as of July 2015)\(^{218}\) in close cooperation with the Government of Ethiopia and civil society organisations, while the migration management and sensitisation component will be implemented by the relevant Government of Ethiopia authorities, in particular the Ministry of Labour and Social Services, the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.\(^{219}\)

d. **Remitting unpaid salaries**

**Private sector:** A Chinese company operating in Libya remitted unpaid salaries for its Bangladeshi workers directly to the Bangladesh Government’s Bureau of Manpower, Employment and Training.\(^{220}\)

---
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**Conclusions**

The Regional Consultation for the MENA region provides an opportunity to discuss and explore many issues of relevance to the work of the MICIC Initiative. Section 1 of this regional discussion paper highlighted how the region’s geography and resources, as well as its national population distribution, brings about particular challenges and vulnerabilities in terms of the region’s mixed migration flows.

The lack of a specific legal framework for protecting migrants caught in countries experiencing conflicts and natural disasters, combined with the scarce ratification of the main instruments related to international migration in destination countries, increases migrants’ vulnerabilities in the region. The mixed nature of migration flows in the region represents one of the key challenges in protecting migrants caught in countries experiencing crises and makes some categories of migrants, including irregular migrants, particularly vulnerable.

This paper focused on crises stemming from conflicts. It brought to the fore concrete experiences of four cases, namely the Lebanon-Israel-Hezbollah war of 2006, the 2011 Libya civil unrest, the on-going Syria civil war as well as the 2015 Yemen civil war. Relevant practices that have emerged from the intervention of different stakeholders, including States, international organisations, civil society and the private sector have been discussed. Important areas of intervention on protecting and assisting migrants during these crises were also highlighted; demonstrating how States and other stakeholders in the region have previously acquired experiences, from which lessons can be learnt. Existing practices consist of the inclusion of migrants in consular contingency plans, the registration of nationals abroad, the cooperative evacuation efforts of migrant workers by relevant actors, the adoption of measures to address the specific needs of domestic migrant workers and irregular migrants, and the development of international cooperation, in particular at borders and in the coordination of evacuations. The examples discussed in this paper are not exhaustive. This paper is intended as an impetus to explore the main trends and notable interventions in the MENA region and it is expected that many more examples will be highlighted during the course of the Regional Consultation.
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### Annex 1: Estimated Sizes of the Principal Migrant Communities in the GCC (thousands people).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indians</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>3,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistanis</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptians</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemeni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshis</td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipinos</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankans</td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordanians/Palestinians</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iranians</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals by country of destination</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>5,850</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>10,979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 2: Total and foreign Employment by Economic Sector in the GCC, 2009a, by per cent of Employment and Foreign Worker Proportion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Bahrain</th>
<th>Kuwait</th>
<th>Qatar</th>
<th>Saudi Arabia</th>
<th>UAE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Sector</td>
<td>%tot. emp.</td>
<td>% for.wk.</td>
<td>%tot. emp.</td>
<td>% for.wk.</td>
<td>%tot. emp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and fishing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and quarrying</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, gas and water</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and retail</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels and restaurants</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport, storage, etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration/defence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and social work</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other community/social service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with employed persons</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other economic activity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total employment (000)</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>2,093</td>
<td>1,742</td>
<td>1,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%foreign workers (all sectors)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Martin Baldwin-Edwards, 2011, Table 13, Author's calculations based on national data. 
\( ^a \) 2008 data for Bahrain and Saudi Arabia.
\( ^b \) Data for Bahrain are incomplete, since total employment for 2008 is recorded elsewhere as 467,000.
\( ^c \) No actual data supplied by the UAE, only per cent by sector; per cent foreign workers calculated by imputation.
Note: %tot.emp. = % of total employment and % for.wk. = % of Foreign Workers.

Annex 4: International Instruments that can be applied to Migrant Workers and their Ratification in the Countries of the MENA Region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ICCPR</th>
<th>ICESCR</th>
<th>ICRMW</th>
<th>ICERD</th>
<th>CAT</th>
<th>UN TIP Protocol</th>
<th>CRC</th>
<th>CEDAW</th>
<th>ILO C105</th>
<th>ILO C29</th>
<th>ILO C143</th>
<th>ILO C97</th>
<th>OAU</th>
<th>1951 RC</th>
<th>1967 Protocol</th>
<th>Kampala Convention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*None of the above countries have ratified ILO C189 – Domestic Workers Convention. (s) signature not yet ratification.

Source: Author’s compilation based on the International Instruments websites compilation lists, checked as of September 2015.