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## Acronyms

**ACWC**  ASEAN Commission on the Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Women and Children  
**ASEAN**  Association of Southeast Asian Nations  
**CBTIP**  Central Body for Suppression of trafficking in persons in Myanmar  
**COMMIT**  Coordinated Mekong Ministerial Initiative against Trafficking  
**DSW**  Department of Social Welfare  
**GMS**  Greater Mekong Sub-region  
**ILO**  International Labour Organization  
**IOM**  International Organization for Migration  
**MoU**  Memorandum of Understanding  
**NGO**  Non-Governmental organisation  
**MPS**  Ministry of Public Security  
**M&E**  Monitoring and Evaluation  
**MOFA**  Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
**NPA**  National Plan of Action to Combat Human Trafficking  
**SPA**  Sub-regional Plan of Action  
**TIPP**  Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, particularly Women and Children  
**TOC**  UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime  
**UNIAP**  United Nations Inter-Agency Project on Human Trafficking  
**UNODC**  United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
Introduction & Details about the Consultative Workshop

The Ministry of Home Affairs and the Coordinated Mekong Ministerial Initiative against Trafficking (COMMIT) Taskforce for Myanmar, in collaboration with the United Nations Inter-Agency Project on Human Trafficking (UNIAP), convened a Consultative Workshop on May 2-3\textsuperscript{rd} 2013 for the Strategic visioning for Post-2013 Coordinated Efforts in Anti-trafficking work in the Greater Mekong Sub-region (GMS) beyond 2013.

UNIAP was established in 2000 with a central focus on trafficking in persons and a mandate to facilitate a stronger and more coordinated response to trafficking in persons in the GMS. In order to prepare a vision for coordinated anti-trafficking work within the Mekong Sub-region beyond 2013, UNIAP is embarking on a consultation process with a wide range of stakeholders. This process will take place through a series of Consultative Workshops at both the national and regional level. The visioning process will be conducted in such a way that it will promote inclusiveness of stakeholders, ensure national ownership and promote national capacity development. The aim is to develop a vision for anti-trafficking work in the GMS covering a 5-year period including clear, concrete results to be achieved for the vision to become a reality. The new strategic vision is being developed through a participatory and transparent consultation process conducted at both the country and regional level, with UNIAP functioning as a secretariat to facilitate the consultations.

This report on the Myanmar Consultation outlines discussions held on the context of trafficking in the national context and throughout the GMS including current challenges in assisting victim protection, identification and re-integration, internal coordination, capacity building, monitoring and evaluation, working with the private sector, good practices, implementation at the country and regional level, and ways forward. The participants at the Myanmar workshop included representatives of various ministries of the Government of Myanmar, the United Nations, other international organisations and national civil society organisations from across the country.

The workshop began with remarks provided by Police Brigadier General Khin Maung Si, Chief of Police General Staff, Myanmar Police Force, Joint Secretary of Central Body for Suppression of trafficking in persons (CBTIP) and Head of the COMMIT country Task Force. Speakers during the opening session also included Mr Geoff Manthey, UNIAP Consultant and Conference Facilitator, and Ms Annette Lyth, Regional Project Manager, UNIAP.

Session One served as an introduction to the Consultative Workshop and was moderated by the Facilitator who explained to the participants the purpose and aim of the consultation and introduced some basic rules. Participants were then asked to work in groups to discuss and identify what the main problems in tackling trafficking are in Myanmar and in the region. Problems and challenges were displayed in lists for all participants to review.

In Session Two, participants were asked to prioritise the issues. Each participant voted on what they thought were the three most important issues through the method of placing coloured dots next to the subjects which they felt were most pressing. The Secretariat and Facilitator then
grouped overlapping themes and tallied the votes together to identify five topics for further consideration. Selections were made based on analysis of each problem, but also whether solving these problems would have a significant impact on human trafficking, whether there would be enough support to solve them, and whether there is sufficient capacity and comparative advantage to work on the issues. The themes selected for elaboration were victim protection, identification and re-integration, internal coordination, capacity building, monitoring and evaluation, and work with the private sector.

In Session Three, stakeholders worked to define the problems and develop the problem analysis. The main purpose of this was to study the root causes and major effects of the problems in order to design better solutions and to make the process of developing a results map easier. After the problems were grouped and prioritized, “problem trees” were developed by each group and for each priority problem to support the analysis. This process helped participants develop a clearer understanding, not only of the surface problems, but also their underlying causes and constraints, and through this to develop a common understanding of the most significant problems faced at the regional, country and community level. Participants were asked to be precise and explicit when expanding on the five topics selected. The issue that was identified provided the trunk of the problem tree. Participants then brainstormed on the major causes of the problem by asking what is causing this to happen, and identified a number of policy constraints, capacity weaknesses, social and cultural norms and attached them to the root of the tree.

In Session Four, participants split into groups to discuss what their vision for the future is in relation to the problems identified on day one. The aim was to come up with a clear, realistic and agreed vision of how things will have positively changed over the next five-year period.

In the Final Session, a results map was developed in order to determine what must be in place to achieve the vision developed in each particular area. Once the various prerequisite intermediate changes were identified, stakeholders then worked to identify the interventions necessary to achieve them.

Participants worked to develop recommendations for a broad spectrum of anti-trafficking stakeholders, including organizations or entities that will benefit from or engage in anti-trafficking activities or whose areas of interest are affected by trafficking. The results maps and strategic visions outlined in this document represent the collective will of a diverse, multi-stakeholder, multi-faceted group of senior government officials and representatives from local and international civil society organisations as well as United Nations Agencies. A number of good practices on tackling trafficking including the drafting of new legislation, working more closely with the private sector, developing new policies and implementation that were discussed by participants and that reflect current practices are included in this report.

The closing speech was delivered by Police Brigadier General Khin Maung Si. The remarks in the Closing Session tied together the common threads of discussion throughout the Conference, especially the need for honesty, openness, and the importance of cooperation and
harmonisation of efforts between the Government, civil society, the media and the private sector, in implementing the recommendations and results to realise the visions set out.

Background Situator to the Consultative Workshop

UNIAP

The UNIAP was established in 2000 to facilitate a stronger and more coordinated response to human trafficking in the Greater Mekong Sub-region (GMS) and with the aim of creating an ‘overarching mechanism’ for the co-ordination of anti-trafficking initiatives by a wide range of stakeholders. UNIAP is managed by a regional management office in Bangkok, with country project offices in the capitals of Cambodia, China, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand and Viet Nam.¹ UNIAP has been implemented over three consecutive phases that illustrate the Project’s evolution over time:

• UNIAP Phase I (2000 - 2003) - 
  The first phase of UNIAP concentrated on creating linkages between the range of different organisations involved in combating trafficking, using its broad and responsive mandate to address emerging issues, and supporting new small-scale pilot initiatives.

• UNIAP Phase II (2004 - 2006) - 
  The second phase of UNIAP was viewed as a consolidation of its work and achievements under the first phase. It was dominated by the project’s work in facilitating the development of a sub-regional Memorandum of Understanding between the six governments of the Greater Mekong Sub-region, accompanied by a Plan of Action to help governments fulfill the commitments made under the MOU - a process now known as the Coordinated Mekong Ministerial Initiative against Trafficking (COMMIT).

• UNIAP Phase III (2007 – 2013) - 
  The third and current phase of UNIAP is aimed at building on the achievements of the first two phases, combining support for further consolidation and institutionalization of current approaches. This phase is due to end in December 2013.

The Coordinated Mekong Ministerial Initiative against Trafficking (COMMIT)

COMMIT has fuelled major progress in anti-human trafficking efforts since its inception in 2004. In 2004, the six Governments of the Greater Mekong Sub-region (Myanmar, Cambodia, China, Lao PDR, Thailand, and Viet Nam) signed a historic Memorandum of Understanding against Trafficking in Persons. This MOU, signed at the Ministerial level, committed the governments to a response to human trafficking meeting international standards, highlighting the need for multi-lateral, bilateral, and government-NGO cooperation to fight human trafficking.

¹ See http://www.no-trafficking.org/how.html for more information
UNIAP serves as Secretariat to the COMMIT Process, and as such is mandated to provide technical, financial, monitoring, reporting, and logistical support to activities under COMMIT. Based on its existing work and mandate as an inter-agency coordinating body, UNIAP is able to draw on its extensive network of partners throughout the region to provide technical and financial assistance to all aspects of the COMMIT Process, and also works with partners to ensure that programs and activities are aligned with government priorities in the COMMIT Sub-regional Plans of Action and National Plans of Action.²

The Myanmar COMMIT taskforce is composed of representatives from Ministry of Home Affairs; Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement; Union Supreme Court; Union Attorney General’s Office; Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security; Ministry of Hotel and Tourism; Ministry of Border Affairs; Ministry of Information; Ministry of Education; Ministry Immigration and Population; Myanmar Women’s Affairs Federation; and Myanmar Maternal and Child Welfare Association.

Opening Speeches

Police Brigadier General Khin Maung Si provided the opening remarks. He began by highlighted the threat of transnational crime which is now a global phenomenon. Human trafficking is one of the most serious, significant and important transnational crimes that we have to address in our society. Through the COMMIT process, much has been achieved in order to combat trafficking. The COMMIT process now serves as an example to other regions of the world on how to take coordinated action to tackle human trafficking. The most significant achievement in the region is the level of cooperation and collaboration between COMMIT government members and international organisations. However, more efficient and effective initiatives are still required with different stakeholders and experts working in the sector.

The participants at this meeting have contributed to and are included in the COMMIT process, its establishment and achievements. As well as highlighting achievements, we also need to identify remaining weaknesses and challenges. The results from this workshop have to be applied in activities and all government departments have to cooperate to implement these activities efficiently.

Police Brigadier General Khin Maung Si invited participants to discuss issues in a frank and open manner and to think about issues of national interest and importance. As well as being harmful to victims, trafficking is damaging the country’s reputation and image. We need to coordinate efforts to address these points.

Mr Geoff Manthey and Ms Annette Lyth were then introduced and invited to take the floor. Mr Geoff Manthey introduced himself and explained that he had more than twenty years experience at the UN working in different agencies, and more than ten years experience facilitating workshops at the country, regional and global level. Through this particular piece of work with UNIAP, he is facilitating seven different workshops. This was the first time he has worked in a series of seven national workshops in this context. This is the last event of the

² See http://www.no-trafficking.org/commit.html
series. The workshops have followed exactly the same agenda for in-country and regional workshops. He stated that UNIAP want to listen to participants’ voices and opinions, experiences on country work and also in the region, to look at what issues remain and what new issues are emerging.

Whilst we want to draw on your wealth of experience; he said that this workshop consultation was designed to be forward looking. The six country consultations in addition to the regional event will feed into the design of the next project document for UNIAP. UNIAP will take all the results and analysis from the consultations and combine them with the two additional exercises to determine the next phase of work for UNIAP. He stated that this is not the only opportunity for input and this is not the only time that participants will get to feed into the process. The workshop has been designed to be discussion based and as participatory as possible. We also hope the process itself will renew and/or create new partnerships in anti-trafficking work in Myanmar.

Police Brigadier General Khin Maung Si, Chief of Police General Staff, Myanmar Police Force, Joint Secretary of Central Body for Suppression of trafficking in persons (CBTIP) and Head of the COMMIT country Task Force address participants

The UNIAP team in Myanmar worked hard to select the right participants to join this consultation. A number of criteria were used to identify potential participants; firstly, the
participant and/or their organisation is an important stakeholder in anti-trafficking work in Myanmar. Secondly, that the participant understands the issues related to anti trafficking. The final criterion is that the participants bring different perspectives. Mr Manthey drew attention to the wealth of knowledge and experience amongst participants on combating trafficking in the region, and said that this should strengthen national and regional mechanisms in the future. Participants have been chosen because they are important stakeholders, understand these complex issues, and understand them in different ways and from different perspectives.

He stressed that this event is not a work planning exercise or a funding proposal and neither is it about designing activities. It is about engaging in constructive discussions on relevant issues. Firstly, there is a need to focus on key problems related to anti-trafficking, which can be in Myanmar or within the region, then conduct analysis on the root causes and effects of those problems. We will then assess where we want to be in the future by developing a ‘vision’ statement, and what are some of the results that surround this vision, which we will identify through this process. Mr Manthey outlined some basic rules for the workshop relating to being challenging but respectful, and then invited all participants to briefly introduce themselves.

**Identifying Main Problems**

Participants divided themselves into five separate groups and worked to discuss and set out what the main problems in tackling trafficking are at the regional, country and community level. Questions were posed to guide discussion. Participants were asked what the most critical problems to be addressed by anti-trafficking work are, whether the problems affecting marginalized groups are being captured and whether current anti-trafficking efforts adequately address the problems facing both men and women. Discussions focused on what is happening and to whom. Participants identified the following themes and specific issues.

**Group one**

1. Weaknesses in awareness raising; Most Myanmar workers are not aware of and don’t ask about working conditions before accepting work. The group’s representative had recently travelled to Jordan to observe migrant workers from Myanmar. They did not ask in advance about the conditions they would face. Awareness raising is necessary in order to learn about the situation in advance.
2. Limited job opportunities; workers cannot select jobs or set working conditions. Workers can earn 60,000 Kyat per month in Yangon which is very low compared to Thailand and other neighbouring countries, where workers can earn up to 200,000 to 300,000 Kyat per month. There is a need to create better job opportunities for people within Myanmar.
3. Low per capita income.
4. Many jobs are temporary and not stable – there is a need for more stable jobs.
5. Change of mindset with regards to expectations and demands.
6. A better balance of demand and supply.
7. Education levels are a concern.
Migrant workers often don’t understand the potential risks or necessary skills. Labour demand is very low in Myanmar and yet the supply of labour is high. For example, there are now many tuktuk and motos drivers in the cities but little demand for such services. There is a link to micro-finance agencies and the low level of education in the country. Micro-finance agencies cannot hand out grants to people with no education because recipient use grants in ways in which they are not supposed to. A change of mind set is required and a better balance of demand and supply in the workforce.

A participant asked what was the target audience for awareness raising. The group representative responded that it would be at a grass roots level. Migrant workers often don’t know how much they can or should be earning. Even when a migrant arrives at a border or transit town, they often don’t know how much they will be earning at their final destination as they have not been informed in advance.

Another participant stated that according to a recent UNICEF study, there are no significant links between educational standards and the risk of being trafficking. Women with high education standards can and are being trafficked. The group representative responded that education should include moral teachings, especially in the monasteries education system. A question was raised about changing mind sets. The group representative responded that people mostly think about gaining wealth when they travel abroad, so they must be educated about the actual situation and potential risks.

**Group Two**

1. Weakness in information sharing.
2. Staying informed about repatriation; the police are informed, but government agencies are often not.
3. The government is not providing enough funding for anti-trafficking initiatives, particularly victim support and law enforcement. The Government agency responsible for victim support is the Department of Social Welfare (DSW) which doesn’t have enough staff at town-ship level.
4. Anti trafficking committees operate at different levels, however coordination is weak.
5. Gaps in victim support.
6. Many annual work plans are devised but suffer from poor implementation.
7. Many community watch groups were set up and were trained but are not active.
8. Border liaison offices are open on the Myanmar – China border. They are good examples of cooperation such as joint investigations and joint arrests; however cooperation between governments is poor. Chinese police officials at the local level don’t know about the MOU that was signed between China and Myanmar. Myanmar police coordinate well with authorities in Kunming province in China, but trafficking occurs in other provinces as well so cooperation at central level is very important.
9. Labour exploitation of Myanmar migrant workers is increasing in China, but Chinese officials don’t recognise or prioritise the issue.
10. Cooperation with Thailand’s law enforcement agencies is generally very good, however they sometimes conduct unilateral investigations. Some of these investigations remain
incomplete and as such, Myanmar officials cannot arrest perpetrators. Joint investigations are required once a victim has been rescued.

11. The differences between criminal justice systems are a major challenge.

12. Compensation from Thailand is not received by victims in Myanmar in a timely fashion. Sometimes, authorities cannot locate victims in Myanmar who have been awarded compensation.

13. Collecting evidence is a great challenge. For example, when a victim is repatriated and s/he is giving evidence in court, often no other evidence is provided or presented.

14. It is essential to set up an anti-trafficking fund.

15. Only temporary shelters exist at present; more shelters need to be set up.

16. Capacity building programmes; retaining trained personal such as police is particularly challenging.

17. M&E system should be in place. M&E for the emergency help hotline is also required.

A participant noted that the cooperation of the Ministry of Education in awareness raising must be considered, but can be discussed at a later stage.

**Group Three**

1. A lack of job opportunities.
2. Low economic status.
3. A lack of knowledge about trafficking, labour rights, legal migration services etc.
4. Acceptance and understanding by communities, parents, community elders, about the consequences of forced marriages (Kachin, Shan, communities).
5. Gaps between awareness raising programmes and behavioural changes. Behaviour is not changing and programmes are failing.
6. Insufficient documentation to enable safe migration.
7. Labour MOUs have not been signed with neighbouring countries other than Thailand. This leads to more illegal migration and poor protection mechanisms for migrant workers.
8. Finance (case management and services)
9. Weak coordination, communication and networking among relevant actors
10. Lack of support from authorities such as community leaders or police officers. Community leaders and parents are involved in trafficking cases.
11. Weak protection mechanism (justice system, abuse of authority)
12. Human resources
13. Difficulty to obtain documentation for case management

Group three included members from different areas of the country. The group’s representative explained that the first two points, a lack of job opportunities and low economic status, leads to poverty which is a contributing factor. Migrant workers do not know how to obtain a passport and fake documents are often used in the migration process. Exploitation happens at different stages of the migration process because migrant workers are not aware of proper procedures. An example was provided where a girl travelled to Singapore for work. She received no wages for three months and had to return to Myanmar.
Shelters are needed for victim support; there are too many gaps in victim support. This requires many years of effort, yet donors do not provide long term assistance. This is also an issue when victims pursue prosecution – it can take many years and requires long term support. A good referral system is also needed. When handling trafficking cases, authorities including the police don't provide enough support or assistance. There are several weaknesses in Myanmar's judicial system. Corruption is an issue. Victims seeking prosecution need support from other resource persons and cannot go to court alone.

A participant asked for clarification about the comment on corruption. The group representative responded that low level police are sometimes familiar with traffickers. Police often don't produce enough evidence to build a case against traffickers. Another participant suggested using the term limited job opportunities rather than a complete lack of opportunities.

**Group Four**

1. Weak in information sharing.
2. Budget limitations - government funding for anti-trafficking is too limited.
3. Follow up after trafficking has been identified is weak.
4. Too few staff at the Department of Social Welfare.
5. Weak TIP committees at all levels.
6. Jobs opportunities are limited for victims – not all victims are supported.
7. Work plans are often good but suffer from weak implementation.
8. Cross border cooperation is good, but gaps remain in communication.
9. Compensation needs to be delivered to victims directly.
10. Lack of establishment of a fund for TIP victims
11. There are not enough shelters for men or women.
12. Capacity building – training for participants should be conducted by persons with practical experience.
13. There is a need for more M&E at all levels.

The group stated that they were analysing not the overall situation with regards to human trafficking, rather, they focused on efforts to combat trafficking. What are the challenges in responding to trafficking?

- Positive elements include the 2005 Anti-trafficking Law which is one of most comprehensive in the region and is in line with the Protocol (TIPP).
- Certain anti-trafficking responses in Myanmar are in line with international standards including the Protocol. We seem to be doing a good job.
- Inter-agency and inter-sector cooperation is a challenge.

When victims return, it should be the Ministry of Social Welfare taking the lead on assisting them. Cases should go through law enforcement agencies and the police. Expertise and responsibilities need to be recognised and respected. Internal mechanisms need to be assessed; the Ministry of Social Welfare is sometimes sidelined, unintentionally, from processes in which they should be included.
These core elements need to be addressed in the next five year national strategy. But we need the political will to succeed, and national institutions that are there to protect victims must be empowered. Sectoral expertise needs to be respected. In terms of internal coordination, many challenges lie with UN agencies. What is the role of the ILO precisely? Is it to deal with return and repatriation of victims? What is the exact role of the IOM in dealing with migration? What is role of UNICEF? Roles and mandates need to be properly set out.

The government is member of these UN agencies. Myanmar representatives sit on the executive board of many UN agencies. The government should recognises the expertise that already exist within agencies, so it can utilise those expertise. We are good at conducting activities but never look back to reflect.

There is a weakness in budgeting and not enough human resources. We need to strengthen monitoring capacities. To what extent has public awareness raising impacted on changes in behaviour? A comparison was made with smoking. The majority of smokers know that it is harmful to their health and yet continue to smoke. Trainings are conducted but people do not follow the advice; they have occupied with other issues. Everyone wants to hold workshops, but how do we best assist groups doing this?

Terminology is an issue. If we do not use the word trafficking, we think we’re not dealing with or tackling trafficking. Cases include labour or sexual exploitation, which can still be trafficking even if the terminology used is different.

A participant asked for clarification on what structures are in place. The group representative responded that structures and mechanisms do exist and are in place, but those who have responsibility do not always know what these responsibilities are or how to deal with them.

**Group Five**

Issues related to return and reintegration:

1. Not enough funds available for victims who return and who wish to be re-integrated.
2. Manpower and capacity issues.
3. Victim identification. A common ID system is required.
4. Job opportunities for returnees and other vulnerable groups. Referral and coordination; empower NGO’s & labour unions to be included in the process.

Issues related to domestic trafficking:

1. Protection and assistance – imperfect realities: law enforcement agencies, NGOs and care givers.
2. Lack of research and data
3. Child soldiers and forced labour
4. Child domestic labour
Safe migration channels and systems – These are improving but not fully accessible, affordable or comprehensive.

Business ethics and employment – This includes environmental and land issues. There is a link between the state of the economy and trafficking; limited job opportunities and the behaviour of businesses.

For example businesses take advantage of lax rules and lack of enforcement of those rules; labour ethics not respected. When employing returning trafficked victims, a safety net needs to provided including things like health insurance. Having a safety net for families makes them more resilient and less likely to be re-trafficked. Education and awareness is necessary both for businesses and those who want to work. Ethical behaviour is needed.

More awareness of human trafficking is required. The public should not accept an imperfect situation. A change of mindset is required. Information should be accessible to everyone, in languages that everyone understands. We need to target those who are illiterate also.

State Action: cooperation between government departments is vital, both at the national and local level. How do we take good intentions on paper and implement at the ground level? Instructions are often unclear and incomplete. We need to move from single individual efforts to a more coordinated system.

In terms of return and re-integration, one of the key challenges is funding proper assistance and ensuring we have the manpower to actually respond to connected issues properly. We need to look at victim identification, the numbers of survivors that are properly identified, the criteria for identification and the referral system for identification. This work might actually create more of a challenge – if the numbers of victims identified is increased by use of a better system, do we have the capacity to meet this and to provide assistance? We need to empower NGOs and other actors who work directly on these issues. Labour unions could be part of the response.

Challenges of internal trafficking include imperfect realities on ground in terms of systems employed by agencies and organisations. Law enforcement agencies and NGOs work on different levels. Organisations and departments have good intentions but results are not positive. Forced labour is a major problem; the situation is gradually improving but it is still an issue. Likewise with child labour, there is a lack of research and data on these issues. There are lot of stories and much anecdotal evidence, but we need more on internal trafficking.

Safe migration systems and channels are becoming more affordable and clear. This can be seen as a bright spot; although whilst things are improving, we need to retain focus on this. For example, the cost of passports, people are not close enough to offices issuing passports, and people not trusting the agencies responsible for issuing passport, means that documentation is still a challenge for most migrants. The issues feed in to creating safe migration channels. Log frame results need to produce evidence from the ground level up. We need to consider how we are going to move towards a more evidence based system of planning and programming.
Organizing and Prioritizing Main Problems

Participants worked together under the instructions of the facilitator to group and prioritize the main problems from the list of identified problems above. The criteria for making the prioritization included i) whether solving this problem would have significant impact on human trafficking; ii) whether there would be enough support to solve the problem; and iii) would we have the capacity and comparative advantage to work on the problem. As a means to prioritize the issues identified, each participant was asked to place coloured dots next to the three subjects that they felt were most pressing. The facilitator then grouped overlapping themes and tallied the votes together to identify five topics. The issues selected as most important would then be adopted as the chosen themes for further analysis.

The agreed prioritized problems based on the voting process amongst participants were:

- Monitoring and Evaluation
- Victim Protection, ID and Re-integration
- Internal Coordination
- Capacity Building
- The Business Sector

Problem Analysis

After the five main problems were prioritized, Mr. Manthey, divided the participants into five groups, where each group was given one main problem for close scrutiny and analysis, where “problem trees” were developed for each priority problem to support the analysis. Beginning with the problem that was identified and positioned as the trunk of the problem tree, participants then brainstormed about the major causes of the problem by asking, “what is causing this to happen?” They then identified a number of policy constraints; capacity weaknesses, social problems and cultural norms, and these became the roots of the tree. The problem analysis was designed to help participants develop a clear understanding not only of the surface problems, but also their underlying causes and constraints. The aim was to help all participants develop a common understanding of the chosen topics.

Stakeholders were also asked to discuss the effects of the problems. ‘Branches’ were created on the problem tree to illustrate how the problem affects the region, country or community. The process involved identifying the most direct effects of the problem, classified under the same categories as were used for the analysis of the causes. In the problem tree, the effects of the higher-level problems are captured in the boxes above the trunk.
Based on the problem tree, participants analysed the causes, root causes and effects of the main issues

**Group One – Monitoring and Evaluation**

The group's representative stated that although some M&E is conducted, it is insufficient. This is largely because actors lack the necessary technical knowledge to conduct M&E. There is low capacity, especially among grass roots organisations, to monitor effectively, and a limited capacity of partners to work with local organisations to help implement such initiatives. There is not enough appreciation of M&E and how and why it contributes to programming. There is also a lack of clarity relating to who is responsible for implementing M&E.

The members stated that ‘we lack independence to evaluate ourselves. Who in our organisations is going to highlight the negatives and shortcomings? We have seen some examples of good practices, but not enough of self-evaluation of programs. For example, entrance and exit of shelters by victims – we do not monitor this properly so do not get the chance to respond to the appropriate level of care. We lack available resources to carry out M&E; conducting M&E is expensive. From the government perspective, there are regulations in
place, but no corresponding system to say how these regulations should be assessed and evaluated. Some programmes are evaluated, but reports and data is only provided to donors and is not feeding back into programmes. The information eventually gets lost.'

One specific challenge was mentioned by the MTV Exit representative who said that it is difficult to measure behavioural changes, for example the campaign to change attitudes on migration. We need creative indicators to track people, to see if money invested in prevention is being well spent.

One cause of the problem is that we don’t take a log-frame approach to monitoring. High level outcomes to programmes are not assessed. Indicators employed usually revolve around numerical outputs like trainings conducted. We want to assess higher or secondary impacts. We lack standardised indicators. The absence of baselines prevents development of appropriate targets. M&E initiatives are not shared despite common challenges issues. Organisations don’t tend to share M&E reports.

The effects of this include bad programming and an inability to prove the impact of projects. There is a lack of quality assurance, i.e. when no standardised indicators are used. This blocks progress and the evolution of programming. When we don't assist victims, we don't empower them and this is negligent. The rescue of victims and prosecution of traffickers are not prioritised; lower-level indicators are prioritised. Ultimately, we should all be working on this. A lack of follow-up can kill an effective programme.

Mr Manthey stated that the problem is that actors don’t conduct enough M&E. There is a clear cause and effect in the problem tree. Quality assurance indicators are needed. A participant suggested that it is not that M&E is not done; rather the problem is how it is being done. The impact level is the key - plenty of actors carry out M&E in Myanmar. Quality and effectiveness is the issue. In the anti-human trafficking working group, we don’t share data. Another participant stated that we cannot mobilise funding from donors for M&E. Making anti-trafficking as national cause is the way forward, however we cannot convince ministers to do this which is necessary if we want to mobilise more resources.
Group One: Monitoring and Evaluation

- Beneficiaries (victims) are not empowered through the assistance process
- Resources are not targeted to the needs
- Negligence to conduct M&E can lead to violation of "do no harm" principle
- Good initiatives / programmes atrophy due to lack of monitoring
- Priority indicators – victims rescued + traffickers prosecuted are neglected
- Lack of proven impact (everybody claims impact)
- Lack of quality assurance in programming
- Perpetuates bad practices and blocks progress of programming

Myanmar anti-TIP actors don’t do enough to monitor and evaluate programming

- Not enough resources available to do M&E (very expensive)
- Relevant Govt regulations are in place, but no appropriate system to monitor and evaluate their implementation
- Programmes sometimes evaluated, but there is no feedback into new programmes
- Lack of standardised anti-trafficking indicators
- Lack of logframe approach to develop indicators. Indicators only at activity level.
- Lack of baseline data makes it difficult to develop indicators
- Lack of information sharing and collaboration

We don’t understand how to do M&E. Plus low capacity among grassroots-level organisations

- Lack of clarity of who should do M&E (not many independent evaluations)
- Main benefactors often don’t get the chance to participate in evaluations or to give feedback.

- Poor policy advice to the decision makers
- Not enough appreciation of the importance of M&E
Group Two - Victim Protection, Identification and Re-integration

A weak system is the main issue; the capacities of organisations are limited for victim identification. Human resources are a major constraint. There is not enough technical support provided. A link exists between the lack of human resources and a weak system.

There is limited amount of information on victims returning from other countries. Organisations don’t understand the procedures used in other countries. This is related to other countries politics and legal systems. In dealing with China for example, Myanmar has to play an inferior role.

Coordination among agencies is weak which is due to a lack of human resources. There is insufficient legal support in both source and destination countries for victims and no legal support agencies. The budget of the government for trafficking efforts is too small.

Victims face difficult conditions in shelters and victims’ rights are not protected properly. Victims do not trust the judicial system or government bodies. Evidence of abuse and corruption is sometimes removed. Such situations leads victims into worse conditions. The environment for returnees is not safe.
Group Two: Victim ID, Protection and Re-integration

- Unsafe return / deportation
- No alternative ways for victim return

- Increasing broker network
- Victims re-trafficked

- Lack of confidence in criminal justice system
- Rights of victims are violated

- No systematic re-integration programme

- Victims pressured not to provide witness testimony
- Victims are not protected from broker / traffickers network

Weak Victim Protection System Mechanism

- Weak skills in victim ID
- Limited knowledge to give assistance by NGOs/CSOs before referring cases to police
- Limited human resources and capacity

- Weak legal support for victim in destination countries
- Lack of information/power balance is an issue
- Weak Coordination mechanism in destination countries

- No specific legal support for victims of internal trafficking
- No specific legal support agency

- No temporary shelter for victims of internal trafficking
- Non-compliance of requests of victims

- Lack of budget (Govt and NGOs)
**Group Three – Internal Coordination**

Group three’s representative stated that the group had looked to make constructive suggestions as well as highlight root causes to problems. They singled out the following issues:

- Multi sectoral responses – importance of expertise
- Loss of motivation of staff
- Systems building
- Synchronisation of systems
- Case management – protection systems
- Bilateral meetings
- Existing commitments

Different departments have different responses and different priority areas. Due to unexpected urgent matters which may arise, these priorities regularly get replaced. If you have to work with relevant departments, they can be too busy and responses can be delayed. We have formed committees at different levels of the country. Different members do not understand the levels and different responsibilities given to them or what they should be doing. Participation is often weak.

Information sharing in a timely manner can also be weak. When handling cases, you have to work with various departments or agencies. Organisations have different regional capacities and focuses. Some organisations know the real national needs but because of donor requirements, cannot change their target areas. Myanmar nationals are afraid of the police, government officials and uniformed people. If cooperation and coordination between government officials and survivors is not strong, it negatively impacts on the prosecution process.

Ministries suffer from insufficient human resources. There is also a lack of transparency between ministries and departments in decision making processes. Operational-level staff can take decisions, but the protocol is often for higher level officials to approve such decisions which delays things. Staff turnover is a problem as talented staff can be moved out of the trafficking sector, and new people bought in who don’t understand roles or necessary responses. This is one of the key causes.

Information sharing – people don't use information technology to good effect. International organisations use latest technology and as a result communication is more efficient. Government departments don’t have the right equipment. Repatriation for example; the World Vision country office passes on information to field offices, but field offices checking with authorities have no information from their head office. By using email or fax, it’s faster to communicate. However these tools are not utilised. Government departments have no allocated budget for victim support. This effects coordination between departments and creates misunderstanding, information gaps and delays. Inconsistent data is an issue – the same programme may be being implemented by different ministries and yet is reported differently. Inaccurate reporting is a concern. The impact of all this is that outcomes are not effective. There is a fundamental weakness in the referral system. This results in weak prosecutions measures.
A participant stated that trafficking needs a multi-sectoral approach. When there is no coordination or a lack of it at least, we do not have a truly functioning approach. We need to look at this from a higher level. One result is the lack of a working multi-sector mechanism. They suggested using agencies as well as ministries and departments. One consequence of misunderstandings mentioned is that staffs lose motivation in their work. They lose their drive and this saps resources.

Another participant highlighted the “systems building” work at UNICEF. A structure and system is in place, but there is much to do to integrate these more tightly; i.e. there are meetings and outcomes, however we need continual systems that feed from one activity to another. Connect points – case management meetings to trainings to DSI. What does the prosecution programme do with regards to compensation? It is loosely structured at present. There is a weakness between systems and structures i.e. between the judicial system and the police. This is not just between government departments though.

Synchronisation of various systems is required. We have an existing system for case management which is called Complete Case Management. However, the process is not complete and it only involves victim repatriation at present. It does not cover the whole process of victims’ cases.
Group Four – Capacity Building

Group four’s representative stated that whenever we go to workshops or meetings, the right people are not in the right place. Sometimes, representatives are sent without understanding the subject or purpose. When we have meetings and trainings, we need the right people to attend, otherwise there is no benefit. Of those that do attend, not everyone shares information or what they have learned. They are not equipped for the job or are in the wrong place. A key cause is weakness in information sharing. When we try to organise trainings for staff, no capacity needs assessments are conducted. Trainings are not based on the needs of participants.

When you attend training, what are the incentives? What will you be equipped with and how can you use this? Some community volunteers don’t know how to apply what they have learned, and this affects motivation. Some training manuals are not practical. For social workers, it is more effective to have on the job training rather than classroom training. Otherwise, they learn about theories but not how to apply them. Our work is not efficient and we are not improving in the work we are doing.

We have limited mentoring skills. This impacts on capacities. Sometimes people attend events with many qualifications and certificates but still lack skills. Quantity is substituted for quality too often. This does not lead to effectiveness in the impact of their work.

A participant stated that one key issue is that when trainings are conducted, staff sometimes return back to work afterwards, and those functions they are trained on are not included in their daily tasks or job description. We train NGOs but they usually aren’t connected to the referral system for example. There needs to be a connected synchronisation of systems. The right training may be conducted at the right time, but when staff go back to their office, its business as usual and their role hasn’t changed.

Another participant stated that when we think of capacity building, we think about trainings and workshops, but actually it is more than this. We need to think bigger. For example in social workforce – there are less than 200 trained social workers in Myanmar. Law enforcement – 320 officers trained each year. How much assistance can those few social workers provide? Building structures is long term work. It requires a long term, sustained commitment. This touched on earlier points related to capacity and needs assessment. It is necessary to look at the whole picture.

A participant commented that in terms of capacity building – we tend to focus on the substance of anti-trafficking work. However, we also need to focus on people and authorities and challenge them if they are not doing the necessary things. People don’t go to local authorities when this should be their first point of call. NGO’s and INGO’s should then challenge local authorities who fail to respond. Without this approach, a perfect system will never be implemented.
Group Five – Business Sector

Group five’s representative began by commenting that the relevant laws in Myanmar are out of date. The Ministry of Labour is updating some laws and adding new legislation. They are also updating procedures. Such procedures must be in line with existing laws.

The limited number of labour inspectors is also a challenge. Few punishments are given out for labour rights violators. The government should award prizes for good employers as well as punish bad employers. The current situation with social security and family affairs is not good. Employers don’t give leave to workers if family members are sick or even when they die. The bigger the business, the bigger the ‘hands’ behind the business which tends to mean more corruption. As a result, workers don’t dare complain about working conditions. Awareness about labour exploitation is low at all levels including members of parliament.

Employer - employee relationships are an issue. We lack a suitable complaint mechanism. Even where there is such a mechanism, workers lack knowledge and people don’t know about it or how to use it. Workers can’t complain because they don’t understand their rights. Three groups lack awareness: employers, employees and rights defenders.

If consumers understood the supply chain of products and were more aware about exploitation along that chain, they wouldn’t buy those products. We need cooperation from consumers. In such cases, media reports, especially investigatory reports, are required in order to inform consumers. Most workers are low in skills and need more training. Investment in skill training and awareness raising is required. Many workers are at risk of being exploited.

This has a heavy social impact, i.e. health impact. These underlying issues cost the country very much and damage the reputation of the country. A bad reputation can lead to less foreign investment and/or fewer exports. This leads to fewer businesses operating here and that results in migration. The net result is unsustainable business development. Too many skilled workers are leaving the country. All these factors lead to lower national development. If labour exploitation cannot be reduced, it will affect the country’s image and development.

A participant stated that Myanmar has low foreign investment levels at present. If this increases, there will be more jobs and less migration. The group representative responded by saying that the challenge for foreign investment is often a lack of information; i.e. a US firm wanting to invest and asking about minimum wage will get four different answers. The Ministry of Labour has said that no law on a minimum wage exists but it will come soon.
Labour Exploitation exists in business sector

Group Five: Business Sector

- Negative effect on sustainable national development initiatives
- Low productivity of sustainable businesses
- Negative reputation of companies and businesses in the State
- Poor safety record and poor health conditions
- Increasing social problems
- People suffer and are enslaved
- Less foreign investment and fewer exports
- Manufacturing, service industries, domestic work

Corruption

- Lack of enforcement
- Laws are outdated and not informed
- Lack of social security / safety net (e.g. Insurance)

Lack of minimum standards / ethical standards (need to integrate in the labour law)

Lack of awareness of fundamental rights

Lack of complaint mechanism

Lack of labour inspectors / interventions

Lack of public awareness and public acceptance of the situation

Lack of awareness of policy makers – PM, relevant ministries, Govt officials

Not having skilled workers or skilled set

Weak in policy, implementation of national workforce management system & mechanism
Vision Statements

Mr. Manthey divided the participants into five groups in order to brainstorm the development of a vision statement. He asked each group to develop a vision statement that provided a clear goal for the country’s anti-trafficking community to aim for over the next five-year period, to address each of the five main problems identified above. Mr. Manthey emphasized that the vision statements should be high-level goals on which the anti-trafficking community as a whole can focus their efforts.

After the brainstorming session, the participants listed out the following vision statements from each of five groups.

Group I – Monitoring and Evaluation

**Vision:** *M&E that is user-friendly, standardised and evidence based, implemented by anti-trafficking actors for informed policy making and quality programming by 2018.*

The group’s representative commented that the M&E system in Myanmar is weak and complicated, so actors are reluctant to use it. Even if it is employed, it still needs to be standardised. Relevant actors need to use an evidence based approach so that data collected is actually used by policy makers.

Mr Manthey stated that the focus in other countries tended to move away from M&E, and that it was good that participants’ maintained close attention on the important role of M&E and did not mix it up with other issues.

Group II - Victim Protection, Identification and Re-integration

**Vision:** *An effective victim protection mechanism through involvement of sufficient resources & necessary procedures in place by 2018.*

The initial vision was for ‘an effective victim protective mechanism in place by 2018’. However, a participant asked whether the phrase mechanism should include human resources? Is having just this mechanism alone sufficient or is more needed?

Mr Manthey asked if when the term mechanism is translated into Burmese and translated back into English, does that term still mean ‘mechanism’? How is this term interpreted in Burmese? He stated that in English, the term is not all encompassing and can be quite limited in scope. He asked whether the group in fact wanted a fully resourced system in place? One participant suggested that ‘sufficient and qualified human resources’ should be included in the vision. The vision was amended.

Group III – Internal Coordination

**Vision:** *All relevant agencies (Government, NGOs, CBOs, INGOs) working efficiently to provide a coordinated response to anti-trafficking, whilst fully understanding their roles and*
responsibilities and being respectful of each other’s areas of responsibilities, and working in a timely and consultative manner.

Mr Manthey asked the group what agencies would be working in a timely and consultative manner towards exactly? The group’s representative responded that agencies would engage in strong internal coordination. Policies would be applied in practice and with full cooperation of the necessary actors. A participant asked if the purpose of coordination is to have an efficient coordinated response? The vision was duly re-worded to include an “efficient” coordinated response.

Group IV Vision – Capacity Building

**Vision:** After five years, the Government has systems and structures in place, which have sufficient number of staff and a workforce who have sufficient capacity and are supported by necessary technology.

The group’s representative clarified that this included competent personnel, trained and with capacities built.

Group V – Business Sector

**Vision:** Myanmar’s business sector plays a leading role in anti-trafficking by being a results-based responsible business entity that addresses social, economic and environmental concerns. No exploitation exists.

The group’s representative stated that labour exploitation is included in the term social exploitation. A participant enquired about use of the term corporate social responsibility (CSR)? They stated that when people talk about CSR, they think about a generalised welfare system. However, when you talk about a rights-based approach to business, it is considered differently. CSR is looked upon in a different light in Myanmar – the terminologies differ. A rights-based approach empowers workers. These interpretations might not be strictly correct but this is how the terms are defined in Myanmar. The term ‘responsible business’ was inserted into the vision statement.

Results Map

Participants created a “Results Map” following discussions on the measures (and structures) that need to be in place to achieve the vision and objectives identified above. The guiding question for this exercise was “what must be done and put in place to achieve the vision that has been developed in a particular area?” Participants were encouraged to take each major problem identified on the trunk of the problem tree and reword it as the immediate positive result with longer-term positive results or effects, articulated as clearly and concretely as possible. The approach taken by participants in developing the results map was to set out the targeted aims in the following lists.
Group One – Monitoring and Evaluation

1. Sharing of data between organisations and Government agencies (findings, information and recommendations).
2. Participatory M&E system (beneficiaries and other stakeholders) is used.
3. Improved programming and policies.
5. Less harm to beneficiaries.
6. Happy donors and more funds
7. Standardised national level M&E indicators developed, used for annual report / programming.
8. Annual reports are used
10. Throughout the M&E process, policy makers should be informed about each step.
11. The Government sets up a monitoring committee for M&E processes.
12. Donors allocate more funds for M&E processes.

A participant offered an additional suggestion which was phrased as a question. Which organisation will monitor the M&E process? A team or committee should be established to steer the M&E process, which should include experts.

Group Two - Victim protection, Identification and re-integration

Group two split their results into regional, national, state and community level achievements.

1. Regional level results:
   - Develop effective / supportive coordination mechanisms.
   - Strengthen police capacities effectively (i.e. MOUs, agreements between two parties).

2. National level results:
   - Refresh / reset coordination mechanisms among relevant parties.
   - Clear roles and responsibilities and division of labour.
   - Build the capacity of responsible persons. Refresh present rules and regulations.

3. State and Division level results:
   - Formed victim protection committee with sufficient capacity.
   - Renew and strengthen TIP body

4. Community level results:
   - Successfully build the capacities of community members to be able to protect themselves.
   - Services trainings and awareness raising activities conducted for community members.
5. State and community:
   - Concerned persons are involved in TIP processes with committed participation to forward sustainability of victim protection mechanisms.

6. Cross border and national:
   - Effective coordination mechanism exists and all victims are protected across the nation and in the region.
   - National guidelines established.
   - More SOPs and bilateral MOUs signed.

A participant stated that we already have national guidelines and a victim repatriation SOP with Thailand. Myanmar needs to develop an SOP with China. Another participant asked what the term “necessary” means in this context? Does it refer to financial and human resources? Mr Manthey asked whether it was necessary to take out ‘human resources and just include general ‘resources’ in the vision statement? This term is broader and more inclusive. The group agreed and the original vision statement was altered.

**Group Three – Internal Coordination**

1. Clarify and divide the roles and responsibilities of each and every institution.
2. Formulate an independent system which can provide a mechanism for institutions to respect and recognise each other’s roles.
3. Form a coordination body which includes multi-disciplinary teams (committee meetings; establish rules and regulations, trafficking law).
4. Regular meetings for working group with timeframes.
5. Amend the referral system.
6. Information sharing – include modern information technology.

Mr Manthey enquired when ‘information sharing’ is mentioned, what details are included? The response was that information sharing is not just about meetings but also about the use of modern technology like email and fax. The result should in fact be less rather than more meetings.

**Group Four – Capacity Building**

1. Organisational structure should be extended. More staffs are assigned and the number of personnel is increased.
2. Systems and structures are improved.
3. Staff utilise modern technology
4. The national budget is increased.
5. Internal and external support is provided.
6. Regular capacity strengthening activities and trainings are conducted, both internal and international.
7. New curriculum is developed and a revised public service exam (PSE) is used.
8. Increased application of modern technology. Recruit and prioritise skilled graduates.
9. Newly recruited staffs are provided with capacity building training.
10. If the government cannot support the budget alone, international partners should be found.

A participant stated that Myanmar needs an expanded system and structure to make sure that capacity building is sustainable. There are three elements to this. In order to meet that expanded system and structure, what is needed is an expanded number of staff. Secondly, the number of personal must also be underpinned by the high quality of staff. Quality requires educational support and also the use of public service exams to ensure candidates are a good standard. The third element is internal training. Once employees join different sectors, they need to have regular capacity building through internal workshops and trainings. One needs to have a national budget line to support this extended system and structure. You also need internal and external public support to make this happen.

We need to make sure we are able to meet future demands. The PSE exam has very traditional types of questions, and as Myanmar moves towards a different type of governance and democracy, skills and knowledge that are required need to be included in the PSE. Also, trainings and workshops are needed to train potential candidates to meet new needs.

Another participant asked whether capacity building programmes would only be for government staff or would it go wider than this? The group prioritised Government and missed other components. The community has not been prioritised sufficiently.

**Group V – Business Sector**

1. Increased number of prosecution and punishment (e.g. blacklisting) of bad businesses and bad employers / owners. Increase penalties.
2. Adequate number of labour inspectors equipped with skills and resources to carry out inspections.
3. Laws in line with international standards, in place with a clear implementation plan.
4. Workers are trained and equipped with the required skill set and knowledge of the job they are doing.
5. Integrated / coordinated capacity building training among Government agencies, private sector, non-governmental agencies, based on demand / required skills.
6. Good regulatory system.
7. Ministry of Labour Directives are passed, in place, regulated, so standardised practices such as not using under 18’s as housemaids are adopted, and minimum wage and working conditions directives are established.
8. A recruitment system that is accessible and transparent.
10. Job fairs for employers and employees.
11. Transparent and easily accessible recruitment system exists so no brokers are needed.
12. Employment agencies follow the provisions according to Department of Labour financing procedures as per the agreement.
A participant suggested that a work life balance policy should be considered. Another representative highlighted the fact that some brokers are exploitative but some are also good. Given the informal mechanisms that have been used for hundreds of years in the labour sector and in migration, not all brokers should be considered exploitative purely on the basis of their involvement in the informal sector.

Mr Manthey said that a transparent recruit system would still have brokers in it. It is necessary to identify and get rid of the bad brokers. The group’s representative responded that prosecution should also be focused on and includes corrupt officials. More media coverage of corruption and bad agencies is required to expose this. A participant highlighted the need for increased awareness among the demand side, buyers and consumers and the young generation in particular.

Mr Manthey rounded off proceedings by stating that of the six countries in which these consultative workshops have taken place, only Myanmar was willing to address the labour market. Other workshop participants did not discuss this in details, and that fact that participants have done so here is very positive.

Closing Speeches

Ms Annette Lyth, Regional Project Manager, UNIAP, started to wrap up the event by thanking participants for all their hard work. She commented that there would be some exciting results from this process, and that the draft report will be circulated with all participants which will give everybody the chance to reflect on the results of the workshop. Participants are free to use for report and the results from this event for whatever purposes suits best. Ms Annette Lyth stated that she will use this report with the five reports from additional country consultations and the results of the regional workshop, and together with colleagues, will work to design a new UN led inter-agency approach to anti-trafficking in persons in the region. Through this process, we are making sure that we are working towards the same vision and in the same direction. She thanked her UNIAP colleagues and the COMMIT country Taskforce for Myanmar.

The closing speech was delivered by Police Brigadier General Khin Maung Si. He began by using the expression mingalaba. He explained that it is a very meaningful word in Myanmar. It means to prevent bad things from happening, so society will be clean, perfect and glorious. It means that everyone, including the government and all people in the country are in perfect harmony, are peaceful and take their own responsibilities. It means that everybody is able to live in a good way. There exists an old Burmese belief that if you do good things, you will get good results from these deeds. Therefore, if you only say one word, and that is mingalaba, it covers all of these things. Police Brigadier General Khin Maung Si said that he was explaining the meaning of the word because he wanted other colleague to understand Myanmar peoples’ values. According to the Myanmar calendar, it is the first month in Myanmar’s New Year, and so we are conducting our brain storming workshop at the right time. We can now produce a vision, the perspectives of which are deep, meaningful and effective. In this age of globalization, we need global perspectives, and whilst we try to keep Myanmar values, we are trying to catch up with global standards. The input of experts who came here to this workshop has helped us
formulate open and clear results. He thanked participants for their frank and open inputs and comments. During this workshop, all participants were free from pre-conception and prejudice, and issued honest and clear perspectives. This has been an extremely valuable process.

Participants gather for a group photo at the end of the event
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<td>Aye Aye Mar Kyaw</td>
<td>National Program Officer</td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>09 8610286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>U Paw Khaing Than</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Union Supreme Court</td>
<td>067 430322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Maciej Pieczkowski</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>09 5154400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>U Aung Ngwe</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>Information and Public Relations Department</td>
<td>09 448534108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Daw Naw Tha Wah</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>Department of Social Welfare</td>
<td>448534794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Andrew Doehler</td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Embassy</td>
<td>536509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Imesh Poichaerl</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>09 421126869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Pol: Col: Aung Htay Myint</td>
<td>TOC</td>
<td>Myanmar Police Force</td>
<td>09 5092314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Simon Baker</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>UNIAP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Simonb.bbk@gmail.com">Simonb.bbk@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>New Ni Win</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Myanmar Police Force</td>
<td>09 49200482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Jennifer Watson</td>
<td>Regional Program Communication / CHO Manager</td>
<td>AUSAID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Tara Dermott</td>
<td>Head of Development, Regional</td>
<td>MTV EXIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Lindsey Higgs</td>
<td>Youth Engagement Manager, Regional</td>
<td>MTV EXIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Dr. Thi Da Oo</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>Union Attorney General Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>U Htein Lynn</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>Ministry of Border Affairs</td>
<td>09 428701969</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>