



Examining the Implementation of Durable Solutions of Protracted Refugee Situation in Indonesia

Heavy Nala Estriani¹

¹ University of Mataram
heavynestriani@unram.ac.id

Abstract. This study examines the Indonesian policy in handling protracted refugee situation. The study related to refugees so far has focused more on examining developed countries as the destination countries for refugees, while neglecting the transit one such as Indonesia, which also affected by the refugee crisis. The protracted refugee situation has placed a special burden on Indonesia especially when it comes to the labor market, education, and health access. In dealing with the protracted refugee situation, UNHCR introduced three durable solutions to resolve the issues which are the local integration, voluntary repatriation, and resettlement. The aim of this paper is to discuss the most feasible durable solutions to be implemented in the case of refugee in Indonesia. Through the analysis of the concept of durable solution, this paper examines the Indonesia's changing behavior in dealing with protracted refugee situations.

Keywords: Durable Solutions, Indonesia, Refugee, Protracted.

Introduction

While Indonesia is not a party to the 1951 Refugee Convention and 1967 protocol, the refugee living in Indonesia is portrayed as protracted refugee situation. At present Indonesia host 12,704 registered refugee, comprising 73 percent adult and 27 percent children [1]. The generosity of the host country has changed significantly for refugees after 9/11, when they consider the forced migration phenomena as a threat to national security. Moreover, since the issue of refugee has been securitized in many occasions, it is now getting harder for refugees to gain citizenship from the host country.

The problem that arises is that the condition of refugees in Indonesia is no longer only seen as a transit refugee but has been in a protracted transit. The protracted refugee situation has placed a special burden on Indonesia especially when it comes to the labor market, education, and health access. In dealing with the protracted refugee situation, UNHCR introduced three durable solutions to resolve the issues which are the local integration, voluntary repatriation, and resettlement [2]. In many protracted refugee situations, durable solution such as local integration, resettlement and voluntary repatriations are needed to be implemented to end the prolonged displacement.

This paper aims to explore the most viable durable solutions that can be implemented in the context of refugees in Indonesia. By analyzing the concept of durable solutions, the paper investigates the evolving approach of Indonesia towards

addressing protracted refugee situations. The study acknowledges that each of the three solutions has its own challenges and potential benefits. However, de facto integration is likely the most suitable option for addressing prolonged displacement, while achieving voluntary repatriation and resettlement may prove challenging due to the stringent immigration policies implemented by destination countries.

Conceptual Framework

According to the article no. 33 in Refugee Convention 1951, person with the refugee status should not be returned or pushed back to their home country [3]. Means country of first asylum, must accept their arrivals, despite their religious, ethnic, affiliations, and political background. The refugee also supposed to get the basic rights guaranteed by the state that received them. Among these rights are the right not to be discriminated against, the right to obtain shelter, education, employment and so forth which is set out in the convention. This is also consistent with that set out in Article 14 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that every person has the right to seek asylum in another country in order to get the protections from any disruption [4]. Still and all, the concept of non-refoulement has obliged the country, not to expel refugees when their lives are threatened. Thus, the concept has become an internal customary law. It is peremptory standard and is based on the just cogens premise. Jus cogens and the concept of non-refoulement have developed into peremptory norms of international norms. That is, the principle compels not only to the country that ratified the 1951 refugee convention, but also the country that did not ratify, all must respect the principle.

The Refugee in Indonesia have fall under category of protracted refugees. UNHCR describes the protracted refugee situation as a prolonged condition facing refugees, who find it difficult to find a way out in solving it. Such prolonged conditions, do not endanger their lives directly, but their economic, social, psychological needs and basic rights are generally not fulfilled. This protracted status is caused by political stagnation and diplomacy efforts that are not going well, both in the home country and the host country. So, there is no agreement that can be implemented to solve the displacement. This stagnation then causes many restrictions on refugee space in the host country, especially in relation to employment [2].

In dealing with the protracted refugee situation, UNHCR introduced three durable solutions to resolve the issues which are the local integration, voluntary repatriation and resettlement. According to UNHCR, there is no hierarchy in implementing durable solutions. But the best way to implement them is to combine these three solutions with a strong collaboration between the home country, the recipients, the humanitarian organizations and the refugees themselves [5]. Voluntary repatriation is to return refugees to their home country with safety and dignity. The repatriation must be based on the basic principle of voluntary and cannot be done by force and coercion. Return in safety means the host country and the country of origin must ensure that personal security both physical and psychological could be guaranteed upon their return. While the concept of return in safety is more tangible, the return with dignity is way more intangible. In this term, the country of origin is obliged to ensure that the people who have moved back should not be subjected to new forms of

violence, discrimination, or displacement, and that their basic human needs and rights, including access to food, shelter, medical care, education, and security, should be respected. In essence, it's about making sure that the process of going back to one's house is respectable and sustainable.

According to Long, voluntary repatriation not only means that refugees have made peace with their home country, but also indicates the presence of community reconciliation between refugees and indigenous communities in their home country [6]. This is in hand with what UNHCR Handbook mentioned about several elements that have to ensure while implementing the concept of voluntary repatriation such physical safety, legal safety, material safety and reconciliation [2]. Furthermore, resettlement is defined as the process of transferring refugees from host or receiving countries to third countries. As outlined in the refugee resettlement handbook issued by UNHCR, resettlement refers to the transfer of a certain number of refugees who meet the criteria set by a third country, thereby recognizing their status and granting them permanent resident status. In this context, resettlement provides refugees with the assurance that their status as permanent residents are equivalent to that of other citizens. Resettlement does not only offer guarantees for an individual, but also extends those guarantees to their entire family, ensuring an equal status. In essence, resettlement ensures that refugees will not be forcibly repatriated or subjected to refoulement.

In the framework of durable solutions, resettlement is considered to be the most ideal concept or durable solution in addressing protracted refugee transit situations [7]. However, many parties agree that resettlement often becomes the last resort when the transit country is unable to facilitate voluntary repatriation and integration due to economic and social issues in the transit country. In this case, according to Stein, resettlement becomes the final option for implementing durable solutions. This is because, despite being generally developed countries, third countries also imposeself limitations on the number of refugees allowed to enter, resulting in only a few refugees being absorbed in the resettlement process [8].

Meanwhile, Jacobsen described the local integration as the forgotten concept of durable solutions in dealing with refugees [9]. He might have a point for there is only little literature so far discussing local integration as durable solution for refugees. However, as stated by Fielden and Hovil [10][11]. This was not a matter of ignored concept, but mostly due to the fact that local integration was undocumented. In many protracted refugees' situation, local integration is mostly implemented and more popular than the other two durable solutions, the repatriation and resettlement. Thus, local integration incorporates three key aspects. Firstly, it represents a legal procedure through which refugees acquire a broader spectrum of rights within the host nation. Secondly, it constitutes an economic endeavor aimed at establishing sustainable livelihoods and achieving a standard of living on par with the local community. Thirdly, it encompasses a social and cultural adjustment process that fosters integration and acceptance, allowing refugees to actively participate in the social fabric of the host country while living free from the specter of discrimination [10]

In legal term, local integration means a situation where refugees are fully accepted by local community which includes citizenship provision. Thus, the formal ways are called as the *de jure* integration. As for *de facto* terms, the integration take place only locally. Means that, the integration is not only a matter of legal status provision by

Government, but also the provision of self-sufficiency and settlement for refugees in local community. Therefore, integration could become a better option for in dealing with protracted situation rather than short term assistance [2][10][11][9]. In many protracted refugee cases, de facto integration is far more popular than the formal one. It is because legal integration is much more complex to be implemented in today situation.

Meanwhile, Jacobsen discussed local integration as an overlooked concept in the context of durable solutions for refugees [9]. He may have a valid point, as there is limited literature that addresses local integration as a durable solution for refugees. However, Fielden and Hovil [10][11] pointed out that the lack of discussion on local integration was not due to it being ignored, but rather because there was little documentation available on the topic. According to Hovil, local integration is frequently implemented and more popular than the other two durable solutions, namely repatriation and resettlement, in many protracted refugee situations.

From a legal perspective, local integration refers to a scenario where refugees are fully accepted by the local community, including being provided with citizenship. This formal process is known as de jure integration. However, there is also a de facto integration, which occurs only on a local level. This means that integration is not solely dependent on the legal status granted by the government but also involves the self-sufficiency and settlement of refugees within the local community. Therefore, integration could be a preferable option in dealing with protracted situations rather than relying solely on short-term assistance. In many protracted refugee cases, de facto integration is more commonly adopted than the formal one because legal integration can be considerably more complex to implement in today's circumstances.

Research Method

To address the key research objectives, this research used qualitative methods. The data collection technique will be collected through multiple sources such as desk review, observation, interviews, and literature study. While the literature study will be conducted to obtain secondary data, the interviews will be conducted to obtain primary and profusely data from the stakeholders associated with this research. The secondary data will be obtained from books, journals, scientific articles, academic theses, proceedings, and websites. As for the case of observation and interviews, this field research will be conducted in Indonesia especially refugee who are stayed in Sidoarjo, East Java. Meanwhile, the supplementary material can be discovered in research centers and government officers.

General Structure of the Study

This paper is structured into five sections. The initial section provides an exposition on Indonesia's open-door policy, delving into its historical context. This policy, characterized by its border openness and acceptance of refugees, has evolved into a generous approach adopted by the country. In the second part, the paper will discuss the protracted situation of refugee in Indonesia. In the third section, an

analysis is conducted to assess the multifaceted impacts of long-term refugee presence on Indonesia's security, demographics, society, and economy. Moving on to the fourth part, it scrutinizes the policies implemented by Indonesia aimed at resolving the protracted refugee situation. Additionally, this section explores the country's commitment to adhering to the refugee regime despite not being a party to the Refugee Convention of 1951. Finally, the last section offers a conclusion that succinctly summarizes the findings related to the central research question.

Result and Discussion

The History of Indonesia's open-door policy

The early history of the arrival of refugees in Indonesia can be traced back to 1979 when Indonesia received thousands of Indochinese refugees as a result of the war between North and South Vietnam. Since then, the number of refugees entering Indonesia has continued to increase, not only from Vietnam but also from other Southeast Asian countries affected by conflicts, such as Laos and Cambodia. By 1979, around 43,000 Vietnamese and Cambodian refugees had arrived in Indonesia using boats [12].

At that time, Indonesia had not ratified the 1951 Refugee Convention, so the country approached the handling of refugees cautiously. With the dispersed presence of refugees in various regions of Indonesia, the government decided to establish a specific island, Pulau Galang in the Riau Islands, as a centralized refugee camp. This was done to prevent any security disturbances with the local communities. Pulau Galang was chosen because it had a relatively small population compared to its neighboring islands. With only 240 inhabitants, Pulau Galang also had a large water supply that could cater to the needs of tens of thousands of refugees [12][11].

By keeping the refugee population concentrated in one area with few local residents, the government hoped to minimize the social and security impacts that could arise from cultural differences, customs, beliefs, and concerns about the transmission of diseases brought by the refugees from Vietnam. Additionally, the proximity of Galang Island to international shipping routes was crucial, as it facilitated the Indonesian government's coordination with neighboring countries such as Malaysia and Singapore for territorial control and patrols [13].

The situation has changed since the early 2000s when Indonesia was once again faced with the arrival of refugees from the Middle East. They came to Indonesia through irregular immigration channels in order to eventually reach their intended destination, Australia. These asylum seekers were mostly fleeing from countries such as Afghanistan and Iraq, which were experiencing conflicts at that time. The arrival of Middle Eastern refugees was referred to as the second wave of refugee arrivals in Indonesia after the Indochina refugees. Since then, with the escalating conflicts in the Middle East, waves of refugees from that region have continued to arrive in Indonesia every year.

Furthermore, Indonesia also received refugees from the Rohingya ethnic group in Rohingya. As a group facing persecution from the Myanmar government, the Muslim Rohingya have long been fleeing to escape oppression in their country. As one of the neighboring countries, Indonesia received Rohingya refugees in several phases,

namely in 2009, 2012, 2015, and 2017 [14]. The arrival of Rohingya refugees in 2009 and 2012 in the East Aceh region led the Indonesian government, under the coordination of the Directorate General of Immigration, to collaborate with UNHCR and IOM to place them in immigration detention facilities and community housing in various areas of Indonesia [15]. In this regard, the shared identity factor as Muslims became one of the reasons why Indonesia accepted both Middle Eastern and Rohingya refugees.

In addition, these asylum seekers consider Indonesia as a stepping stone before heading to Australia. The reason they use Indonesia as a transit country is that Australia has very strict immigration policies. Immigrants who travel to Australia by air typically hold valid visas, such as for business, education, or tourism purposes. However, asylum seekers often find it difficult to obtain such visas due to various reasons, including the challenges they face in obtaining passports, Australia's policy of not issuing visas to people from refugee-producing countries, and airlines being urged to be aware of potential asylum seekers among their passengers [16].

The difficulties faced by asylum seekers in reaching Australia through air travel have led them to opt for boat journeys from Indonesia to Australia. However, in response to the surge in the number of boat people entering Australia in the early 2000s, Australia changed its immigration policies towards immigrants and refugees. Since the year 2000, Australia has collaborated with the Indonesian government to prevent asylum seekers from using boats to travel from Indonesia to Australia. This cooperation is governed by the Regional Cooperation Agreement (RCA), under which Australia provides financial support through the International Organization for Migration (IOM) to assist and provide various facilities for refugees in Indonesia. The IOM funds the construction of detention facilities and the addition of facilities to manage asylum seekers [17]. Through this agreement, the Australian government aims to manage the flow of asylum seekers and enhance their assistance to refugees in Indonesia.

Protracted Refugee Situation

If we look at the current condition of refugees in Indonesia, Indonesia is no longer portrayed as a transit country as was the case with the Indochina refugees in the past. This is because the refugees in Indonesia now find themselves in a protracted refugee situation. This situation arises due to the prolonged waiting period for refugees in the transit country, as the uncertainty surrounding the resettlement process in their intended destination or third countries increases. The waiting process for refugees from the transit country to a third country has extended from an average of 9 years in 1996 to 26 years in 2016 [18][19].

In other words, the refugees in Indonesia are facing an extended and unresolved state of displacement, as they wait for a resolution to their refugee status, whether through resettlement in a third country or other durable solutions. This protracted situation poses significant challenges for the refugees, as they often lack access to stable living conditions, education, employment, and basic rights during their extended stay in Indonesia. It also places a burden on the Indonesian government, which has to address the needs of a long-term refugee population within its borders.

The Refugee in Indonesia have fall under category of protracted refugees. UNHCR describes the protracted refugee situation as a prolonged condition facing refugees, who find it difficult to find a way out in solving it. Such prolonged conditions, do not endanger their lives directly, but their economic, social, psychological needs and basic rights are generally not fulfilled. This protracted status is caused by political stagnation and diplomacy efforts that are not going well, both in the country of origin and the host country. So, there is no agreement that can be implemented to solve the displacement. This stagnation then causes many restrictions on refugee space in the host country, especially in relation to employment.

Despite not being the intended destination for these refugees, both external and internal factors significantly contribute to the prolonged duration of their stay in Indonesia. External factors are related to the policies of destination countries such as Australia and the United States, which have become increasingly stringent in accepting refugee resettlement. As a result, refugees face difficulties in finding durable solutions and getting resettled in those countries. On the other hand, internal factors contributing to the protracted refugee situation involve the challenges faced by Indonesia itself. The situation of the refugees in Indonesia and the interaction between refugees and the local communities are the two primary challenges that the nation must solve.

The first issue arises from the circumstances of the refugees. Over the course of more than a decade, several incidents of suicide among refugees have occurred in Indonesia. Specifically, 14 Afghan refugees have taken their own lives in 2022 due to the uncertainty of their resettlement by UNHCR to a destination country [20]. Beyond suicide cases, the overall uncertain situation of refugees in Indonesia leads to depression, frustration, and, in some cases, protests, demonstrations, and even further instances of self-harm.

The protracted refugee situation places considerable strain on the refugees themselves, the Indonesian government, and the local communities. The refugees are left in limbo with no clear future, and the Indonesian authorities face the challenge of managing the long-term presence of a refugee population within the country's borders. Additionally, local communities may also experience tensions and complexities arising from interactions with the refugee population. Resolving this protracted situation requires comprehensive efforts, collaboration between nations, and humanitarian assistance to address the needs and vulnerabilities of the refugees in Indonesia.

The presence of refugees in Indonesia is also not centralized within a single community housing. They are scattered across several major cities in Indonesia. Some are located in community housing provided by IOM, UNHCR, and local governments, while others are integrated within the local communities. Previously, there were a number of refugees who were still held in immigration detention centers. However, after the issuance of Presidential Regulation No. 125 of 2016, refugees are no longer allowed to stay in detention centers and must be relocated to community housing.

Indonesia must find solutions to prevent the presence of refugees from causing conflict within the local communities. Potential conflicts may arise between different groups, including the foreign refugees, local communities, and internal refugees, due to identity differences and economic disparities. For example, social tensions have

occurred between refugees living in community housing and the local community in the Puspa Agro resident in Sidoarjo District, East Java. In this area, the presence of refugees is perceived as disturbing to the local community, as it has led to violations of security rules and instances of unofficial marriages between refugees and local residents. These social frictions have also resulted in feelings of social jealousy with internal refugees who are located nearby in a separate housing facility. In terms of facilities and infrastructure, the community housing for foreign refugees is often perceived to be better than the housing provided for internal refugees, who are predominantly victims of the conflict in Sampang, Madura, East Java.

To address these issues, Indonesia needs to implement measures that promote social cohesion, understanding, and mutual respect among all groups. This includes providing adequate support and services to both foreign and internal refugees to ensure their well-being and integration into local communities. Moreover, efforts should be made to engage in community dialogue and awareness campaigns to reduce misconceptions and foster positive relationships among all residents. Creating an inclusive and harmonious environment is essential in preventing conflicts and promoting peaceful coexistence between refugees and the local population.

Another internal factor is that Indonesia, as a transit country, faces numerous limitations in fulfilling the basic rights of refugees and asylum seekers. This often leads to challenges for Indonesia, not only in terms of managing the refugee population but also due to legal issues concerning the treatment of asylum seekers and refugees [21]. Regarding Indonesia's legal stance in handling refugees, Krustiyanti (2012) argues that Indonesia's non-ratification of the refugee convention imposes restrictions on its policies concerning refugees. Ratification, according to her, should be based on careful considerations, as an ill-advised decision could have negative consequences for Indonesia in the future. The absence of legal regulations concerning refugee's results in weak coordination among relevant institutions, leading to many difficulties in addressing refugee-related issues.

The condition of refugee living in Indonesia depicted by Susetyo [22] as lost in transit, due to the legal vacuum of regulation in Indonesia. Although Indonesian government has taken several measures in providing some clarity about the term of 'refugee' and their treatment during their stay in Indonesia, as mentioned in Presidential Regulation No.125 of 2016, those still lack of comprehensive mechanism related to the rights of the refugee. Moreover the implementation of Presidential Regulations in the field is still overlap between the stakeholders. Therefore, the coordination among the agency is hardly needed to deliver the rights and obligations of refugee and asylum seeker in Indonesia. This is also to ensure that the social and cultural challenge between refugee and local community are well maintained. Considering the social friction among them is happened frequently.

Thus, as part of the effort to minimize the social frictions on local residents, the local government together with the National and Political Unity Agency (Bakesbangpol), Polsek, Rudenim, IOM, and UNHCR, are improving coordination and cooperation in handling refugees. In its development, strengthening the synergy between related agencies is a challenge currently facing Indonesia. This is because so far, the absence of refugee regulations has made each agency seem to operate independently and it is not clear who should be responsible for handling refugees.

Examining the Durable Solution

As explained in the conceptual framework, UNHCR applies durable solutions to address protracted refugee situations, which include local integration, resettlement, and voluntary repatriation. Durable solutions are essential instruments to ensure proper handling and protection of refugees. This means that refugee protection and durable solutions are interconnected and cannot be separated. Durable solutions are critical in guaranteeing that refugees receive protection from the international community, regardless of their backgrounds and identities.

As stated by UNHCR, there is no hierarchy in implementing durable solutions. However, the most effective approach is to combine all three solutions and foster strong collaboration between the home country, host countries, humanitarian organizations, and the refugees themselves [5]. This means that all possible options should be explored and considered to find the most suitable solution for addressing refugees' needs, both in the short and long term. Regarding the implementation in the field, there is no prioritization among the durable solutions. All three have equal importance, depending on which solution is most feasible to be implemented first, considering the conditions and circumstances in the transit and destination countries.

Resettlement

UNHCR has played a crucial role in the global resettlement process. Approximately two-thirds of the global refugee population have been resettled through UNHCR, while the remaining resettlements have been facilitated by other entities, such as private sponsorship programs, like the one implemented by Canada, to support global resettlement efforts [23]. However, when looking at the global resettlement trend over the past decade, there remains a significant gap between the number of resettlement applications and the actual number of refugees resettled. The percentage of resettled refugees has never reached 15% in the last decade. Additionally, the outbreak of Covid-19 since 2020 has had a considerable impact on the acceptance of resettlement by developed countries, particularly the United States, which reduced its resettlement numbers.

As evident in 2021, the global resettlement efforts only covered four percent of the one million refugees in need of resettlement [23]. This indicates that the current global resettlement efforts are falling far short of meeting the growing needs of refugees requiring resettlement. Finding long-lasting solutions and being resettled in destination countries has become considerably more challenging for refugees as a result of the Covid-19 outbreak. The resettlement process has been impacted, and the pace at which refugees can be relocated to third countries has slowed due to the reduced capacity and travel restrictions. Filling this gap and stepping up worldwide resettlement efforts are essential if we're going to offer refugees long-lasting solutions and make sure they're safe and well-off. More options for refugees to be relocated in secure nations require ongoing cooperation between UNHCR, governments, and international organizations.

For transit countries like Indonesia, the role of UNHCR in facilitating resettlement to third countries is crucial. It can be said that preventing the emergence of protracted

refugee transit situations heavily depends on the resettlement of refugees to third countries. Among the three long-term solutions adopted by UNHCR to address refugee issues, resettlement efforts are often the most feasible option. Therefore, Indonesia is highly reliant on the policies of third countries that have ratified the Refugee Convention, such as Australia, the United States, New Zealand, and others. In the context of resettlement, UNHCR does not have the authority to determine the final destination for refugees. Instead, UNHCR can only propose refugee candidates, and the acceptance decision is made by the respective third country, whether they will accept the particular refugees or not.

The implementation of immigration policies that restrict refugees, as seen in the United States and Australia, has significant impacts on the conditions of refugees in Indonesia, as it increases the waiting time for resettlement. This delay in resettlement creates a protracted situation for refugees, prolonging their stay in transit countries like Indonesia and further complicating their integration into local communities and access to essential services. The reduction in the global resettlement quota has indeed impacted refugees in Indonesia and further entrenched them in a protracted refugee situation. When compared to other countries in Europe and the United States, the number of refugees in Indonesia is significantly smaller. As a result, with the decreasing global resettlement quota, it becomes increasingly evident that refugee resettlement in Indonesia is almost impossible to achieve [24].

In recent years, the resettlement process for refugees from Indonesia to third countries has experienced a decline. This is primarily due to destination countries like Australia and the United States implementing policies that limit the number of refugees admitted into their territories. For instance, Australia, under the government of Scott Morrison, has enforced a policy prohibiting resettlement for refugees who have been registered by UNHCR in Indonesia after July 2014 [25]. The change in Australia's policy towards refugees began in September 2013 when Prime Minister Tony Abbott implemented Operation Sovereign Border (OSB). Under this policy, Australia deployed its military to prevent the entry of boats carrying undocumented immigrants attempting to reach its borders [21]. These policy changes have significantly reduced the opportunities for refugees in Indonesia to be resettled to Australia and other destination countries. As a result, the number of refugees facing protracted transit situations in Indonesia has increased, as they have limited options for finding a durable solution and being resettled to a safe and stable country.

Furthermore, the United States, which is the second largest destination country for refugee resettlement from Indonesia after Australia, has also implemented restrictive policies. Under the administration of Donald Trump, the United States reduced its refugee admission quota to only 50,000 refugees, marking a 66 percent decrease compared to the Obama administration, which admitted up to 110,000 refugees [26]. The reductions and restrictions imposed by third countries on refugees have had a significant impact on the uncertainty faced by asylum seekers and refugees in transit countries, including Indonesia. This has led to a protracted refugee transit situation, as the waiting period for refugees in transit countries has increased due to the uncertainty surrounding the resettlement process.

The prolonged transit situation in Indonesia is a result of the longer waiting times for refugees to be resettled to a third country. The time refugees spend in transit countries waiting for resettlement has significantly increased over the years. For

instance, the average waiting time for refugees in transit countries was nine years in 1996, but it had risen to 26 years by 2016 [18]

Between De Jure and De Facto Inegration

As a transit country, Indonesia has implemented voluntary repatriation and resettlement to third countries as solutions for refugees. Meanwhile, local integration has been challenging to implement in Indonesia because it involves providing refugees with the same rights as citizens, such as access to employment, education, and other services. Thus, local integration is suited most for developed countries that have ratified the refugee convention and can provide refugees with long-term opportunities for integration.

However, the prolonged displacement with refugee living in Limbo in Indonesia has forced the country to boost the independent refugee for self-reliant especially for whom has long been living in the midst of local society. The changing behavior of Indonesian government related to refugees' condition since the latest presidential decree also influencing the government to developing best practices for refugee to have a self-reliant. For instances, prior to the release of the 2016 decree, the Indonesian government is making efforts to gradually integrate refugees into the local communities by moving the refugees from detention to community housing. This actually signifies Indonesian move towards desecuritization, which shifts the approach from accommodating refugees in detention-like facilities to placing them in non-detention facilities within local communities.

Indonesia faces difficulties implementing local integration due to its status as a transit country, particularly in light of the fact that it has not ratified the 1951 Refugee Convention. Similar to forced repatriation, voluntary repatriation is challenging to accomplish because it depends on the refugees' willingness to return to their origin country. Refugees who have relocated to Indonesia have already gone through de facto integration. De facto integration, according to Jacobsen (2001), happens when the neighborhood embraces the presence of refugee. They can live in the society, have access to necessities like housing and daily food, and engage with the locals.

De facto integration is distinct from de jure integration, where refugees obtain full rights like employment, naturalization, and other citizenship rights [9]. De jure integration is applicable in destination countries that have ratified the Refugee Convention. In transit countries like Indonesia, de facto integration is more common, where refugees are able to coexist within the community and access basic necessities, but they may not have all the legal rights and privileges of full integration.

While not ratifying the refugee convention, Indonesia has begun to open the door for refugee children to complete formal education in public schools. Many local educational administrations in Indonesia have granted partial and full scholarships to refugee students to attend public schools and certain private schools. Children of refugees who previously did not have access to formal education in Indonesia will benefit from Indonesia's stance regarding these permits in the future. In the last quarter of 2017, through a memorandum drawn up between Indonesia, UNHCR, IOM and the Education Service of the City of Medan, agreed 297 refugee children to be enrolled in public primary schools [27]. There have been calls from IOM and

UNHCR for access to refugee children's education, and then the government has responded to the call, by convening a Special Coordination Meeting (Rakursus) held by Kemenkopolkham to discuss the right to education for children of refugees in Indonesia. In the framework, Indonesia will focus on ensuring that 2,383 refugee children in Indonesia can go to formal school [28]. The Indonesian effort is an illustration of how external forces are able to impose pressures that can contain the change in a country's policy.

Referring to the durable solution framework by UNHCR [11] the presence of civil society is a form of de facto local integration. It means that refugees are accepted by the community, and there are groups within society willing to assist refugees by providing aid and protection while they are in Indonesia. This is a positive indication that the community does not perceive refugees and asylum seekers as security threats. The presence of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) reflects a humanitarian aspect that considers the rights of refugees. This becomes a supportive factor for desecuritizing the refugee issue in Indonesia.

The presence of civil society organizations, particularly Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) that advocate for refugees and asylum seekers, plays a significant role as government partners in helping address the needs of foreign refugees in Indonesia. Local NGOs that consistently highlight refugee issues also influence Indonesia's policies. Several NGOs in Indonesia are actively providing advocacy for refugees, including SUAKA (Indonesian Civil Society Network for Refugee Rights Protection), JAPPSI (Indonesian Refugees and Asylum Seekers Advocacy Network), LBH (Legal Aid Institute) Jakarta, Human Rights Working Group (HRWG), People Crisis Centre, Roshan Learning Center, World Relief, Yayasan KKSP (Urban Social Work Group), and Yayasan Geutanyoe (The Geutanyoe Foundation).

The existence of SUAKA as a voluntary civil society network emerged from the awareness of individuals and organizations about the vulnerable situation faced by asylum seekers and refugees in Indonesia. Established in 2012, SUAKA has become a legal entity in the form of an association based on the decree of the Ministry of Law and Human Rights in 2018. SUAKA's mission goes beyond providing legal assistance, advice, and information to asylum seekers and refugees; it also focuses on raising public awareness about asylum seekers and refugee issues.

According to Taylor [29] the development of civil society in the Asia-Pacific region, specifically those providing advocacy for asylum seekers and refugees, plays a significant role in enhancing the protection of individual refugees. The presence of civil society is referred to as "filling the gap" or addressing the gaps in refugee protection. This is because, despite the presence of UNHCR or IOM in recipient countries, the multitude of issues and tasks they handle may limit their ability to fully accommodate the individual needs of each refugee. In this regard, the presence of civil society organizations (LSM) also helps the performance of local governments in the recipient country. The role of LSM, being closer to the conditions on the ground, enables them to act swiftly in coordinating with both local and central governments regarding issues encountered in the field. Additionally, unlike UNHCR and IOM, LSM has more flexibility in implementing programs, as they are perceived to be representing the local community.

This proximity to the local context allows LSM to better understand the needs and challenges faced by refugees and asylum seekers. They can quickly respond to emerging issues, advocate for necessary support, and collaborate with local and national authorities to address the challenges effectively. Unlike international organizations such as UNHCR and IOM, civil society organizations are perceived as part of the local community, which can positively impact the perception and cooperation from the government and other stakeholders. Being viewed as internal partners, LSM can work more closely with government authorities and provide valuable insights from the local perspective.

However, this is different for civil society organizations (LSM) as they are considered to represent the local community. Although their 'pro-refugee' perspective may not represent the entire society, their presence serves as an indication of how the local community accepts refugees. Referring to UNHCR's long-term solution [11] the presence of civil society reflects de facto local integration. This means that refugees are accepted by the community, and there are even groups within the community willing to provide assistance and protection to refugees while they are in Indonesia. This positive representation indicates that the community does not perceive refugees and asylum seekers as security threats. The presence of civil society organizations reflects a humanitarian aspect that considers the rights of refugees. This becomes a supporting factor in the process of desecuritizing the refugee issue in Indonesia.

References

1. Budiman, R. P. (2012). Kebijakan Indonesia terhadap pengungsi Vietnam di pulau Galang, 1979-1996. <https://lib.ui.ac.id/file?file=digital/20300737-S42012-Ryan%20Prasetia%20Budiman.pdf>
2. Connor, P., & Krogstad, J. M. (2017). U.S. on track to reach Obama administration's goal of resettling 110,000 refugees this year. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2017/01/20/u-s-on-track-to-reach-obama-administrations-goal-of-resettling-110000-refugees-this-year/>
3. Crisp, J. (2004). The local integration and local settlement of refugees: A conceptual and historical analysis, Jeff Crisp. UNHCR Working Paper, 102.
4. Fandik, M. (2013). The Journal of Universitas Negeri Surabaya. 1(1). <https://ejournal.unesa.ac.id>
5. Fiddian-qasmieh, E., Loescher, G., Long, K., Sigona, N., Long, K., & Sigona, N. (2014). The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies. In The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199652433.001.0001>
6. Fielden, A. (2008). Local Integration: An Under-Reported solution to protracted refugee situations. UNHCR Working Paper, 158.

7. Fiske, L. (2017, March 8). Refugee Transit in Indonesia: The Critical Importance of Community. IPI Global Observatory. <https://theglobalobservatory.org/2017/03/indonesia-refugee-crisis-unhcr/>
8. Hirsch, A. L., & Doig, C. (2018). Outsourcing control: The International Organization for Migration in Indonesia. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 22(5), 681–708. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2017.1417261>
9. Hovil, L. (2014). Local Integration. In *The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies*. Oxford University Press.
10. Jacobsen, K. (2001). The forgotten solution: Local integration for refugees in developing countries. *New Issues in Refugee Research*.
11. Johsty, M. (2017). Indonesia gives refugee children hope for a brighter future. UNHCR Indonesia. <https://www.unhcr.org/id/en/10568-indonesia-gives-refugee-children-hope-for-a-brighter-future.html>
12. Khalid, S. (2022, January 16). An Afghan Refugee Commits Suicide in Indonesia. *Hasht-e Subh Daily*. <https://8am.media/eng/an-afghan-refugee-commits-suicide-in-indonesia/>
13. Krustiyati, J. M. A. (2012). Kebijakan Penanganan Pengungsi di Indonesia: Kajian dari Konvensi Pengungsi 1951 dan Protokol 1967. *Law Review*, 12(2), Article 2.
14. Lau, P. Y. F. (2021). Empowerment in the Asylum-seeker Regime? The Roles of Policies, the Non-profit Sector and Refugee Community Organizations in Hong Kong. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 34(1), 305–327. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fez090>
15. Long, K. (2013). *The point of no return: Refugees, rights, and repatriation*. Oxford University Press.
16. Meuko, N. (2019). Rakorsus Kemenko Polhukam Bahas Hak Sekolah 1.894 Anak Pengungsi Asing di Indonesia. *beritasatu.com*. <https://www.beritasatu.com/nasional/544256/rakorsus-kemenko-polhukam-bahas-hak-sekolah-1894-anak-pengungsi-asing-di-indonesia>
17. Missbach, A. (2017). Accommodating Asylum Seekers and Refugees in Indonesia: From Immigration Detention to Containment in “Alternatives to Detention.” *Refuge*, 33(2), 32–44. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1043061ar>
18. Mukhtar. (2016, December 5). Research on Rohingya Refugees. SUAKA. <https://suaka.or.id/research-on-rohingya-refugees/>
19. Nadyatama, R. (2017). The Rohingya crisis: What could Indonesia do better? *Indonesia at Melbourne*. <https://indonesiatmelbourne.unimelb.edu.au/the-rohingya-crisis-what-could-indonesia-do-better/>
20. Nethery, A., Rafferty-Brown, B., & Taylor, S. (2013). Exporting Detention: Australia-funded Immigration Detention in Indonesia. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 26(1), 88–109. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fes027>
21. Refugee Convention. (1951). *Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees*. UNHCR. <https://www.unhcr.org/media/convention-and-protocol-relating-status-refugees>
22. Stein, B. N. (1986). Durable solutions for developing country refugees. *International Migration Review*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2546035>
23. Susetyo, H. (2023). *Lost in transit: Refugees stranded in a legal vacuum in Indonesia by Heru Susetyo, SH, LL.M., M.Si. Ph.D – Fakultas Hukum Universitas Indonesia*. <https://law.ui.ac.id/lost-in-transit-refugees-stranded-in-a-legal-vacuum-in-indonesia-by-heru-susetyo-sh-ll-m-m-si-ph-d-2/>
24. Taylor, S., & Rafferty-Brown, B. (2010). Waiting for Life to Begin: The Plight of Asylum Seekers Caught by Australia’s Indonesian Solution. *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 22(4), 558–592. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/eeq034>

25. UNHCR. (2005). Hand Book for Self-Relience. UNHCR: Reintegration and Local Settlement Section.
26. UNHCR. (2007). The 10-Point Plan in Action, 2016 Update, Chapter 7: Solutions for Refugees. UNHCR.
27. UNHCR. (2021). Global Trends Report 2021. UNHCR. <https://www.unhcr.org/media/global-trends-report-2021>
28. UNHCR. (2023). Fact Sheets. UNHCR Indonesia. <https://www.unhcr.org/id/en/fact-sheets>
29. United Nations. (1948). Universal Declaration of Human Rights. United Nations; United Nations. <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>
30. USCRI. (2001). Paying the Price: Australia, Indonesia try to Stop Asylum Seekers. Refworld. <https://www.refworld.org/docid/3c58099a1.html>.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

