

Nonstate Actors' Practices and Agency in Indonesian Refugee Protection

The Importance of Communities of Practice

Nino Viartasiwi

Introduction

Discussions about refugee protection and governance in Indonesia mainly focus on the discourses that surround Indonesia's status as a transit country, as Indonesia is not a signatory party to the 1951 Refugee Convention or the 1967 Refugee Protocol and does not intend to become one. The Indonesian government also relies on the state's lack of international obligations as a convenient excuse to justify why they have not implemented comprehensive refugee protection beyond the 2016 Presidential Regulation concerning the Treatment of Refugees (PR 125). Tonally, PR 125 emphasizes emergency relief rather than sustainable refugee governance. Additionally, the Indonesian government usually demands that international organizations contribute significantly to refugee protection and management in Indonesia (*Jakarta Post* 2021; Sadjad 2021). For example, under the Regional Cooperation Arrangement (RCA), which will be discussed later in this chapter, the UNHCR and the IOM have the authority to process and care for refugees in Indonesia (Kneebone 2017). The role of nonstate actors is not yet a widely researched topic in the field

of Indonesian refugee protection. In this chapter, ‘nonstate actor’ refers to individuals and national organizations that are different and separate from the state or state apparatuses. Nonstate actors are, at best, seen as pressure groups with a role that is complementary to that of the state and international organizations. However, nonstate actors are central to refugee management; in Indonesia, nonstate actors facilitate a considerable amount of refugee protection (Viartasiwi et al. 2021). While nonstate actors are not policy makers, unlike the state and international organizations, their role in refugee protection is far from a complementary one.¹

Compared to the number of nonstate actors working on popular issues, such as development programmes and other human rights issues, the number of nonstate actors working on refugee protection and advocacy in Indonesia is small.² This may be because refugee advocacy by nonstate actors is relatively new in the Indonesian context.³ This chapter predominately relies on interviews and personal communications with twenty interviewees who are civil society organization (CSO) activists, government officials and officers of international organizations. In the context of this chapter, ‘civil society’ refers to a broad range of actors including individuals, NGOs, social movements, charities, religious groups, international organizations, business entities and educational organizations that are considered intermediaries, as they work between the state and the beneficiaries of the work. In this case, the beneficiaries are refugees and asylum seekers. A CSO is therefore an organization that does this work and operates within this in between space. CSOs are a form of nonstate actor, but this definition specifically refers only to organizations that work between the state and the beneficiaries rather than any entity that is distinct from the state (like a nonstate actor). This chapter also uses relevant statements from officials that have been sourced online and in the media. To gain a deeper understanding of the Indonesian refugee protection context, I observed refugee advocacy and activist environments and interviewed relevant people. All interviewees were aware of the interview’s purpose and off-the-record statements have not been quoted.

This chapter explores how nonstate actors with limited agency, resulting from a lack of funding or labour, navigate their work within a community organization to develop a community of practice (CoP). The discussion is organized into two sections that illustrate how the link between practice and the transformation of agency into an effective type can create a CoP. In the first section, this chapter describes the practices and agency of individuals and CSOs in Indonesia that protect refugees at the local and national levels. The aim of this section is to elucidate how agency and practices are mutually linked in the Indonesian refugee protection context. In the second section, this chapter examines the concept of CoP by exploring how the peer learning process enabled through CoPs has successfully enhanced the agency of nonstate actors and attracted new actors to the movement.

The Roles and Functions of Nonstate Actors in Indonesian Refugee Protection

There are two main roles that may be embodied by nonstate actors working with refugees in Indonesia. These roles create different functions and influence the capacity of Indonesia-based nonstate actors. The first role that may be adopted by nonstate actors is that of the humanitarian actor with a service delivery function that aims to enhance refugee protection. The second role that may be adopted is that of the human rights defender with an advocacy function that seeks to positively influence the state's response to refugee concerns. Nonstate actors may embody both or either of the functions in their practice. The humanitarian actor's degree of agency can be determined by their level of competence, effectiveness and the efficiency with which they deliver service in the field. The human rights defender's success in fulfilling its advocacy function can be measured by their influence on policy making. Despite different functions and measures of achievement, both roles require strong practice and thorough learning processes to impact their agency.

Nonstate actors that work in service delivery are usually initially recruited for specific work with either the UNHCR or the IOM and, after the work for which they were engaged is completed, the relationship between the nonstate actor and the organization continues. At the national level, nonstate actors may be involved in national coordination, but when working at the local level, nonstate actors may execute refugee protection projects in partnership with the UNHCR or the IOM, such as the collaboration with Geutanyoe in Aceh that is discussed later in this chapter. However, some CSOs initially work with the IOM and the UNHCR as project partners but then move to independent practice. One such organization is Lembaga Studi Kebijakan Publik (LSKP) (translated as Institute for Public Policy Studies), as demonstrated by its work in Makassar, which will also be discussed in more detail later on in this chapter. Generally, nonstate actors engage in advocacy work after performing service delivery work, as they recognize that policy reform is the only way to ensure that refugees in Indonesia enjoy adequate protection, even in the transitory context.

Refugee protection in Indonesia is characterized by the practice of nonstate actors at the local and national levels. Some individual actors and organizations work exclusively at either the national or the local level, while some CSOs work across both levels. To illustrate the different contributions of nonstate actors, in this chapter I will analyse several CSOs that work at the national level and others that work in specific geographical areas of Indonesia: Makassar in South Sulawesi, Pekanbaru in the Sumatran province of Riau and the semi-autonomous province of Aceh.

CSOs Working at the National Level and in Greater Jakarta

CSOs that work at the national level and in Greater Jakarta (the capital city of Indonesia and its satellite cities known as Jabodetabek: Jakarta, Tangerang, Depok, Bogor and Bekasi) usually work within the INGO network. These INGO networks are founded and supported by more established human rights organizations. There are only a few CSOs in Indonesia that work exclusively on refugee issues, such as JRS Indonesia (which is an INGO), SUAKA and various refugee-led organizations. Other CSOs, such as the Sandya Institute,⁴ the Church World Service,⁵ Dompot Dhuafa⁶ and Save the Children,⁷ do not exclusively focus on refugee protection, but do work on this issue in Indonesia. CSOs that work at the national level or are based in the Greater Jakarta area have relatively strong connections to international organizations, international communities, the media and academic communities due to their high agency, which is enabled by strong networking skills and the geographical benefit of being based in and around the capital city.

JRS Indonesia was the first CSO that worked exclusively on refugee issues at the national level in Indonesia. Although JRS Indonesia is part of the global JRS organization, it is registered in Indonesia as a national humanitarian organization. Globally, JRS works in fifty-seven countries. JRS Indonesia was founded in 1980 to aid the Indochinese refugees living in camps on Galang Island, Indonesia, from 1979 to 1996, during the Indochina refugee crisis and the actioning of the CPA (JRS Indonesia n.d.).⁸ The organization has since assisted other refugees and internally displaced persons in Indonesia. JRS Indonesia also do advocacy work that seeks to influence refugee protection policy. JRS Indonesia is one of the few CSOs that provides livelihood services and economic empowerment assistance to refugees in Bogor, south of Jakarta. One of its programmes is Refutera, an online shop for marketing handicrafts produced by refugees in Bogor and Jakarta. Refutera is run in collaboration with Skilled Migrants and Refugee Technicians (hereinafter 'SMART'), a refugee-led organization that aims to nurture the economic independence of refugees. The Refutera project focuses on urban refugees in Greater Jakarta (see Refutera n.d.). These refugees are known as *refugee mandiri* or 'independent refugees' as they do not receive livelihood support from the IOM or the UNHCR (Mixed Migration Centre 2021: 32). JRS is also an important player in several civil society movements and advocacy campaigns, including the Alternatives to Detention (ATD) movement, the Access to Education for Child Refugees campaign and the Civil Society Coalition for Refugees' Economic Independence campaign.⁹

SUAKA is another CSO dedicated to working on refugee issues in Indonesia. SUAKA was also the first CSO to provide legal assistance to

refugees at the national level. In addition to this work, SUAKA engages in advocacy work that is directed towards the Indonesian government, the general public and refugee communities. SUAKA is a member of various national civil society coalitions and a regional refugee protection network namely the Asia Pacific Refugee Rights Network (APRRN) (see Chapter 8 in this volume). To undertake its daily activities, the organization is mobilized by volunteers and interns, and is dependent on funding from public donations.¹⁰

Other refugee-focused and refugee-led CSOs also work in the Greater Jakarta area. These include the Refugees and Asylum Seekers Information Center Indonesia, which does advocacy;¹¹ the Sisterhood Community Center, which runs refugee women empowerment programmes, and SMART, which works on IT education and economic empowerment.¹² A social movement, the Jakarta Bersatu Project, focuses on the economic empowerment of refugee women in collaboration with an Indonesian CSO, the Liberty Society. Refugee-led organizations are also the force behind the creation and operation of many of the refugee learning centres in Jakarta and Bogor. Refugee-led organizations and their activists benefit from partnerships with expatriate communities, international communities and regional organizations like the APRRN.

Indonesian CSOs, such as the Sandya Institute and Dompot Dhuafa, while not exclusively focused on refugee protection, have also worked on refugee issues. The Sandya Institute conducts research on refugee issues and has enabled refugees to access education by setting up temporary Indonesian language classes. However, whether and how much their activities focus on refugee issues is dependent on the personal preferences of the organization's leaders and the availability of its volunteers.¹³ Dompot Dhuafa, a national Islamic charity organization, offers an informal education service to refugee children, and provides monetary donations and (when necessary) emergency relief to Rohingya refugees stranded in Aceh. Indonesian branches of INGOs, such as the Church World Service and Save the Children, view and manage refugee issues as part of their other missions, including family-specific adaptation to climate change and advocacy on children's issues (Church World Service n.d.; Save the Children n.d.). Even though these organizations do not exclusively work on refugee issues, their contribution to refugee protection is influential, especially in supporting refugee livelihoods.

CSOs at the Local Level

Refugee protection outside of Greater Jakarta is mostly dominated by the IOM as most refugees who live elsewhere in Indonesia are recipients of the IOM's livelihood assistance, with the exception of some independent

refugees. Even so, the IOM must also collaborate with other CSOs to extend protection beyond just the basic needs of refugees. The next section will provide an overview of local CSOs in Makassar, Pekanbaru and Aceh.

LSKP in Makassar

Makassar, the capital of South Sulawesi Province, is an Indonesian city with a high refugee population. Around 1,738 refugees and asylum seekers live in Makassar (UNHCR Indonesia 2021). However, there are not many CSOs that actively work on refugee issues in the area. A local NGO, the LSKP, is one of the few CSOs in Makassar working on refugee issues.

LSKP is a well-known local NGO that focuses on local social-political issues. On refugee issues, LSKP works with the IOM and, more recently, the Makassar City Government to provide educational and psychological assistance to refugee children. LSKP began delivering services to unaccompanied migrant children after winning a project bid from the IOM to provide homeschooling for thirty-seven unaccompanied migrant children in two IOM shelters, Maysarah and D'Win, from October 2017 to August 2018. For the project, LSKP recruited university graduates as volunteers to work as teachers and social workers, in addition to a counsellor.

The IOM did not extend the contract after it ended in 2018 for budgetary reasons, which were a consequence of Australia cutting its funding of the IOM in Indonesia.¹⁴ Nevertheless, LSKP decided to continue the work. The services were extended to all refugee children – including those who lived with their parents, instead of just unaccompanied migrant children – at the same time as the release of the new memorandum of understanding between LSKP and the IOM.¹⁵ Under the new memorandum of understanding, LSKP volunteers are not compensated, whereas previously a teacher received an honorarium of approximately US\$14 per session and a social worker received US\$9 per day. As a token of appreciation, the IOM provides a certificate of recognition and a monthly transportation allowance of US\$7. LSKP supervises and offers brief training sessions and study packs to volunteers. During the volunteer recruitment process, LSKP received an overwhelming number of applications from university graduates, enabling the organization to expand its services from two to fifteen locations out of around twenty-two to twenty-five locations. Throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, all classes were held online. According to an LSKP leader:

As an NGO we are used to conduct [*sid*] a long-term programme, especially programmes that related to children. So, when a programme for children is ended abruptly, it become [*sid*] an issue for us because it concern [*sid*] with their education's sustainability ... According to IOM, there is no money [to continue the programme] ... So we have just opened a volunteer class ... IOM

[will provide] certificate to volunteer that LSKP recruits [*sic*]. At first, IOM also didn't believe it [that it would work], I also did not know, but we had to try. Our NGO's work has always been creative and always lacked money. From my experience, there always be people who care, [volunteers willing to help].¹⁶

Additionally, LSKP collaborates with the UNHCR and a local government agency, the Integrated Service Center for Women and Children Empowerment (Pusat Pelayanan Terpadu Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Anak: hereinafter 'P2TP2A'), to address gender-based violence in refugee communities.¹⁷ It makes use of community shelters – a local government resource for combating gender-based violence – which are neighbourhood- or village-based. Refugees are allowed to access government-owned women's shelters. There is no record of how many women or refugees have accessed these services.

As a longstanding NGO with a diverse range of activities, LSKP understands that refugees, especially refugee children, represent a unique societal concern due to their noncitizen status, ethnic diversity, conflict-related trauma and inability to speak Indonesian, in addition to the transitory nature of living in Indonesia. Thus, prior to LSKP's involvement in the IOM project bidding process, representatives travelled to Bogor and Jakarta to gather information from other NGOs in their networks and observe refugee communities. During their visit, they learned that there are significant differences between the refugee settlements in Bogor-Jakarta and Makassar, including with regard to receiving IOM aid and freedom of movement.¹⁸

Dompot Dhuafa Riau, UIR Refugee Corner, Kovid Psikologi and the Refugee Empowerment Centre in Pekanbaru

As of 29 October 2021, Pekanbaru, the capital city of Riau Province, was home to 906 refugees and asylum seekers. Almost all of the refugees in Pekanbaru receive livelihood support from IOM's Pekanbaru office in the form of accommodation, monthly stipends and access to healthcare services. Additionally, UNHCR maintains a field office in Pekanbaru.

CSOs have only recently become involved in refugee issues in Riau. This occurred after the primary actors in refugee protection in Pekanbaru, the IOM and the UNHCR, created networks of CSOs as partners in 2019 and 2020. The UNHCR formed a collaboration circle with Dompot Dhuafa Riau, the Pekanbaru-based Tzu Chi Buddhist Foundation Indonesia, the Islamic University of Riau (hereinafter 'UIR') and the Refugee Empowerment Centre (REC) to establish protection initiatives. The IOM mostly collaborates with CSOs as a partner or project financier, collaborating with the Riau chapter of the Indonesian Planned Parenthood Association (hereinafter 'IPPA') on projects such as the Youth Centre and the Community Centre. The Community Centre is a continuation of the successful Youth Centre programme; in

this new endeavour, the IOM partners with additional stakeholders, such as Kovid Psikologi, to provide mental health services to refugees. Kovid Psikologi is an organization that was founded in 2021 by the master's programme at the Faculty of Psychology at the Sultan Syarif Kasim State Islamic University Riau (UIN SUSKA) (Jasnida 2021). Through empowerment and social integration activities, the Community Centre seeks to enhance refugee protection (IPPA 2021). Another CSO circle is the Teman Refugees (refugees' friends) WhatsApp group, which was created by the UNHCR and the Pekanbaru City Government to discuss everyday social problems regarding refugees, such as public order concerns caused by refugees' demonstrations in public spaces. The members of the WhatsApp group are representatives of organizations and individuals interested in refugee issues.

In 2019, Dompét Dhuafa Riau got involved in refugee protection in Pekanbaru after it was invited to train other organizations at a UNHCR event on Age, Gender and Diversity Mainstreaming training. Dompét Dhuafa Riau wanted to create a school for refugees emulating the Dompét Dhuafa schools in Jakarta, which was encouraged by the Dompét Dhuafa headquarters in Jakarta. However, at the time of writing, the plan had not yet been implemented due to difficulties with government bureaucracy and the COVID-19 pandemic. Dompét Dhuafa Riau has also financially contributed to numerous UNHCR causes, including returning a Pekanbaru-based refugee family to their home in Jakarta and supporting Rohingya refugees in Aceh by providing them with financial assistance.¹⁹

In 2021, Dompét Dhuafa Riau funded a pilot programme, established by the UNHCR Pekanbaru and in collaboration with the UIR, to provide refugee youth with a short university education. From September 2021 to October 2022, five refugee youths (three Afghans, one Sudanese and one Rohingya individual) were allowed to enrol in two semesters of selected courses at UIR's International Relations Department, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences. Dompét Dhuafa Riau allocated IDR24 million (US\$1,900) to two participants: one Rohingya and one Afghan refugee. UIR and the UNHCR funded the remaining three participants. Participants received monthly internet and education allowances in addition to tuition fees and other academic expenses. Upon graduation, they would receive a certificate of acknowledgement from the university. Dompét Dhuafa Riau claims that the programme is a one-of-a-kind trial that will motivate Dompét Dhuafa Jakarta to replicate it. Not only does the initiative seek to assist refugee youth in obtaining an education, but it also seeks to build community leaders and distract refugee youths from the uncertainty that surrounds resettlement prospects:

The issue of [re]settlement is still there and an important point. So, how can the issue be diverted for a while [from their minds] ... When they live in Indonesia, they have other opportunities, not just waiting for the resettlement ... The hope is that after this one-year program, a written statement from UIR will be issued,

because for a diploma it must be registered and administratively complicated, so issuing a certificate should be enough ... Maybe the knowledge and the certificate can be used for resettlement opportunities or maybe they have the opportunity to get a job in Pekanbaru or maybe in Jakarta ... We hope they can take advantage of the opportunity and the knowledge and the certificate are useful in the future.²⁰

The university short course programme is delivered by a private university: the UIR. The selected refugee youths can join selected courses provided by the university's International Relations Study Programme. Additionally, in March 2021, the Dean of the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences and the UNHCR signed an agreement to establish the Refugee Research Centre. The centre – Indonesia's first university-level refugee research centre – aspires to be a leader in refugee studies in Indonesia and advocate for refugee protection in Riau. It is staffed by students and lecturers from the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences and was not active until early 2022 due to disruption caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. It is the interest of staff and students that drives UIR's involvement with the Pekanbaru refugee crisis. The founder of the two programmes, who did not wish to be named, confessed that she initially sought a gap in an academic field. However, after numerous official and informal discussions with UNHCR officers and students on refugee issues, her interest in the subject grew. As a result, collaborations between the UNHCR and other stakeholders were formed.²¹

Kovid Psikologi conducts online programmes that target refugee mental health by providing free psychological consultation services in collaboration with the IOM. Kovid Psikologi also conducts advocacy work focused on the protection of refugees in Pekanbaru. In 2021, Kovid Psikologi organized three webinars at which other stakeholders were invited to discuss the situation of refugees in an effort to improve refugee protection in Pekanbaru. Additionally, Kovid Psikologi is a member of the Community Centre that was founded by the IOM and the Indonesian Planned Parenthood Association.²²

The REC is a student-run organization founded by Riau University students. Established in August 2020, REC intends to run a variety of programmes, ranging from research to empowerment; however, from September 2020 to early 2022, online Indonesian language classes for refugees were its sole active programme, which were taught by volunteer teachers from across Indonesia. REC works in collaboration with the UNHCR Pekanbaru and the Pekanbaru City Government. It receives material assistance, such as mobile phones and computers, from the UNHCR, which enables it to run programmes. It was founded after a student activist, known here as MR, conducted research at the UNHCR and learned about the refugee situation. Motivated by her discussions with the UNHCR Pekanbaru officers, she recruited other students to create a community that focused on refugee-related

initiatives.²³ REC now has about twenty-five members, most of whom are university students. MR was invited to join the Teman Refugees WhatsApp Group by a UNHCR officer and engaged with other interested parties about refugee issues by chatting and messaging in the group:

In the group we share activities or achievements of those institutions related to refugees such as research, classes for refugees, healthcare services, trainings and the like ... The group is a place to appreciate others' works, motivation sharing and finding support for our work.²⁴

Pekanbaru refugee protection is defined by a variety of CSO communities, each with its own distinct membership. The majority of actors got involved with the cause after being invited to join a CSO community by fellow practitioners. Another distinguishing feature of Pekanbaru refugee protection is the diversity of university-based communities that have formed refugee protection circles. Considering the small population of refugees in Pekanbaru – there are fewer than 1,000 – the small population of Pekanbaru residents and the size of Pekanbaru city, the involvement of various different universities is a rare case in the landscape of Indonesian refugee protection at the local level. In larger Indonesian cities that have bigger refugee populations, universities rarely pay attention to their local refugee communities and refugee issues beyond the occasional research by lecturers and students, small protection programmes, such as Indonesian language training, or the rare opportunities for refugees to study at those universities.²⁵

Yayasan Geutanyoe in Aceh and Jakarta

Aceh Province has become a temporary safe haven for Rohingya refugees whose boats broke down on their journey to Malaysia due to its geographical position in the Strait of Malacca (Melaka) and long coastlines. With assistance from the Malaysian government and international organizations, the local governments of the cities along Aceh's coast have been temporarily housing refugees who have landed in their territories. The primary distinguishing feature of refugee protection in Aceh is that it focuses on temporary, emergency responses. This differs from the response of other refugee-populated cities in Indonesia, which instead focus more on social and livelihood assistance. Yayasan Geutanyoe (Geutanyoe Foundation) is one of the main local, nonstate actors working on refugee issues in the Aceh Province.

The Geutanyoe Foundation was founded in 2013 in Banda Aceh with the initial aim of improving education and promoting Acehnese culture. It shifted its focus to include refugee concerns after the 2015 Andaman Sea crisis and, in particular, works with Rohingya refugees who were trapped in

the Aceh Sea.²⁶ Additionally, Geutanyoe Foundation has become a partner organization of the IOM and has approximately fifteen staff and volunteers. In 2022, it is focused on providing emergency responses in crises and public policy advocacy for refugees. Among the Geutanyoe Foundation's current projects is a study on developing refugee protection within Aceh's provincial legal system, known as *Qanun* (see Abubakar and Yoesoef 2004).²⁷ Additionally, in July 2021, Geutanyoe appointed a representative in Jakarta to engage with national CSOs, stakeholders and the media on refugee protection. Representatives were also appointed in Medan, the capital of the North Sumatra province bordering Aceh, to ensure the continued provision of support and informal education to Rohingya refugees housed at three IOM facilities in the city. This expansion reflects the fact that Rohingya refugees only tend to be in Aceh temporarily before being gradually moved to IOM housing facilities in Medan and Pekanbaru or, in many cases, secretly fleeing to Malaysia to reunite with family and access greater job opportunities, among other personal reasons:

Geutanyoe opened a Jakarta office after we found it difficult to communicate with friends and the government in Jakarta ... In Jakarta we communicate with activists, human rights organizations, IOM, and government both formally and informally ... I was in Kontras Aceh²⁸ [2014–2017] before joined Geutanyoe [*sid*] in 2021 so I use my former connections ... Geutanyoe should be part of any coalition on refugee issues and collaborate with other organizations ... The challenge during the pandemic is [*sid*] that online communication is not as flexible as in-person meeting ... Informal, in-person meetings are more effective for building engagement.²⁹

Geutanyoe Foundation maintains positive relationships with Indonesian human rights groups such as the Indonesian Legal Aid Institute (LBH), the Indonesian Forum for the Environment, Kontras Aceh and SUAKA Indonesia. In Aceh, Geutanyoe is also in close contact with a forum of Panglima Laot, the sea commanders of Indigenous communities in Aceh, to collaborate on rescuing refugees who are stuck in Aceh waters (Mu'aqaffi 2021).³⁰ As a result of Geutanyoe's focus on policy advocacy and its desire to collaborate with other CSOs, it is an active member of the Civil Society Coalition for Refugees' Economic Independence. Geutanyoe is a member of the APRRN in regional Asia and has participated in various APRRN events.

Communities of Practice in Indonesian Refugee Protection

For Indonesian nonstate actors working on refugee protection, joining a community organization can be key to enhancing agency and developing

practices. Among Indonesian nonstate actors, the connections and peer learning gained from working alongside other refugee protection organizations has created a CoP.

CoP is a concept that originated in knowledge management studies and seeks to improve performance, mostly among education and business organizations. In organizational performance, a CoP can strengthen team building and enable talented practitioners to stand out (Kerno and Mace 2010). However, CoP is a loose concept as there is no widely accepted theoretical framework that explains its formation and management (Bolisani and Scarso 2014). In theory, CoPs are key to the social learning that determines the consistency of an organization's practices, as well as its development. The CoP approach was first introduced by Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger. Lave and Wenger's work interrogates how an organization can unfold and facilitate the learning process, enabled by group learning and information sharing among parties with a common area of interest. Wenger later developed the approach into a broader social concept by identifying the boundaries of the idea, and the social coherence to the approach that is observable in wider society (Wenger 1998). Lave and Wenger define CoP as a 'group of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly' (Wenger-Trayner and Wenger-Trayner 2015). CoPs have two central ideas: first, that learning is a core mechanism of practice; and, second, that practice is organized in a community structure (Bueger and Gadinger 2018). There are three junctures required by practitioners to develop a CoP (Wenger-Trayner and Wenger-Trayner 2015): first, in the field of domain, the participants share an interest, purpose and commitment; second, in the field of community, the members mutually engage and care for each other; third, in the field of practice, the practitioners share a repertoire of communal resources for a better practice. The repertoire also involves practical knowledge that is based on experience.

The mutual engagement of practitioners facilitates the process of 'thinking together' (Pyrko, Dörfler and Eden 2017). Thinking together guides the practitioners to recognize the mutual problems in their field, close the knowledge gap and, eventually, form tacit understandings among practitioners, which is the key to sustaining the practice (Bolisani and Scarso 2014; Pyrko, Dörfler and Eden 2017). In Indonesian refugee protection, nonstate actors benefit from a CoP to develop agency through processes of mutual learning and thinking together, which assist them to come to a tacit understanding on issues that must be prioritized, among other issues that need to be addressed. This peer learning and thinking together process is formed through almost daily interactions and casual conversations in WhatsApp groups and cafes, and in more serious discussions facilitated in online meetings. Informality is thus a characteristic of the process of thinking together and enhancing the bond. Even when employed with nonpractitioners, such as government

officials, informality and mutual engagement help to forge nonpractitioners' understanding of refugee issues. As a UNHCR officer claimed:

In Riau, I found that personal advocacy through informal meetings [such as] in a coffee shop while watching soccer together is more effective than in a [formal] forum. In a forum I would be asked about my Merah Putih – nationalism – when we involved in arguments [with government officials]. I have built good personal relationships with government officers and policemen for refugee protection ... I had to go door to door to build their understanding ... We have our favourite coffee shop as an [informal] basecamp ... I also communicate with students, academic and CSOs for protection works through informal and formal meetings.³¹

Similarly, as an activist said that:

I often feel networks [are] based on volunteers. So knowing these people, knowing their expertise, knowing their interests, and connecting them with other actors. That is sort of the organic way a network is established. Just creating opportunities to meet and discuss and keeping actors engaged and motivated to drive it ... Usually fits in some way or the other, the interest of the individual or the organization that is involved.³²

The conventional understanding of CoP values the physical presence and close spatial proximity of practitioners to trigger mutual learning and tacit knowing (Amin and Roberts 2008). However, as demonstrated by Pekanbaru's NGO activities and the nationwide CoPs that collaborate on current issues, such as the one that advocates for refugee children to be able to access education, at least for Indonesian CoPs, close spatial proximity is not completely necessary. The spatial elements of CoPs have proliferated from physical proximity or face to face meetings into virtual communities, particularly in the context of COVID-19. On virtual communities, Ash Amin and Joanne Roberts suggest that even when social ties are relatively weak, with reputational trust, online communities may replicate a rich texture of social interaction with the capability to generate knowledge with the same 'stickiness' as created by interactions within local spatial proximity (Amin and Roberts 2008). Even though the virtual communities in Indonesian CoPs came into existence due to external factors – the COVID-19 pandemic and dispersed locations of practitioners across Indonesia – rather than by choice, the effectiveness of the practice is evident. Collective movements are prepared and coordinated on the internet. However, it is still questionable if virtual CoPs are sustainable, as the ties among group members are very loose due to many factors, including unfamiliarity with each other.

As Emanuel Adler and Vincent Pouliot observe, practices are 'both *individual (agential)* and *structural*' (Adler and Pouliot 2011). This study's

interviewees – both practitioners and volunteers – reported that they were motivated to join the refugee protection cause after being involved in a human rights NGO or CoP. Their involvement in refugee protection was strengthened by gaining more knowledge, intensively engaging in day-to-day activities and building networks with other practitioners.³³

All of the interviewees are key figures within their CSOs, which all work on refugee protection. This research has made apparent that CoPs have accelerated the agency development of both individual and organization-based practitioners. At the same time, with the support of the community, both individuals and organizations become more engaged with the cause by intensifying their practices through sharing experiences, thinking together, joining political movements and expanding their networks. However, one question remains: does the acceleration of personal and organizational agency correspond with the agency required to influence the policy-making process?

To influence policy making, in addition to strengthening their agency through practice, nonstate actors need to understand the local political discourse about refugees. In Indonesia, government officials see the refugee issue as a minor social issue because of three basic assumptions: first, the assumption that refugee protection is a global challenge that Indonesia has adequately responded to with humanitarian action as it is not signatory to the 1951 Refugee Convention³⁴ second, Indonesia sees itself as merely a transit country for Australia-bound refugees and not as a destination country for other refugees, such as the Rohingya refugees; and, third, Indonesia does not grant asylum to refugees.³⁵

We have many refugees from Myanmar. In fact, it was the last fasting month [around April 2021], they [refugees from Myanmar] were expelled by Malaysia, by Brunei, but we accommodated them. They are human! [But] after being accommodated, it is very difficult to return it to the UNDP [meant to be UNHCR]. According to the UN's decision, the refugees are their responsibilities. The UN [should] took care of it. But this is not, which [then, they] are left here. But we feed them. We don't have the heart to 'throw them away', but we also don't carelessly make them citizens, because there are [national] rules to follow.³⁶

The Indonesian government is reluctant to widen refugee protection, such as by giving refugees the right to engage in income-generating activities and social integration, as it argues that the Indonesian public are not ready to accept these changes.³⁷ However, these statements were made without the support of data. In fact, these statements contradict survey results on the readiness of the Indonesian public: in Pekanbaru and Bogor, survey participants indicated that they supported the social integration of refugees, including giving them access to work rights (Viartasiwi and

Ramadhani 2022). The Indonesian government's refusal to broaden refugee protection in reliance on purported public opinion has shifted the social issue to a somewhat political issue. Prevailing official attitudes constrain nonstate actors and their ability to advocate for policies that would advance refugee rights in Indonesia. A formal CoP may be able to overcome these political constraints. Alice M. Nah, relying on the APRRN as a case study, argues that a formalized network or CoP helps local civil society actors to advocate for refugee protection (Nah 2016). Nah contends that a formal network is a safe space for nonstate actors to interact, thus changing the power dynamic between nonstate actors and the UNHCR, helping nonstate actors to move beyond the local context, changing the dynamics of the field by introducing a new actor – the new organization – and reinforcing the engagement of actors (Nah 2016).

Nah's theory is confirmed when it is applied to SUAKA which was established in 2013 as a network-based organization by a coalition of national NGOs – LBH Jakarta, the Human Rights Working Group, JRS Indonesia, the Indonesian Legal Aid Foundation and other human right activists – to fill a gap in the need for legal assistance for refugees and refugee advocacy. In essence, SUAKA is a CoP in the form of a legal organization. As a CoP, SUAKA is the entry point for Indonesian nonstate actors to engage in refugee advocacy as it is a volunteer-based organization, making it easier for individuals to join. As an established organization, it is a partner of UNHCR and a member of APRRN. When it shifted from being a CoP to a formal organization, SUAKA became a new actor that is also part of another CoP. After SUAKA was established, the Indonesian refugee protection work that is performed by CSOs was strengthened. Practitioners have been more focused and other CoPs have since been established, as Indonesian practitioners now have an organization made up of designated people to work as intermediaries between all actors. However, informality still characterizes Indonesian CoPs through the bonds between practitioners, the practice of thinking together and information sharing, all of which occur in daily, casual interactions that are facilitated by the WhatsApp Group or other casual meetings.

Agency Strengthening in Communities of Practice

After SUAKA was established, the Indonesian refugee protection CSOs' first experience of learning how to enhance their agency from within a CoP was likely the coalition that was established to advocate for Alternatives to Detention (ATD). During 2018 and 2019, Indonesia released refugees and asylum seekers from immigration detention centres all over the country. The Indonesian government's decision to release all of the detained

refugees and asylum seekers was largely due to the Australian government's announcement in March 2018 that it would cut further funding for refugees in Indonesia (Missbach 2021). Australia had funded the detainment of refugees in Indonesia under the regional cooperation arrangement between the two countries. Under the agreement, Indonesia agreed to intercept and detain 'irregular migrants' – refugees – on their way to Australia. Indonesia then hosted the refugees with the help of the IOM and the UNHCR (Kneebone 2017). With the Australian funding cut, the Indonesian government decided that it was preferable to release all of the detainees, leaving them to be managed by the IOM and the UNHCR. The IOM provided accommodation for many refugees and asylum seekers in IOM-supported community housing facilities. Even though the release of most refugees from detention was not the result of CSO advocacy, the decision coincidentally aligned with social attitudes: prior to the decision, refugee detention in Indonesia had been growing into a public concern that sparked social movements on ATD (see APRRN 2016: 5, 9; Choi 2020: 115).³⁸ The advocacy work on ATD was a learning process for Indonesian nonstate actors working on refugee protection.

The scrutiny of Indonesian immigration detention likely began with a 2009 report by Australian refugee advocate Jessie Taylor. The report detailed the appalling situation in prisons, detention centres and compounds across Indonesia in which around 2,000 refugees and asylum seekers – including a large number of children, babies and unaccompanied minors – were detained (Taylor 2009; Nethery, Rafferty-Brown and Taylor 2013). The UNHCR and the IOM had also been very critical of Rudenim (as immigration detention is referred to in Indonesia), because the Indonesian government used detention as an immigration tool and a deterrent (UNHCR 2012). In 2013, Human Rights Watch released a report that focused on refugee children and their situation in Indonesia, and also exposed the mistreatment that occurred in immigration detention centres (Human Rights Watch 2013). After the aforementioned publications became publicly available, the Indonesian and international media covered the issue.

In June 2014, the UNHCR launched a global strategy to end the detention of asylum seekers and refugees named *Global Strategy – Beyond Detention 2014–2019*. Indonesia was one of the twenty countries that was involved in the programme. The UNHCR reached out to various stakeholders – including entities other than states, which were its traditional partners – such as national human rights institutions, NGOs and the judicial and legal community (UNHCR 2014). The UNHCR, in coordination with relevant government bodies and through discussions with national and international NGOs, developed an Indonesian *National Action Plan* (UNHCR Indonesia 2017). This was followed by the formation of the Detention Working Group, which was tasked with implementing the *National Action Plan*. After the Andaman Sea

crisis in 2015, waves of Rohingya refugees fleeing violence in Bangladesh and Myanmar once again arrived in Indonesia. In 2016, President Joko Widodo signed PR 125, in which the terms 'refugee' and 'illegal immigrant' were legally defined. However, PR 125 still allows people rescued at sea to be placed in mandatory temporary detention without indicating any time-frame for their release, thus risking arbitrary and prolonged detention. This is at odds with the Indonesian *National Action Plan*, which was launched the following year, in 2017.

According to this study's interviewees, the Detention Working Group's discussions, which focus on releasing refugee children from detention, were attended by local human rights activists, NGOs, the UNHCR, the IOM, the APRRN and the Indonesian government. Discussions and public advocacy, such as rallies and audiences with the Indonesian government and the governments of other Southeast Asian countries, became important learning moments.³⁹ The refugee detention issue also started to attract the attention of academia and the general public, although this attention predominantly focused on Rohingya refugees. Antje Missbach asserted that Indonesian NGOs were part of the ATD movement, though they were not the driving forces behind its campaigns (Missbach 2017). Still, the involvement of various NGOs and individuals in the movement created a CoP that has advanced the cause and improved both the practices and agency of those involved.

Several coalitions were established after the ATD movement. Some coalitions were established temporarily to respond to emergency issues, such as a civil society coalition that released a joint statement responding to the arrival of Rohingya refugees on Idaman Island in eastern Aceh on 4 June 2021. The coalition urged the Indonesian government to collaborate with and implement inclusive protection of the refugees stranded in Aceh.⁴⁰ The Civil Society Coalition for Refugees' Economic Independence campaign was established in 2021 and holds monthly meetings to share knowledge and case updates, learn the best practice for policy-focused advocacy work and organize meetings with relevant stakeholders.⁴¹

Indonesian refugee protection-focused CoPs also take the form of focus group discussions. One such discussion is Kepo Jurnal, an online discussion group that was established in 2018 and brings together researchers, observers, activists, students and sympathizers for a monthly discussion on refugee issues, facilitating peer learning. In 2021, government agencies also established a discussion forum to develop a governance mechanism on the education of refugee children. The Indonesian National Research and Innovation Agency initiated the forum in collaboration with the Indonesian government's Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology and the Ministry of Women Empowerment and Child Protection, the Asia Dialogue on Forced Migration (ADFM), JRS Indonesia, the IOM and the

UNHCR. Researchers and activists who work on refugee issues were also invited to the six-monthly discussions. However, whether these coalitions and discussion groups can influence policy making remains to be seen.

CoPs have yielded positive results for the refugee protection movement in Indonesia. At the local level, such as in Aceh, Makassar and Pekanbaru, CoPs have been entry points for new actors to join the cause. Even though the UNHCR and the IOM remain the main actors in refugee protection and the force behind the arrival of new actors, the CoPs in Pekanbaru have created cycles of practices. With more practitioners joining the cause, the social learning process occurs as practitioners benefit from knowledge sharing and support systems. This Indonesian case study also illustrates the causal interaction between practice and agency in situations of change: as new practices emerge and agency transforms, the more robust agency enables the expansion of practice.

The Ongoing Challenges

CoPs are not self-sustaining processes. Many CoPs have fizzled out, despite their promising starts. Alton Y.K. Chua suggests that contextual factors, such as pseudo-community, weak leadership, the misalignment of values and, in the case of business organizations, underleveraged management support, contribute to the downfall of CoPs (Chua 2006). The development of the Indonesian refugee protection CoP is, unfortunately, not steady. The following discussion identifies the ongoing challenges for the sustainable growth of the Indonesian refugee protection CoPs.

Provisional Community

The experiences of nonstate actors in CoPs suggest that almost all of the CoPs in Indonesian refugee protection are informal organizations in the form of coalitions, movements or group discussions.⁴² An informal coalition is a limited form of CoP because it lacks the mechanisms and structure required for practice. Moreover, most coalitions and movements are motivated to respond to a trending issue, such the arrival of Rohingya refugees in Aceh waters, rather than aiming for long-term projects and broad goals. Therefore, the practices are less sustainable as they have limited opportunities for a shared repertoire and thus a loose form of engagement. In terms of advocacy, Nah (2016) suggests that CoPs that are coalitions and movements are politically less potent than CoPs that are formal organizations or institutions. The tactics often employed by the less formally organized CoPs – statements, press releases, media

campaigns and rallies –often do not reach the general public very widely due to the movement's temporary nature and lack of a long-term strategy.

The temporary nature of informal coalitions becomes problematic, as was demonstrated by the ATD movement. Even though the Indonesian public had started to recognize refugee issues, the momentum ended after the refugees were released from detention because the movement lost its object and therefore ended. Although the postdetention housing policy for refugees is, as Missbach describes, a 'continuum of unfreedom', with the postdetention accommodation resembling detention, the issue has already ceased to be in the public's consciousness (Missbach 2021).⁴³ Two opinion polls also discovered that for other, nondetention refugee issues, the public is generally unaware of and disinterested in the plight of refugees, even when they live in places with significant refugee populations (Viartasiwi and Ramadhani 2022). This loss of momentum stems from the CoP's coalition structure, which is transitional and casual.

Disruption of Practice

The concepts of stability and change are useful in understanding CoPs. Stability allows for a process of repetition that enables practitioners and analysts to decipher which actions are the most significant for a particular practice (Duvall and Chowdhury 2011). In a CoP, the most significant signifiers are shared as a 'good practice'. Disruption to the repetition can change the practice. Hence, in order to have a good, solid example of practice by recognizing the important signifiers, stability is needed. The relative success of the Indonesian ATD movement should have been a good practice that could be used as a shared repertoire. However, the practice was disrupted by an abrupt change in circumstances: the discontinuity of the movement. The Indonesian ATD movement was stopped after the refugees were released from immigration detention. Field observation has found that the practitioners who were involved in the Indonesian ATD have moved away from refugee issues and the new practitioners are not familiar with ATD movement. Therefore, the good practice failed to become a shared repertoire. New practitioners will need to follow the same, unoriginal routes of practices to develop their learning.⁴⁴

In other CoPs, the COVID-19 pandemic was also a change-inducing event. The pandemic necessitated a change in the advocacy tactics used for social issues, including refugee protection. Audiences with government officials, personal meetings with community leaders or visits to universities and schools were restricted. Advocacy workers adapted to online-based advocacy. This changed practice as the online platform disrupted the regular, in-the-field practices but also allowed the community to reach wider practitioners. The two national coalitions that aim to conduct policy-based advocacy,

as described in the aforementioned examples, are possible because of the online platform; however, this platform will also make it difficult to maintain in-the-field coordination.

Brokerage

Facilitation is used by CoPs to achieve stability of practice (Wenger 1998). CoP community members sometimes participate in other communities, so a broker is needed to go between two parties. Brokers facilitate connections within communities, the translation of knowledge, the sharing of experiences, the alignment of perspectives and the suggested repertoire (Bueger and Gadinger 2018). Brokering or convening is an indispensable role in a CoP. A UNHCR officer in Pekanbaru believes that his role is to connect entities and encourage them to join refugee protection activities:

My personal belief is that part of our works is to match local resources and refugee resources. To make them meet and share the positive energy because if it only rely to us [the officers] then the driving force is weak and we need more instruments.⁴⁵

In the Indonesian case, it was possible to form nonstate actors' refugee protection-based networks because some individuals work behind the scenes to initiate and foster relationships and the network. The role of this individual is not only to bring refugee protection practitioners together with the outside community – such as to the funding community – but, more importantly, to foster interactions between practitioners inside the community. Birgit Bräuchler, Kathrin Knodel and Ute Röschenthaler's (2021) 'brokerage from within' brokerage method describes the form of brokerage employed in Indonesian refugee protection CoPs. Individuals and organizations that adopt the role of broker and coordinate various CSOs and individual practitioners have also contributed to practices being extended beyond service delivery works to encompassing advocacy work. This is especially the case when CoPs do not take the form of a formal organization, as the broker role fulfils the vacant position left by the lack of a formal organization and its usual functions. Brokerage is indispensable in Indonesian refugee protection CoPs. However, relying on a single individual or institution to nurture a CoP is a potential risk to the movement's sustainability.

Voluntary and Individual-Based Action

A particular issue in establishing a CoP is that a CSO's advocacy work is typically powered by volunteers. In a CoP, volunteer practitioners execute the repertoire collection, knowledge sharing, skill empowerment

and consolidation of the movement. The motivations behind these actions are very dynamic and whether the work can be completed depends on the individuals and their ability to successfully juggle their personal and professional lives with voluntary advocacy work. Therefore, the sustainability of their work is inherently finite. Each CSO has its own advocacy focus; this places additional burdens on a CoP and its ability work on its focus. An activist who was a pioneer in the Indonesian refugee protection network admitted that:

In Indonesia, because the refugee issue is not a mainstream issue, each organisation has distinct advocacy platform and strategic issues to pursue ... We were lucky to have one person that was skilful in connecting the people behind different organisations to take up refugee protection advocacy ... We need a regular coalition to promote a shared, inclusive advocacy agenda. It is not easy because Indonesian NGOs on refugee protection are mostly caregivers and service providers, not on the research advocacy that can provide academic language for the policymaking.⁴⁶

This statement makes it clear that if the Indonesian refugee protection CoP aims to do work other than caregiving, more practitioners with diverse skills should be invited to join the movement. Currently, the majority of practitioners in the CoP work in service provider CSOs or are students. Therefore, more research-based practitioners or advocacy specialists need to join the CoP to fill this gap in its advocacy work. The absence of comprehensive refugee governance in Indonesia means that there is still a lot of work to be done. Tasks such as translating academic research into policy-friendly language and communicating it to policy makers cannot be done in spare time. This space needs policy-making advocacy and to raise public awareness in order to work towards its advocacy objectives. This work requires strategy, tactics, group support and capital, as well as more time than a volunteer may be able to provide. Voluntary and individual work will not be sufficient to sustain and broaden the Indonesian CoP on refugee protection to work beyond service provision.

Conclusion

The experiences of Indonesian nonstate actors, working at both the national and local levels, suggest that there are two different outcomes for the agency of the two different roles that nonstate actors can perform. Nonstate actors working in refugee protection in Indonesia who embody the role of the humanitarian actor (the service delivery function) have successfully employed and enhanced their agency, as is commendably proved by their practices and initiative in the field. However, nonstate actors working in

refugee protection in Indonesia have been less successful when embodying the human rights defender role with its advocacy function; they need to strengthen their agency by undertaking more practices. Yet, the greatest task facing the Indonesian refugee protection CoP is finding a way to transform individual agency into collective agency that can successfully influence policy making.

CoPs are powered by individuals and organizations that share mutual goals and engage with one another's practices to share experiences, best practices and collect knowledge and repertoires. At a more individual level, organizations and individuals that are involved in the CoP could benefit from this interaction and learning process, which could eventually transform their agency. However, at an organizational level, the loose structures of coalitions and movements disturbs the continuity of learning process and practices, which eventually hinders the growth of collective agency. The informality of these loose structures is effective for individual interaction and peer learning; however, when it comes to the sustainability of the practices and community, informality negatively impacts practices and the sharing of repertoires through uncertainty. A nationwide structured and formal collaboration is needed for competent and legitimate practices; this applies both to humanitarian actors and human rights defenders with their different functions.

Finally, this study concludes that nonstate actors are as influential as state agents in the refugee protection context in Indonesia. The importance of nonstate actors makes it clear that refugee protection governance should not solely be the domain of state actors. Nonstate actors' roles in the Indonesian context have been overlooked owing to their frequent work in advocacy and service provision, rather than policy making. This study suggests that the time has come to provide more room for and support to nonstate actors so that they may contribute to policy making in domestic refugee protection governance.

Nino Viartasiwi is a lecturer on the International Relations Study Programme, President University, Indonesia. She is also a senior research fellow at the Resilience Development Initiative (RDI); a think tank on resilience studies and sustainable development. She is a co-founder of the RDI Urban Refugee Research Group (RDI UREF) and is actively involved with various human rights CSOs in Indonesia and Southeast Asia. She received her Ph.D. in International Relations from Ritsumeikan University, Japan, with a dissertation about the political economy of violence in the West Papua conflict. Currently, her research focuses on forced migration, violence, social integration and transnationalism.

Notes

1. Interview with ZP, the Campaign and Public Awareness Coordinator, SUAKA (Zoom meeting, 22 April 2021) (hereinafter 'ZP'); interview with LS, activist, APRRN (Zoom meeting, 4 May 2021) (hereinafter 'LS').
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. See Sandya Institute, <https://www.indorelawan.org/organization/5a6740d307badd4da787db4>.
5. See Church World Service, <https://cwsglobal.org/our-work/asia/indonesia> (retrieved 22 May 2024).
6. See Dompét Dhuafa, <https://www.dompétdhuafa.org> (retrieved 22 May 2024).
7. See Save the Children Indonesia, <https://savethechildren.or.id> (retrieved 22 May 2024).
8. The term 'Boat People' here refers to the Vietnamese people who fled their war-torn country by boat and ship and were stranded in Indonesian waters at the end of the 1970s. From 1979 to 1996, the UNHCR took care of around 122,000–145,000 refugees, mostly Vietnamese but also Cambodian, in camps constructed on a remote and small island in Riau Province, Indonesia, called Galang Island. For more about Galang Island and the refugee camps, see Kneebone, Missbach and Jones (2021).
9. Interview with GG, National Information and Advocacy Officer, JRS Indonesia (Zoom meeting, 28 April 2021) (hereinafter 'GG'); LS (n 1).
10. ZP (n 1).
11. See RAIC Indonesia, <https://www.raicindonesia.org> (retrieved 22 May 2024).
12. See SMART, <https://smartforglobal.org> (retrieved 22 May 2024).
13. Interview with RL, Executive Director, Sandya Institute (Zoom meeting, 23 April 2021) (hereinafter 'RL').
14. For more on the Australian funding cuts to refugee programmes in Indonesia and their impact, see Missbach (2018).
15. Interview with AYY and H, Director and Finance and Administrative Manager, LSKP Makassar (Makassar 6 November 2019) (hereinafter 'AYY and H').
16. Ibid.
17. P2TP2A is an agency that works at the local level as part of the Ministry of Women Empowerment and Child Protection. It is present in all Indonesian cities and is managed by the local government.
18. AYY and H (n 15).
19. Interview with HM and RW, Director and Education Manager, Dompét Dhuafa Riau (Pekanbaru, 10 November 2021) (hereinafter 'HM and RW').
20. Ibid.
21. Interview with CS, the Head of UIR Refugee Research Center, Universitas Islam Riau (Pekanbaru, 10 November 2021).
22. Interview with CM, Director of Kovid Psikologi, UIN Suska Riau (Pekanbaru, 11 November 2021).
23. Interview with MU, Founder, Refugee Empowerment Center (WhatsApp, 6 January 2022) (hereinafter 'MU').

24. Ibid.
25. It is rare for refugees in Indonesia to access higher education. Several universities, both state and private, such as Tanri Abeng University in Jakarta, President University in Bekasi, Hasanuddin University in Makassar and Sam Ratulangi University in Manado, have had refugees studying and graduating from undergraduate degrees. The University of Indonesia in Jakarta and the Muhammadiyah University of Yogyakarta offer several nondegree programmes for refugees. However, the programmes are irregular or supported by individuals, so only a few refugees can access them.
26. Interview with RSP and RM, ex-Director and Jakarta Representative, Yayasan Geutanyoe (Zoom meeting, 8 November 2021) (hereinafter 'RSP and RM').
27. Qanun is a local law set by the Aceh government, which forms part of the local rights granted to the Province in accordance with the special autonomy status of the Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam Province. However, the Qanun must also align with Indonesian national law.
28. Kontras (Komisi Untuk Orang Hilang dan Korban Tindak Kekerasan [Commission for Missing Persons and Victims of Violence]) is an Indonesian human rights NGO that works across Indonesia. It was founded in 1998 – acting at first as a task force – by CSOs and Indonesian community leaders to tackle human rights issues. Kontras is now a CSO and works to uphold democracy and human rights in Indonesia. It is supported by smaller branches in some provinces, such as Kontras Aceh and Kontras Papua.
29. RSP and RM (n 27).
30. Panglima Laot is an Indigenous sea commander under Aceh customary law – a role that is facilitated as a part of the customary rights granted by the special autonomy status that Aceh Province enjoys. Panglima Laot levels are tiered and range from the subdistrict to the provincial level. Panglima Laot's contribution is mainly maintaining the maritime environment and managing conflict in maritime communities. However, according to Mu'aqaffi (2021), Panglima Laot also contributes to maritime security through its collaborations with other stakeholders, such as the Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, the Indonesian National Police and the Indonesian Navy.
31. Interview with MRS, Protection Associate, UNHCR Pekanbaru (Pekanbaru 8 November 2021) (hereinafter 'MRS').
32. LS (n 1).
33. RL (n 13); MU (n 24).
34. An abstract of statements from Indonesian officials at various events. See, for example, interview with CA, the Head of the Indonesian Foreign Refugee Task Force of the Coordinating Ministry of Politics, Legal and Security Affairs (Jakarta 25 February 2020) (hereinafter 'CA'); see also Government of Indonesia, Government of Malaysia and Government of Thailand (2015).
35. Interview with MMD, the Coordinating Minister for Political, Legal and Security Affairs of Indonesia (Menkopolhukam) (Jakarta, 28 September 2021).
36. Ibid.
37. Abstracts of interviews with CA (n 35); ITD and ROE, officials of the Pekanbaru City Government's National Unity, Politics and Community Protection Agency (Bakesbangpolinmas) (Pekanbaru, 9 November 2021); and YN, official

- at the Pekanbaru Immigration Detention Centre (Rudenim) (Pekanbaru, 9 November 2021); and a presentation in a meeting with Indonesian Coalition of Civil Society for Refugees Access to Livelihood by BP, the Assistant Deputy of Coordination for Handling of Transnational Crimes and Extraordinary Crimes of the Coordinating Ministry of Politics, Legal and Security Affairs (Jakarta, 14 March 2022).
38. For more information about this decision, see Chapters 7 and 8 in this volume.
 39. LS (n 1); ZP (n 1); RL (n 13).
 40. The statement lists nine recommendations that highlight the importance of transferring refugees from the isolated island to shelters in Aceh, working with the locals and respecting Acehnese tradition, and documenting the experience to assist future inclusive policy making. The organizations that have signed the joint statement are Suaka JRS, Yayasan Geutanyo, LBH Banda Aceh, Dompot Dhuafa, Amnesty International, Kontras, Kontras Aceh and the Sandya Institute.
 41. The members of the Civil Society Coalition for Refugees' Economic Independence members are SUAKA, the Resilience Development Initiative Urban Refugee Research Group (RDI UREF), JRS Indonesia, Dompot Dhuafa and Yayasan Geutanyoe.
 42. ZP (n 1); LS (n 1); GG (n 9); HM and RW (n 19); MU (n 24).
 43. The continuum of unfreedom refers to the absolute exclusion of refugees from society as a result of a government's policies and regulations.
 44. In August 2022, representatives from JRS Indonesia, SUAKA and RDI UREF attended a regional ATD CoP meeting in Kuala Lumpur, held by the International Detention Coalition, with partners from Malaysian and Thai CSOs. In the meeting, Indonesian practitioners relearnt about the ATD movement from their counterparts.
 45. MRS (n 32).
 46. GG (n 9).

References

- Abubakar, Al Yasa', and M. Daud Yoesoef,. 2004 'Qanun Sebagai Peraturan Pelaksanaan Otonomi Khusus Di Provinsi Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam [Qanun as a Regulation for Implementation of the Special Autonomy in the Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam Province]', *Jurnal Legislasi Indonesia* 1: 15.
- Adler, Emanuel, and Vincent Pouliot. 2011. 'International Practices: Introduction and Framework', in Emanuel Adler and Vincent Pouliot (eds), *International Practices*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3–35.
- Amin, Ash, and Joanne Roberts. 2008. 'Knowing in Action: Beyond Communities of Practice', *Research Policy* 37(2): 353–69.
- APRRN. 2016. *Annual Report 2015*.
- Bolisani, Ettore, and Enrico Scarso. 2014. 'The Place of Communities of Practice in Knowledge Management Studies: A Critical Review', *Journal of Knowledge Management* 18(2): 366–81.

- Bräuchler, Birgit, Kathrin Knodel and Ute Röschenhaler. 2021. 'Brokerage from within: A Conceptual Framework', *Cultural Dynamics*, 33(4): 281–97.
- Bueger, Christian, and Frank Gadinger. 2018. *International Practice Theory*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Choi, Won Geun. 2020. 'Advancing Refugee Protection from Bottom-up: Case of the Asia Pacific Refugee Rights Network (APRRN)', PhD thesis. Manoa: University of Hawaii.
- Chua, Alton Y.K. 2006. 'The Rise and Fall of a Community of Practice: A Descriptive Case Study', *Knowledge and Process Management* 13(2): 120–28.
- Church World Service. n.d. 'Indonesia'. Retrieved 22 June 2023 from <https://cws-global.org/our-work/asia/indonesia/>.
- Duvall, Raymond D., and Arjun Chowdhury. 2011. 'Practices of Theory', in Emanuel Adler and Vincent Pouliot (eds), *International Practices*. New York: Cambridge University Press: 335–55.
- Human Rights Watch. 2013. *Barely Surviving: Detention, Abuse, and Neglect of Migrant Children in Indonesia*. Retrieved 22 May 2024 from <https://www.hrw.org/report/2013/06/23/barely-surviving/detention-abuse-and-neglect-migrant-children-indonesia>.
- IPPA (Indonesian Planned Parenthood Association). 2021. Surat Undangan Pelantikan Community Centre [Invitation Letter for Community Centre Inauguration].
- Jakarta Post*. 2020. 'JakPost up Close #18: Bridging the Gap in Refugee Response in Southeast Asia'. Retrieved 22 May 2024 from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hdTWAT-MI4k>.
- Jasnida, Jasnida. 2021. 'Rektor UIN Suska Riau Launching Kovid Psikologi Indonesia', *Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau*, 23 August. Retrieved 17 March 2022 from <https://www.uin-suska.ac.id/2021/08/23/rektor-uin-suska-riau-launching-kovid-psikologi-indonesia>.
- JRS Indonesia. n.d. 'Jesuit Refugee Service History'. JRS Indonesia. Accessed 22 June 2023. <https://www.indorelawan.org/organization/5a6740d307badd4da787db4>.
- Kerno, Steven J., and Stephanie L. Mace. 2010. 'Communities of Practice: Beyond Teams', *Advances in Developing Human Resources* 12(1): 78–92.
- Kneebone, Susan. 2017. 'Australia as a Powerbroker on Refugee Protection in Southeast Asia: The Relationship with Indonesia', *Refuge* 33(1): 29–41.
- Kneebone, Susan, Antje Missbach and Balawyn Jones. 2021. 'The False Promise of Presidential Regulation No. 125 of 2016?', *Asian Journal of Law and Society* 8(3): 431–50.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Malaysia. 2015. 'Joint Statement Ministerial Meeting on Irregular Movement of People in Southeast Asia'. Press release, 20 May. Retrieved 23 June 2023 from <https://reliefweb.int/report/myanmar/joint-statement-ministerial-meeting-irregular-movement-people-southeast-asia>.
- Missbach, Antje. 2017. 'Accommodating Asylum Seekers and Refugees in Indonesia: From Immigration Detention to Containment in "Alternatives to Detention"', *Refuge* 33(2): 32–44.

- . 2018. 'Falling through the Cracks', *Policy Forum*, 8 August. Retrieved 16 July 2020 from <https://www.policyforum.net/falling-through-the-cracks>.
- . 2021. 'Substituting Immigration Detention Centres with "Open Prisons" in Indonesia: Alternatives to Detention as the Continuum of Unfreedom', *Citizenship Studies* 25(2): 224–37.
- Mixed Migration Centre. 2021. *A Transit Country No More: Refugees and Asylum Seekers in Indonesia*. Retrieved 31 October 2022 from https://mixedmigration.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/170_Indonesia_Transit_Country_No_More_Research_Report.pdf.
- Mu'aqaffi, Gaffar. 2021. 'The Legacy of Spice Route: The Role of Panglima Laot in Maritime Security in the Modern Aceh', *Jurnal Masyarakat dan Budaya* 23: 379–92.
- Nah, Alice M. 2016. 'Networks and Norm Entrepreneurship amongst Local Civil Society Actors: Advancing Refugee Protection in the Asia Pacific Region', *International Journal of Human Rights* 20(2): 223–40.
- Nethery, Amy, Brynna Rafferty-Brown and Savitri Taylor. 2013. 'Exporting Detention: Australia-Funded Immigration Detention in Indonesia', *Journal of Refugee Studies* 26(1): 88–109.
- Presidential Regulation No 125/2016 Concerning the Treatment of Refugees (Indonesia).
- Pyrko, Igor, Viktor Dörfler and Colin Eden. 2017. 'Thinking Together: What Makes Communities of Practice Work?', *Human Relations* 70(4): 389–409.
- Refutera. n.d. 'Welcome to Refutera Online Store'. Refutera. Retrieved 22 June 2023 from <https://refutera.com/about-us/>.
- Sadjad, Mahardhika Sjamsoe'oed. 2021. 'What Are Refugees Represented to Be? A Frame Analysis of the Presidential Regulation No. 125 of 2016 Concerning the Treatment of Refugees "from Abroad"', *Asian Journal of Law and Society* 8(1): 451–66.
- Save The Children Indonesia. n.d. 'Save The Children Home'. Save The Children. Retrieved 22 June 2023 from <https://savethechildren.or.id/>.
- Taylor, Jessie. 2009. *Behind Australian Doors: Examining the Conditions of Detention of Asylum Seekers in Indonesia*. Retrieved 22 May 2024 from <https://www.safecom.org.au/pdfs/behind-australian-doors-examining-the-conditions.pdf>.
- UNHCR. 2012. 'UNHCR Deplores the Death of an Asylum Seeker in Pontianak, Indonesia'. Retrieved 4 June 2021 from <https://www.unhcr.org/news/briefing/2012/3/4f509c726/unhcr-deplores-death-asylum-seeker-pontianak-indonesia.html>.
- . 2014. *Beyond Detention: A Global Strategy to Support Governments to End the Detention of Asylum-Seeker and Refugees, 2014–2019*. Retrieved 4 June 2021 from <https://www.refworld.org/docid/536b564d4.html>.
- UNHCR Indonesia. 2017. *Beyond Detention: National Action Plan Indonesia*. Retrieved 4 June 2021 from <https://www.unhcr.org/5666a2ea9.pdf>.
- . 2021. *Monthly Statistical Report March 2021*.
- Viartasiwi, Nino, et al. 2021. *Understanding the Urban Refugee Governance in Indonesia: Main Concerns and Stakeholders*. Final Report 9. Resilience Development Initiative.

- Viartasiwi, Nino, and Ikrana Ramadhani. 2022. *Public Opinion Polling on Social Integration Concerning Refugees and Asylum Seekers in Indonesia: Bogor (Regency and City) and Pekanbaru City*. Pop-up Discussion Series Report No 9, Resilience Development Initiative.
- Wenger, Etienne. 1998. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger-Trayner, Etienne, and Beverly Wenger-Trayner. 2015. 'Communities of Practice: A Brief Introduction'. Retrieved 22 May 2024 from <https://scholars-bank.uoregon.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1794/11736/A%20brief%20introduction%20to%20CoP.pdf>.