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This report presents the findings and recommendations of an island-wide study on Involuntarily Returned Migrants (IRM)s in Jamaica. The research was conducted between July to August 2018 and utilised both quantitative and qualitative research methods. More specifically, a survey as well as in-depth interviews were undertaken to collect primary data from a purposive, convenience sample of 143 IRMs. Data was only collected from IRMs and as such other stakeholders such as the Ministry of National Security and Non State actors, though consulted, were not part of the sample.

The objectives of the study was to ascertain insight on IRMs’ personal and family backgrounds; challenges related to reintegration; needs for and access to services/programmes to assist with their reintegration process; gender differences with respect to these needs and access; and the level of re-offending since deportation.

The main highlights from the study are:

- On average, IRMs were living for 17 years in other countries at the time of their most recent deportation to Jamaica.
- There are more male than female IRMs (which is corroborated by the literature review).
- The majority of IRMs (57.8%) were last deported from the UK while one-third (37.5%) were deported from the US and approximately 5% from Canada.
- Almost 9 out of 10 IRMs (87.6%) have close family members in the country from which they were deported, including children (48.4%) and a spouse (27.8%).
- Currently, 35.3% and 35.3% of IRMs are living in a permanent or a temporary location respectively. A striking 20% of IRMs are either living in a shelter (9.2%), with someone (8.3%) or have nowhere to live (2.5%).
- IRMs face a wide range of socioeconomic challenges related to the lack of job opportunities (54.1%), finances (43%), discrimination (30%), emotions (27.1%), accommodation (20%), family (19.5%), health (18%), and obtaining documentation (8.3%). Also, 11.3% of IRMs reported that they were victims of crimes.
- Only 8.9% of the IRMs included in the study had been offered financial assistance or reintegration payments from their country of deportation. A large majority (65.8%) was receiving some form of support from family members, including financial (26.4%) and emotional (24.8%) support. However, one-fifth of IRMs received no assistance at all at the time of their deportation.
- The IRMs made several suggestions that would improve their situation following deportation. These were mostly related to work/jobs (36.4%), family support (15%), emotional/psychological support (11.2%) as well as accommodation and financial support combined with the above (20%).
- With regard to services or programmes IRMs would like to see implemented by the government, IRMs listed the following: more resources for NGOs to enable them to work more effectively with deportees (48.1%).
more accommodation for deportees (47%); counselling services (46%); retraining, recertification and skills training (44.4%); a fast track for the issuance of IDs and other documents (40.6%); and public education to reduce the stigmatization of IRMs (32.3%).

- Half of IRMs in the sample reported that criminal offences led to their deportation while immigration offences were reported by 34.9% of IRMs as factors leading to deportation. Possession of drugs (marijuana and cocaine) was mostly associated with criminal offences and overstaying one's visa was linked mostly to immigration offences.

- 90% of the interviewed IRMs reported that their family members were affected by their deportation. This took the form of jeopardized/broken family bonds; stress to meet household financial needs; emotional hardship; and a decline in children's social lives and academic performances.

- IRMs face several challenges in the reintegration and rehabilitation process, including separation from their families; loss of financial independence; discrimination; culture shock; and the lack of a social network.

- IRMs who returned to family members in Jamaica faced fewer challenges in reintegration than those who had no family to return to.

- The interviewees’ ideal programme for assisting deportees would include services for expediting the redocumentation process; advice and support to get back on their feet; skills training; financial assistance; and provision of accommodation for homeless IRMs.

- Not all IRMs are fully aware of the various organisations, programmes and services for IRMs that exist in Jamaica.

- There is no striking contrast between the needs and the access to services based on the IRM was a man or a woman.

As a result of the findings and the literature review, the following ten (10) recommendations:

1. Continued focus on both reintegration and rehabilitation.
2. Public sensitization and media campaign.
3. More psycho-social support and engagement of the family in rehabilitation efforts of IRMs.
4. Reintegration efforts to begin in the host country before deportation.
5. Provision of information sessions upon arrival in Jamaica.
6. Temporary accommodation for IRMs who have nowhere to live in reception centres.
7. Fast track and discounted rates for the acquisition of certain documentation.
8. Development of skills training, entrepreneurial, internship and mentorship programmes.
9. Inter-agency coordination of the various databases on IRMs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHC</td>
<td>British High Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs</td>
<td>Community-based Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARICOM</td>
<td>The Caribbean Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSME</td>
<td>CARICOM Single Market Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDCs</td>
<td>Community Development Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FURI</td>
<td>Family Unification and Resettlement Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoJ</td>
<td>Government of Jamaica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Organisation for Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRM</td>
<td>Involuntarily Returned Migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCF</td>
<td>Jamaica Constabulary Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRRAP</td>
<td>Jamaica Reducing Re-Offending Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT</td>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDAs</td>
<td>Ministries, Departments and Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNS</td>
<td>Ministry of National Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTF</td>
<td>Medium-term Socio-economic Policy Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>National Indicative Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NODM</td>
<td>National Organisation for Deported Migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPEP</td>
<td>National Poverty Eradication Policy and Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCT</td>
<td>Overseas Countries and Territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICA</td>
<td>Passport, Immigration &amp; Citizenship Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDC</td>
<td>Social Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDGs</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATIN</td>
<td>Statistical Institute of Jamaica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNRC</td>
<td>United Resident Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 SECTION 1: THE CONTEXT

1.1 BACKGROUND

1.1.1 Introduction

Jamaica has a long history of migration. This spans from the pre-colonial times to the period of slavery and after emancipation. The movement of people to and from Jamaica remains prevalent today. A 2016 World Bank report notes that the top countries that people emigrate from are small island countries such as Samoa (60.2%) and Jamaica (40.4%)\(^1\). According to a 2009 publication, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has also noted that Jamaica is one of the countries most affected by brain drain\(^2\), referring to the volume of skilled migrants in particular who have left the country. Short-term, long-term and permanent stays in other countries, and the return of Jamaicans back to their home country (voluntarily or involuntarily), are very common.

Challenges in the country of origin and (perceived) opportunities outside of the country have resulted in a high rate of emigration\(^3\). There are various reasons for an individual or a family to leave their country of origin, but the most common reason cited in the literature for Jamaica relates to economic push factors. Simply put, migrants leave Jamaica primarily to earn more money, to send remittances home, and to seek employment. This view is supported by the high income gaps between Jamaica and key destination countries - namely the United States of America (US), Canada and the United Kingdom (UK). It has been reported that the average per capita income in high-income OECD countries exceeded USD 43,000 while the figure for low-income countries was USD 600 in 2015\(^4\).

Beyond the economic reasons, Jamaicans gravitate towards the above destination countries due to factors such as social capital (eg family ties), geographic proximity to Jamaica and the fact that English is their official language. An overview of some of the push and pull factors - ranging from economic to social to political factors\(^5\) - for emigration is captured in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Push and Pull Factors for Migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUSH FACTORS</th>
<th>PULL FACTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low salaries</td>
<td>High salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informality (unregulated structures and systems)</td>
<td>Formality (organised structures and systems)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>Employment opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecurity (crime and violence)</td>
<td>Security (more personal security)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of social security programmes</td>
<td>Presence of social security programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate and environmental risks</td>
<td>Environment that is less vulnerable to external shocks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The highest number of Jamaican emigrants live in the US, although this has not always been the case. Many Jamaicans were recruited to the UK to support the First and Second World Wars and post Second World War reconstruction. Specifically, large numbers of Jamaicans were recruited to work in hospitals and the transport sector. However, migration to the UK reduced over time and the US started to aggressively recruit Jamaicans (as nurses and teachers) in the 1970s. Canada soon joined in the recruitment of skilled professionals.

Within the Caribbean region, Anguilla, the British Virgin Islands, and Antigua and Barbuda are common destinations for Jamaican emigrants as they are considered popular tourist areas. Intraregional migration was initiated with the CARICOM Free Movement Protocol under the CARICOM Single Market Economy (CSME). The Protocol was established in 1989 and enables the free movement of skilled labour in particular. It also aims to provide a framework for enhancing the social and economic development potential of migration within the region by providing for the free movement of highly qualified nationals.

The movement of people across borders creates both benefits and challenges. The benefits have been well cited in the existing literature. For example, migrants from less developed countries have largely experienced a 15-fold increase in income, an increase in school enrolment rates, and a 16-fold reduction in child mortality after moving to a developed country. In the countries of origin, migration is known to lower unemployment. Remittances sent home also benefit the countries of origin. Remittance flows to developing countries reached USD 432 billion in 2015; significantly, this is over three times the size of official development assistance.

Challenges associated with migration include the difficulty in establishing the number of undocumented (illegal) migrants. It is however believed that undocumented migration is rising due to increasingly restrictive entry requirements in destination countries in the developed world, combined with increasing poverty levels and instability in parts of the developing world. Additionally, the need for cheap labour has incentivised trafficking as well as unregulated and illegal employment and exploitation in the workplace. The trafficking of people violates several human rights norms. However, economic, social and political challenges continue to increase the vulnerability of young people to exploitation by traffickers. This is turning Jamaica and other countries in the region into destinations and places of transit for traffickers. To address trafficking, the Government of Jamaica cooperates with the US, India, Panama and the Dominican Republic, as these are the main countries where Jamaican victims of human trafficking are located.

Undocumented and vulnerable migrants often work under unregulated conditions without social or economic protection and in fear of being caught and deported. This irregular migration flow (migrants who have entered or work in a country without a proper visa or in violation of laws governing entry, stay or employment of foreigners) is of great concern.

---

1.1.2 International Trends in Returned Migration
(Voluntary and involuntarily)

Involuntary returned migrants are ‘nationals of a country abroad who involuntarily return to their country of birth following charges for offences committed and who have been convicted - most criminal and some civil, in countries overseas.’\(^{15}\) Being convicted of a crime, illegal entry into a country, and lack of immigration documents or proof of nationality could result in a person being deported/involuntarily returned to their country of origin.

People can also be expelled from a country in other ways. For example, it has been noted that if a developing country has a large informal economy, migrant workers from neighbouring countries may relocate to these countries to compete with native workers. This situation often creates tension, which can lead to attacks on migrants as well as to expulsion, especially during volatile economic periods.\(^{16}\)

This happened in Nigeria in 1983 when the Nigerian government expelled more than 2 million immigrants (primarily Ghanaians) following a domestic economic crisis. Prior to the expulsion of Ghanaians, the Government of Ghana expelled 140,000 Nigerians in 1969\(^{17}\). More recent examples of forced repatriation, or involuntary returned migration, include the following\(^{18}\):

- South Africa deported more than 300,000 migrants in 2008.
- The United States deported more than 2.8 million immigrants during 2008-15.
- Saudi Arabia sent back 427,000 workers between 2013 and 2014 after a change in migration policy and implementation of programmes to increase the employment rate of citizens.

The trend of increased numbers of involuntarily returned migrants over the years reflects the trend of stricter migration policies and laws in the destination countries. In the past year, the situation has been exacerbated by the tightening of immigration policies in the US under the Donald Trump administration\(^{19}\). For example, a series of anti-crime and anti-terrorism bills passed by the US Congress in the 1990s led to a large increase in deportations from the US.\(^{20}\)

Additionally, the 1996 US Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act stated that non-nationals charged with criminal and non-criminal offences, including offences committed prior to the change in law, should be deported.\(^{21}\) The Caribbean countries, to which the largest number of people have been deported, include the Dominican Republic and Jamaica.\(^{22}\)

In some cases, undocumented workers and those in informal employment find ways to re-enter the destination countries after being deported back to their country of origin. Sometimes, changing migration policies can also negatively impact those who are residing legally in destination countries. The recent Windrush\(^{23}\) scandal in the UK, which mistreated and wrongfully deported British residents of Caribbean descent (including Jamaicans) back to their countries of origin, illustrates this.

---

\(^{15}\) Migration Policy Institute, Jamaica: From Diverse Beginning to Diaspora in the Developed World, 2010. See: https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/jamaica-diverse-beginning-diaspora-developed-world/


\(^{23}\) Named the Windrush generation after the British ship, the Empire Windrush, which brought hundreds of Caribbean migrants to the UK in 1948.
The Windrush generation refers to British residents who came to the UK from Commonwealth countries after the Second World War. Their parents were invited to the UK as labourers. This group’s rights were guaranteed in the UK’s Immigration Act of 1971 whereby they were given the right to remain in the UK but the UK’s Home Office failed to keep a record of those who stayed. Despite arriving legally into the country, many of them, along with their children, did not receive the necessary papers from the British authorities proving their status. Some found out, over time, that they are ‘undocumented’, meaning the state considers them to be illegal immigrants.

Under new immigration policies and laws (the Hostile Environment Policy and the UK Immigration Acts of 2014 and 2016), the Windrush generation were forced to prove their status in the UK but this was almost impossible for those who did not get documents at the time of their arrival to prove they were in the UK legally. As a result, some were denied access to state healthcare, lost their jobs and homes and were threatened with deportation. Some were indeed asked to leave the UK and were deported.

The Jamaican Prime Minister issued an official statement urging the British Government to quickly address the Windrush Matter (see Annex G). The British Government apologized for those negatively impacted by the scandal, but this has not repaired the damage caused.

---


25 Ibid
1.1.1 Migration and the Sustainable Development Goals

Issues concerning migration are reflected in several Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), including SDG 8, 10 and 17. SDG 8 concerns promoting inclusive and sustainable economic growth, employment and decent work for all. Target 8.8 specifically seeks to protect labour rights and promote safe and secure working environments for all workers, including migrant workers. This applies particularly to female migrants and those in precarious employment.26

SDG 10 aims to reduce inequality within and among countries. Target 10.7 refers to facilitating orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through the implementation of planned and well managed migration policies. Goal 10 also recognizes the importance of remittances for the economies of origin countries, primarily developing countries, and seeks to reduce the transactional costs of migrants sending remittances to their countries of origin. Specifically, SDG 10 aims to reduce the transaction costs of remittances to less than 3% by 2030.27

1.1.1.2 Instruments and Frameworks governing Extradition and Deportation

Deportation and extradition are two different processes. Deportation happens when a government expels a foreign offender from their territory, whereas extradition is ‘the recovery of an offender who fled from one country to another by the requesting government from the government that the offender has fled to’.28 Extradition is usually preceded by an agreement between the two countries. It is important to emphasize that extradition is not a decision that is taken unilaterally by a government; it can only be carried out on the basis of a bilateral or a multilateral extradition treaty.29

On the other hand, deportations are only subjected to domestic laws and rules, although these laws and decisions by the governments of destination countries are usually governed/informed by international laws.30 In other words, deportations do not require an agreement between countries as it is at the discretion of the government of the destination country in light of existing domestic policies and laws. Deportees fall into two categories: (1) those who are deported for offences such as drug possession, illegal possession of firearms, homicides and violent crimes and (2) those who are returned for immigration infractions. The latter group contains the highest number of deportees.31

For Jamaica, the government’s draft Returns and Reintegration Policy and Procedural Guideline (Deportation Policy) highlights the existing laws and institutions that are relevant to the processing of deportees (IRMs). At the international and regional levels, Jamaica is signatory to several treaties in relation to migrants and the movement of people. These treaties32 are:

- The Universal Declaration of Human Rights
- Various International Labour Organisation conventions on the protection of the rights of all migrant workers and members of their families
- Convention on the Rights of the Child
- The United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organised Crime
- Free movement protocol under the CARICOM Single Market and Economy
- Signatory to the Millennium Declaration which emphasizes humanitarian law, international human rights and sustainable development
- Cotonou Partnership Agreement between the EU and the African, Caribbean and Pacific countries - Article 13 speaks to migration and seeks to reaffirm existing obligations and commitments in international law, to ensure respect for human rights and to eliminate all forms of discrimination

The draft Deportation Policy provides guidelines on managing deportations. Details of this policy are discussed later in the report. The intention is that the Policy will be implemented and supported by the following national laws: the Jamaican Constitution, Jamaican Nationality Act, Aliens Act, Deportation Act, Immigration Restricting Commonwealth Citizens Act, Criminal Justice (Administration) Act, Finger Prints Act, Emergency (Public Security) Act, Emergency Powers Act, the Child Care and Protection Act, Trafficking in Persons Act, and Offences Against the Person Act.33

29 Ibid
30 Ibid
31 Government of Jamaica, Draft Returns and Reintegration Policy and Procedural Guideline (Deportation Policy)
32 As cited in the Government of Jamaica’s Draft Returns and Reintegration Policy and Procedural Guideline (Deportation Policy)
33 As cited in the Government of Jamaica’s Draft Returns and Reintegration Policy and Procedural Guideline (Deportation Policy)
International treaties on extradition include the following:\(^{34}\)

- Geneva Convention on the Treatment of Prisoners of War (1929)
- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide (1948)
- European Convention on Extradition between Member States of the Council of Europe (1957)
- 1996 Convention relating to extradition between member states of the European Union
- Mutual Legal Assistance Treaties provide guidelines for states regarding the sharing of information and evidence related to criminal investigations and prosecutions including, but not limited to, transnational crime such as drug trafficking, terrorism and human trafficking. Parties to these treaties are obligated to assist in the investigation, prosecution and suppression of offences.
- London Scheme for Extradition within the Commonwealth (1968)

Specifically, there is a bilateral Extradition Treaty between Jamaica and the US. As a result of increased drug trafficking in its territory, the US sought Jamaica’s cooperation to reduce the incidence of this practice. The GoJ’s Extradition Act of 1991 also provides guidelines on how to manage extraditions.

1.1.3 Involuntarily Returned Migrants: The Case of Jamaica

The immigration laws and policies of destination countries have a significant impact on the number of IRMs. As noted earlier, those deported involve two main groups of people: convicted persons and immigration offenders.

Jamaica received the highest number of deported criminal persons in the region up until the year 2013.\(^{35}\) The draft Deportation Policy of Jamaica highlights that 48,726 people were involuntarily returned to Jamaica between 1996 and 2013. For the years 2011, 2012 and 2013, the number of deported persons to Jamaica was 2,629, 2,309 and 2,139 respectively; this represents a decrease of 12% from 2011 to 2012 and a further reduction of 7% from 2012 to 2013.\(^{17}\) These reductions contrast with an increase in deportations from Caribbean countries, including Trinidad and Tobago, St Maarten and Barbados.\(^{38}\)

Precise figures for the year 2013 reveal that 2,139 persons were deported for criminal and non-criminal offences in that year. While data for 2014 seem to be missing, there appears to be a general downward trend in the volume of IRMs based on recent figures from the 2016 Annual Deportation and Reintegration report by the Ministry of National Security (MNS).\(^{39}\)

The number of deportees has reduced from 2,139 persons in 2013 to 1,979 in 2015. The 2016 Annual Deportation Report also reveals that there was a reduction of 11% in the total number of people returned between 2015 and 2016 from 1,979 to 1,757. Based on current trends, more male migrants return involuntarily as compared to females, but there has been a decline in both female and male IRMs to Jamaica. For the period 2015-2016, the number of male deportees decreased from 1,581 to 1,378. The number of female deportees is significantly lower: 398 in 2015 to 376 in 2016.\(^{40}\)

With regards to age, the majority of deportees (both male and female) generally fall within the range of 18 to 50 years. For females, the majority of those deported are 26 to 30 years old, while male deportees are aged 31 to 35 and 41 to 45. Table 2 below highlights the age group of deportees by sex in 2016.\(^{41}\)

---


\(^{36}\) Government of Jamaica, Draft Returns and Reintegration Policy and Procedural Guideline (Deportation Policy)

\(^{37}\) Government of Jamaica, Draft Returns and Reintegration Policy and Procedural Guideline (Deportation Policy)

\(^{38}\) Government of Jamaica, Draft Returns and Reintegration Policy and Procedural Guideline (Deportation Policy)

\(^{39}\) Government of Jamaica, Draft Returns and Reintegration Policy and Procedural Guideline (Deportation Policy)

\(^{40}\) Government of Jamaica, Draft Returns and Reintegration Policy and Procedural Guideline (Deportation Policy)

Both Caribbean and non-Caribbean countries are known for deporting Jamaican citizens. The top deporting countries are as follows: US at the top, followed by the UK, Trinidad and Tobago, Bahamas, Canada, Curacao and Barbados. Given that there is a downward trend in the volume of deportations, it is logical that the number of Jamaicans expelled from most of these countries is decreasing. The only exception is Trinidad and Tobago where deportations increased during the period 2015-2016. Table 3 below captures the rate of deportations between 2015 and 2016 by the top deporting countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPORTING COUNTRY</th>
<th># of Jamaicans Deported in 2015</th>
<th># of Jamaicans Deported in 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curacao</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bahamas</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes the age group with the majority of deportees

The reasons for deportation vary, as noted above. The offences are related to illegal entry, drugs, assault, sexual offences and murder/attempted murder. Based on the available statistics for the years 2015 and 2016, the top reason for deportation is non-criminal as a vast number of deportees (48%) are sent back due to overstaying or illegal entry/re-entry. Across the different types of offences, there is a positive trend with regard to the reduction in the number of all offences between 2011 and 2016 as demonstrated by Table 4.


---

Table 4: Number of Deportation Offences by Type from 2011-2016


1.1.1.3 Gender Dimension of Migration
Historically, more Jamaican men migrated for various reasons, including to support war and post-war efforts in Europe and to support infrastructure work, such as the building of the Panama Canal. Female migration is however increasing given the higher educational attainment of women and the need for labour in sectors largely dominated by women (e.g., nursing, teaching). New opportunities are opening for young and qualified women in the health, education, and service sectors in the US and Canada. Unfortunately, women are also being recruited in less favourable sectors such as prostitution in tourist destinations in the Caribbean and beyond.44 The increased movement of women across borders is in line with international trends.

It has been reported that there were approximately 250 million international migrants throughout the world as of 2015, with women making up 48 percent of this population.45 Much of the literature also contends that female migration increased as the growth of the tourist industry in the Caribbean led to a higher demand for female workers in the service sector.

1.1.1.4 Places of Settlement
Recent data indicate that the majority (52%) of IRMs identified the Kingston Metropolitan Area (KMA) and St Catherine, while 48% indicated the rural areas, as their place of settlement.46 Specific divisions in the KMA and St Catherine with the highest number of IRMs are St Catherine North (227 persons; 25%); St Catherine South (187 persons; 21%); St Andrew South (150 persons; 16%); St Andrew North (106 persons; 12%); and Kingston West (104 people; 11%).47 The divisions in the rural area accounting for the highest number of IRMs are Clarendon (184 people; 22%), St James (140 people; 17%), St Ann (93 people; 11%) and Manchester and Westmoreland (87 people; 10%). Less than 7% of IRMs settled in all other divisions in this area as at 2016.48

1.1.1.5 Challenges Faced by IRMs
IRMs face a plethora of challenges when they return to Jamaica. Upon their arrival, they are already stigmatised as they are assumed to be criminals and therefore held responsible for rising crime levels. There is also concern that the inflow of IRMs is contributing to transnational crime through their networks abroad.49

---

The Government’s Return and Reintegration Policy and Procedural Guideline states that one of the drivers for the development of the Policy is related to indicators which suggest high levels of correlation between the return of involuntary migrants and an increase in crime.

It also highlights the public’s view that crime and violence are synonymous with deportees. This understanding, according to the Policy, has led to the need for a policy to guide and manage the issues arising from deportation.

Jamaica’s murder rate is indeed high at between 25 and 42/100,000 people; this is seen as an ‘epidemic amount of violence’. However, the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) states in a 2017 publication that the relation of this violence to migration has not been thoroughly investigated in the literature.

A recent island-wide survey to better understand the experiences of deportees highlighted that 91.8% of those interviewed had not been arrested or charged with an offence since returning to Jamaica. Likewise, 90% of the study’s sample had not re-migrated illegally. Nonetheless, this finding does not appear to positively impact the perception of IRMs as criminals.

The perception of the Jamaican public are that Involuntarily Returned Migrants are mostly criminals (The Jamaica Returns and Reintegration Policy and Procedural Guidelines - Deportation Policy)

---

50 Government of Jamaica, Draft Returns and Reintegration Policy and Procedural Guideline (Deportation Policy)
52 Thomas-Hope, Elizabeth, Reintegration and Rehabilitation of Forced Returnees to Jamaica: Survey of the Reintegration of Deportees, 2014
Many IRMs find it difficult to reintegrate into Jamaican society. Some of the deportees left Jamaica at birth or at a very young age, and therefore have a limited social network and may be unfamiliar with Jamaica. For example, many do not have existing networks of family and friends to help them reintegrate upon their return. Due to the stigma and the associated discrimination and isolation they face, they also find it difficult to find employment. With a lack of employment opportunities and very few options, IRMs may resort to offering their services to traffickers or to criminal activities, thereby becoming re-offenders.53

Other challenges faced by IRMs are highlighted below:

- Depression as a result of their status and the resulting stigma, separation from family
- Lack of documentation to prove their identity
- Difficulty in paying for accommodation
- Lack of support from families (sometimes due to family members feeling ill-equipped to deal with deported persons and the associated stigma)
- Drug and alcohol abuse
- Financial difficulty
- Inability to relate to the country (culture shock)
- Physical and mental health issues associated with the deportation
- Lack of community support networks/family ties leading to alienation
- Lack of skills to find employment
- Discrimination leading to marginalisation and social dislocation

The Government of Jamaica recognises the strong need to provide support to IRMs to help them reintegrate into Jamaican society in a productive manner. The difficulty many deportees experience in securing employment, despite their skills, has negative implications for their health, access to housing and other basic needs. It also has a wider impact on the broader society when a large segment of a country’s population is marginalised and remains highly vulnerable. Programmes, services and other interventions aimed at rehabilitating and reintegrating migrants and preventing future irregular emigration of those who have returned is critical for the security, economic growth and social cohesion of the country.

1.1.4 The Reintegration and Rehabilitation of Involuntarily Returned Migrants initiative

As noted earlier, the return of IRMs, and their vulnerability, is a major concern for the Government of Jamaica (GoJ). IRMs require considerable assistance for their reintegration and participation in Jamaican society. A reduction in re-offending, including rehabilitation of returned migrants, as well as effective community reintegration, remains a priority area for the GoJ as outlined in the National Crime Prevention and Community Safety Strategy.54 The strategy serves as a guide for collaboration between ministries, departments and agencies, and partnerships with local authorities, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and other community organisations.55

The government’s approach to supporting and reintegrating deportees has been described as ad hoc,56 although this is changing. Various ministries, including the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Social Security and Labour, have recently made efforts aimed at reintegrating deportees in order to empower them to make productive contributions to Jamaican society.57 Nonetheless, deportees have expressed that NGOs are currently more active in providing support than the government.58

The Ministry of National Security has collaborated with a range of stakeholders, including the British High Commission and various NGOs, to implement programmes and projects to help deportees successfully reintegrate into their communities. This has been achieved largely through the Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Offender and Deported Persons Programme, funded by the British High Commission (BHC). As part of this programme, the Jamaica Reducing Re-Offending Action Plan (JRRAP) was developed.59

52 Government of Jamaica, Draft Returns and Reintegration Policy and Procedural Guideline (Deportation Policy)
53 Government of Jamaica, Draft Returns and Reintegration Policy and Procedural Guideline (Deportation Policy)
54 Government of Jamaica, National Crime Prevention and Community Safety Strategy, October 2010
56 Migration Policy Institute, Jamaica: From Diverse Beginning to Diaspora in the Developed World, 2010. See: https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/jamaica-diverse-beginning-diaspora-developed-world/
57 Migration Policy Institute, Jamaica: From Diverse Beginning to Diaspora in the Developed World, 2010. See: https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/jamaica-diverse-beginning-diaspora-developed-world/
59 Government of Jamaica, Draft Returns and Reintegration Policy and Procedural Guideline (Deportation Policy)
The Government has also established partnerships with selected NGOs through this programme to strengthen its efforts towards the rehabilitation and reintegration of IRMs. The aim of JRRAP was to reduce the rate of re-offending amongst local offenders and deportees and improve the rehabilitation and reintegration of these groups. The key initiatives of the programme are captured in Table 5 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service/Support</th>
<th>Lead Organization/Agency</th>
<th>Objective(s)</th>
<th>Achievement(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reception, relocation, reintegration</td>
<td>NGO called the National Organisation for Deported Migrants</td>
<td>Help with reintegration and redocumentation; advice and support before and after removal from the UK; meet and greet at airport</td>
<td>Family reunification; provision of accommodation; successful job referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder engagement, liaison and removal</td>
<td>British High Commission</td>
<td>Communication with immigration offenders in the UK before return</td>
<td>Coming Home to Jamaica booklets distributed to IRMs to help ease transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICA secondment to Jamaican High Commission</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>To work with UK Home Office to verify identities of Jamaicans</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICA investigation team in Kingston</td>
<td>Government of Jamaica</td>
<td>Carry out field investigations in Jamaica</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills training and income generation initiative</td>
<td>Open Arms Centre (NGO)</td>
<td>Homeless shelter and day drop-in centre that provides support services to returning migrants with no family or friends who can assist</td>
<td>Job referrals; family reunification; transitional accommodation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Taken from Draft Returns and Reintegration Policy and Procedural Guideline (Deportation Policy)

In addition to its engagement with the BHC-funded programme, the 2016 Annual Deportation and Reintegration Report states that the MNS supports the Jamaica Constabulary Force, the Jamaican Customs Agency and Passport, Immigration and Citizenship Agency with the monthly receptions and processing of deportees, although the precise role of the MNS in these processes is not clarified. The MNS also supports the quarterly NGO stakeholder forum which assesses current reintegration and support services to deportees. Ideas on how to strengthen ongoing processes and systems for IRMs are discussed at this forum. Training is also provided to the members of the forum to improve the sustainability of reintegration efforts. The Government of Jamaica is also seeking to build a coordinated response to support IRMs’ reintegration back into Jamaican society, by strengthening the policy, legislative and institutional frameworks that guide the management and treatment of IRMs.

---
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This is being achieved through the Reintegration and Rehabilitation of IRMs Project, funded by Cities Alliance through United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The objectives of this project include finalising the National Deportation Policy as well as developing a strategy and standard operating procedures for managing the rehabilitation and reintegration of IRMs. It also aims to increase the capacity of key institutions and organisations, both government and non-government bodies, that deliver services for IRMs. The project will also generate evidence through an island-wide study on IRMs; this evidence will inform the regulatory framework for IRM reintegration and rehabilitation as well as the capacity of service providers to address the needs of IRMs effectively.

As mentioned earlier, NGOs are seen to be very active in supporting IRMs in many ways. The services they have provided include counselling, skills training and accommodation among others. Such integration efforts are necessary to avoid some of the problems which have arisen both for individual deportees and for society. Moreover, useful skills are potentially wasted where deportees fail to secure jobs because of stigma.

The key NGOs and the services they provide are outlined in Table 6 below.

### Table 6: NGOs and the Services provided to IRMs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>Type of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Arms Drop-In Centre</strong></td>
<td>Emergency to medium-term accommodation and case management of male deportees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marie Atkins</strong></td>
<td>Emergency to medium-term accommodation primarily for males but they also offer accommodation to females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hibiscus</strong></td>
<td>Emergency accommodation and case management for females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salvation Army</strong></td>
<td>Residential substance abuse treatment programme and upholstery and woodwork skills training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Heart (St James)</strong></td>
<td>Emergency to medium-term accommodation, case management for both sexes, skills development training in areas of small livestock farming (chicken, pig and rabbit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portland Rehabilitation Management</strong></td>
<td>Emergency to medium-term accommodation, case management for males and females; skills training in small farming and chicken rearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Unification and Resettlement Initiative</strong></td>
<td>Assist deportees in need of vocational or skills training, shelter, counselling and referrals as well as assist with re-documentation (national ID, Tax Registration Number, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Organization for Deported Migrants</strong></td>
<td>Referrals to other service providers, support with (re)acclimatization to Jamaica, assistance with re-documentation (national ID, Tax Registration Number etc), transportation from the airport to residence in Jamaica</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Taken from Draft Returns and Reintegration Policy and Procedural Guideline (Deportation Policy)

---
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The large inflow of deportees has led to the development of a draft Deportation Policy to manage the deportation process, as mentioned earlier in this report. The Policy was developed by the MNS as part of its efforts towards the management of illegal migration. The Policy is in line with the priorities identified in the country’s Vision 2030, specifically the National Goals as described in the National Development Plan.65

The overall aim of the Deportation Policy is to create a safe, cohesive and just Jamaica. Specifically, the Policy aims ‘to establish, enhance and standardise procedures and programmes, with the appropriate legislative support to ensure that the policy is grounded in law and supported by efficient administrative mechanisms’.66 The Policy addresses the following priority areas:67

- Provide stipulations on the treatment and processing that various categories of deportees receive (eg minors, disabled persons) from the point of reception to the type of reintegration mechanisms that are recommended
- Develop communication and notification protocols to be observed when persons are being deported to Jamaica, bearing in mind people have in the past been deported to Jamaica who were later found to be non-Jamaicans
- Define the processes of nationality and identity verification for persons who are awaiting deportation to and from Jamaica
- Guide negotiations and dialogue in relation to the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Jamaica and key deporting countries - MoUs to include the verification procedure to be undertaken in order to confirm Jamaican nationals; guidelines in relation to the sharing of criminal record information; the number of persons to be deported under charter flight arrangement; and the frequency of such charter flights. MoUs will also include information on agreed mechanisms for appropriate rehabilitation and reintegration.

The specific objectives68 of the Deportation Policy are:

- To enhance the GoJ’s capacity to effectively manage issues relating to deportees
- To develop a framework for data collection and analysis that is evidence-based at the national level
- To provide a coordinated approach to support and manage deportations to and from Jamaica
- To enable a common negotiating position with major deporting countries with regards to issues relating to the deportation of Jamaican nationals
- To facilitate the resettlement of deportees through shared initiatives with civil society partners in order to provide social services and support structures
- To implement mechanisms to manage and monitor high-risk deportees to Jamaica.

The Deportation Policy ultimately aims to establish standardised processes. In implementing the policy, a coordinated mechanism with clear institutional arrangements is essential to allow for comprehensive reintegration services. These services should be adequately monitored to enable the beneficiaries to become self-sufficient and productive citizens.

### 1.1.5 Main Stakeholders and Target Groups

Based on the understanding of the local initiatives and the meetings during the inception period, the main stakeholders and target groups of the IRM - Reintegration and Rehabilitation of Involuntarily Returned Migrants project in Jamaica are presented below:

- **The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Jamaica Country Office** - as the agency funding the project through Cities Alliances – whose main focus is to improve the lives of 100 million slum dwellers by the year 2020 and has run a few reports and project concept notes on the deported migrants case in Jamaica – through the Catalytic Fund and UN Habitat.69 Also, the UNDP Deputy Resident Representative will provide quality assurance, oversight on the project as well as the final review and approval of the deliverables.

- **Municipalities and local authorities** are important players in reintegration and rehabilitation as they respond to the influx of deported migrants in their cities.

---
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Non-governmental organisations presented in Table 6, as well as others such as the Jamaica Aids Support for Life which may not have IRMs as a direct target group, but nonetheless may provide services to people living with HIV/AIDS who also happen to be an IRM. Another organisation that gears its services directly towards IRMs is the Family Unification and Resettlement Initiative (FURI). FURI aims to assist in the reintegration of deported persons by collaborating with other service agencies through the following services:

- Accommodation/shelter referrals
- Employment/vocational counselling and training referrals
- Drug/alcohol abuse rehab referrals
- Counselling
- Re-connection with family
- Help in obtaining national ID, TRN, etc

Jamaica Constabulary Force (JCF) whose reports have identified high risk of crime and challenges in integration for deportees and will influence the deportation policy and framework development.

Line Ministries such as the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of National Security of Jamaica (MNS) more specifically, the Crime Prevention and Community Safety Unit, as they are key players in finalising the National Deportation Policy.

Passport, Immigration and Citizenship Agency (PICA) The mandate of this executive agency is to help to keep Jamaica’s borders safe. With respect to IRMs, PICA works with the UK Home Office to verify identities of Jamaicans and to conduct field investigations in Jamaica.

Involuntarily Returned Migrants - The direct beneficiaries and most important stakeholders of this Study are the IRMs themselves. Their lives are most affected by the policies and programmes that are developed in response to the findings resulting from this Consultancy.

1.2 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

1.2.1 Project Overall Objective, Purposes and Results

The overall objective of the Reintegration and Rehabilitation of Involuntarily Returned Migrants project is ‘to have an improved coordinating system for the rehabilitation and reintegration of involuntarily returned migrants’ in Jamaica. The coordinating system will entail joint efforts by government and local organisations to better address IRM needs. It will also hinge on a strengthened policy, legislative, and institutional framework.

In July and August 2018 an island-wide study on IRMs was conducted with the aim of providing evidenced-based data to serve as the basis for an improved system and to inform policies.

Key findings of the Study will contribute to two priority outcomes:

- Strengthened regulatory framework for IRM reintegration and rehabilitation (Outcome 1);
- Improved capacity of service providers on the island to cooperate and to address the long-term needs of IRMs (Outcome 2).
1. **Strengthened regulatory framework for IRM reintegration and rehabilitation**

   (Outcome 1)

   The results of the island-wide study on IRMs will provide evidence-based data to inform the design of future social interventions geared towards IRMs as well as for the development of policies such as the:

   > (Draft) National Deportation Policy
   > (Draft) Standard Operating Procedure
   > (Draft) Reintegration and Rehabilitation Strategy
   > Protocol for tracking IRMs

2. **Improved capacity of service providers on the island to cooperate and to address the long-term needs of IRMs** (Outcome 2)

   As previously mentioned, there are several NGOs and agencies currently providing services to IRMs. The information from this study will assist these organisations to better identify the most salient needs of IRMs to enable them to adopt more appropriate responses. Additionally, it is hoped that the findings of the study will promote increased coordination, the forging of strategic partnerships and creation of synergies among the service providers to better serve the IRM population.
2 SECTION 2: THE STUDY

2.1.1 Research Design and Methodology
The study sought to assess the following dimensions of the IRM experience:

- personal and family backgrounds of involuntarily returned migrants
- challenges related to reintegration
- needs for and access to services and programmes to assist with the reintegration process
- gender differences with respect to these needs and access
- level of re-offending (incarceration, arrests or convictions) since deportation

Based on the literature (including the results of the Re-integration and Rehabilitation of Ex-offenders and Deported Persons Programme Baseline Study, 2009) and the aims listed above, the following research questions were formulated.

- What is the demographic profile of IRMs in Jamaica?
- What kinds of socio-economic support have IRMs received since returning to Jamaica? From whom? From where?
- What kinds of psycho-social and health needs do IRMs have? Have they received treatment? And from where?
- What have been the lived experiences of IRMs and their perceptions since deportation? Challenges faced, etc.
- Do the experiences shared by IRMs differ by sex, sexual preference, the age they migrated and/or how long they have been involuntarily returned to Jamaica?
- What type of offences have IRMs committed before and/or after deportation?
- How do the results of this Study compare with the findings of the baseline study in 2009? Has much changed? Positively or negatively?

In order to effectively answer these questions, the research employed mixed methods. That is, the use of both quantitative and qualitative techniques. The chosen quantitative technique was a survey using a questionnaire that was partially developed by the MNS, Crime Prevention and Safety Unit and the UNDP (See Annex B).

The questionnaire was tested and piloted before it was used. This helped to identify issues such as the length of questionnaire (persons may get restless if it is too long), misinterpretation of the questions by participants and problems with the survey instrument that might lead to biased answers. Likewise, some questions relating to sexual history and condom use were reworded to avoid being too intrusive or insensitive.

The demographic data (e.g. age, address, etc.) and the levels of re-offending were readily quantified and therefore more easily extracted.

However, as deeper (and potentially more sensitive) issues were explored, the qualitative method of the in-depth interview was also used.

A purposive sample is a non-probability sample that is selected based on characteristics of a population. In this case, we were only interested in Involuntary Returned Migrants for the study.

Due to the nature of the research, the sample was purposive and consisted of 143 IRMs. The questionnaire was administered to 133 IRMs and 10 IRMs were interviewed in July-August 2018.

It should be noted that based on the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Consultancy, the scope of the study was limited to IRMs. As such, though stakeholders such as the UNDP, the MNS and NGOs were consulted in the design and testing of the questionnaire (as well as for reflecting on the findings), they were not a part of the actual sample.

Access to the sample was provided by the NODM (National Organization for Deported Migrants) and the collection of the data (survey and in-depth interviews) was accommodated on the premises of the following providers of services to IRMs: NODM and Open Arms in Kingston, Portland Rehab in Port Antonio, Open Heart in Montego Bay, St Gabriel’s Church in May Pen. Participants of the study travelled to their closest venue and were provided with a stipend after participating in the research.
2.2 LIMITATIONS

The main constraint pertains to both the size and type of sample. Due to the absence of a sampling frame a convenience sample was used. This means that only persons who have come in contact with one of the service providers (such as NODM) were included in the study. This may have biased the findings in that IRMs who have never been in touch with one of the organisations may have different opinions from those participating in the survey. Likewise, a larger sample would have increased the confidence interval for the generalisation of the findings.

2.3 FINDINGS

2.3.1 Survey results

2.3.1.1 Demographic

The questionnaire comprised over 70 questions. A total of 133 questionnaires were collected for analysis. The response rate to the questionnaire varied according to the questions posed. The average age of IRMs was 51 years with the youngest age 27 years and the eldest 72 years. Almost two-thirds (65.9%) of the sample were male and a third (32.6%) female. A majority of the IRMs were single with 14% married, 10% divorced or separated and 8% in common-law relationships. The larger proportion (38.6%) of the IRMs attained secondary level education and a quarter attained skill certifications. Less than 10% of the IRMs achieved university or postgraduate level education. One-quarter of the respondents reported being employed. A little over one-fifth (22.6%) reported being self-employed while those who reported being employed part-time and full-time were 9.8% and 8.3% respectively. Among IRMs who reported being unemployed, approximately 43% reported being out of work and looking for work, while 11.4% stated they were unable to work.
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2.3.1.2 Place of Origin

Forty-three per cent of IRMs were born in the parishes of Kingston and St Andrew. IRMs from St Catherine, Clarendon and St James each accounted for almost 10% of the sample. Most (55.1%) of the IRMs lived in Jamaica while they attended high school. IRMs who lived in the UK and the US accounted for 16.5% and 15.7% of the sample while 2.4% of IRMs lived in Canada while attending high school. Seventy-one point four per cent of IRMs reported that the communities in which they lived while growing up were ‘very good’ or ‘fairly good.’ Approximately 37% of IRMs are living in communities they grew up in as youths and almost 60% are living in communities they grew up in the first time they travelled abroad.

Parish Of Birth (%)

No. of respondents: 125
2.3.1.3 Residency Abroad

The average age of IRMs when they first left Jamaica to go abroad was 24 years, while the youngest and oldest ages were 1 and 55 years respectively. Almost 60% of IRMs were working legally while living overseas. Most (57.8%) IRMs were last deported from the UK and just over one third (37.5%) were deported from the US. IRMs deported from Canada accounted for roughly 5% of the sample. Only 5% of IRMs served in the military in the country they were deported from. When asked about the last year they were deported to Jamaica, 8.2% of IRMs reported that they were deported between 1975 and 1999. Between 2000 and 2004, 10.6% of IRMs were deported, 16.4% of IRMs were deported from 2005 to 2009 and more than a third (35.3%) were deported between 2010 and 2014. Almost 30% of IRMs were deported from 2015 to 2018. On average, IRMs were living in other countries for 17 years at the last time of deportation to Jamaica.
2.3.1.4 Family configurations in host country
Almost 9 in 10 (87.6%) IRMs have close family/relatives in the country from which they were deported. When asked about specific relatives who currently reside in the country from which IRMs were deported, almost one-quarter of IRMs reported that they have a parent; 27.8% have a spouse/partner; 47.1% have siblings and 48.4% have children. Approximately 92% of IRMs reported having some family living in Jamaica. IRMs who have a parent or spouse/partner living in Jamaica each accounted for less than 10% of sample. A little more than one-fifth (21.8%) of IRMs have a sibling living in Jamaica. Nearly one-third (32.3%) of IRMs have children living in Jamaica.

2.3.1.5 Experience since Return to Jamaica
Nearly 30% of IRMs reported feeling sad when they were first deported to Jamaica while one-fifth reported feeling hopeless. Less than 10% reported feeling ashamed while 13.3% reported feeling angry. The current feelings of IRMs vary. Almost half of the sample (41.1%) reported feeling happy. However, the remainder of IRMs (58.9%) reported feeling sad, in shock or in denial, angry, ashamed and hopeless.

### Feelings & Deportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Current Feelings post deportation</th>
<th>Feelings when First Deported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hopeless</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashamed</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial/ Shock</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. of respondents: 99 and 98
Most IRMs are currently living in permanent (35.3%) or temporary (35.3%) accommodation. 9.2% of IRMs are living in a shelter, 8.3% are staying with someone and 2.5% have nowhere to live while 1.7% are not sure about their current living situation.

In terms of interaction between IRMs and family members in Jamaica, more than half of the sample (52.1%) interacted with family members ‘a fair amount’ to ‘a lot’. One-fifth of the sample interacted with family members ‘now and then’, while 22.6% interacted with family members ‘hardly ever’ to ‘not at all’. Almost 60% of IRMs interacted with family members living abroad and more than a quarter (26.2%) report interacting with family members abroad ‘now and then’. Almost 15% of IRMs ‘hardly ever’ interacted or ‘did not interact’ with family members living abroad.

The majority (52.5%) of the sample feel they have been ‘quite fairly’ or ‘very fairly’ treated by persons in authority since deportation. One-fifth of the sample were indifferent about the treatment by those in authority while less than 6.7% felt ‘unfairly or very badly mistreated’ by those in authority.

Among IRMs engaged in non-paid activity, 50.9% reported doing volunteer work, 39.6% were currently studying or participating in training and 9.4% were in apprenticeship programmes.

2.3.1.6 Access to Support Services

Eight point nine per cent of IRMs reported being offered financial assistance or reintegration payment from the country of deportation. More than three-quarters (78.9%) of the sample did not accept/receive any help from UK’s Facilitated Return Scheme (FRS). Approximately two-thirds (65.8%) of IRMs reported receiving some form of support from family members. IRMs were asked specifically about the types of support received. More than one-quarter (26.3%) reported getting financial support, 24.8% reported receiving emotional support. Those who received help in obtaining and finding documentation accounted for 10.5% and 11.3% respectively.

IRMs were asked which individuals or organisations provided the most help when they were deported to Jamaica. More than one-third (35.6%) reported NODM, 15% stated that the most help came from family members while one-fifth reported receiving no assistance when deported to Jamaica. IRMs were asked if the assistance they received, whether money, skills training, obtaining documentation, finding accommodation, transportation, care packages and/or group discussions were helpful in any way. Almost three-quarters (72.3%) of the sample reported that the assistance was ‘fairly helpful’ or ‘very helpful’.

No. of respondents: 19 and 122

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction with Family in Jamaica</th>
<th>Interaction with Family abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interaction with famliy since deportation (%)
Among IRMs who received certified skills, 27.6% reported that training was paid for by government; almost one-fifth reported payment for training was made by family/friends; 6.9% was paid by community/NGO; more than one-third (34.5%) was paid for by IRMs themselves and 13.8% paid for by other unnamed sources. When IRMs were asked about the best thing that has happened since deportation, ‘making a new start’ and having a ‘sense of freedom’ ranked highest, accounting for 27% and 25.2% respectively.

The Best thing that happened to IRMs post deportation (%)

- Family related: 14.4%
- Making a new start: 27%
- Sense of freedom: 25.2%
- Nothing: 19.8%
- Other: 13.5%
2.3.1.7 Challenges since deportation

IRMs were asked about the challenges faced since deportation. Thirty per cent reported facing discrimination, 54.1% reported challenges due to lack of job opportunities, 27.1% faced emotional challenges and almost 20% faced accommodation challenges. Almost 43% of IRMs reported facing financial challenges, 19.5% reported facing family challenges. Health challenges were faced by 18% of IRMs, 8.3% of IRMs had difficulties getting documentation and just over 10% (11.3%) were victims of crimes. The majority (87.5%) of IRMs did not report difficulties in accessing certain services because of their gender. More than a quarter (26.3%) of the IRMs were not familiar with the Windrush Generation Scheme.

### Challenges faced by IRMs (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of job opportunities</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of mental support</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of accommodation</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finances</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining documents</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim of crimes</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of respondents s vary for each challenge listed

IRMs were provided with a list of suggestions to improve their situation following deportation. The most popular suggestion was related to jobs/work (36.4%), followed by family support (15%) and emotional/psychological support (11.2%). One-fifth of the IRMs reported that all suggestions, including accommodation and financial as well as those mentioned above, were important.

Of those IRMs who answered the question about services or programmes they would like to see implemented by the government, approximately 46% reported counselling services and 40.6% reported improved fast tracking the issuance of IDs and other documents. Forty-seven per cent of IRMs wanted the government to provide more accommodation for deportees. A similar percentage of IRMs (48.1%) wanted the government to provide NGOs with more resources to enable them to work more effectively with deportees. Almost one-third (32.3%) wanted the government to provide public education to reduce stigma and 44.4% of IRMs wanted government to provide retraining, recertification and skills training.

2.3.1.8 Health

Approximately 56% of IRMs reported having serious health issues including asthma, brain tumour, diabetes, eczema, fibroids, glaucoma, HIV, and high blood pressure among others. Almost half (48.8%) of the sample of IRMs reported receiving treatment. More than half (53.5%) also reported receiving treatment at local clinics; more than one-third (34.9%) received treatment at public hospitals and almost 12% received treatment at a private facility. Overall, most (60%) IRMs reported receiving ‘fairly good’ and ‘very good’ treatment at these treatment centres. A small percentage (14.3%) of the sample presently or in the past have had substance addictions.
One-third (33.3%) of IRMs reported being addicted to alcohol, 22.2% addicted to narcotic drugs, 18.5% addicted to both and approximately 26% addicted to some other substance. More than one-third (34.2%) of IRMs reported receiving treatment for an addiction and almost two-thirds (63.2%) reported being ‘completely cured’ or ‘much better’.

IRMs with serious Health Issues (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. of Respondent: 119

Location where IRMs received treatment (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private facility</th>
<th>Public hospital</th>
<th>Local clinic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. of respondents: 43

IRMs reported being involved in various types of sexual relationships. Over one-third (34.6%) reported being in a casual relationship, 29.6% stated they were in a common-law relationship, 13.6% were in visiting relationships, 11.1% were married and 11.1% were in other sexual relationships. Regardless of sexual relationship type, most (60.5%) IRMs were in relationships lasting three years or more. Over 8 in 10 (86.4%) IRMs reported using a condom during sex ‘always’ or ‘sometimes’, and two-thirds (67.7%) of IRMs also reported using a condom the last time they had sex.

Marital Status (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visiting</th>
<th>Casual</th>
<th>Marries</th>
<th>Common Law</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. of respondents: 81

When asked about the chance of contracting HIV/AIDS more than three quarters (78.3%) of IRMs reported that they had ‘little’ to ‘no chance’ of contracting the virus. Almost 8% of IRMs stated that their chances of contracting the virus were ‘moderate’, while 4.3% of IRMs reported having a ‘good chance’ of contracting the virus. Almost 10% of IRMs reported being ‘unsure of the chances’ of contracting HIV/AIDS. Approximately 57% of IRMs reported taking an HIV/AIDS test in the past 12 months.
2.3.1.9 Penal and Administrative Offences
Half of IRMs in the sample reported that criminal offences led to their deportation while immigration offences were reported by 34.9% of IRMs as factors leading to deportation. Possession of drugs (marijuana and cocaine) was mostly associated with criminal offences and overstaying one’s visa was linked mostly to immigration offences.

- Criminal offence
- Immigration offence
- Both criminal and immigration offences

No. of respondents: 106

Almost 50% of IRMs who were charged were imprisoned, 27.8% were placed in another form of detention and less than 10% given bail. Since deportation, only approximately 6% of IRMs reported being arrested or charged with an offence.

2.3.1.10 Documentation
IRMs were asked to report the different types of documentation they possess – both Jamaican and non-Jamaican. Most (89.2%) have a birth certificate, 90.2% have a Tax Registration Number (TRN) and 68.4% have National Insurance and Voter’s/National ID respectively. Only 35.7% of IRMs reported having a Jamaican driver’s license and 23.2% had a non-Jamaican driver’s license. Almost 56% of IRMs reported having a Jamaican passport and 8.6% have another form of Jamaican ID. Almost 8% of IRMs have another foreign ID or documentation.

2.3.2 Results from the in-depth interviews
A total of ten deportees were interviewed; six men and four women. Many of those interviewed were deported from the US and only two from Canada and the UK respectively.

Number of IRMs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The interviews revealed one particular case in which an undocumented worker was deported to Jamaica because of working illegally in Canada. Like many other IRMs who participated in this study, he was the breadwinner for his family.

All the interviewees either went abroad to seek work in order to provide for their families, or were taken to these countries by their families at an early age to seek better living conditions, especially in terms of financial and social security.

When these people were sent back to Jamaica it was devastating, both for them and their families; family bonds were jeopardized/broken and more stress was placed on meeting the financial needs of the household due to a reduction of income.

90% of the interviewees reported that their families were affected by their deportation in the terms mentioned above. In their own words they described the experience as ‘traumatic’, ‘depressing’, ‘confusing’, ‘a time of anxiety’, and ‘a time of hardship’. These emotional experiences eventually impacted children’s academic performances and their social lives. Some highlights relating to the impact on families of the IRMs interviewed were:

- Complete alienation from children and/or partners
- Conflict and tension within homes
- IRMs missing out on major milestones of their children’s lives (graduations, prom, weddings, first job, birth of grandchildren, etc)
- Weak academic performances of IRMs' children abroad

From the interviews, it would appear that the deportation caused more disruption in the relationship between the IRMs and their children, than between IRMs and their partners. In other words, the interviewees reported that it was harder for them to adjust to being away from their children’s lives, while it was easier to get over a stalled intimate relationship with their spouse.

### 2.3.2.2 Alienation from Family

Family is a social institution that plays the biggest role in the socialisation process. Resocialisation is a major part of reintegrating persons back into a society. When people are deported back to their native country, they usually lean on their families for support. The findings revealed that the close friends and families of some IRMs were all living abroad. Those who had families or friend/s living here in Jamaica were reported to be very distant and received little support or no support at all, which contributed to the difficulty experienced in reintegration back into Jamaican society.

Although it is most common for the total institutions 70 (prisons, military, fraternity houses, and the military, etc) to be responsible for resocialisation, findings from the interviews revealed that IRMs who returned to their families experienced fewer challenges in reintegration compared to those who had no families to return to.

### 2.3.2.3 Culture Shock

Culture shock was mainly experienced by IRMs who have been away for many years, especially those who spent their formative years in the foreign country. These particular IRMs have grown accustomed to a particular way of life. Most interviewees were unaware of the evolving culture of their native country. Some IRMs were not acquainted with the laws of Jamaica, current affairs, the people, the system of government, how certain legal procedures are carried out, etc. As a result, returnees were in a state of complete confusion on arrival, having no idea what to do or where to go for help. Some IRMs interviewed for this study reported such experiences as being ‘lost’. Two deportees reported a profound sense of cultural bereavement within 48 hours of landing back in Jamaica.

### 2.3.2.4 Discrimination: Marginalization and Social Disorder

Only one person reported discrimination based on his status as a ‘deportee’. He recounted being labelled as a thief and a criminal and was an outcast in his community for a time. While he noted that this experience did not damage his character in any way or affect him emotionally, he later moved somewhere else as it impeded his reintegration process.

---

70 A total institution is a place of work and residence where a great number of similarly situated people, cut off from the wider community for a considerable time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered life.
2.3.2.5 Loss of Independence
Money plays an important part in being independent. Many of the IRMs interviewed returned to Jamaica with little or no money and struggled to find employment. Some of these deportees claimed that it took 4 years to find a job, and that lack of money and no family led to homelessness. Others reported feeling a loss of independence (especially those who were living in shelters). Those living with families and friends shared this feeling as they were unable to contribute to bills and other household expenses. This loss of independence contributed to a longer rehabilitation process.

2.3.2.6 Needs for and Access to Services and Programmes designed for IRMs
In the interviews persons were asked to describe what the ideal programme for assisting deportees would include. The most common answers to this question were:
- A service which assisted deportees in the redocumentation process
- A service that offers advice and support to deportees so that they can 'get back on their feet'
- Programmes that offer skills training
- A programme that offers financial assistance
- A programme that provides accommodation for IRMs with no homes
Based on the answers above we can conclude that some IRMs are not fully aware of the various organisations and programmes available in Jamaica and the types of services they provide.

2.3.2.7 Gender Differences: Needs and Access to Services
The findings from the interviews showed no striking contrast between the needs and access to services of the two genders. Both males and females had similar needs, and accessed the same services (redocumentation assistance, counselling and accommodation). No-one interviewed reported that any issues regarding health services for males and females.

2.3.2.8 Recidivism of IRMs
IRMs were detained abroad for various offences such as drug trafficking, drug abuse, gun charges, immigration offences, etc.

Demographic Breakdown of IRMs with Felony Charges
Seven of the interviewees were imprisoned due to a felony. One of the 7 was female and 6 were males (one of whom was also charged with immigration offences: overstaying and illegal working. After his first deportation in 1994, he was deported again 20 years later for the same offences. Hence, he was a repeat offender.)

Demographic Breakdown of IRMs with Immigration Offence Charges
Four of the interviewees (2 females and 2 males) were detained due to immigration offences. However, as mentioned above, one person (male) was also charged with a felony (first degree murder) alongside immigration offences. From the findings, it was revealed that only 1 out of the 10 was a repeat offender. (Coincidentally, this was the same person who was deported for a felony and also for an immigration offence.) The remainder of the interviewees were not repeat offenders and in addition, they have not been charged with any crime since their deportation.
3 SECTION 3: THE WAY FORWARD

3.1 Recommendations

In view of the remit of this study, aspects relating to system weaknesses and potential threats to the successful rehabilitation and reintegration of the IRMs dominate the findings. The issues identified should not be considered as discrete, but as overlapping and complementary.

Despite the limitation of a convenience sample, the results are applicable and relevant to inform policies and programmes with respect to IRMs. This is enhanced by the high level of consistency in the findings of this study with the existing literature and the use of mixed methods (with the in-depth interviews reinforcing the data emanating from the survey). Likewise, all the data from this study is in line with the findings from previous baseline studies.

Based on the findings from this study and the literature review (cited in Section 1), several recommendations are proposed. The respective stakeholders (including IRMs) can reflect on each of the recommendations and devise appropriate strategies for taking action.

As already illuminated in previous studies, the findings of this research confirm that IRMs fall into two categories: (1) those who are deported for offences such as drug possession, illegal possession of firearms, homicides and violent crimes and (2) those who are returned for immigration infractions. The latter group comprises the higher number. This study revealed that half of IRMs in the sample reported that criminal offences led to their deportation while immigration offences were reported by 34.9% of IRMs as factors leading to deportation. Possession of drugs (marijuana and cocaine) was mostly associated with criminal offences and overstaying one’s visa was linked mostly to immigration offences.

RECOMMENDATION 1: CONTINUED FOCUS ON BOTH REINTEGRATION AND REHABILITATION

‘The findings from the in-depth interviews show that nearly all the persons in the sample are not fully aware of the various organisations and the services they provide for IRMs in Jamaica.'
It is therefore recommended that national policies and programmes are designed with a two-pronged approach to focus on both reintegration and rehabilitation. It is important to note that rehabilitation efforts should not be placed solely on lowering recidivism rates with respect to criminal behaviour. Emphasis should also be placed on rehabilitating persons who are prone to substance abuse. The findings showed that one-third (33.3%) of IRMs reported being addicted to alcohol, 22.2% addicted to narcotic drugs, 18.5% addicted to both and approximately 26% addicted to some other substance. Over one-third (34.2%) of IRMs reported receiving treatment for some addictions.

Interestingly, when IRMs were questioned about the challenges they have faced since their return to Jamaica, discrimination was a major issue (30% of the sample reported this). Only the lack of job opportunities (54.1%), financial challenges (43%) and emotional issues (27.1%) scored higher. This finding may be due to the prevailing public (mis)perception that IRMs contribute to surges in crime. In other words, crime and violence are synonymous with deportees and as the influx of IRMs increases, so does crime. However, the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) states in a 2017 publication that the relation between violence and migration has not been thoroughly investigated in the literature. A recent island-wide survey to better understand the experiences of deportees highlighted that 91.8 per cent of those interviewed had not been arrested or charged with an offence since returning to Jamaica. Likewise, 90% of the study’s sample had not remigrated illegally. The findings of this study corroborate the IOM report. Since deportation, only 6% approximately of IRMs reported having been arrested or charged with an offence. Nonetheless, despite no empirical data to support this misperception that IRMs are criminals, they continue to be regarded as such by the general public. This has stood in the way of IRMs successfully reintegrating in Jamaican society when they are discriminated against and marginalised. If the stigmatisation comes not only from the wider society but from IRMs’ family members in Jamaica and poses a hindrance to their family relationships, the reintegration process may be impeded even further.

It is therefore proposed that a public awareness campaign is launched to inform persons of the foregoing data and to showcase IRMs who have contributed to the positive development of their communities. The latter is especially important in order to remove the stigmatisation of IRMs as only being ‘criminals’. For example, Mr. Tremayne Brown, who is an IRM, was awarded a Badge of Honour for Gallantry by the Government of Jamaica in 2018 for his efforts in saving a young boy from drowning. Furthermore, IRMs may benefit greatly if the public is sensitised about the challenges they face as involuntarily returned migrants. A dialogue between IRMs and the communities they live in may not only foster awareness of their situation, but also enable social networking. This, in turn, may facilitate IRMs’ reintegration and rehabilitation and in the long run prevent their alienation and a potential decline in their mental health.

The comprehensive programming also requires closer attention to the IRMs’ psycho-social needs, given the myriad of emotions they face and the psychological trauma they experience. This intervention, then, would go beyond modifying approaches that cater mainly to their physiological and safety needs, to building effective psycho-social support structures and relations. Note, for example, that despite the merits of the present interventions, IRMs remain concerned about their mental health issues. The findings from the study show that one of the main services or programmes IRMs would like to see implemented by the government and other support groups, is counselling services. Although it is most common for the total institutions (prisons, military, fraternity houses and the military, etc.) to be responsible for re-socialisation, the findings from the interviews revealed that IRMs who returned to their families showed fewer challenges in reintegration compared to those who had no families to return to.
Furthermore, results from the survey and the in-depth interviews show that gains made in total institutions are often quickly depleted in an unsupportive home and community context. The findings suggest that IRMs with family support transition more easily and are better adjusted, while those without family support expressed great frustration and feelings of alienation that impact the success of their transition.

As approximately 92% of IRMs reported having some family living in Jamaica, an approach that includes the more active involvement of family members should be feasible. It is here that key stakeholders may consider facilitating innovative, low cost ideas for reaching and incorporating families in the rehabilitation process. Critically, family members would profit from relevant education and development, which may then boost their engagement and support of IRMs during the critical stage of reintegration.

However, emotional and practical support from family members residing in Jamaica is just one aspect from which IRMs may greatly benefit with regard to their psycho-social wellbeing, social integration and living situation. Another aspect is the maintenance of relationships with members of their nuclear family (especially children) from whom they may find themselves geographically separated. As the study results have shown, the separation from family members is reported by many IRMs to be a major obstacle in their reintegration and rehabilitation process.

During the in-depth interviews, Hibiscus Jamaica (a NGO established in 1993 to support the resettlement, reintegration and rehabilitation needs of deported migrant women) was mentioned repeatedly as providing exceptional service. Once the interviewer probed for more information, it was discovered that the high satisfaction levels with Hibiscus related to the range of services they offered before the deportation.

More specifically, the IRM was contacted by a representative from the NGO which in some cases acted as a broker between family members in Jamaica and the IRM in the host country. Before the IRM even boarded the plane, arrangements for their pick up, accommodation and documentation had been made.

There is no denying the positive impact on IRMs of having advance preparations. The individual had a clear idea of what to expect and the process of putting plans in place reduced the level of anxiety surrounding the deportation. As far as possible, the Government of Jamaica should forge partnerships with civil organisations located in host countries such as the Family Unification and Resettlement Initiative (FURI).

Practical suggestions for promoting reintegration before deportation include the establishment of a calling system. This system would allow family members, prospective mentors, and representatives from support agencies to telephone the holding facility and speak directly with the IRM. This interaction would provide the individual with an opportunity to voice questions, concerns or opinions to the caller. It would also communicate and reassure the IRMs that locally ‘someone cares’. It will also instill hope for a positive future upon return, while creating the desire to establish and work toward goals. Additionally, it is a first step in protecting mental health and encouraging a positive state of mind. The motivation and self-esteem of IRMs would also be enhanced through this interaction.

Another practical recommendation is presenting the IRMs with a Survival Kit. The Survival Kit should include items such as:

- A map and directory showing service providers
- Do’s and don’ts tips to consider when navigating in the country
- Financial management information
- Positive affirmations
- Motivational and educational books
- A Calendar/agenda

The first recommendation was motivated by the finding that some IRMs are not fully aware of the various organisations and programmes available in Jamaica and the types of services they provide. They were often aware of just one service provider, for example NODM, and usually this knowledge came some time after their return to the island.
With the average IRM having spent 17 years abroad, in some cases their formative years, they may no longer be, or have never been, accustomed to or familiar with the prevailing social norms and practices, political situation, laws, procedures, etc., in Jamaica. For this reason, it is recommended that customised information sessions for IRMs be organised after their arrival. These sessions could be administered by local NGOs and should include legal information, common procedures IRMs usually undergo, or cultural sensitisation.

This type of assistance would not only educate and empower IRMs to handle matters independently and to adapt more quickly to their environment, group information sessions would also create a sense of ‘not being alone’ and enable IRMs to exchange their experiences or discuss challenges they face and possible solutions with people who share a similar fate. The creation of a supportive social network made up of IRMs and the provision of much needed emotional support and understanding for their situation are two more positive by-products of this highly feasible and effective assistance.

Nearly 20% of the survey sample reported a lack of accommodation upon arrival in Jamaica. It is therefore not surprising that they expressed the wish for a programme that provides accommodation for homeless IRMs.

The fundamental psychological human need for shelter motivates the recommendation of temporary accommodation in reception camps for IRMs who have nowhere to live. These camps, either led by government or non-government organisations, would provide IRMs with a temporary solution and an alternative to life on the street or in a shelter where conditions are often precarious. With more time to organise themselves and assistance from organisations working in the field, IRMs in need would have a greater chance of not re-offending and find a more permanent solution to their living situation.

The Government of Jamaica could consider instituting a system that facilitates the accelerated processing and issuance of birth certificates, national identification, tax registration and other documents that are necessary for resettlement. This scheme could also be subsidised so that IRMs pay discounted rates for these services.

The findings suggest that vocational skills training would be best suited for IRMs as 38.6% of the persons surveyed attained secondary level education and a quarter attained skill certifications. Less than 10% of the IRMs achieved university or postgraduate level education. The skills training programme could connect IRMs to colleges, universities or skills training institutions. Financial support could be facilitated by support agencies or government scholarships and bursaries.

The scholarships should be provided to IRMs committed to becoming productive citizens. The selection criteria could include the areas of volunteerism, community involvement, and contributions to the sustainability of the national rehabilitation and reintegration programme, etc. Successful scholarship recipients could serve as the face of the public sensitisation campaigns mentioned in Recommendation 2.
Additionally, only one-quarter of the IRMs reported being employed. A little over one-fifth (22.6%) reported being self-employed, while those who reported being employed part-time and full-time were 9.8% and 8.3% respectively. This implies an entrepreneurial inclination amongst IRMs that can be further stimulated through programmes designed to enable them to access micro-credits to boost their existing business and/or to equip them with skills such as sales, marketing, bookkeeping, etc., to better operate their business. In other words, the focus should not necessarily be only on job placement.

A practical recommendation is for the provision of coaching to the approximately 43% of IRMs who stated that they were out of work and looking for work. They could have access to a Career Development Specialist to support the development of their employment portfolios.

The portfolios would contain information that is personal, suitable for sharing with prospective employers, training institutions and support agencies. The portfolio should be A Diary of Achievement, which provides written documentation of the IRM’s life accomplishments and successes. The documentation in the portfolio should include, but not be limited to, the following: medium-term goals, targeted resume, letter of application, skill certificates, academic degrees, samples/photographs of work, letters of reference/support (personal and professional references), a list of awards and honours.

Additionally, the Career Development Specialist would connect IRMs with training institutions and recruiting agencies and integrate them into personal and professional development seminars.

Qualified IRMs could be reintegrated into the world of work through structured work experience related to each individual’s major and/or career goals. The internship supported by a paid stipend would offer the chance to prove their capabilities and showcase their level of professionalism. It should provide the possibility of a full-time job offer at the end, based on their performance. This should be a partnership between the Private Sector Organisations and the Government of Jamaica.

Alongside the internship programme a mentoring component could be incorporated where there is one-on-one or group contact between IRMs (mentees) and mentors (who can be IRMs who have successfully reintegrated). This contact will enable a positive rapport to be established between the IRMs and their mentors prior to and after landing. Volunteer mentors within an IRM community should be identified and would serve as role models to allay their fears, problems, employment issues and housing concerns.

Another type of incentive would be an incentive award that could be made available to all IRMs. This would encourage and motivate IRMs to engage positively in the rehabilitation and reintegration programme. For example, each eligible IRM may receive a maximum of $100,000 in supportive services: (dental work, eye glasses, rent, tools, essential document fees, etc.) for outstanding achievements or gaining meaningful employment upon return to the island.

RECOMMENDATION 9: INTER-AGENCY COORDINATION OF THE VARIOUS DATABASE ON IRMS

It is being recommended that there is more inter-agency coordination and sharing of information among the different entities that interact with IRMs. There are several entities such as the NODM and PICA who currently collect data on IRMs. Each entity can provide access to their respective database and retrieval systems (in compliance with data protection and privacy laws). This will enable the national government to gather evidence-based data to inform strategies pertaining to IRMs.

The various database would also be able to provide referral information for the relevant agencies that work with IRMs. The type of data that could be shared are (non-exhaustive list):

- Name, ID numbers, contact details and criminal history of IRMs.
- A current resource listing of agencies and/or individuals within each parish that provides support to IRMs. The database should be designed to provide referral information which can be individualised. It should also be updated with IRMs’ profile data and engagement status for retrieval by the relevant paid professionals.
- Participants/beneficiaries of the respective skills training, internship and mentorship programmes.
Once all of the above recommendations have been implemented, it is important to track, measure and report on the results of the various policies, programmes and interventions geared towards IRMs. A robust M&E system that relies on data furnished by the various database of the different institutions (see Recommendation 9) should be developed with indicators formulated, baseline values determined and targets set.

3.2 CONCLUSIONS

The data generated in the study on IRMs have revealed several aspects of IRMs’ lives, most importantly their current living situation and the challenges they face with regard to reintegration and rehabilitation. The ten recommendations aim at informing the regulatory framework for IRM reintegration and rehabilitation as well as at improving the capacity of service providers to address the needs of IRMs effectively.

It is clear that neither reintegration nor rehabilitation can happen properly and sustainably when the individuals in question face their situation alone. In order to achieve the anticipated results, there should be:

1. Combined efforts by IRMs, non-governmental organisations, local authorities and government bodies, and different service providers, including increased coordination, strategic partnerships and the creation of synergies and collaborations among service providers;

2. A holistic approach to the matter, eg by including family members and communities in the process of IRMs’ reintegration and rehabilitation;

3. The provision of relevant assistance, including information, specialised trainings and programmes to facilitate their new lives in Jamaica.

By adhering to the above, the project’s ultimate goals may be achieved, namely that IRMs’ needs are addressed effectively. Additionally their rehabilitation and reintegration process becomes more efficient and sustainable, and that IRMs will be able to live a self-determined life in dignity while participating in and productively contributing to Jamaican society.
3.3 ANNEXES

3.3.1 Annex A TOR for Consultancy

IRM - Reintegration and Rehabilitation of Involuntary Returned Migrants in Jamaica

Local Consultant to Conduct Study on Involuntary Returned Migrants in Jamaica

Terms of Reference

Location: Kingston, Jamaica
Application Deadline: Individual Consultant
Type of Contract: National Consultant
Post Level: English
Languages Required:
Starting Date: February 2018
Duration of Initial Contract: 75 non-consecutive working days over 4 months

A. Background and context

The Reintegration & Rehabilitation of involuntary Returned Migrants Project will complement and build on existing initiatives at the national and local levels to strengthen systems to address issues associated with the treatment of involuntary returned migrants in the country and especially in urban centres. This project seeks to strengthen the policy, legislative and institutional framework that guides the management and treatment of IRMs to the island. This includes finalizing the National Deportation Policy and developing a strategy and standard operating procedures (SOPs) for managing the rehabilitation and reintegration of involuntary returned migrants.

The project will also contribute to increasing the capacity of entities including non-government organizations to provide more efficient and effective services to IRMs and strengthen the integration of migration issues in the local sustainable development planning process now being undertaken by local authorities. It is expected that the project will result in the creation of a national coordination mechanism through the building of partnerships to address issues concerning involuntary returned migrants, aligned to the country’s policy priorities on migration.

The project’s key expected outcomes are:
1. Improved policy and legislative framework governing issues related to Involuntary Returned Migrants (IRMs)
2. Enhanced access to services for IRMs
3. Enhanced capacity of local authorities, to mainstream migration in planning and service provisions
number of activities under the Reintegration and Rehabilitation of Involuntary Returned Migrants in Jamaica Project (IRM Project) that is funded by Cities Alliance through UNDP.

The overall goal of this project is to have an improved coordinating system for the rehabilitation and reintegration of involuntary returned migrants. As such, the MNS desires over the period from February 2018 to May 2018 to complete an islandwide study on IRMs. Key findings will contribute to the following priority outputs under the IRM Project:

- Regulatory framework for IRM reintegration and rehabilitation strengthened (Output 1)
- Capacity of service providers to network and address long term needs of involuntary returned migrants improved (Output 3)

B. Objectives of the Consultancy

The goal of the consultancy is to undertake an islandwide study on the rehabilitation and reintegration of IRMs in Jamaica. In so doing, the consultant will execute several tasks with deliverables under a contractual arrangement with the following objectives in mind:

- Complete a study on the rehabilitation and reintegration of IRMs in Jamaica using quantitative and qualitative methods. This study should include an understanding of:
  - IRM Personal background (education, level of employment, marital status, children, etc)
  - The need for services/programmes in support of the rehabilitation and reintegration of IRMs.
  - IRM access to services/programmes (including health care, jobs/skills training, etc)
  - Family dimensions of involuntary returned migrants
  - Challenges related to reintegration
  - Gender differences in needs and access to services, challenges to reintegration
  - Level of re-offending (e.g., incarceration, arrests and/or conviction) since deportation

- Validate study findings with stakeholders
- Provide recommendations to address ongoing challenges of the IRMs as identified in the study
- Provide suggestions on how study findings can inform Regulatory frameworks for reintegration of IRMs. These may include: Returns and Reintegration Policy, Standard Operating Procedure, Reintegration and Rehabilitation Strategy, Protocol for tracking IRMs.

B. Scope of work

Within the framework of this Terms of Reference, the Consultant will be required to complete all tasks detailed below.

Methodology

The study will adopt qualitative and quantitative techniques, with use of a questionnaire partially developed by the MNS, Crime Prevention and Community Safety Unit and UNDP. The consultant will use the partially drafted survey tool and add questions related to the scope. In addition it is expected that the consultant will develop the interview guides for information collected through qualitative methods, such as focus groups or in-depth interviews. The questionnaire, analysis and report will be informed by existing sources including but not limited to Re-Integration and Rehabilitation of Ex-offenders and Deported Persons Programme Baseline Study 2009: Deported Persons, Survey of the Reintegration of Deportees.
Sampling

Due to the confidential nature of the study, the sampling frame will be provided to the consultant. Since this is an island wide study there will be an effort to sample at least 10-15% of all TRMs stratified by parish. In addition, special consideration will be given to gender and other vulnerable groups (e.g., persons with disabilities, etc)

Deliverables

The table below provides a listing of all the key deliverables of this consultancy and the level of effort and timeline associated with each deliverable. The overall study is expected to take 4 months, including preparation, data collection, analysis and reporting. The assignment is expected to commence on February 2018 with the final report expected by May 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables/Output</th>
<th>Duration (Estimated # of days or weeks)</th>
<th>Timeline/Deadline</th>
<th>Schedule of Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inception Report</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>February 16, 2018</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Inception report (This report should include a detailed research methodology, a work plan with scheduled data collection, analysis, reporting; and draft data collection tool/guide. A meeting with UNDP/MNS should be held prior to this submission to agree on tools, design, and methodology, work plan and other details)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Report</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>March 13, 2018</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report (This report should follow the suggested report outline and provide the preliminary analysis and the data collected, challenges, limitations, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation Session</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>April 18, 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power point Presentation of key findings and recommendations to the Project Board and Technical Working Group for feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Final Report:</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>May 2, 2018</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final Report—including electronic and 2 printed copies (UNDP will provide the template for the front cover (which will have to be approved)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPLEMENTATION AND REPORTING ARRANGEMENTS

The consultancy will be for 75 non-consecutive working days over a four month period from December 2017 to March 2018. The duty station for the contract assignment will be Kingston, Jamaica.

The consultant will report to the Project Manager, the Manager, Diversions & Reintegration Manager at the Ministry of National Security and work in close collaboration with UNDP. As manager of the contract, UNDP Deputy Resident Representative (DRR) will provide quality assurance and oversight for the assignment. The substantial technical review and final approval of deliverables by the consultant will be performed by the Project Manager and the DRR, UNDP. Payments will be made upon receipt and approval by UNDP Jamaica CO. All work/documents associated with this consultancy is the property of UNDP and must be submitted before final payment will be made.

The report should be no more than 40 pages developed with respect to the following:

- Cover page (need to use UNDP cover page template)
- Table of Contents
- Acknowledgements
- List of Acronyms
- List of Charts (if applicable)
- Executive Summary
- Introduction/Background and Purpose
- Study Approach and Methods
- Limitations
- Findings
- Conclusions
- Recommendations to address ongoing challenges of the IRMs as identified in the study
- Annexes (e.g., data collection tools)

REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

1. Academic Qualifications/Experience

- The team leader must possess a Post Graduate Degree in Social Sciences, Statistics, Development Studies or any related field
- At least 10 years' experience in conducting baseline/evaluations for complex projects being implemented by Government, non-government or private sector actors
- A demonstrated understanding of issues with vulnerable populations, especially migrants
- Key reintegration standards for capacity building with communities and key stakeholders
- Will be an asset
- Demonstrated experience in designing survey methodology, developing data collection tools, data collection, processing and analyzing data.
- Strong organizational, analytical and reporting skills, presentation skills, attention to detail, ability to meet deadlines, and proficiency in Microsoft Office and qualitative data analysis software/tools
- Excellent communication and interpersonal skills and team oriented work style.
- Ability to interact effectively with communities, government and non-governmental service providers, including hosting government and partnership sessions/meetings
- Demonstrated experience in leading at least two similar assignments
- Previous experience working with local government systems, UN agencies and/or in Small Island Development States will be an asset.

APPLICATION PROCEDURE
Qualified and interested candidates are requested to apply no later than 25 September 2017. Please submit the following to demonstrate your interest and qualifications by explaining why you are the most suitable for the work:

- **Cover letter** explaining why you are the most suitable candidate for the advertised position.
- **Completed P11 form (Personal History Form)** (available on UNDP website) including past experience in similar projects and contact details of referees. Please also include a detailed CV.
- **Technical Proposal** – should include (a) detailed proposed strategy/methodology, work plan timeline; risks/limitations; consideration of a gender approach for assignment; (b) detailed profile of the expertise of the consultant, especially as it relates to scope of work;
- **Financial Proposal** – specifying a total lump sum amount for the tasks specified in this announcement. The financial proposal shall include a breakdown of this lump sum amount for the specified tasks (e.g., costs related to data collection, validation session, travel, and any other costs, including the number of anticipated working days). Overall, this financial proposal should include costs to deliver the work plan.

Incomplete applications will not be considered. Please make sure you have provided all requested documents.

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that would take into account both the technical qualification of individual Consultants as well as their financial proposals. The contract will be awarded to the candidate obtaining the highest combined technical and financial scores. UNDP retains the right to contact references directly. Due to large number of applications we receive, we are able to inform only the successful candidates about the outcome or status of the selection process.

**Technical Evaluation Criteria**

**Academic Qualifications** 15%
- Post Graduate Degree in Social Sciences, Statistics, Development Studies or any related field – 15%

**Skills and Experience** 40%
- Demonstrated experience in designing survey methodology, design of data collection tools, data collection processing and analyzing data – 20%
- At least 10 years’ experience in conducting baseline/evaluations for complex projects being implemented by Government, non-government or private sector actors – 10%
- A demonstrated understanding of key reintegration standards for capacity building with communities and key stakeholders will be an asset – 10%

**Competencies** 15%
- Excellent command of the English Language and drafting ability as demonstrated by technical proposal – 15%

Points awarded as follows:
- Clarity (3 points)
- Specificity (3 points)
- Language (3 points)
- Feasibility (3 points)
- Approach to work (3 points)

**Total Technical Score** 70%
UNDP is committed to achieving workforce diversity in terms of gender, nationality and culture. Individuals from minority groups, indigenous groups and persons with disabilities are equally encouraged to apply. All applications will be treated with the strictest confidence.

Approval

Signature
Name Elsie Laurence-Chounoune
Deputy Resident Representative
Date 13 Dec. 2017

Approval

Signature
Name Rohan Richards
Chief Technical Director
Date 12 Dec. 2017
Reintegration and Rehabilitation of Involuntary Returned Migrants (IRMs) Survey

Dear Respondent, thanks for taking the time to be part of this study on the Reintegration and Rehabilitation of Involuntary Returned Migrants (IRMs). The information you provide is confidential and will be only be used to help organisations develop programmes to better serve you. Please do not write your name as everything is anonymous and private. If you wish, you can be provided with access to a copy of the report which will be written to present the findings of this study. Please be honest and complete ALL the questions. Thanks again for your time.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Age last birthday
2. Sex/Gender Male [ ] Female [ ] Other [ ]
4. Education (stage completed): Primary [ ] Secondary [ ] Skill certificate [ ]
   Tertiary college certificate [ ] University Bachelor’s degree [ ] Postgraduate degree [ ]
   Please specify the name of the certificate or degree.....................................................................................
   Other certification [please specify].....................................................................................
5. What other work SKILLS do you have? .....................................................................................
6. Employment status - Are you currently employed? Yes [ ] No [ ]
   a. If employed are you are you: Self-employed [ ] Employed full time [ ] Employed part time [ ]
   b. If you are unemployed are you :
      Out of work and looking for work [ ] Retired [ ] Unable to work [ ]
      Other, please state .....................................................................................

PLACE OF ORIGIN

7. Where in Jamaica were you born? Parish.......................................................... Community ..........................................................
8. Which country/countries did you live in while you were in high school? Indicate all that apply.
   Jamaica [ ] Other Caribbean [ ] [please state where]..........................................................
   UK [ ] USA [ ] Canada [ ] None of the above state where? ..........................................................
9. What was your community like for you - when you were growing up?
   Very good [ ] Fairly good [ ] Neither good nor bad [ ] Not so good [ ] very bad [ ]
10. Are you currently living in the district/community where you:
    Grew up as a youth? Yes [ ] No [ ]
    Left the 1st time you went abroad? Yes [ ] No [ ]
    No, a different place than before? Yes [ ] No [ ]
RESIDENCY ABROAD

11. How old were you when you FIRST left Jamaica to go abroad? .............................................

12. Were you working legally while living overseas? Yes [ ] No [ ]

13. Did you serve in the military in the country you were deported from? Yes [ ] No [ ]

14. Which country were you LAST deported from? Caribbean [state where] .................................
    UK [ ] USA [ ] Canada [ ] none of the above [ ] [state where] .................................

15. WHICH YEAR were you last deported to Jamaica? ..........................................................

16. How long were you in that particular country at the last time you were deported to Jamaica?
    ............... years ............... months

FAMILY

17. Do you have any close family or relatives in the country from which you were deported?
    Yes [ ] No [ ]

18. If yes, does this include: A parent [ ] Spouse/ partner [ ] Sibling [ ]
    Child/children [ ] [please state the ages of children] .................................
    Other relatives [ ] [please state indicate] ..........................................................

19. Do you have any family living in Jamaica? Yes [ ] No [ ] Parent spouse/ Partner [ ] Sibling [ ]
    child/children [ ] [ages of children] ................................. Other relatives [ ]

EXPERIENCE SINCE RETURN TO JAMAICA

20. How did you feel when you were FIRST deported to Jamaica? You were:
    Happy [ ] Sad [ ] Denial/Shock [ ] Angry [ ] Ashamed [ ] Hopeless [ ]

21. How do you feel now? You are:
    Happy [ ] Sad [ ] Denial/Shock [ ] Angry [ ] Ashamed [ ] Hopeless [ ]

22. What are your living arrangements now? Is your accommodation
    Permanent [ ] Temporary/For the time being [ ] Temporary at a shelter [ ]
    I am not sure [ ] staying with someone [ ] nowhere to live [ ]

23. Have you ALWAYS HAD SOMEWHERE TO LIVE since you were deported? Yes [ ] No [ ]

24. How much do you see &/or interact with your family members in JAMAICA?
    A lot [ ] A fair amount [ ] Now and then [ ] Hardly ever [ ] Not at all [ ]
    I have no family here [ ]

25. How much do you communicate with your family members who are LIVING ABROAD?
    A lot [ ] A fair amount [ ] Now and then [ ] Hardly ever [ ] Not at all [ ]
    I have no family abroad [ ]

26. Are your close friends NOW those persons who you knew BEFORE you travelled abroad?
    Yes [ ] Almost all [ ] Most of them [ ] Half and half [ ] Hardly any [ ] None at all [ ]
Reintegration and Rehabilitation of Involuntary Returned Migrants (IRM) Survey

Dear Respondent, thanks for taking the time to be part of this study on the Reintegration and Rehabilitation of Involuntary Returned Migrants (IRM). The information you provide is confidential and will be only be used to help organisations develop programmes to better serve you. Please do not write your name as everything is anonymous and private. If you wish, you can be provided with access to a copy of the report which will be written to present the findings of this study. Please be honest and complete ALL the questions. Thanks again for your time.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Age last birthday
2. Sex/Gender Male [ ] Female [ ] Other [ ]
4. Education (stage completed): Primary [ ] Secondary [ ] Skill certificate [ ] Tertiary college certificate [ ] University Bachelor's degree [ ] Postgraduate degree [ ]
   Please specify the name of the certificate or degree .......................................................................................
   Other certification [please specify].......................................................................................
5. What other work SKILLS do you have? .......................................................................................
6. Employment status - Are you currently employed? Yes [ ] No [ ]
   a. If employed are you are you: Self-employed [ ] Employed full time [ ] Employed part time [ ]
   b. If you are unemployed are you: Out of work and looking for work [ ] Retired [ ] Unable to work [ ]
   Other, please state .......................................................................................

PLACE OF ORIGIN

7. Where in Jamaica were you born? Parish.............................................. Community ..............................................
8. Which country/countries did you live in while you were in high school? Indicate all that apply.
   Jamaica [ ] Other Caribbean [ ] [please state where] .................................................................
   UK [ ] USA [ ] Canada [ ] None of the above state where? ..............................................
9. What was your community like for you - when you were growing up?
   Very good [ ] Fairly good [ ] Neither good nor bad [ ] Not so good [ ] very bad [ ]
10. Are you currently living in the district/community where you:
   Grew up as a youth? Yes [ ] No [ ]
    Left the 1st time you went abroad? Yes [ ] No [ ]
    No, a different place than before? Yes [ ] No [ ]
RESIDENCY ABROAD
11. How old were you when you FIRST left Jamaica to go abroad? .........................
12. Were you working legally while living overseas? Yes [ ]       No [ ]
13. Did you serve in the military in the country you were deported from? Yes [ ]       No [ ]
14. Which country were you LAST deported from? Caribbean [state where] .........................
   UK [ ]       USA [ ]       Canada [ ]                 none of the above [ ] [state where] .........................
15. WHICH YEAR were you last deported to Jamaica? ..............................................
16. How long were you in that particular country at the last time you were deported to Jamaica?
       ........................ years  ........................ months

FAMILY
17. Do you have any close family or relatives in the country from which you were deported?
       Yes [ ]       No [ ]
18. If yes, does this include:  A parent [ ]       Spouse/ partner [ ]       Sibling [ ]
       Child/children [ ] [please state the ages of children] .................................
       Other relatives [ ] [please state indicate] .....................................................
19. Do you have any family living in Jamaica? Yes [ ]       No [ ]
       Parent spouse/ Partner [ ]       Sibling [ ]
       child/children [ ] [ages of children] ...............................       Other relatives [ ]

EXPERIENCE SINCE RETURN TO JAMAICA
20. How did you feel when you were FIRST deported to Jamaica? You were:
       Happy [ ]       Sad [ ]       Denial/Shock [ ]       Angry [ ]       Ashamed [ ]       Hopeless [ ]
21. How do you feel now? You are:
       Happy [ ]       Sad [ ]       Denial/Shock [ ]       Angry [ ]       Ashamed [ ]       Hopeless [ ]
22. What are your living arrangements now? Is your accommodation
       Permanent [ ]       Temporary/For the time being [ ]       Temporary at a shelter [ ]
       I am not sure [ ]       staying with someone [ ]       nowhere to live [ ]
23. Have you ALWAYS HAD SOMEWHERE TO LIVE since you were deported? Yes [ ]       No [ ]
24. How much do you see &/or interact with your family members in JAMAICA?
       A lot [ ]       A fair amount [ ]       Now and then [ ]       Hardly ever [ ]       Not at all [ ]
       I have no family here [ ]
25. How much do you communicate with your family members who are LIVING ABROAD?
       a lot [ ]       A fair amount [ ]       Now and then [ ]       Hardly ever [ ]       Not at all [ ]
       I have no family abroad [ ]
26. Are your close friends NOW those persons who you knew BEFORE you travelled abroad?
       Yes [ ]       Almost all [ ]       Most of them [ ]       Half and half [ ]       Hardly any [ ]       None at all [ ]
27. How do you feel you were treated by persons in authority (e.g. government officials, managers at organisations, police etc.), since you were deported to Jamaica?
   Very fairly [ ]        Quite fairly [ ]        Neither one way or the other [ ]        Unfairly/Badly [ ]
   Very badly/Mistreated [ ]

28. Are you currently engaged in any of the following kinds of non-paid activity?
   Studying/training [ ]        doing volunteer work [ ]        apprenticeship [ ]

ACCESS TO SUPPORT SERVICES

29. Were you offered any financial assistance or rehabilitation payment from the country you were deported?  Yes [ ]        No [ ]        Not applicable [ ]

30. Did you accept/receive any help from the UK's Facilitated Return Scheme (FRS)?
   Yes [ ]        No [ ]        Not applicable [ ]

31. Have you received any form of support from family members? Yes [ ]        No [ ]
   If yes, what kind? financial [ ]        emotional [ ]        help in getting documentation [ ]
   help with finding accommodation [ ]        other ..............................................................
   From whom? Jamaica: Parents [ ]        Spouse [ ]        Children [ ]        Sibling [ ]        Other relatives [ ]
   Abroad: Parents [ ]        Spouse [ ]        Children [ ]        Sibling [ ]        Other relatives [ ]

32. Who or which organization did you get the MOST HELP from when you were deported to Jamaica?
   FRS [ ]        NODM [ ]        Open Arms [ ]        Open Heart [ ]        Portland Rehabilitation [ ]
   FURI [ ]        Family members [ ]        Government of Jamaica [ ]        Friend/s [ ]
   other [ ] [state who/which organization] ___________________________; I received NO help [ ]

33. If you received some help when you were deported, what kind of help was it? (Indicate all that apply)
   Money [ ]      Skills training [ ]        Help in getting documentation [ ]
   help with finding accommodation [ ]        Transportation [ ]        Care packages [ ]
   Group discussion [ ]        Anything else? [Please state what it was] __________________________

34. Was the assistance offered to you:
   Very helpful [ ]        Fairly helpful [ ]        Not really helpful [ ]        Not at all helpful [ ]
   I didn’t get any help [ ]

35. Are you aware of any benefits that you might have been entitled to?
   a. Yes [ ]        No [ ]
   b. If yes, what are they?  Social Security [ ]      Disability [ ]     Pension [ ]        Insurance [ ]
   Other [ Please state ] __________________________

36. Have you obtained any certified skills since your deportation?

37. If yes, please state in which area(s) __________________________

38. How was it paid for?        Self [ ]        Family/friends [ ]        Government [ ]
   Community/Non-government organisation [ ]        Other [please specify] __________________________

39. Are those skills being used in current employment?  Yes [ ]        No [ ]

40. What was the BEST THING that happened to you after you came back to Jamaica?
   Family Related [ ]        Making a New Start [ ]        Sense of Freedom [ ]
   Nothing [ ]        Other __________________________

41. What are the challenges you faced since being deported?
Accommodation related [ ]  Financial related [ ]  Family related [ ]  Health related [ ]
Difficulty getting documentation [ ]  Being a victim of crime [ ]
Other ..............................................................

42. Do you find it difficult to access certain services because of your gender? Yes [ ]  No [ ]

43. If yes, what service(s) ............................................................................................................................

44. Are you familiar with the Windrush Generation scheme? Yes [ ]  No [ ]
a. If ‘Yes’, do you believe you fall within any of the categories? Yes [ ]  No [ ]

45. What are your MAIN suggestions to improve the situation for persons deported?
Family support [ ]  Job/work related [ ]  Accommodation related [ ]  Financial related [ ]
Emotional/psychosocial support [ ]
Other ...................................................................................................................................................................

46. What services or programmes would you like the government to put in place to assist persons who have been deported?
Counselling services [ ]
Fast tracking of the time taken to issue IDs and other documents [ ]
More accommodation [ ]
Providing NGOs with more resources to enable them to better work with deported persons [ ]
Public education to reduce the stigma [ ]
Re-training / re-certification / skills training [ ]
Other ...................................................................................................................................................................

47. What areas of training would you recommend for persons who have been deported?
...................................................................................................................................................................

* * * * * * * *

HEALTH
48. Have you had any serious health issues since being deported to Jamaica? Yes [ ]  No [ ]

49. If YES, do you care to say what they are/were?
...................................................................................................................................................................

50. Have you received any treatment? Yes [ ]  No [ ]

51. If yes, where did you receive this treatment?
Local clinic [ ]  Public hospital [ ]  Private facility [ ]

52. How was the service/treatment you received for these health issues since you were deported?
Very good treatment [ ]  Fairly good [ ]  Neither good or bad [ ]  Not really bad/none at all [ ]
No health issues/not applicable [ ]

53. Do you have any SUBSTANCE ADDICTIONS?
Now or in the past [ ]  No [ ]

54. If you now have, or in the past had addictions, is/was this for Alcohol [ ]  Narcotic drugs [ ]  Both [ ]
Other [ ] (state what) ...................................................................................................................................................................

55. If you still have this addiction, are you receiving any treatment for it?
Yes [ ]  No [ ]

56. Did you in the past, receive any treatment for it?
Yes[ ]  No [ ]
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57. If YES, what was the result of the treatment? Completely cured [ ]
   Much better [ ] I didn’t keep it up [ ] It hardly helped [ ] Didn’t help at all [ ]

58. What types of sexual relationship are you currently engaged in?
   Visiting [ ] Casual [ ] Married [ ] Common Law [ ] Other [ ]

59. How long is your current relationship been going?
   1-3 months [ ] 4-6 months [ ] 7 -12 months [ ] Over a year - 2years [ ] Over 3 years [ ]

60. Do you normally use a condom during sex?
   Always [ ] Sometimes [ ] Never [ ]

61. Did you use a condom the last time you have sex?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

62. If not what are your reasons for not using a condom?
   Did not have ready access to a condom [ ] Condom takes away from the pleasure [ ]
   Other reason [ ], please explain ......................................................................................................................

63. Is it easy for you to access condoms when you need one?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

64. What do you think are your chances of contracting HIV/AIDS are?
   No chance [ ] Little chance [ ] Moderate chance [ ] Good chance [ ] Unsure [ ]

65. Have you done an HIV Test in the 12 months
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

**PENAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE OFFENCES**

66. Did your deportation result from a criminal offence [ ] or immigration offence [ ]?
   Or both criminal and immigration [ ]

67. What were you charged with? ......................................................................................................................
   Does not want to say [ ]

68. What happened after you were charged with the offence? (indicate all that apply)
   Prison [ ] Other form of detention [ ] Given bail [ ]

69. How do you feel you were treated by persons in authority (e.g. government officials) in the country
   from which you were deported?
   Very fairly [ ] quite fairly [ ] Neither one way or the other [ ] Unfairly/badly [ ]
   Very badly/was mistreated [ ]

70. If you were badly treated, in what ways did this happen? (indicate all that apply)
   Physical [ ] Administrative [ ] Verbal abuse [ ]

71. Give examples about the treatment you received ..........................................................................................

72. Since you were deported, have you ever been arrested or charged with an offence? YES [ ] No [ ]
73. Do you have any of the following documents:

- Jamaican Birth Certificate? Yes [ ] No [ ]
- Tax Registration Number (TRN)? Yes [ ] No [ ]
- National Insurance? Yes [ ] No [ ]
- Voter’s /National ID? Yes [ ] No [ ]
- Jamaican Driver’s License? Yes [ ] No [ ]
- Driver’s License from an issuing country that is NOT Jamaica? Yes [ ] No [ ]
- Jamaican Passport? Yes [ ] No [ ]
- Do you have any other Passport NOT issued by Jamaica? Yes [ ] No [ ]
- Do you have any other Jamaican ID or documentation? Yes [ ] No [ ]
- Any other foreign ID or documentation? Yes [ ] No [ ]
3.3.3 Annex C Interview Protocol

Pre-Interview Script. This interview will ask questions about different moments in your experience before and after your deportation to Jamaica. I will be electronically recording the interview so that it can be transcribed later. The audio recording will be destroyed as soon as the interview is transcribed. You may stop the interview at any time or refuse to answer any questions that make you uncomfortable.

1. First I would like to ask you about the circumstances surrounding the beginning of the deportation process.
   a. Which country were you deported from?
   b. Why were you deported to Jamaica?
   c. How long since you have been deported and where are you currently living?
   d. Were you ever detained in a detention or penal facility?
      i. How long were you detained or incarcerated before you were deported?
      ii. Were you allowed any type of contact or communication with your family during the detention period? Please describe.
   d. Were you ever charged or convicted of a crime in the country where you were deported from?
   e. What was this period before the deportation like for you and your family?
   f. What emotions did you experience when you first learnt you would be deported?
   g. How did you cope during this period?
   h. Looking back, is there anything you would do the same way and anything that you wish you had done differently?

2. Now, I will be asking you about the period following the actual deportation.

   a. Tell me about your experiences in the first 48 hours after landing in Jamaica? What emotions did you experience? (Make a note of which airport the person arrived as well as whether it was on a chartered or commercial flight.)
   b. If you have children, what changes happened for your children? (Probe: emotional, social, behavioural, academic, contact with partner)
   c. What changes happened in the family following the deportation? (Probe: child care arrangements, work, household chores, contact with partner)
   d. How did you make sense of these changes? What did you tell yourself about it?
   e. Did you have support during the first few weeks after you first arrived in Jamaica? If so, what kind? (Probe: people, organizations, activities)
   f. What support or resources were most helpful? What would you have wished you had during this time?
   g. What else did you do or happened that helped you cope during this period?
   h. How was the relationship between you and your partner affected?
   i. How was the relationship between your partner and your children affected?

4. How has life been for you in the last few months/years since your deportation? (Probe: employment status, living arrangements, acquisition of new skills, new partnerships/children etc)

5. Is there anything else you would like to add regarding your experience of your deportation that would be important for me to know?

7. If the Government of Jamaica was to design a programme for deported persons, from your perspective, what should the ideal programme look like?

8. Do you mind sharing your hopes and dreams for the future?

9. Is there anything else you would like to share that has not been discussed?
3.3.4 Annex D List of documents consulted in the desk review

- Government of Jamaica, Jamaica Reducing Re-Offending Action Plan (JRRAP), 2009
- Government of Jamaica, National Crime Prevention and Community Safety Strategy, October 2010
- Government of Jamaica, Returns and Reintegration Policy and Procedural Guideline (Deportation Policy) – DRAFT

3.3.5 Annex E Contact List for NGOs supporting the IRMs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>Contact Persons</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portland Rehabilitation Management</td>
<td>Ms Amanda Thompson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:prmjamaica@gmail.com">prmjamaica@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(876) 993-9166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Arms Drop-in Centre</td>
<td>Mrs Yvonne Grant, Ms Natasha Malcolm</td>
<td><a href="mailto:openarmscentre@gmail.com">openarmscentre@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(876) 938-1757/806-3070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Heart Charitable Mission</td>
<td>Mr Robert Clare</td>
<td><a href="mailto:openheartcharitablemission@live.com">openheartcharitablemission@live.com</a></td>
<td>(876) 979-9097/409-8070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Organisation for Deported Migrants</td>
<td>Mr Oswald Dawkins</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nodmjamaica@gmail.com">nodmjamaica@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(876) 356-1126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Unification and Resettlement Initiative</td>
<td>Ms Marlene Brown</td>
<td><a href="mailto:firstborn2005@yahoo.com">firstborn2005@yahoo.com</a>, <a href="mailto:familyunif_int@yahoo.com">familyunif_int@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>(876) 353-4739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PM Urges UK Government to Quickly Address Windrush Matter

Prime Minister Andrew Holness has urged the Government of the United Kingdom to move quickly to decisively and fairly deal with the plight of persons known as the Windrush generation.

Despite living and working in the UK for decades, thousands of people who arrived in the country as children in the first wave of Commonwealth migration (called the Windrush Generation) were being threatened with deportation.

Many of those affected are of Jamaican and Caribbean heritage.

Speaking following a meeting with British Prime Minister Theresa May in London today (April 17), Prime Minister Andrew Holness said the British Government must address the matter.

“We were particularly encouraged by your Home Secretary’s statement in Parliament yesterday, which not only recognized the invaluable contribution of Caribbean nationals to the rebuilding of the United Kingdom after World War II, but also animates a process which will ensure that these persons who arrived pre-1973 will have their cases reviewed with haste and with the required sensitivity,” said Mr. Holness.

The Prime Minister who made a statement to the media outside 10 Downing Street said it is important to address the matter fairly and justly.

“We think however that it is extremely important to have procedural steps clearly outlined and widely shared to ensure that people are aware of the requirements; that the evidentiary burden is reduced, the application process dramatically simplified and that pre-1973 Commonwealth Caribbean migrants currently detained as illegal immigrants are released and that those deported are afforded the necessary UK assistance in having their cases urgently reviewed and their rights restored. We would like to encourage the UK government to use records at its disposal such as school, health, and tax records and that there be a presumption of legal residence on the part of the Windrush Generation while their cases are being reviewed and that these individuals continue to benefit from access to medical care, employment, and other services,” added Prime Minister Holness.