

Summary Report
Regional Workshop on Human Rights-Based Approaches to Address Intersectionality of Vulnerabilities in the Context of Trafficking in Persons: Validation of the Zero Draft ASEAN Policy Brief on Disability and Trafficking in Persons: Strengthening Protection for Persons with Disabilities

7-8 May 2026
Laguna, the Philippines

Introduction

1. The ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR) in collaboration with the ASEAN Commission on the Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Women and Children of Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, the Philippines and Thailand, with the support of the Australian Government through the ASEAN–Australia Counter Trafficking (ASEAN-ACT) Program convened a workshop to present ASEAN Policy Brief on Disability and Trafficking in Persons: Strengthening Protection for Persons with Disabilities and provide participants with the opportunity to reflect on the document from their own national and professional contexts. It promoted a co-creation process in which ASEAN member states and stakeholders collectively learn from one another and jointly shape the policy brief. It also aimed to ensure that the policy brief reflects diverse regional perspectives, experiences, and realities.
2. The workshop was co-chaired by AICHR Philippines, SOMTC Philippines, ACWC Philippines, and AICHR Thailand. It was attended by 63 participants from across ASEAN Member States.

Session 1: Opening and Welcome Remarks

3. **H.E. Asst. Prof. Dr. Bhanubhatra Jittiang**, the Representative of Thailand to the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR) and Project Proponent, welcomed participants to the workshop and noted that it was the first regional activity dedicated to validating the zero draft of the ASEAN Policy Brief on Disability and Trafficking in Persons. He emphasised that trafficking in persons remains one of the most pressing human rights challenges in the region and disproportionately affects individuals facing multiple and intersecting vulnerabilities. He highlighted that the policy brief seeks to examine whether existing counter-trafficking systems are effectively reaching those most at risk of exploitation and exclusion.

Dr. Bhanubhatra further explained that the initiative builds on previous efforts led by the ACWC Representatives of Indonesia and Thailand, who initiated regional discussions on the intersection between disability and trafficking in persons and identified significant gaps in existing responses. He noted that the draft was informed by research conducted since 2023–2024 as well as the regional dialogue held in Bangkok in January 2025. Acknowledging the role of AICHR in advancing the initiative, he stressed that the policy brief remains a working document intended to encourage constructive feedback, critical reflection, and the incorporation of diverse perspectives rather than serve as a final regional consensus. In this regard, he underscored the importance of meaningful participation by persons with disabilities and individuals with lived experiences of trafficking, whose perspectives are essential in ensuring the relevance and credibility of the document.

He encouraged participants to openly share their views, including disagreements and recommendations, particularly where the draft may not fully reflect national contexts or where important issues may have been overlooked. He emphasised that meaningful outcomes could only be achieved through active dialogue, collaboration, and collective engagement among all

participants. He also expressed appreciation to the Australian Government, particularly the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) and the ASEAN–Australia Counter Trafficking (ASEAN-ACT) Program, for their continued technical and financial support.

4. **Asst. Secretary Lilian M. De Leon**, Representative of the SOMTC Philippines and Lead Shepherd on Trafficking in Persons, welcomed participants on behalf of the SOMTC Philippines. She recognised the leadership of ACWC, particularly Indonesia and Thailand, together with AICHR and the support of the Australian Government through ASEAN-ACT in advancing discussions on human rights-based approaches to addressing intersectional vulnerabilities in trafficking in persons. She noted that the workshop contributes to the implementation of the ASEAN Multisectoral Work Plan Against Trafficking in Persons 2023–2028 (Bohol TIP Work Plan 2.0), particularly Priority Area B.1.3.

Asst. Secretary De Leon emphasised ASEAN’s commitment to ensuring accessible protection, care, and support services for all victims of trafficking, including persons with disabilities. She highlighted that vulnerabilities associated with trafficking are often interconnected and shaped by factors such as disability, gender, poverty, migration status, and limited access to justice. These intersecting vulnerabilities, she noted, deepen exclusion and increase the risks faced by victims. She further explained that the policy guide under development is intended to serve as a strategic tool for policymakers, practitioners, and frontline responders by strengthening understanding of the complex realities experienced by victims and bridging the gap between policy commitments and operational practice.

She also observed that forms of exploitation affecting persons with disabilities are frequently underreported, misunderstood, and inadequately addressed. Nevertheless, she noted that ASEAN’s responses are becoming increasingly deliberate, practical, and action-oriented. She encouraged participants to contribute actively to the validation of the zero draft and to help shape a practical policy instrument that aligns with ASEAN frameworks, including the ASEAN Convention Against Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children (ACTIP), and broader regional commitments.

5. **H.E. Amaryllis Tiglao-Torres**, Chair of ACWC and Representative of the Philippines on Women’s Rights to ACWC, welcomed participants to the two-day workshop and reaffirmed ASEAN’s commitment to strengthening protection for persons with disabilities, particularly in the context of trafficking in persons. She noted that ongoing global challenges, including rising living costs, economic instability, energy insecurity, and conflict, continue to disproportionately affect poor, vulnerable, and marginalised communities, making it increasingly urgent to address the intersection between disability and trafficking.

H.E. Amaryllis highlighted poverty as one of the primary drivers of trafficking in persons, noting that traffickers often exploit individuals facing economic hardship and limited opportunities. She emphasised that persons with disabilities face heightened risks of trafficking due to factors such as discrimination, exclusion, limited access to information and services, and dependence on caregivers. She further observed that accessibility challenges extend beyond physical barriers to include communication, information, legal assistance, and access to justice. In some cases, she noted, dependence on caregivers may itself become a source of vulnerability when those entrusted with care facilitate or perpetrate exploitation.

She further noted that trafficking can also result in long-term or permanent disabilities, including physical injuries, traumatic brain injuries, mental health conditions, malnutrition, and other forms of medical dependency. As such, survivors of trafficking may themselves become persons with

disabilities as a direct consequence of exploitation. She emphasised that the policy brief, jointly advanced by ACWC and AICHR, seeks to strengthen protection measures for persons with disabilities and address the intersectional vulnerabilities that increase risks of trafficking.

In concluding her remarks, H.E. Amaryllis underscored the importance of ensuring that the policy brief is strategic, credible, and grounded in existing ASEAN human rights and anti-trafficking frameworks. She stressed that participants' expertise, experiences, and perspectives would be critical in shaping an effective and practical policy response. Noting that trafficking thrives in situations of silence, exclusion, and fragmented responses, she called for stronger regional coordination and collective ASEAN action to build more inclusive and effective protection systems for vulnerable populations.

Session 2: Introduction, Workshop Objectives and Agenda Overview

6. **H.E. Asst. Prof. Dr. Bhanubhatra Jittiang**, the Representative of Thailand to AICHR and Project Proponent, provided an overview of the background, objectives, and agenda of the workshop. He noted that trafficking in persons remains one of the key challenges facing the ASEAN region and continues to require coordinated regional responses. He emphasised that ASEAN Member States face significant challenges in addressing trafficking in persons, particularly when viewed through an intersectionality lens that recognises how multiple and overlapping vulnerabilities can increase individuals' risks of exploitation and exclusion.
7. Dr. Bhanubhatra explained that the workshop forms part of a broader initiative that produced two policy briefs, one focusing on disability and trafficking in persons and another examining broader intersectional vulnerabilities associated with trafficking. He noted that the studies and consultations undertaken under these initiatives informed discussions during the regional dialogue held in Bangkok in January 2025. The studies sought to explore how research findings and regional experiences could be translated into practical policy tools and instruments to strengthen ASEAN's responses to trafficking in persons. He further shared that the initiative originated from a proposal submitted to AICHR and subsequently evolved through collaboration with ACWC and other regional partners, reflecting ASEAN's commitment to strengthening regional cooperation and promoting inclusive responses that address the needs of persons with disabilities and other vulnerable groups.
8. Turning to the objectives of the workshop, Dr. Bhanubhatra explained that the workshop aimed to present the zero draft of the policy brief and provide participants with an opportunity to review and reflect on the document from their respective national and professional perspectives. Participants were encouraged to validate the key findings emerging from the studies and contribute technical inputs and recommendations to strengthen the draft. He emphasised that a key objective of the workshop was to promote a co-creation process through which ASEAN Member States and stakeholders could collectively learn from one another and jointly shape the policy brief. In this regard, he underscored the importance of maintaining an ASEAN-led process to ensure ownership of the final document by ASEAN Member States.
9. Dr. Bhanubhatra further noted that the workshop sought to ensure that the policy brief reflects diverse regional perspectives, experiences, and realities. Through discussions and exchanges among participants, the workshop aimed to contribute to the development of practical policy tools that can support future regional and national efforts to combat trafficking in persons and strengthen protection for persons with disabilities and other vulnerable groups.

10. He concluded by providing an overview of the workshop agenda, which included presentations on the draft policy brief, technical working sessions, and plenary discussions designed to facilitate the exchange of ideas and recommendations. He noted that discussions on the second day would focus on strengthening policy coherence between ASEAN regional frameworks and national-level initiatives, including consideration of how regional commitments can be aligned with national policies and implementation mechanisms. He emphasised that the workshop was designed not only to gather inputs for the policy brief but also to promote shared learning, collaboration, and regional cooperation among ASEAN stakeholders. The reflections, recommendations, and technical contributions generated throughout the workshop would inform the next stages of the policy brief development process and contribute to strengthening ASEAN's collective response to trafficking in persons and disability inclusion.

Session 3: Overview of the Zero Draft Policy Brief

18. **Dr. Elisabeth Jackson** of La Trobe University, Lead Researcher, joined the workshop virtually and presented the overview of the Zero Draft ASEAN Policy Brief on Disability and Trafficking in Persons. She explained that the draft was developed through a comprehensive research process that included desk reviews, national consultations across six ASEAN Member States, and a series of validation workshops. The research sought to better understand the intersection between disability and trafficking in persons and to identify practical measures to strengthen protection for persons with disabilities within ASEAN's anti-trafficking responses.
19. Dr. Jackson highlighted that the relationship between disability and trafficking in persons operates in two keyways. First, persons with existing disabilities may face heightened risks of trafficking and exploitation due to various social, economic, and structural barriers. Second, trafficking itself may result in disability through physical abuse, sexual violence, hazardous working conditions, psychological trauma, illness, and the absence of adequate medical and psychosocial support. She emphasized that disability should not be understood solely as an individual impairment but also as a consequence of barriers within society, including discrimination, inaccessible environments, communication barriers, and unequal access to information and services.
20. While persons with disabilities are widely recognized as a vulnerable population, Dr. Jackson noted that there remains limited data on the prevalence and characteristics of trafficking affecting persons with disabilities. Many cases remain hidden and underreported, particularly where exploitation occurs within families, communities, or other informal settings. As a result, only a small proportion of cases are identified and reported through formal systems.
21. Drawing on survivor consultations conducted during the research, Dr. Jackson illustrated how persons with disabilities may experience multiple forms of trafficking and exploitation, including sexual exploitation, forced labour, forced marriage, and forced begging. She noted that exploitation may occur across borders, within communities, or within family environments, and that perpetrators are often individuals who hold positions of trust or authority over victims. The consultations further demonstrated how trafficking can both exploit existing vulnerabilities and create new disabilities as a consequence of abuse and exploitation.
22. The research identified poverty, social exclusion, limited access to education, and employment discrimination as key drivers of vulnerability. Households that include persons with disabilities often face additional financial pressures related to healthcare, transportation, assistive devices, and caregiving responsibilities. Barriers to education, including inaccessible facilities, discrimination, bullying, and inadequate support services, may limit opportunities for persons with disabilities and reduce access to information on rights, trafficking risks, and available support mechanisms.

Similarly, employment discrimination and limited access to decent work opportunities may increase exposure to exploitative and unsafe forms of labour.

23. Dr. Jackson also reviewed the existing international, regional, and national frameworks relevant to disability inclusion and trafficking in persons. She noted that ASEAN Member States have established important legal and policy foundations through instruments such as the Palermo Protocol, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), and the ASEAN Convention Against Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children (ACTIP). While all ASEAN Member States have adopted national laws relating to disability rights and trafficking in persons, challenges remain in ensuring effective implementation due to resource constraints, institutional capacity gaps, and limited coordination across sectors.
24. The research identified several gaps in policy implementation and service delivery. These included challenges in victim identification and reporting, limited accessibility of reporting mechanisms and support services, insufficient disability inclusion knowledge among frontline responders, and communication barriers that hinder victim identification and evidence collection. Additional challenges were identified in relation to shelter accessibility, long-term recovery and reintegration support, psychosocial services, and access to specialized disability services, particularly outside urban centres. The research also highlighted significant barriers to accessing justice, including limited availability of legal aid, inadequate accessibility measures within justice institutions, and persistent misconceptions regarding the credibility and capacity of persons with disabilities to participate in legal proceedings.
25. In response to these findings, the Zero Draft Policy Brief proposes recommendations across five key areas: prevention; identification; support services and recovery; access to justice; and policy and legislative frameworks. The recommendations call for strengthening access to education, social protection, employment, and information for persons with disabilities; improving disability-inclusive victim identification mechanisms; enhancing the accessibility of shelters, hotlines, and support services; strengthening access to justice through reasonable accommodations and legal support; and integrating disability inclusion more explicitly into national and regional anti-trafficking frameworks. The recommendations further encourage stronger collaboration between disability and anti-trafficking stakeholders and promote the alignment of national policies and monitoring systems with ASEAN commitments and regional frameworks.

Session 4: Breakout Group Discussions – Critical Review of Key Sections of the Zero Draft Policy Brief

26. **Ms. Nurul Qoiriah** and **Ms. Lucia Pietropaoli** from the ASEAN-ACT facilitated the breakout group discussions. Participants were divided into eight facilitated groups to undertake a structured technical review of the Zero Draft Policy Brief. Discussions focused on four thematic areas, namely: (i) Prevention and Risk Reduction (Intersectional Vulnerabilities); (ii) Protection and Victim Support (Disability-Inclusive Responses); (iii) Access to Justice and Accountability; and (iv) Cross-Sectoral and Coordination Mechanisms.
27. The breakout discussions aimed to validate the key findings of the draft, identify gaps and emerging issues, strengthen the evidence base, and ensure that the analysis accurately reflects regional and national realities. Participants were also invited to identify additional issues and recommendations that may not yet be adequately reflected in the draft.

Session 5: Plenary Discussion on Breakout Group Results

28. During the plenary session, rapporteurs from each breakout group presented the key findings and recommendations emerging from their discussions. Participants subsequently provided additional reflections and technical inputs to further strengthen the Zero Draft Policy Brief. The key findings presented in this section represent a consolidated synthesis of the breakout group discussions and subsequent plenary deliberations.
29. Across the discussions on Prevention and Risk Reduction: Intersectional Vulnerabilities, participants identified poverty, income insecurity, social exclusion, stigma, limited livelihood opportunities, and barriers to inclusive and tailored education as the primary structural drivers of trafficking risk for persons with disabilities. These conditions increase dependency, restrict access to information and services, and reduce opportunities for safe employment, livelihood development, social participation, and protection from exploitation. Households with persons with disabilities may also experience additional financial pressures associated with health care, transport, assistive devices, caregiving, and daily support, increasing vulnerability to deceptive recruitment, debt bondage, forced labour, forced begging, and other forms of exploitation. Participants further emphasised that trafficking itself can cause or exacerbate disabilities through hazardous working conditions, physical injuries, violence, trauma, psychosocial harm, and lack of timely medical care. The policy brief should therefore recognise both persons with pre-existing disabilities and those who acquire disabilities as a consequence of trafficking, including the heightened risk of further exploitation or re-trafficking if appropriate recovery, rehabilitation, and social protection measures are not provided.

Participants identified migration, labour mobility, and cross-border movement as significant structural factors shaping trafficking risks for persons with disabilities. Migrant workers and fishers—including both regular and irregular, land- and sea-based workers—often face limited access to information, labour protections, monitoring, and support services throughout the migration cycle. Family separation, language barriers, insecure migration status, limited knowledge of rights, and weak access to assistance in destination countries further increase vulnerability to exploitation. Participants also noted that hazardous working conditions may result in injury or disability, while migrant workers who acquire disabilities often face additional barriers to accessing protection, rehabilitation, and reintegration. Discussions highlighted the importance of strengthening shared responsibility between countries of origin and destination and emphasised that States should explicitly recognise and address the heightened vulnerabilities of persons with disabilities within labour migration systems, including recruitment, employment, return, and reintegration processes.

Participants stressed that intersectionality should be understood within national and local contexts, recognising how disability interacts with geographic isolation, rural and border communities, and unequal access to services. Risk is further compounded by factors including poverty, gender, age, migration status, statelessness or refugee status, indigeneity, ethnicity, religion, low educational attainment, sexual orientation and gender identity, conflict, disasters, institutionalisation, and dependence on family members or caregivers. Participants cautioned against treating persons with disabilities as a homogeneous group and emphasised that prevention measures should be tailored to different types of disabilities, support needs, and social and cultural contexts. They also noted that stigma may discourage some persons from registering as persons with disabilities, limiting both access to services and the visibility of their protection needs. The policy brief should therefore frame disability as intersecting with multiple forms of disadvantage rather than as a standalone risk factor.

Participants also highlighted the growing importance of disaster-related, environmental, conflict-related, and technology-facilitated risks. Disaster-prone areas, climate change, environmental

degradation, pollution, and armed conflict may contribute to displacement, injuries, disability, poverty, family separation, and increased dependence on others, thereby heightening vulnerability to trafficking. Participants also identified unsafe and poorly regulated online environments as an emerging concern, particularly given the rapid growth of online recruitment, digital deception, scam compounds, forced criminality, and other technology-enabled forms of trafficking. They emphasised that prevention strategies, legal frameworks, and protection systems should become more responsive to these evolving risks, particularly in cross-border contexts where evidence gathering, victim identification, reporting, and access to protection remain challenging.

30. In response to the question on gaps in current prevention laws, policies, strategies, and programmes in addressing compounded vulnerabilities and effectively reaching persons with disabilities, participants identified significant gaps in awareness, early detection, accessible information, disability-inclusive communication, reintegration, aftercare, and data systems. Awareness of trafficking remains limited among the general public and is often lower among persons with disabilities, who may not receive information in accessible formats or may not know how existing legal protections apply to them. Participants noted that trafficking information, national work plans, rights information, reporting pathways, and prevention programmes are often not communicated through universal design or accessible formats, including easy-to-understand language, sign language, audio, Braille, or community-based outreach. Authorities may also have limited capacity to detect and identify at-risk populations early, especially where persons with disabilities are undocumented, geographically isolated, reluctant to register for disability-related benefits because of stigma or not connected to services. Prevention programmes were viewed as only partially effective or not yet fully effective, with stronger reach in highly urbanised and well-funded areas than in rural, remote, border, or underserved communities. Participants also highlighted inadequate reintegration mechanisms, lack of aftercare, limited psychosocial support beyond short service periods, and insufficient monitoring of the well-being and trauma experienced by migrant workers and returned victims. Data gaps were repeatedly raised, including weak disability-disaggregated data, lack of data on disability acquired as a result of trafficking, and limited data on whether victims receive support, are reintegrated, or participate in justice processes. Participants further noted that some ASEAN Member States' national laws and action plans do not clearly recognise disability acquired after trafficking, and that the ASEAN Enabling Masterplan and national action plans due for review or expiry should be updated to better reflect the intersection between disability and trafficking in persons.
31. Participants identified several promising practices and models that have demonstrated potential to reduce trafficking risks for persons with disabilities. A key lesson emerging from the discussions was that the most effective approaches integrate disability inclusion into existing counter-trafficking, social protection, and community development systems rather than establishing parallel mechanisms. Participants emphasised that strong multi-sectoral collaboration among government agencies, organisations of persons with disabilities (OPDs), civil society organisations (CSOs), community-based organisations, faith-based organisations, and local communities is essential for strengthening prevention, early identification, referral, and long-term support.

At the regional level, participants highlighted ASEAN's policy dialogues, technical working groups, prevention guidelines, peer-learning initiatives, and engagement with civil society and subject matter experts as valuable platforms for promoting disability-inclusive approaches and sharing good practices across Member States. At the national and community levels, participants recognised community-based prevention models, including migrant help desks jointly operated by self-help groups, community organisations, and local governments, as effective mechanisms for providing information, monitoring migration, identifying persons at risk, facilitating referrals, and supporting migrants before departure, during migration, and upon return.

Participants also shared several examples of promising national practices that could be adapted across ASEAN. These included the Philippines' conditional cash transfer programme and Barangay Inter-Agency Councils Against Trafficking, which strengthen social protection, early identification, community engagement, and referral pathways; Singapore's investment in early childhood and family support programmes; information and awareness campaigns in Lao PDR to improve the identification of victims of trafficking with disabilities; Malaysia's legislative reforms to strengthen protection for persons with physical and psychosocial disabilities, together with labour rights training for the private sector; and the contribution of faith-based organisations in supporting prevention, victim assistance, and community reintegration.

Across the discussions, participants consistently highlighted that effective prevention requires transparent communication, accessible and disability-inclusive information, community ownership, and the meaningful participation of OPDs, CSOs, victim-survivors, and other grassroots actors. These approaches were viewed as critical to strengthening awareness, reducing vulnerability, improving early identification and referral, and promoting sustainable, community-based prevention of trafficking in persons.

32. In response to questions regarding barriers to accessing protection and services, participants identified multiple obstacles that prevent victims with disabilities from accessing protection, assistance, and support services. These include physical barriers, such as inaccessible shelters, courts, public buildings, transport, and service provider offices; communication and information barriers, including limited access to sign language interpreters, accessible information, and alternative communication methods; and attitudinal barriers, including stigma, discrimination, unconscious bias, and assumptions that persons with disabilities are unable to make decisions or provide reliable testimony. Participants also highlighted documentation and eligibility barriers, such as difficulties obtaining identity documents, disability registration, or other documents required to access services. Additional barriers include poverty, limited social support, inaccessible transport, remote and rural locations, institutional dependence, and inadequate funding to provide reasonable accommodations and accessible services. Participants further noted that persons with non-apparent disabilities—including psychosocial, intellectual, cognitive, developmental, and communication disabilities—are frequently overlooked because their support needs are not readily recognised.
33. Regarding the impact of these barriers on victim identification, referral, access to justice, and support services, participants agreed that they significantly hinder timely identification and access to referral pathways, shelters, health care, psychosocial support, legal assistance, social protection, and reintegration services. Communication barriers may prevent victims from disclosing their experiences, while inaccessible reporting mechanisms can delay identification, referral, and access

to appropriate assistance. Dependence on family members, carers, institutions, or personal assistants may further limit independent help-seeking, particularly where these individuals are perpetrators, facilitators, or exercise undue influence over victims. Participants also observed that stigma and fear of discrimination may discourage individuals from identifying themselves as persons with disabilities or as victims of trafficking, thereby reducing the visibility of their protection needs within existing systems. Participants therefore emphasised the importance of individualised assessments that consider each person's disability, support needs, and circumstances, together with sustained trauma-informed case management, psychosocial support, aftercare, and access to specialised mental health services to promote long-term recovery, rehabilitation, and reintegration.

34. In response to questions regarding legal and policy gaps, participants identified several shortcomings in existing laws, regulations, and policies that limit disability-inclusive victim protection. Existing anti-trafficking legislation often provides only general protection and does not adequately address the specific rights and needs of persons with disabilities. Participants also highlighted the absence of mandatory disability-inclusive training requirements for frontline responders, limited legal provisions on disability-disaggregated data collection and data protection, and insufficient consultation with organisations of persons with disabilities (OPDs) and victim-survivors during law and policy development. Additional gaps include limited dedicated funding for accessibility, specialised support services, reasonable accommodations, interpreters, social workers, and shelter improvements, as well as the need to strengthen legal recognition of the intersection between trafficking and disability.
35. In considering whether reasonable accommodation and accessibility are adequately addressed in existing frameworks, participants generally agreed that current provisions are only partially implemented. While accessibility requirements exist in some countries, implementation remains inconsistent and often focuses primarily on physical infrastructure rather than communication, information, procedural, psychosocial, cognitive, or intellectual accessibility. Participants stressed that accessibility and reasonable accommodations should be embedded throughout the entire protection continuum—from victim identification and reporting through investigations, legal proceedings, recovery, and reintegration—and supported by adequate resources, monitoring, and accountability.
36. Regarding gaps in institutional practices, standard operating procedures, and service delivery, participants identified significant shortcomings in the implementation of disability-inclusive responses. Intake forms, screening tools, assessment processes, referral pathways, and standard operating procedures often fail to accommodate the diverse needs of persons with different types of disabilities. Participants also highlighted inconsistent coordination among agencies, limited monitoring and evaluation of service quality, accessibility, and outcomes, insufficient disability-disaggregated data to assess service effectiveness, and the absence of integrated, "one-stop" service models for victims with disabilities. In addition, many persons with disabilities remain unaware of available protection and support services, while organisations providing specialised disability-inclusive assistance often receive limited or inconsistent government funding. Participants therefore emphasised the need to strengthen disability-inclusive institutional practices, improve inter-agency coordination and accountability, establish integrated service delivery models, and ensure sustainable investment in specialised support services.
37. In response to questions regarding challenges faced by frontline responders and service providers, participants observed that practitioners frequently face limited financial and human resources, high workloads, insufficient disability-inclusive training, lack of confidence in supporting diverse disability needs, and limited access to interpreters and specialised professionals. Misconceptions about disability may result in victims being incorrectly assessed, denied services, or referred to

inappropriate institutions. Participants emphasised the importance of strengthening trauma-informed and survivor-centred approaches, introducing trauma stewardship and wellbeing measures for frontline staff, expanding disability-inclusive training and practical tools, increasing government support for OPDs and civil society organisations, and improving coordination to ensure protection services are accessible, responsive, and accountable.

38. Regarding legal and policy gaps affecting disability-inclusive victim protection, participants identified shortcomings in existing laws, regulations, policies, budgets, and implementation frameworks that limit effective protection and support for victims with disabilities. These include the absence of mandatory disability-inclusive training requirements for first responders and service providers, limited specialised training, and anti-trafficking legislation that does not adequately address the specific rights, needs, and vulnerabilities of persons with disabilities. Participants also highlighted insufficient budget allocations for shelter accessibility, reasonable accommodations, trained personnel, interpreters, social workers, and specialised support services. While accessibility provisions exist in some legal and policy frameworks, implementation and enforcement remain inconsistent and often focus primarily on physical accessibility, with limited attention to psychosocial, intellectual, cognitive, communication, and other non-apparent disabilities. Participants further identified the need to strengthen legal and policy frameworks on disability-disaggregated data, data protection, and meaningful consultation with organisations of persons with disabilities (OPDs) and trafficking survivors with disabilities in the development and revision of laws, policies, regulations, and standard operating procedures. Participants therefore emphasised the importance of strengthening national legal and policy frameworks to consistently address reasonable accommodation, accessibility, disability-specific support, data protection, and the intersection between trafficking in persons and disability.
39. Regarding institutional and frontline capacity gaps, participants identified significant challenges affecting the delivery of disability-inclusive protection and support services. Frontline responders and service providers often face limited financial and human resources, inadequate disability-inclusive training, high workloads, limited confidence in responding to diverse disability needs, restricted access to sign language interpreters and specialised professionals, and risks of vicarious trauma and burnout. Participants noted that intake forms, screening tools, assessment processes, referral pathways, and standard operating procedures frequently fail to accommodate the diverse needs of persons with different types of disabilities, while institutional coordination, monitoring, and evaluation of service quality remain inconsistent. They also observed that many persons with disabilities are unaware of available services, integrated "one-stop" service models are rarely available, and organisations providing specialised disability-inclusive support often receive limited or inconsistent government funding. Misconceptions about disability may also result in victims being inappropriately referred or denied appropriate services. Participants therefore emphasised the need to strengthen trauma-informed and survivor-centred approaches, introduce trauma stewardship and wellbeing measures for frontline personnel, improve disability-inclusive tools and guidance, expand specialised training, strengthen government support for NGOs and OPDs, and enhance coordination and accountability to ensure that protection services are accessible, responsive, and effective.
40. In response to questions regarding barriers to reporting, investigation, prosecution, and access to remedies, participants identified a range of obstacles that prevent victims with disabilities from accessing justice. These include inaccessible reporting mechanisms, complaint systems, legal aid services, and information on legal rights, as well as low legal literacy, inaccessible legal language, and limited availability of accessible information, education, and communication (IEC) materials. Participants noted that fear of stigma, discrimination, retaliation, institutionalisation, community backlash, and lack of trust in legal processes may discourage victims from reporting trafficking or

pursuing legal remedies. Additional barriers include poverty, remote geographic locations, inaccessible transport, and limited access to qualified legal, medical, and psychosocial services. Participants also highlighted significant disparities between central and local levels, where frontline officials often lack the knowledge, skills, and resources to respond effectively to victims with disabilities. Long case processing times, delays in compensation or restitution, inaccessible complaint mechanisms, and concerns regarding privacy and media reporting were also identified as factors that reduce victims' willingness to participate in justice processes.

41. In discussing procedural and evidentiary challenges, including the availability of reasonable accommodations during justice processes, participants highlighted repeated interviews, limited use of trauma-informed approaches, absence of individualised assessments, and inadequate access to interpreters, personal assistants, intermediaries, Braille, alternative communication methods, and other procedural accommodations. Participants observed that justice actors frequently conflate mental capacity with legal capacity and credibility, particularly for persons with psychosocial, intellectual, cognitive, developmental, or communication disabilities. Heavy reliance on victim testimony, combined with limited forensic, medical, digital, or cross-border evidence, may further disadvantage victims with disabilities where testimony is misunderstood or afforded less weight. While some countries have introduced guidance or standard operating procedures on supporting persons with disabilities in justice processes, participants generally agreed that reasonable accommodation and accessibility measures remain inconsistently available and implemented. They emphasised the need for dedicated budgets, disability-inclusive procedural guidance, specialised focal points, individualised assessments, and strengthened capacity among justice actors to ensure that victims with all types of disabilities can participate effectively throughout investigations and court proceedings.
42. In discussing the risks of criminalisation and measures to strengthen the application of the Non-Punishment Principle, participants expressed concern that victims with disabilities may be misidentified as offenders where disability, trauma, or communication barriers are not recognised during screening and victim identification. Victims who are unable to communicate clearly, provide inconsistent accounts due to trauma, or have invisible disabilities may be incorrectly perceived as lacking credibility or as offenders, particularly in situations involving forced criminality, online exploitation, scam compounds, illegal work, or other trafficking-related offences. Participants emphasised that strengthening the application of the Non-Punishment Principle requires disability-responsive screening and victim identification, trauma-informed interviewing, accessible reporting mechanisms, individualised assessments, and greater recognition of invisible disabilities. They further recommended strengthening practical guidance, standard operating procedures, and specialised training for law enforcement, immigration officers, prosecutors, social workers, service providers, and other frontline practitioners, while ensuring the meaningful participation of organisations of persons with disabilities (OPDs) in the development, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of justice responses.
43. Regarding inter-agency coordination, participants agreed that coordination among social services, justice, health, labour, migration, protection authorities, local governments, civil society organisations (CSOs), non-governmental organisations (NGOs), organisations of persons with disabilities (OPDs), community actors, law enforcement, social workers, and other frontline practitioners exists in many ASEAN Member States but remains uneven in its effectiveness. Key challenges include limited awareness of the intersection between trafficking in persons and disability, fragmented institutional mandates, inadequate budget allocations, insufficient data sharing, uneven institutional capacity, and limited coordination mechanisms at the local level. Participants emphasised the need for integrated coordination across the entire counter-trafficking

continuum, including prevention, victim identification, investigation, protection, referral, prosecution, recovery, reintegration, and monitoring. They also highlighted the importance of institutionalising disability-inclusive capacity building for frontline practitioners, clarifying the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders at regional, national, sub-national, and community levels, and strengthening the engagement of NGOs, OPDs, and other non-state actors in training, victim referral, and service delivery.

44. With respect to referral pathways and community-level engagement, participants noted that referral and reporting mechanisms remain difficult for victims with disabilities to navigate and do not consistently incorporate OPDs, NGOs, grassroots organisations, community groups, local governments, or other community actors. Participants recognised the critical role of community-based organisations in early identification, reporting, prevention, victim support, and referral, particularly in rural and remote communities. They recommended institutionalising the roles of community organisations, OPDs, NGOs, and local governments within national referral mechanisms and ensuring that referral pathways are accessible, disability-inclusive, and responsive to physical, communication, information, economic, geographic, and linguistic barriers. Participants also identified challenges in cross-border referral and repatriation, emphasising the need to strengthen disability-inclusive consular assistance, bilateral cooperation, accessible shelters, and coordinated support throughout identification, protection, repatriation, recovery, and reintegration.
45. On data and information systems, participants identified disability-disaggregated data as a critical gap affecting evidence-based policymaking and service delivery. They observed that data relating to disability, trafficking, migration, victim support, and justice outcomes are often collected separately, with limited interoperability, inconsistent reporting, and insufficient baseline information on victims with disabilities. Participants highlighted the need to strengthen disability-inclusive data collection, harmonise reporting frameworks, improve information sharing, and establish common standards for data governance, privacy, confidentiality, and security. They further recommended strengthening the capacity of frontline personnel to collect disability-sensitive data, engaging information technology specialists, researchers, and academic institutions, and ensuring that government agencies lead data management and coordination with technical support from OPDs, CSOs, service providers, and victim-survivors.
46. Regarding governance and institutional frameworks, participants highlighted the need for clearer institutional mandates, stronger accountability mechanisms, and explicit integration of disability inclusion into national counter-trafficking legislation, policies, action plans, budgets, and implementation frameworks. Participants recommended clarifying the roles of government agencies, OPDs, CSOs, communities, and other stakeholders through stakeholder mapping and strengthened coordination mechanisms. They also emphasised the importance of regularly reviewing governance arrangements, strengthening monitoring and evaluation, ensuring the meaningful participation of persons with disabilities and victim-survivors, and establishing clear accountability measures, including mechanisms to address corruption and misconduct by officials involved in trafficking responses.
47. Regarding regional and cross-border cooperation, participants highlighted the need to strengthen collaboration among ASEAN Member States and ASEAN sectoral bodies to support disability-inclusive responses to trafficking in persons. While recognising the important role of existing ASEAN frameworks and mechanisms, participants noted that cross-sectoral coordination, information sharing, and technical cooperation remain inconsistent across the region. They recommended strengthening regional guidance on disability-inclusive victim identification, referral, and protection, promoting knowledge exchange among organisations of persons with

disabilities (OPDs), government agencies, and other stakeholders, and enhancing technical cooperation on disability inclusion.

Participants also emphasised the need to strengthen cross-border mechanisms for victim identification, referral, protection, repatriation, return, and reintegration, supported by accessible reporting systems, disability-inclusive consular assistance, and closer collaboration among diplomatic, labour, welfare, immigration, and law enforcement authorities. In addition, participants highlighted the importance of strengthening regional accountability mechanisms to address corruption, exploitation, and other barriers that undermine effective cross-border cooperation and protection for victims with disabilities.

48. In summary, participants underscored that the policy brief should strengthen disability inclusion across all stages of anti-trafficking response, from prevention, awareness-raising, early identification, screening, and referral to protection, shelter, recovery, psychosocial support, access to justice, accountability, restitution, compensation, reintegration, data systems, and regional cooperation. The plenary confirmed the need for a more detailed, practical, rights-based, trauma-informed, survivor-centred, and disability-inclusive policy brief that reflects national and local realities, recognises emerging forms of trafficking, and moves beyond viewing persons with disabilities only as vulnerable beneficiaries. Persons with disabilities should also be recognised as rights holders, survivors, partners, experts, policy contributors, community actors, and leaders whose participation is essential in policy development, implementation, monitoring, and review. Participants further emphasized that OPDs, CSOs, NGOs, community organisations, frontline practitioners, victim-survivors, government agencies, ASEAN sectoral bodies, and development partners all have complementary roles in ensuring that the policy brief is translated into accessible, adequately resourced, accountable, and implementable action at regional, national, local, and community levels.

Session 6: Breakout Group Discussions – Critical Review of Regional and National Recommendations

38. Participants were divided into facilitated breakout groups to undertake a structured review of the regional and national recommendations contained in the Zero Draft Policy Brief. Groups 1–4 were tasked with reviewing and refining the regional recommendations, while Groups 5–8 focused on reviewing and strengthening the national recommendations. Guided worksheets and discussion questions were provided to support a policy-oriented review of the recommendations, with particular attention given to their clarity, feasibility, alignment with ASEAN frameworks, and practical applicability across diverse national contexts.

Session 7: Plenary Discussion on Breakout Group Results

39. During the plenary session, rapporteurs from each breakout group presented the key findings and recommendations arising from their review of the regional and national recommendations contained in the Zero Draft Policy Brief. The discussions focused on reviewing the relevance, clarity, feasibility, and practical application of the recommendations, as well as identifying areas for further refinement. Participants subsequently provided additional reflections and technical inputs to further strengthen the proposed recommendations. The findings presented in this section represent a consolidated synthesis of the breakout group discussions and subsequent plenary deliberations.

40. Groups reviewing the regional recommendations generally agreed that the recommendations were aligned with existing ASEAN commitments and frameworks relating to trafficking in persons, disability inclusion, and human rights. Group 1 highlighted the importance of strengthening references to the ASEAN Multisectoral Work Plan Against Trafficking in Persons 2023–2028 (Bohol TIP Work Plan 2.0) and proposed that SOMTC could provide additional support and guidance in the implementation of relevant recommendations. Group 3 proposed placing greater emphasis on specific issues and vulnerabilities identified during the consultation process to ensure that the recommendations adequately reflect the realities experienced by persons with disabilities affected by trafficking.

In reviewing the clarity and actionability of the recommendations, several groups noted that some recommendations would benefit from clearer identification of responsible actors and implementation mechanisms. Participants emphasised the importance of ensuring that recommendations clearly indicate who is expected to take action at both regional and national levels.

A substantive discussion took place regarding the terminology used in recommendations relating to access to justice. **Vincent Balingan**, President of the Hard of Hearing Group Philippines (HOHGP) expressed concerns regarding proposals to replace the term “reasonable accommodation” with “procedural and age-appropriate accommodation”, noting that reasonable accommodation remains a fundamental principle underpinning access to justice for persons with disabilities. He suggested that removing the concept entirely could unintentionally narrow the scope of the recommendation.

41. In response, **Karla** from LifeHaven explained that procedural accommodation imposes a stronger obligation on institutions to provide accommodations required for participation in legal proceedings, whereas reasonable accommodation may be subject to limitations based on considerations such as cost or institutional capacity. Representatives from Malaysia further highlighted the importance of procedural accommodation under Article 13 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) and recommended ensuring that the policy brief remains consistent with the terminology and obligations contained within the Convention. Participants generally agreed on the importance of ensuring that the recommendations remain aligned with international disability rights standards while strengthening practical access to justice.
42. Discussions on feasibility highlighted the need to ensure that recommendations can be implemented across diverse national legal systems and institutional contexts. Group 2 noted that recommendations relating to access to justice should take into account the actual experiences of victims and be applicable across ASEAN Member States. Participants observed that legal definitions, procedures, and judicial processes differ significantly across countries. Discussions highlighted the importance of ensuring that regional recommendations remain compatible with domestic laws while promoting common principles that facilitate regional cooperation and cross-border responses to trafficking in persons.
43. Participants further discussed the importance of ensuring consistency between national and regional legal frameworks. Examples were raised regarding differences in legal recognition and judicial outcomes across jurisdictions, emphasising the need for recommendations to be sufficiently flexible to accommodate varying legal systems while maintaining coherence with ASEAN commitments and regional agreements.
44. Additional recommendations were discussed. Participants proposed several additional regional actions to strengthen implementation of the policy brief. These included developing ASEAN

guidance on disability-inclusive victim identification, screening, interviewing, referral, protection, recovery, return, and reintegration; establishing regional good practice guidance for accessible shelters and disability-inclusive support services; supporting ASEAN Member States to strengthen multidisciplinary victim identification teams that include OPDs and civil society organisations; and developing practical guidance on handling trafficking cases involving victims with different types of disabilities, particularly during investigation, prosecution, and court proceedings.

45. In addition, Participants also recommended strengthening regional cooperation on technology-facilitated trafficking, online exploitation, forced criminality, and emerging trafficking trends; supporting ASEAN Member States to report disability-disaggregated trafficking data through existing SOMTC mechanisms; facilitating exchange of promising practices among ASEAN Member States; strengthening cross-border identification, referral, and reintegration mechanisms; and institutionalising the participation of OPDs within ASEAN anti-trafficking coordination, policy development, monitoring, training, and awareness-raising initiatives.
46. Last point from the regional recommendations was discussed regarding the priority. Across the discussions, participants identified the priority regional recommendations requiring early implementation. Across the group discussions, there was broad consensus on the importance of developing practical regional guidance on disability-inclusive victim identification, prevention, access to justice, and support services, accompanied by capacity-building for policymakers and frontline responders. Participants also prioritised strengthening disability-disaggregated trafficking data collection and reporting through regional mechanisms, while clarifying the roles and responsibilities of relevant ASEAN Sectoral Bodies and strengthening cross-sectoral coordination to support implementation. Additional priorities included supporting ASEAN Member States to translate regional guidance into national policies and regulations, strengthening cross-border identification, referral, protection, recovery, and reintegration mechanisms, and ensuring the meaningful participation of organisations of persons with disabilities (OPDs) and multidisciplinary stakeholders in ASEAN counter-trafficking responses.
47. During the plenary discussion on the proposed national recommendations, participants generally agreed that the recommendations provide a strong foundation for strengthening disability-inclusive responses to trafficking in persons across ASEAN Member States. They welcomed the emphasis on disability-inclusive victim identification, long-term recovery and reintegration, disability-disaggregated data systems, and stronger collaboration between disability and counter-trafficking stakeholders. Participants also recognised that, while the recommendations are broadly relevant across ASEAN, their implementation should remain sufficiently flexible to accommodate differing national legal frameworks, institutional arrangements, capacities, and available resources.
48. Participants further emphasised that effective implementation would require sustained political commitment, adequate financial and human resources, strengthened institutional capacity, and closer coordination among government agencies, organisations of persons with disabilities (OPDs), civil society organisations (CSOs), and other stakeholders. Particular attention was drawn to improving disability-inclusive standard operating procedures, expanding trauma-informed and survivor-centred services, strengthening long-term recovery and psychosocial support, enhancing disability-disaggregated data systems, and ensuring meaningful participation of OPDs and victim-survivors throughout policy development, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.

49. Participants also proposed several refinements to strengthen the national recommendations. These included explicitly recognising persons who acquire disabilities as a consequence of trafficking, integrating disability inclusion more systematically into national anti-trafficking legislation, policies, action plans, referral mechanisms, and victim support systems, strengthening accessibility standards across justice institutions and victim services, improving coordination between disability and counter-trafficking sectors, and expanding support for migrant workers, cross-border victims, and persons experiencing multiple and intersecting vulnerabilities.
50. Overall, participants identified three overarching priorities for national implementation: (i) strengthening disability-inclusive victim identification, referral, and protection systems; (ii) integrating disability inclusion into national legal, policy, and institutional frameworks, supported by adequate resources and coordinated implementation; and (iii) expanding accessible, trauma-informed, and long-term recovery, rehabilitation, and reintegration services, while ensuring the meaningful participation of OPDs and survivors throughout implementation and monitoring.

DAY 2

45. **H.E. Asst. Prof. Dr. Bhanubhatra Jittiang**, the Representative of Thailand to AICHR and Project Proponent, opened the second day of the workshop by providing a summary of the key discussions from Day 1. He highlighted the main policy issues and recommendations identified by participants and noted that AICHR and ASEAN-ACT would review and consolidate the inputs received throughout the workshop. He emphasised that the recommendations and observations generated during the discussions would be analysed and synthesised to strengthen the next iteration of the policy brief.

Session 8: Breakout Group Discussions and Plenary – Framing and Policy Coherence

46. Participants were divided into facilitated breakout groups to review the overall framing, positioning, and policy coherence of the Zero Draft Policy Brief. The discussions aimed to assess whether the document was appropriately aligned with relevant ASEAN commitments, mandates, and strategic frameworks, including the ASEAN Convention Against Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children (ACTIP), the ASEAN Multisectoral Work Plan Against Trafficking in Persons 2023–2028 (Bohol TIP Work Plan 2.0), the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), the ASEAN Enabling Masterplan on Mainstreaming the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and other relevant ASEAN declarations and frameworks. Participants were also invited to review the overall problem statement, policy logic, and consistency of the draft with the mandates of AICHR, ACWC, SOMTC, and SOMSWD.
47. To facilitate targeted discussions, participants representing ASEAN sectoral bodies and regional organisations were invited to review and provide technical inputs on: (i) the alignment of the Zero Draft with relevant ASEAN and international frameworks; and (ii) policy coherence across the mandates of AICHR, ACWC, SOMTC, and other relevant ASEAN sectoral bodies. Participants representing ASEAN Member States, organisations of persons with disabilities (OPDs), and civil society organisations were invited to review the overall framing of the Policy Brief, including the clarity of the problem statement, policy logic, and narrative, and to identify opportunities to strengthen its relevance and practical application. To support the group discussions and ensure a consistent approach across all breakout groups, a structured worksheet was developed to guide participants through the review process.
48. Regarding alignment with ASEAN and international frameworks, participants agreed that the Zero Draft is broadly aligned with existing ASEAN and international commitments and reinforces

ASEAN's priorities across prevention, protection, prosecution, partnership, disability inclusion, and access to justice. Participants noted that the draft appropriately reflects the principles of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), including non-discrimination, accessibility, reasonable accommodation, participation, and equality before the law, while also aligning with the ASEAN Enabling Masterplan on Mainstreaming the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the ASEAN Declaration on Disability-Inclusive Development. To further strengthen policy coherence and legitimacy, participants recommended referencing additional international human rights and disability frameworks and ensuring stronger linkages between regional commitments and their practical implementation within ASEAN Member States.

49. Yayasan Lembaga Kajian dan Advokasi Independensi Peradilan (LeIP) Regarding the clarity of the problem statement and overall framing, participants agreed that the Zero Draft clearly establishes the nexus between disability and trafficking in persons within the ASEAN context. However, they recommended strengthening the analysis of intersectionality by more explicitly demonstrating how disability interacts with other forms of vulnerability, including poverty, gender, age, migration status, indigeneity, and other intersecting forms of disadvantage, while recognising that disability may both increase vulnerability to trafficking and arise as a consequence of trafficking. Participants further emphasised that the policy brief should move beyond framing persons with disabilities primarily as vulnerable groups by recognising them as rights holders, active participants, and partners in prevention, protection, and access to justice. They also recommended strengthening the narrative through clearer definitions, practical examples, lived experiences, and stronger links between disability-inclusive approaches and improved counter-trafficking outcomes, including more effective victim identification, access to justice, protection, and long-term recovery. Throughout the discussions, participants underscored the importance of ensuring that the policy brief remains practical, action-oriented, and responsive to the diverse legal, institutional, and operational contexts of ASEAN Member States, while providing a coherent strategic framework to guide future regional cooperation and national implementation.

Session 9: Next Steps and Timeline Agreement

52. **H.E. Anita Ashvini Wahid**, Representative of Indonesia to AICHR, provided an overview of the proposed next steps and timeline for finalising the policy brief. She explained that the immediate priority would be to revise the Zero Draft by incorporating the inputs, recommendations, and observations gathered throughout the regional validation process. The drafting team would review all contributions to ensure that stakeholder perspectives are appropriately reflected in the revised document.
53. H.E. Anita noted that the revision process is expected to take place in June, during which the Zero Draft will be consolidated into a more refined ASEAN Policy Brief on Disability and Trafficking in Persons. Following the revision process, efforts will focus on facilitating review and endorsement through relevant ASEAN mechanisms, led by AICHR Thailand as the project proponent. She emphasised the importance of strengthening coordination across ASEAN sectoral bodies to promote a more coherent and comprehensive regional response to disability and trafficking issues.
54. Participants were also informed of ongoing efforts to strengthen linkages with other ASEAN initiatives addressing trafficking in persons, including AICHR-led work on the application of non-punishment principles for victims of trafficking in persons. Discussions highlighted opportunities to further enhance cooperation among AICHR, ACWC, SOMTC, and other relevant ASEAN bodies to promote greater policy coherence and complementarity across regional initiatives.

55. Looking ahead, participants were informed that coordination and engagement with relevant ASEAN sectoral bodies and endorsement processes are expected to continue throughout the second half of 2026. The policy brief is anticipated to enter the finalisation, formatting, and design phase by October, with the aim of launching the completed document during the ISM Review meeting in December 2026.
56. In his closing reflections, **H.E. Asst. Prof. Dr. Bhanubhatra Jittiang**, the Representative of Thailand to AICHR, emphasised the importance of strengthening collaboration and alignment among ASEAN bodies working on trafficking in persons, disability inclusion, human rights, and protection issues. He noted that trafficking in persons continues to evolve, requiring policy responses to remain adaptive, responsive, and informed by emerging trends and vulnerabilities. He further highlighted the importance of maintaining partnerships with organisations of persons with disabilities, civil society organisations, frontline practitioners, and other stakeholders to ensure that future responses remain inclusive and evidence-based.
57. Dr. Bhanubatra concluded by expressing appreciation to all participants for their active engagement, technical contributions, and willingness to share their expertise and lived experiences throughout the workshop. He also conveyed appreciation to ASEAN-ACT, development partners, and the Government of the Philippines for their support in convening the workshop and advancing regional cooperation on disability inclusion and trafficking in persons.