Cross Border Coordination & Global Governance Challenges : A Review on Rohingya Refugee Crisis

Mehruba Islam

Abstract

Leaving no refugee behind is the newly incorporated indicator on refugees in the global agenda SDG. This specific indicator in SDG framework is a game-changer in global governance. At present throughout the world, around 65.6 million people are identified as refugee. Significant portion of the global refugees are from developing countries, mostly hailing from Asia. At present, Bangladesh is weighed down with more than 1.1millon Rohingya refugee. Although the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) is working with the mandate to protect refugees, and assist them through voluntary repatriation, no noteworthy progress has yet been observed in this regard. The ongoing Rohingya refugee crisis of Bangladesh has turned into a regional crisis with regional consequences which is the reflection of regional governance gap. Nevertheless, a wide range of factors like poor local, regional and global governance fueled the growing refugee trend along with poor coordination problems. The study identifies the gaps and debates around refugees in the field of global governance. The study has pointed out the role and effectiveness of multilateralism in regional and global institutions regarding the refugee issue. This study also recommended the necessity of institutional networking to ensure effective regional and global governance in order to manage refugee crisis. In addition, the necessity of coordination among global institutions has been emphasized for better refugee management that aims atsafe repatriation and resettlement plan. Nevertheless, coordination networking among international and regional bodies is mostly important to resolve the refugee issue.

Keywords :
Refugee, Resettlement, Governance gap, Multilateralism, Repatriation plan, Coordination networking

Introduction

Refugees are the forcibly displaced person who have fled from their country of origin. Around 65.6 million people in the world are identified as refugee because of persecution and violence which is the highest ever after World War II (Bank &Fröhlich, 2018). Among them 20 million including 7 million children have to run away from their homeland. Around 86% of these refugees are from developing countries, mostly hailing from Asia. Conflicts in Syria, Afghanistan and Myanmar forced South Asia to host refugees from both within and outside the region (Ahmed, 2018). At present, throughout the world around 19.9 million refugees are surviving with bleak future. Among them around 8.7 millions are at Asia including 1.1 million in Bangladesh (Sharma, 2021).

Statement of the Problem

Bangladesh, the highly densely populated country of 160 million has to shelter 1.1 million rohingya refugees coming from the borderline country Myanmar.In addition, Bangladesh

Mehruba Islam, Senior Assistant Secretary (on Lien), Ministry of Public Administration

has to deploy both of her physical and human resource to manage the Rohingya refugees. This never-ending crisis has some other adverse consequences in the socio-economic lifeline of Bangladesh. Neither the global institutions nor the Myanmar government is concerned enough to start the repatriation process.Amidst such a humanitarian crisis, global governance has been identified as the single most powerful tool that could refer to political cooperation and negotiation in response to refugee problems and affect more than one state or region. However, coordination between different governments or international agencies is widely assumed as most amicable way to deal with the rohingya refugee challenges, where global leader will be the key governance actors to bind and treat all those issues properly towards achieving the safe repatriation objective. Notwithstanding the facts, UNHCR, the custodian agency for identifying policy and governance gaps in terms of SDG achievements for refugees, has not demonstrated any significant success.

Research Questions

1. What are the existing global governance gap while dealing with Rohingya refugee issue?
2. How the governance gap could be better addressed?

Research Methods

This qualitative study followed a secondary data analysis method as an approach to investigate on the research topic. This qualitative study attempts to drawing upon relevant literature and presents the existing theories and models focused on refugee management from governance perspective. The history of refugee crisis and the transitional challenges relating to forced migration has been examined for a better understanding of the research topic. This study also incorporates an in-depth analysis of open-access secondary documents which are focused on the global governance gap. In addition, the study used relevant quantitative data from secondary sources. Furthermore, the study covers in depth interviews of 10 students from Myanmar and a focus group discussion with15 international students from 15 different countries enrolled in various types of Master's program in the University of Melbourne, Australia. Their views have been incorporated in this study from the global governance perspective.

Literature Review

Refugee crisis mainly arise from two basic problem- first one is forceful migration due to political unrest situation or war, and another one is voluntary migration towards developed countries in search of better livelihood and work opportunity. However, the European context of refugee migration has been analyzed widely by several authors mainly from the point of pull and push factors to identify solutions to the problem. In reality, instead of

looking for solutions outside Europe, the EU and its Member States must reform asylum policy and support frontier states (Kugiel, 2016). In south asia, the refugee issue is mainly originated from internal and inter country conflict. Bangladesh, Iran and Pakistan are the best example of the refugee hosting country. Iran and Pakistan, the two countries are hosting large number of Afghan refugees. Both countries have continued to talk about returning refugees to their homeland, UNHCR did not pay any attention (Ahmed, 2016). It is therefore important to think of alternative options through which the host countries of South Asia can be supported. In this context, the North-South cooperation through greater engagement between the EU and the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) to address protracted refugee situations is needed. Despite criticism on its performance, the importance of SAARC cannot be ignored (Ahmed, 2019). Both UNHCR and Afgan have vested interested in Pakistan. Therefore, none of them are interested to start repatriation process. On the other hand, Pakistan was highly criticized for raising the repatriation issue of Afgan refugees in global arena (Gufran,2011).

Background of Rohingya Refugee Crisis

Most of the refugee crises in the history are triggered by internal conflicts in which ethnic identity is a prominent element and civilians are often used as weapons (Loscher, 2009). Indian subcontinent has refugee problem since British period. Rohingya refugees have been living in the place Rakhine (former name Arakan) for hundred years. After the independence of Burma in 1948 (now Myanmar) Arakan became part of Myanmar. In 1962, emergence of army coup and martial law in Myanmar, brought misfortune for these people (Islam, 2018).Rohingyas are the world's most persecuted Muslim minority residing in Myanmar for generations (Ahmed, 2010). Myanmar government has denied them as the citizens of Myanmar. The Rohingya have been experiencing ethnic and religious persecution within Myanmar's borders. Later on, hundreds of thousands have fled to borderline countries in including Bangladesh, Malaysia, Indonesia, and Philippines. The majorities of Rohingya refugees have runaway to Bangladesh and were settled in two officially registered refugee camps in the district of Cox's Bazar.

Recently, violence in Myanmar has turned into a devastating stage which forced 1.1 million refugees to abandon their homeland and take shelter in Bangladesh. Since the 1970s the Rohingyas have started to find their shelter in Bangladesh. In 2012, Bangladesh denied to accommodate the Rohingya refugees as its national security was threatened. Despite having asylum for more than 20 years some of the rohingyaare involved in anti-government activities along with drug peddling, social violence etc. Now in 2021, Bangladesh is once again on the jeopardy of analogous tricks.

Identified global governance gap in dealing with the Rohingya Refugee issue

Refugee crises are not new in world politics rather it is a persistent problem since the post-World War II. Generally, the refugees from the developing 'Third World' either remain in neighboring countries of first asylum or to return to country of origin (Lui, 2004). Currently nearly two-thirds of the world's refugees are in unending exile (UNHCR, 2009a). According to UNHCR, all the 25 countries mostly affected by the protracted refugee situations (PRS) are in the developing world (Guterres, 2010) and leading to political and security concerns for host countries through raising tensions between refugees, the local people and the international community (Loescher and Milner, 2005a). Such situations make the regional and global governance questionable as well as ineffective. Moreover, internal socio-political dilemma followed by communal conflict of a country or within two country or invasion by external country is the core cause of forced migration. Initially, refugee problem have effect on border and then it become a global problem, more specifically a matter of global politics. World history of refugee reflects the global political division from different angles. Geopolitical as well as geo-economic interests fuel the facts and decide the future of the destitute people.

Inter-State power politics and organizational role

State contributions to the UNHCR and state behavior is highly influenced by the international organization (Vayrynen, 2001). Alternatively, organizations like UNHCR are always in search of secure donor states (Roper &Barria, 2010). For instance - the Rohingya refugee problem arises from internal governance problem of Myanmar. To be more specific, China has a good private trade relation in Myanmar. Gas supply line of China passes over the area of Rakhine (the Rohingya occupant area) which needs to be clear up for their private benefit. Similarly, China and Russia placed veto on the recommendation of UN fact finding missions in creating UN backed safe zone creation in Myanmar to ensure safe rehabilitation of the Rohingya which is a barrier on global governance. China did it for the sake of attaining greater public benefit along with good diplomatic relation with borderline Myanmar government.In this regard, Castles (2003) states that- "The northern economic interests played a role in perpetuating local wars while also contributing to underdevelopment in the South through their trade and intellectual property regimes." (Castles, 2003:p.13-14)

However, Ruggie (1993) analyzed the state behaviors and used to examine the determinants influencing the Northern countries' contributions to protect refugee in the South. To promote cooperation approaches, the discrepancy of capabilities, bargaining power, the interests of the Northern countries, use of the UNHCR to develop Northern countries' awareness of the inter-linkage across issue-areas is important (Betts, 2008). For

instance – Norway and England have significant contribution in expanding education opportunity for refugee which reflects the global responsive attitude. Similarly, to ensure medical facilities in the refugee camps international NGO are working altogether in collaboration with UNHCR as private governance framework.

Regionalism

The ongoing Rohingya refugee crisis has been turned into a regional crisis with regional consequences which is the reflection of regional governance gap. It poses a decisive test for the 10ASEAN members due to lack of a political and legal framework. ASEAN's primary aim is to prevent the region's involvement in the great power rivalry and reinforce consultation and consensus, and focus on the peaceful resolution of inter-state disputes. Southeast Asian regionalism thus served to prevent foreign interference and enabled the member-states to focus primarily on internal affairs (Dosch, 2012). However, the non-interference policy in ASEAN's conduct of regional affairs has never been fixed (Jones 2010). The Philippines and Cambodia are the only two parties to the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees or its 1967 Protocol. Because of the principle "non-interference in the internal affairs of ASEAN Member States" as mentioned in the charter ASEAN remain silent. Notwithstanding this principle, Malaysia and Indonesia has taken a stronger stance on the protection of the Rohingya Muslims (Shivakoti, 2017). ASEAN has just started to develop legal human rights framework through the ASEAN Declaration of Human Rights (Orchard, 2016). Similarly, SAARC is quiet regarding the Rohingya issue although it is the south Asian association for regional cooperation. The norm of non intervention remains strict in case of non member countries. Bangladesh, a SAARC member and the host country of Rohingya refugee passed a resolution in the parliament demanding citizenship and the right of return for the Rohingya in Myanmar . Non cooperation among member countries among regional institution is vivid here.

Negotiation failure

Recently, UNHCR is emphasizing on repatriation and reintegration in the name of international security which was discouraged before 1980. Whenever the regional institution fails to make concrete decision then negotiation remains as the way to move the issue. Bilateral or multilateral negotiations are generally arranged to settle down conflict.

ASEAN Member States are Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam.

Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Nepal, the Maldives, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. SAARC comprises 3% of the world's area, 21% of the world's population. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/South_Asian_Association_for_Regional_Cooperation(Accessed on 9 May 2019) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_reactions_to_the_2016%E2%80%9317_Rohingya_persecution_in_Myanmar

On the other hand, voluntary repatriation is presented as the humane solution (Chimni, 1991). Bascom (1994), Harrell-Bond (1989), and Rogge (1994) have pointed out that inadequate studies are found on the solution of voluntary repatriation which is far from being the ideal solution. In this regard, theory of negotiations developed by Brams (1994) and Doherty (1993) examined negotiations in refugee crisis among a range of organizations and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). They identified that negotiations are done under the shadow of law where each organization or country as a bargainer knows its valuation and just wait for opposite bargainer to be evaluated where UNHCR is the mediator.

To address such problem, Zeager and Bascom (1994) referred to the theory of moves (Brams and Mattli, 1993; Brams, 1994) to repatriation negotiations. The 'moves model' states that the rational choice of moving depends on past, present and future choice which the mover can anticipate and able to rank between choices. Nonetheless, the 'theory of negotiations' suggested for the voice of the country of asylum as a separate player to make the choice to permit or deny settlement in the asylum country endogenous although a large number of people are obliged to leave their own countries and communities to seek safety elsewhere (UNHCR, 1995). But voluntary repatriation to the country of origin is unfortunately unlikely in a substantial number of cases despite it is thought as the ideal solution. The moves model also examines the motive of international community to assist the refugees where Zeager and Bascom (1996) pointed out only two players (country of origin and UNHCR) involved in the negotiations. The country of origin and UNHCR both will separately choose whether or not to allow repatriation and provide assistance to the refugees. If the negotiations are unsuccessful to produce a repatriation agreement then implicitly assume a host country that is willing to allow the refugees.

Absence of Multilateralism

Multilateralism, the opposite concept of bilateralisms evolves to synchronize the management of contentious issue. Multilateral negotiations are a management tool in the international politics (Hampson, 1995:6) and a key variable in global outcome which refers coordination among three or more states in accordance with certain principles (Ruggie, 1993:8). It has been established to erase the dilemmas in the effective coordination of humanitarian assistance activities which is still an elusive matter. Rather than vesting the authority of coordination in a single organization through top-down control, it is prudent to be timely to consider and encourage operational coordination of relief agencies as it is cost oriented (Stephenson, 2005). It is evident that the absence of multilateralism has aggravated the gap in the refugee governance scenario throughout the world. To overcome the situation, a centralized 'orchestration' capacity is regarded as the best way to serve in a 'wingman' function, buttressing rather than leading the coalitions (Thouez, 2018). For

instance, only Bangladesh is up roaring to repatriate the Rohingra to their homeland with all citizen rights. But in the absence of well-coordinated and unbiased multilateral institution, no visible progress is seen yet. Donor agencies under the banner of northern countries are busy with day to day service rather than considering the long term effect of refugee camp in a densely populated country.

Geo-politics and Geo-economics of Refugee

Geopolitical as well as geo-economic interests fuel the facts and decide the future of the destitute people. For instance-Myanmar is rich in gems, timber, oil, natural gas (both offshore and on shore) which are the matter of interest of USA based companies (Kuok, 2014). Furthermore, Myanmar's military link with North Korea is an important fact to keep friendly relation. On the other hand, USA has military defense in the Philippines that compact the geopolitical as well as geo-economics relation to greater extent. However, being a giant power USA's intention to invest in trade and defense is highly important to the countries with fragile socio-economic status. At present, apart from the Rohingya issue UNHCR has to concentrate in Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan regarding the similar issue. Within few years, global governance will definitely turn back towards newly raised issue and UN bodies will no more emphasize on the Rohingya issue like rest other countries. It will run routine project in a flexible manner only.

Inactive Coalitions

Recent refugee crises, through the lens of the United Nations (UN) illustrates that the states and the UN system is challenged to reconsider traditional hierarchies of power and influence as unilateral state action is no longer effective to solve global issue. Coalitions of the states, inter-governmental organizations, local governments and non-state actors are facing new challenges. Nevertheless, such coalitions are interdependent entity reflecting the multi-level governance interaction.

Poor Governance and inappropriate coordination in leadership

Governance and leadership in today's world is the reflection of an alloy of continuities and discontinuities (Lampton, 2014). 'Global governance' is a distinct issue (Weiss, 2000) is the combination of global democracy, global efficiency, global law, global leadership and global morality. Institutions linked with policymakers often failed to echo the policy impacts (Black, 2001). Economic convergences of the rising powers are viewed as global governance challenge (Kahler, 2013). Power politics is the underlying cause of the challenge. Problem within the institutional work design are also escalating the challenges. For instance- ASEAN abides by principles of compromise, consultation, and consensus endorsed by the United Nations. It is indeed true that ASEAN has limited capacity to

interfere in the Rohingya crisis as Myanmar has rejected offers to reconcile the situation, not just from ASEAN, but also from China as well. So the roles of neighboring countries and international bodies become limited in this regard .

Most difficult challenge identified from the background which requires attention from the governance body is the coordination in national-regional–global leadership system. Power politics is the underlying cause of the challenge. Problem within the institutional design like- United Nations, World Bank, ASEAN, SAARC, ICC are also escalating the challenges.

Effortless Support of Influential World Leaders

No single event like rohingya refugee ever had drawn such global attention and solidarity. Since the invasion of refugee in 2017, leaders from around the world have visited the refugee camps in Bangladesh. Despite the joint visit by the Secretary-General of the United Nations Antonio Guterres and the President of World Bank Group Jim Yong Kim, refugee crisis remains unresolved. Later on Nobel Laureates Mairead Maguire, Shirin Ebadi and Tawakkol Karman travelled to Bangladesh to observe the plight of the Rohingya.

High-level delegation from 58 countries of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC); a delegation from the U.N. Security Council and the European Union; a United States Congressional fact-finding mission and Dhaka-based diplomats have also observed the situation of refugees. From the visit of global leaders, it could easily be presumed that coordination and institutional arrangement gap are delaying the governance procedure in following ways-

Coordination Potholes

Since 2017, representatives of different government and international organization have visited rohingya camps in Bangladesh. In spite of the prompt visit, no visible coordination has yet been established. Neither the financial issue nor the repatriation issue has been in global discussion. USA donated 406 million dollar for refugee but did not take any more responsibility. On the other hand, China vowed for 6000 US dollar per family only if they repatriate to Myanmar. In case of institutional donation, World Bank provided 165 million US dollar. However, yearly 920 million US dollar is needed to manage the basic need of 1.1 million refugees more alarmingly the amount is not static, it is increasing every day (Moussalli, M. (1992).

Institutional arrangement gap

The UNHCR has emphasized on repatriation of Rohingya back to Myanmar which will be 'safe, voluntary and sustainable'. Later on Myanmar and Bangladesh signed a new repatriation agreement in November 2017. Despite the agreement, the UN noted that the situation in Rakhine is still not conducive to safe returns but UN did not take any measure to bring stability in Myanmar.

ILO (international labor Organization) could play a vital role through creating arrangement of agricultural labor supply to Middle East or any other country whoever needs it. It will create employment opportunity for the refugee. But ILO has separated them from the overall issue.ASEAN and SAARC are setting themselves apart from the bilateral issue but Rohingya refugee is a global issue that needs widespread attention.

Degradation of Law and Order Situation

In reality, over populated countries are reluctant to accept large numbers of refugees. Host country has to face enormous pressure to meet up the demand side including water, food, fuel, medicine etc. For instance, since 1970s the Rohingya refugees are staying in Bangladesh but the refugee surge of 2017 with more than 1.1 million bound her to lobby to international organization to force Myanmar to repatriate its citizen as Bangladesh herself is overpopulated with 160 million people within a land of 1,47,570 sq. km . Local governance system of Bangladesh becomes exhausted with managing the huge volume of refugee along with the law and security issues occurring within and outside camps. Despite having asylum for more than 20 years, some of the Rohingya are involved in anti-government activities along with drug peddling in the border. In 2017, Bangladesh denied accommodating the Rohingya refugees as its national security is consistently threatened by anti-social activities connecting to drug. Very recent report reveals that more than 25000 Rohingya counterfeit passport and fly abroad.

Environmental Governance in Risk

Worldwide environment is placed as the most important issue. But in refugee camps, both natural and human environment are in wilting status. For instance- in Bangladesh, government has to deforest the hill to make camps for the refugee. In addition, wood-based cooking fuel claim for further deforestation. Moreover, barren hills are highly vulnerable to land slide. Such a huge environmental damage can no longer be balanced by the government rather it will further derail the environmental governance activity in hilly area. Possible Solutions to Governance Challenge in Rohingya Refugee Issue

The fundamental principles of refugee protection are inclined by the new humanitarianism and to some extent it is transforming the character of UNHCR (Chimni, 2000). Networked

governance is an approach to problem solving that integrates the external capacities of organizations and individuals with government . The need for governments' action through new specialized multilateralism and internationalisms need to be well established to address the growing hyper-indebtedness in the global south and the accumulation of contradictions in the immigration regime prevalent in the global north (Sassen, 2002). The functional logic of international cooperation leads to hypotheses about the conditions under which the institution of multilateralism may be a feasible and efficient solution, as in coordination problems (Martin, 1992). To resist the weakening of global governance greater transparency, institutional flexibility and construction of informal transnational networks need to be combined altogether. Loscher (2009) mentioned that –

> "Greater inter agency cooperation, financial support and reinforcement of existing institutional mechanisms are the only effective ways for the international community, both to manage interdependent issues like refugee movements, and to ensure long-term global strategic stability."- Loscher, 2009: p. 44-48)

However, in April 2018, a MoU relating to voluntary return of Rohingya refugees was signed in between the UN Refugee Agency, Myanmar and the government of Bangladesh. Till today there is no significant attainment in repatriation. Recently, China offered to mediate between Myanmar and Bangladesh proposing a three-phase solution including setting up a Quadrilateral Coordination Committee between China, India, Bangladesh, and Myanmar. On the other hand, ASEAN and the international community need to play a supportive role in providing humanitarian support like restoration of infrastructure and providing aid to returning Rohingya refugees .If the world adopts preventive as well as conditional preventive measures on Myanmar then there would be a possibility to solve the Rohingya problem in a direct and time bound manner.

Global pressure

A durable solution for the Rohingya refugee depends on the ability to return Myanmar without violence and ensuring their protection under the rule of law (UN General Assembly, 1948). The overall solution to the Rohingya crisis is possible if two-way pressure on Myanmar is possible, for instance-Preventing remittance and imposing 100% economic sanctions on Myanmar. On the other hand, if Myanmar stared to return back it's citizen with all amenities then it will get back confiscated facilities proportionately. Simultaneously, ban on foreign investment in Myanmar can be imposed in similar way. International Communication ban can also be imposed as a tertiary measure of creating

---

https://medium.com/@thefaketree/5-lessons-from-a-networked-governance-organization-6c2e85032233 viewed on 11 May 2019.

pressure. Ignoring the fake argument of Myanmar relating to delayed repatriation procedure. For instance, Myanmar is denying to accept their citizen without verification which is surely a propaganda to delay the repatriation process. Effective lobbying with the five UN Security Council's members who has the power to impose economic, military and political sanctions on Myanmar.

Cross border coordination

The mandate of UNHCR needs extension to cover and oversee registration and protection. Nonetheless, to promote assistance to keep an eye on the agreement with international refugee law and assists for international refugee rights standards are essential. In addition, to seek long-lasting way out to refugee inflows towards borderline countries and to coordinate the fundamental requirements of the refugees, deliberate repatriation plan is also required. A reduced stress on social services rendering to refugees need to be ensured.

Burden sharing

During the Cold War, the Northern countries widely accepted resettlement within the context of the ideological conflict between East and west. In the past, the industrialized countries have advocated resettlement as a solution (Zolberg et al., 1989:272) and preferred resettlement to repatriation (Stoessinger, 1963). Coercion, competition, learning, and emulation are the factors of resettlement motivation (Soh, Kim& Yu, 2017). 'Burden-sharing' is also an internationally discussed as well as feasible concept of refugee resettlement. At present the solution of resettlement is offered to less than one per cent of the world's refugees (Loescher, 1996:148).

The needs and gaps of rohingya are increasing alarmingly. All those powerful and economically solvent countries as well as the institutions have to share the burden proportionately. The UN coordinated inter-agency rejoinder plan estimates around 434 millon USD humanitarian needs for 1.2 million people. A combined work plan focused on budget generation along with short term, midterm, long term rehabilitation or repatriation is the best way to share burden (Alam,1986).

It is time to step up policy advocacy in terms of international human rights law and legal frameworks, to consider the significant economic cost of the crisis, and to deconstruct and highlight critical humanitarian, political, gender and security issues (Dörschner&Machts, 2011). However, the global agenda of burden sharing includes- Humanitarian response; Protection Issues for all gender (Women & Children, disable), Direct Economic Cost, Legal Instruments, Sustainability, Security Issues (both national and global perspective, Geo-political Dimensions and Geo-Economics.

https://thediplomat.com/2018/10/aseans-limited-role-in-solving-the-rohingya-crisis/

Role of Bangladesh in global governance challenge resolution process

Bangladesh has always been an active player in favor of mobilizing global consent for Rohingya repatriation. Bangladesh does not want the rohingya to stay long-term. Rather, Bangladesh wants to overcome the challenges gradually. Firstly, Bangladesh plans to act out a well-built domestic legislation on the refugee. At the same time, Bangladesh plans to bring change in the immigration law with a curb in the flow of refugees. Secondly, Bangladesh needs to articulate bilateral or multilateral treaties with Asian countries for controlled refugee incursion. Finally, to pressurize Myanmar; Bangladesh has to influence the international communities.

In addition, Bangladesh needs to initiate immediate repatriation with the help of international assistance. However, creating education, healthcare, and employment opportunities for the Rohingya is ongoing besides this incorporation strong follow up on human and drug trafficking needs attention. Bangladesh also needs to deal with domestic, regional and international agencies, aid organizations, civil society and academic circles to formulate a sustainable as well as ethical solution to the crisis. Simultaneously, non-interference needs to be eradicated by regional organizations in humanitarian situations and active participation of ASEAN and SAARC can ensure better coordination in regional level to manage the refugee.

Key strengths of governance challenge

The crisis is complex, and solutions need to be multifaceted; however, international governments are well aware, and they could find ways to support Bangladesh and to find solutions to this crisis. A regional solution and global support platform has already been established where international organization and power leaders need to take the lead to execute visible and durable actions. A united approach by ASEAN members and partners could be taken to engage politically with the Government of Myanmar to bring an end to the displacement and provide humanitarian durable solution.

Key weaknesses of governance challenge

Internal historical, communal as well as political conflicts of Myanmar might not be resolved by global interfere but the torture on rohingya could be stopped through law. Long term financial support plan is needed to rehabilitate the penniless people and generate employment opportunity. However, Consensus among world power exercising leaders is not established yet. Moreover, coordination among global institution is not also synchronized yet to formulate a work plan to achieve goal.

Governance debates relating to Rohingya refugee aspect

UNHCR is the only UN body entitled to deal with refugee issue. At present apart from rohingya issue, UNHCR has to covert its concentration to Syria, Iraq, Afganistan regarding the refugee issue. Like rest other countries, refugee issue within few years UN bodies will no more emphasize on rohingya issue. The institution will run their routine project in a flexible manner and the host country will face enormous pressure to tackle the demand side including food, medicine and water supply. In addition to institutional factor, world leading power states would lose their interest day by day. Global governance definitely will turn back towards newly raised issue.

At a glance, this theoretical review reveals that the ongoing global governance is not proficient enough to successfully settle the refugee issue without hindering the interest of refugee or refugee hosting state. Recurrent change in governance framework, political as well as government system has significant impact on the applicability and exercise of relevant rules, policies or treaties.

The gap identified by in the study refers to growing disparity, division, tension and extremism, within and among nations regarding socio cultural issue. Secondly, within national government mechanism failure is evident in good governance. Thirdly, poor regional coordination deteriorates the diplomatic relation within states. Fourth and the foremost important point is the traditional way of governing without accounting or amalgamating the concept of hierarchy, multilateralism or orchestrations.

Conclusion

Rohingya crisis is no longer only a humanitarian calamity but a potential threat to Bangladesh's internal stability. Bangladesh finds itself in a fix trying to fulfill the national interests of the country, and uphold human security issues of Rohingya (Rahman, 2010). Parnini (2013) outlined the local and international responses to manage and resolve the Rohingya problems. For understanding the nature of this problem, the forced migration of the Rohingya to Bangladesh and its internationalization process are also need to be singled out. In addition, the approach should integrate developmental and humanitarian factors into the total picture of the Rohingya refugee problems within the framework of non-traditional security crisis. Bilateral negotiations between Bangladesh and Myanmar as well as democratization in Myanmar accelerated by the concerted efforts of the local and international communities can eventually bring about a durable solution to the Rohingya problems (Parnini, 2013).

In the competitive world, regionalism is rising because of failure in coordination (McLaren 2002). On the other hand, multilateralism is an unattained ideal and an established practice (Rosenberg, 2001). UNHCR since the early stage of its inception has been dependent on

NGOs as an operational partner to move beyond states to secure a broader donor base (Ferris, Elizabeth G. 2003). The implementation of refuge protection obligation needs a shift toward well managed and collectivized approach with sound implementation mechanism covering both the refugee rights and state interest (Hathaway, 2016).

Finally, the success of global governance solely depends on the effective institutional networking. Coordination through appropriate networking among international and regional bodies is equally important. UNHCR as an international organization to lead the refugee management task requires more authority to set network among states within and outside the pocket of conflict.These initiatives would actively contribute to overcome the governance gap. Furthermore, synchronization of the national-international NGO and individual state activity with adequate funding should mandatorily involve proper repatriation and resettlement guideline from UNHCR. Finally, UNHCR is solely responsible to lead the way forwardin collaboration with global institutions for the wellbeing of all Rohingya refugee residing in Bangladesh.

Reference

Ahmed, I. (Ed.). (2010). *The plight of the stateless Rohingyas: Responses of the state, society & the international community*. University Press.

Ahmed, Z. S. (2018). The Role of SAARC and EU in Managing Refugees in South Asia and Beyond: Potential for North-South Cooperation. *Global Policy*, 9(1), 76-84.

Ahmed, Z. S. (2019). Managing the refugee crises in South Asia: The role of SAARC. Asian and Pacific Migration Journal, 28(2), 210-219.

Ahmed, ZS (2013) Regionalism and Regional Security in South Asia: The Role of SAARC, New York: Routledge.

Ahmed, ZS (2019). Managing the refugee crises in South Asia: The role of SAARC, Asian and Pacific Migration Journal.

Akhtaruzaman, M. (2006). Legal Protection of Refugees under Bangladesh Laws. *Human rights and domestic implementation mechanism*, 175.

Alam, S. (1986). Charter of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation: A Critique. *Indian Journal of International Law (hereinafter IJIL)*, 26, 452.

Assembly, U. G. (1948). Universal declaration of human rights. *UN General Assembly*.

Bank, A., &Fröhlich, C. (2018). Forced Migration in the Global South: Reorienting the Debate.

BASCOM, J. (1994) 'The Dynamics of Refugee Repatriation: The Case of Eritreans in Eastern Sudan', in Gould, W. T. S. and Findlay, A. M. (eds.) Population Migration and the Changing World Order, New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Betts, A. (2003). Public goods theory and the provision of refugee protection: The role of the joint-product model in burden-sharing theory. *Journal of refugee studies*, 16(3), 274-296.

Betts, A. (2008). North-South cooperation in the refugee regime: The role of linkages. *Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations*, 14(2), 157-178.

Betts, A. (2013). The migration industry in global migration governance. In *The migration industry and the commercialization of international migration* (pp. 63-81). Routledge.

Black, R. (2001). Fifty Years of Refugee Studies: From Theory to Policy. *The International Migration Review*, 35(1), 57-78. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.ezp.lib.unimelb. edu.au/stable/2676051

Brams, S.J. (1994) Theory of Moves. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. BRAMS, S. J., And A. E. Doherty (1993) Intransigence in Negotiations: The Dynamics of Disagreement. Journal of Conflict Resolution 37:692-708.

Castles, S. (2003). Towards a sociology of forced migration and social transformation. Sociology 31, no. 1: 13–34.

Chimni, B. S. (1991). "Perspectives on Voluntary Repatriation: A Critical Note', International Journal of Refugee Law 3(3):541-547.

Chimni, B.S. (2000) Globalization, Humanitarianism and the Erosion of Refugee Protection, Journal of Refugee Studies, 13:3, 243–263.

Cutts, M. (Ed.). (2000). *The state of the world's refugees, 2000: Fifty years of humanitarian action*. Geneva: UNHCR, Oxford University Press.

Davies, J. S. (2012). Network governance theory: a Gramscian critique. *Environment and Planning* A, 44(11), 2687-2704.

Dörschner, J., &Machts, F. (2011). *The 1951 Convention relating to the status of refugees and its 1967 protocol: A commentary*. Oxford University Press.

DOSCH, J. (2011). Southeast Asia: ASEAN and the challenge of regionalism. In: M. K. CONNORS, R. DAVISON, and J. DOSCH, eds. *The new global politics of the Asia Pacific*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, pp.121-139.

Ferris, Elizabeth G. (2003). The role of non-governmental organizations in the international refu gee regime. In Problems of protection: The UNHCR, refugees, and human rights, ed. Niklaus Steiner, Mark Gibney, and Gil Loescher, 117-40. New York: Routledge.

Ghufran, N (2011) The role of UNHCR and Afghan refugees in Pakistan. Strategic Analysis 35(6): 945–954.

Hathaway, J. C. (2016). A global solution to a global refugee crisis. *European papers: a journal on law and integration*, 1(1), 93-99.

Islam, M. S. (2018). ROHINGYA ISSUES AND THE CHALLENGES OF BANGLADESH. *Academy*, (7 (34)). Retrieved from<https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/rohingya-issues-and-the- challenges-of-bangladesh> on 9 May 2019.

JONES, L. (2010). ASEAN's unchanged melody? The theory and practice of 'non-interference' in Southeast Asia. The Pacific Review. 23(4). pp.479-502.

Kahler, M. (2013). Rising powers and global governance: negotiating change in a resilient status quo. *International Affairs*, 89(3), 711-729.

Karns, M., & Karen, M. (2004). The politics and processes of global governance. Colorado: *Lynne Rienner Publishers*.

Kim, J. (2021). The role of international intervention in managing refugee crises: lessons from Vietnamese and North Korean refugee cases in China. The Pacific Review, 1-29.

Kuok, L. (2014). Promoting peace in Myanmar: *US interests and role*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Kugiel, P. (2016). The refugee crisis in Europe: true causes, false solutions. *The Polish Quarterly of International Affairs*, 25(4), 41-59.

Lampton, D. (2014). Governance and Leadership. In *Following the Leader: Ruling China, from Deng Xiaoping to Xi Jinping* (pp. 47-77). University of California Press. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.ezp.lib.unimelb.edu.au/stable/10.1525/j.ctt5hjhc0.7

Loescher, G. (1996). Beyond charity: International cooperation and the global refugee crisis: A twentieth century fund book. Oxford University Press.

Loscher, G. (2009). A Universal Mandate to Protect: The Challenges of Refugee Protection. Harvard *International Review*, 31(3), 44-48. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.ezp.lib.unimelb.edu.au/stable/42763321

Manyin, M. E. (2010). *US Accession to the Associaiton of Southeast Asian Naitons' Treaty of Amity and Cooperation* (TAC). DIANE Publishing.

Martin, L. L. (1992). Interests, power, and multilateralism. *International Organization*, 46(4), 765-792.

McLaren, J. (2002). A Theory of Insidious Regionalism. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 117(2), 571-608. http://www.jstor.org.ezp.lib.unimelb.edu.au/stable/2696436 (Accessed on 10 May 2019).

Milton, A., Rahman, M., Hussain, S., Jindal, C., Choudhury, S., Akter, S., & Efird, J. (2017). Trapped in statelessness: Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 14(8), 942.

Mohammad N. (2012) Refugee Protection Under the Constitution of Bangladesh: A Brief Overview. Refugee Watch (39) pp. 141-156.

Moussalli, M. (1992). Handbook on Procedures and Criteria for Determining Refugee Status under the 1951 Convention and the 1967 Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees. *Geneva: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees*.

Olson, Mancur, and Richard Zeckhauser. (1966). An economic theory of alliances. Review of Economics and Statistics 48:266-79.

Parnini, S. N. (2013). The crisis of the Rohingya as a Muslim minority in Myanmar and bilateral relations with Bangladesh. Journal of Muslim minority affairs, 33(2), 281-297.

Rahman, U. (2010). The Rohingya refugee: A security dilemma for Bangladesh. Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies, 8(2), 233-239.

Rogge, J. R. (1994). 'Repatriation of Refugees', in Allen, T. and Morsink, H. (eds.) When Refugees Go Home: African Experiences, UNRISD.

Roper, S., &Barria, L. (2010). Burden Sharing in the Funding of the UNHCR: Refugee Protection as an Impure Public Good. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 54(4), 616-637. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.ezp.lib.unimelb.edu.au/stable/20773710

Rosenberg, R. (2001). The OAS and the Summit of the Americas: Coexistence, or Integration of Forces for Multilateralism? *Latin American Politics and Society*, 43(1), 79-101. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.ezp.lib.unimelb.edu.au/stable/3177014 (Accessed on 10 May 2019)

Sassen, S. (2002). Governance hotspots: Challenges we must confront in the post-September 11 world. Theory, culture & society, 19(4), 233-244.

Sharma, Indrajit (2021).Indefinite Hosting of Rohingya Refugees a Growing Concern for Bangladesh. The Diplomat.Retrieved from https://thediplomat.com/2021/07/indefinite-hosting-of-rohingya-refugees-a-growing-concern-for-bangladesh/

Shivakoti, R. (2017). ASEAN's role in the Rohingya refugee crisis. *Forced Migration Review*, 56, 75-77.

Soh, C., Kim, M., & Yu, Y. (2017). The Emergence of New Resettlement Countries: A Human Rights Norm Cascade? *Journal of International and Area Studies*, 24(1), 105-124. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.ezp.lib.unimelb.edu.au/stable/44272882.

Stephenson, Jr, M. (2005). Making humanitarian relief networks more effective: operational coordination, trust and sense making. *Disasters*, 29(4), 337-350. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.0361-3666.2005.00296.x>

Stoessinger, G. (1963). The Refugee and the World Community, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Suhrke, A. (1998). Burden-sharing during refugee emergencies: The logic of collective versus national action. *Journal of refugee studies*, 11(4), 396-415. https://academic.o up.com/jrs/article-abstract/21/3/380/1540786

Thielemann, E. (2018). Why refugee burden-sharing initiatives fail: Public goods, free-riding and symbolic solidarity in the EU. JCMS: *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56(1), 63-82.

Thouez, C. (2018). Strengthening migration governance: the UN as 'wingman'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 1-16.

Väyrynen, R. (2001). Funding dilemmas in refugee assistance: political interests and institutional reforms in UNHCR. International Migration Review, 35(1), 143-167.

Vayrynen, Raimo. (2001). Funding dilemmas in refugee assistance: Political interests and institutional reforms in UNHCR. International Migration Review 35:143-67.

Weiss, T. G. (2000). Governance, good governance and global governance: conceptual and actual challenges. *Third world quarterly*, 21(5), 795-814.

Yesmin, S. (2016). Policy towards Rohingya refugees: a comparative analysis of Bangladesh, Malaysia and Thailand. J Asiatic Society Bangladesh (*Humanities*), 61(1), 71-100.

Yesmin, S. (2016). Policy towards Rohingya refugees: a comparative analysis of Bangladesh, Malaysia and Thailand. Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bangladesh (Hum.), 61(1), 71-100.

Zamindar, V. F. Y. (2007). The long partition and the making of modern South Asia: Refugees, boundaries, histories. Columbia University Press.

Zolberg, A. IL, Suhrke, A., and Aguayo, S. (eds.) (1989). Escape From Violence: Conflict and Refugee Crisis in the Developing World, New York: Oxford University.