Co-funded by the European Union

RCSD The Regional Center for Social Science and Sustainable Development Chiang Mai University

Mahidol University Institute for Population and Social Research

Mahidol Migration Center Institute for Population and Social Research (IPSR) Mahidol University

Institute of Human Rights and Peace Studies Mahidol University

IOM UN MIGRATION

POST-ACTIVITY REPORT

"Climate Justice and Migration Concerns: Human Rights Documentation and Reporting Workshop"

17-18 July 2026 (Friday/Saturday)

Simultaneous Interpretation: English/Thai

Regional Center for Social Science and Sustainable Development (RCSD), Chiang Mai University



Co-funded by the European Union

Table of Contents

1. Background and Rationale 3
2. Training Overview 4
3. Participants' Profile 5
4. Learning Outcome and Overall Improvement through Pre- and Post-test 6
   4.1. Pre- and Post-Test Results Comparison (n=14) 6
   4.2. Qualitative Analysis of Open-ended Questions 7
5. Interpretation of Findings 8
6. Participants' Evaluation of the Workshop 9
   6.1. Most Useful Training Session for Participants' Work 10
   6.2. Topics that Most Improved Participants' Understanding 11
   6.3. Participants' Evaluation of the Workshop Outcomes 11
7. Additional Comments and Suggestions 17
8. Conclusion 18
9. Annexes 18
   9.1. Annex 1: Training Agenda 18
   9.2. Annex 2: Training Activity Photos 22

Prepared by:

· *Yamin Theint, Research Assistant, Mahidol Migration Center-Joint Research Unit (MMC-JRU), Institute for population and social research (IPSR), Mahidol University*

1. Background and Rationale

Climate change and environmental pressures are increasingly driving complex human mobility in many parts of the Global South, where rapid development and population growth already strains resources and local and regional ecosystems. Scientists predict ongoing global climate change to trigger adverse events affecting about 143 million people in the Global South by 2050, leading to various forms of human mobility, including migration and displacement. Many global South countries heavily rely on agriculture and natural resources. Rising temperatures, floods, and water scarcity are placing strain on livelihoods and driving rural-to-urban migration. Migration is also deeply shaped by armed conflict and rising food insecurity. In 2021, the military coup in Myanmar led to multi-dimensional crises. The May 2025 Cambodia–Thailand border conflict resulted in mass displacement of over 300,000 people on both sides of the border.

The Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC) reported that 1.5 million internal displacements caused by disasters have been recorded in 2024 in East Asia & Pacific Regions. The Southeast Asian countries with the incidence of displacements in 2024 due to natural disasters such as recurrent floods, cyclones, and droughts were the Philippines (1,036,000), Myanmar (126,000) and Indonesia (39,000). Thailand is facing increasing climate-related threats, such as rising temperatures, water scarcity, coastal erosion, and extreme weather events. These challenges are exacerbated by regional conflicts: tensions and conflicts in Myanmar and Cambodia, and legal / political conflicts with Laos, which complicate environmental protection and contribute to displacement from hydro-electric projects. These concerns directly affect livelihoods, agricultural production, and push vulnerable populations, especially migrant workers and ethnic communities, to move in search of safety and income. Yet these movements remain underreported to international monitoring systems, national government, and international agencies. Activists and community practitioners play a critical role in documentation, but many require capacity building, access to tools grounded in rights reporting, ethical data collection, and safe-guarding practices.

The objective of this workshop is to develop advocacy skills for environment and human rights activists, researchers, and community practitioners. The threats facing the environment through climate change and pollution are significant and responses are urgently needed. Skills and practices from these disciplines of the environment and human rights are often separated, which weakens their impact. By grounding environmental protection in international law and protection mechanisms and ensuring human rights are applied to situation of environmental degradation, will increase the ability of people to respond to climate change and other environmental stresses.

2. Training Overview

Project: Climate Justice and Migration Concerns: Human Rights Documentation and Reporting
Dates: 17,18 July 2026
Location: Regional Center for Social Science and Sustainable Development (RCSD), Faculty of Social Sciences, Chiang Mai University

Training Committee:

- Mahidol Migration Center-Joint Research Unit (MMC-JRU), Institute for population and social research (IPSR), Mahidol University
- Institute of Human Rights and Peace Studies (IHRP), Mahidol University
- Regional Center for Social Science and Sustainable Development (RCSD), Faculty of Social Sciences, Chiang Mai University
- International Organization for Migration (IOM) Thailand

Training Coordinator: Yamin Theint, Research Assistant,Mahidol Migration Center-Joint Research Unit (MMC-JRU), Institute for population and social research (IPSR), Mahidol University

Trainers:

- Dr.Michael George Hayes (Institute of Human Rights and Peace Studies,Mahidol University)
- Dr. Bencharat Sae Chua (Institute of Human Rights and Peace Studies,Mahidol University)
- Dr.Sudarat Musikawong (Institute for Population and Social Research,Mahidol University)
- Dr.Sirada Khemanitthathai(Faculty of Political Science and Public Administration,Chiang Mai University)
- Dr.Elliot Sean Turner Lodge,Faculty of Social Sciences,Chiang Mai University
- Mr.Tom Weerachat, International Accountability Project
- Ms.Joan May Salvador(Regional Coordinator, Secretariat,Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development (APWLD)
- Mr.Thiti Ratchadatikun (IOM Thailand)
- Dr.Andrew Wai Phyo Kyaw (The Regional Center for Social Science and Sustainable Development, Chiang Mai University)

Note: This workshop training was made possible with the financial support of the Mahidol Migration Center-Joint Research Unit, Institute for Human Rights and Peace Studies, International Organization for Migration, Regional Center for Social Science and Sustainable Development, with special thanks to the Mahidol University International Relations Division.

Number of Participants:

Participants	Female	Male	LGBTQIA+	Total
All Participants	9	4	1	14

Objectives:

This workshop aims to strengthen the capacity of environmental activists and practitioners working in Thailand to understand and report climate-induced migration from a human rights perspective. As well as develop human rights activists whose work is relevant to environmental rights. The workshop will provide conceptual knowledge and practical skills to document cases, analyze patterns, and improve analysis of environmental data to effectively build advocacy. The workshop is based on the principle of climate justice which frames environmental advocacy in rights context and helps to more accurately target audiences.

One focus is an understanding of the human rights context to environmental and climate-induced migration, and building practical skills in reporting on this, whether this is through a human rights system (such as through the UN), or alternative forms of advocacy such as policy interventions of public outreach. A secondary, but very important component is giving space for the collaboration among activists working at the intersection of environmental justice, climate change, and migration.

3. Participants' Profile

- Demographic Characteristics

A total of 14 participants attended the training, comprising 9 women (64.3%), 1 LGBTQIA+ participant (7.1%), and 4 men (28.6%). Participants represented a diverse range of professional backgrounds and institutional affiliations, including civil society organizations, humanitarian agencies, research institutions, universities, and grassroots organizations working in the areas of human rights, migration, environmental justice, refugee protection, and community development.

- Institutional Affiliation and Professional Roles

Participants represented a diverse range of organizations and institutions working in human rights, migration, environmental justice, humanitarian assistance, refugee protection, and academia. They were affiliated with organizations including the Kachin Environmental Justice Center (KEJC) Myanmar, Saferworld, the Humanitarian Observatory for Policy and Education in Southeast Asia (HOPESEA), Migrant Working Group (MWG), Chiang Mai University, the Legal Assistance and Research for Refugee Protection Project at the Faculty of Law, Chiang Mai University, Stella Maris Seafarers' Centre Songkhla, the Institute for Muslim Affairs in Myanmar, Paris Nanterre University and LAVUE UMR 7218 CNRS, as well as independent human rights organizations. Participants held positions such as General Secretary, Country Manager, Researcher, Project Coordinator, Regional Officer, Advocacy Assistant, Centre Manager, doctoral candidate, graduate student, and development and human rights practitioner. This diversity of institutional affiliations and professional roles contributed to rich discussions and interdisciplinary learning throughout the training.

4. Learning Outcome and Overall Improvement through Pre- and Post-test

Pre- and post-tests were conducted to assess participants' baseline knowledge and measure learning outcomes following the two-day training. The assessment combined objective knowledge questions with open-ended questions to capture both participants' factual understanding and their ability to critically reflect on climate justice, climate mobility, human rights documentation, and advocacy. The analysis included both quantitative scoring of objective questions and qualitative thematic analysis of participants' written responses.

Comparison of the pre- and post-test results demonstrates an overall improvement in participants' knowledge following the training. The objective assessment covered 12 scored questions (Questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15), with a maximum score of 21 points. These questions assessed participants' knowledge across key thematic areas, including advocacy principles, climate mobility, human rights reporting, human rights in the context of climate change, planned relocation and displacement, climate mobility data collection, gender dimensions of climate change, international legal frameworks on climate-induced displacement, refugee law, qualitative case study research methods, and digital evidence documentation (photo metadata).

4.1. Pre- and Post-Test Results Comparison (n=14)

In the pre-test, participants' scores ranged from 7 to 17 out of 21 points, with an average score of 12.6 (59.9%), indicating a moderate level of baseline understanding prior to the training. In the post-test, scores ranged from 9 to 18 out of 21 points, with an average score of 14.0 (66.7%). Overall, the results indicate an improvement in participants' performance following the training, reflected in both the higher average score and the increase in the highest score achieved.

Comparison of the pre- and post-test results demonstrates positive learning outcomes across the group. The increase in average scores suggests that the training strengthened participants' understanding of core topics, including climate justice, climate mobility, human rights reporting and documentation, advocacy, qualitative research methods, and the use of digital evidence, such as photo metadata, in human rights documentation. Overall, the findings indicate that the training contributed to enhancing participants' knowledge and analytical capacity in applying a human rights-based approach to climate justice and mobility issues.

4.2. Qualitative Analysis of Open-ended Questions

The pre- and post-test included four open-ended questions (Questions 1, 6, 10, and 16) to assess participants' conceptual understanding, critical thinking, and ability to apply climate justice and human rights concepts to real-world contexts.

Question 1: Understanding of Climate Justice

Participants generally demonstrated a broad understanding of climate justice before the training, although many responses primarily associated the concept with environmental protection, equal treatment, or support for people affected by climate change. Following the training, participants' definitions became more comprehensive and rights-based. Many responses incorporated key concepts such as equity, human rights, accountability, participation, historical responsibility, unequal impacts of climate change, and the protection of vulnerable communities. Several participants also recognised that climate justice extends beyond environmental concerns to address social, economic, and political inequalities, reflecting a deeper conceptual understanding of the topic.

Question 6: Climate Action, Environmental Policy, and Displacement

Participants demonstrated increased awareness of the unintended consequences of climate action and environmental policies. Many identified examples in which conservation initiatives, protected areas, mining activities, renewable energy projects, carbon credit schemes, and planned relocation programmes contributed to land dispossession, displacement, or restrictions on community livelihoods when implemented without meaningful consultation or respect for human rights. Several participants drew on professional experiences from Myanmar and Thailand, including cases involving Indigenous communities, migrant workers, mining projects, and flood recovery programmes. These responses reflected an increased ability to critically analyse environmental policies through a human rights lens rather than viewing climate action as inherently beneficial.

Question 10: Climate Crisis as a Gender and Social Justice Issue

Responses showed a stronger understanding of the relationship between climate change and existing social inequalities. Participants frequently highlighted that women, Indigenous peoples, low-income households, migrants, older persons, and other marginalised groups experience disproportionate climate impacts because of structural inequalities, unequal access to resources, and limited participation in decision-making. Several responses also referred to gender roles, unpaid care responsibilities, intersectionality, and unequal access to protection during disasters. Overall, participants demonstrated a shift from viewing climate change primarily as an environmental or scientific issue to recognising it as a broader human rights and social justice challenge.

Question 16: Information Required for Human Rights Documentation

Participants identified a wide range of information needed to build evidence-based human rights cases involving development projects or corporate actors. Frequently mentioned sources included testimonies from affected communities, photographs with metadata, environmental and social impact assessments, land ownership records, company documents, project permits, legal and policy frameworks, financial information, satellite imagery, complaint mechanisms, and records of human rights violations. Many participants also emphasised the importance of documenting community impacts, accountability, and project decision-making processes. Compared with the pre-test, responses reflected a more systematic understanding of evidence collection and documentation strategies required for research, advocacy, and accountability processes.

5. Interpretation of Findings

The quantitative findings indicate that the training contributed to an overall improvement in participants' knowledge across the key thematic areas. The average score increased from 12.6/21 (59.9%) in the pre-test to 14.0/21 (66.7%) in the post-test, demonstrating improved understanding of climate justice, climate mobility, human rights reporting and documentation, advocacy, research methods, and digital evidence collection.

The qualitative findings complement these results by showing a deeper conceptual understanding of the training topics. Compared to the pre-test, participants' post-test responses were more comprehensive and analytical, demonstrating a stronger ability to apply a human rights-based approach to climate justice, recognise the impacts of climate change on vulnerable communities, and identify appropriate evidence for documenting climate-related human rights issues. Overall, the findings suggest that the training successfully strengthened both participants' knowledge and their capacity to apply the concepts in research, documentation, and advocacy.

6. Participants' Evaluation of the Workshop

Evaluation Statement	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)
7.1 Overall, I am satisfied with the workshop.	64.3	35.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
7.2 The presentations were informative and relevant to my work/study.	42.9	57.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
7.3 The workshop provided sufficient opportunities for interactive discussion and participant engagement.	37.5	37.6	25.0	0.0	0.0
7.4 The workshop was well planned and organized.	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7.5 The duration of the training was appropriate.	21.4	42.8	28.6	7.1	0.0
7.6 I gained new knowledge that I did not know before.	64.3	35.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
7.7 The food and refreshments were appropriate.	50.0	42.9	7.1	28.6	0.0
7.8 The venue was appropriate.	35.7	28.6	7.1	28.6	0.0

6.1. Most Useful Training Session for Participants' Work

Participants were asked to identify the one session they found most useful for their work and explain why. Responses indicated that the Human Rights Documentation session was the most frequently cited, selected by 5 of 14 participants (35.7%). Participants highlighted that the session provided practical guidance on good documentation practices and could be directly applied to evidence collection, reporting, and future human rights work.

The Understanding Climate Justice session was identified by 4 participants (28.6%), who noted that it introduced a new perspective on the relationship between climate change and human rights and helped them better understand the concept of climate justice. The Climate Mobility and Environmental Migration/Displacement session was selected by 2 participants (14.3%), who found

the discussion on migration and displacement particularly relevant to their work. One participant (7.1%) identified the Making Use of Reports and OECD Accountability Mechanisms session as the most valuable because it introduced new and practical concepts, while another (7.1%) valued the overall conceptual framework provided by multiple speakers. One participant (7.1%) stated that all sessions were beneficial because they contributed to strengthening knowledge and skills in human rights documentation.

Session identified as most useful	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Human Rights Documentation	5	35.7
Understanding Climate Justice	4	28.6
Climate Mobility & Environmental Migration/Displacement	2	14.3
OECD Accountability / Making Use of Reports	1	7.1
Multiple sessions/frameworks	1	7.1
All sessions	1	7.1
Total	14	100.0

6.2. Topics that Most Improved Participants' Understanding

Topic/Session	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Human Rights Documentation / Good Reporting Practices	6	42.9
Climate Justice (including Feminist Perspective)	5	35.7
OECD, World Bank, ADB, and Development Finance Accountability / Making Use of Reports	5	35.7
Climate Mobility, Environment and Displacement	2	14.3
Stakeholder Mapping	1	7.1
Policy Advocacy, Campaigns and Communications	1	7.1

6.3. Participants' Evaluation of the Workshop Outcomes

Evaluation Statement	Very High (%)	High (%)	Average (%)	Low (%)

9.1 Relevance of the workshop content to your work or study	50.0	28.6	21.4	0.0
9.2 Balance between theory and practice	21.4	42.9	35.7	0.0
9.3 Confidence in applying the knowledge gained in work or study	42.9	21.4	35.7	0.0

6.3.1. Evaluation of Session 1: Understanding Climate Justice (Dr. Elliot Lodge)

Evaluation Statement	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)
1. The trainer demonstrated expertise and provided valuable insights.	71.4	21.4	7.1	0.0	0.0
2. The speaker presented the topic clearly and effectively.	64.3	28.6	7.1	0.0	0.0
3. The content presented was relevant to the workshop theme and objectives.	57.1	35.7	7.1	0.0	0.0
4. Overall, I am satisfied with the session.	71.4	21.4	7.1	0.0	0.0

Overall, participants rated Session 1: Understanding Climate Justice very positively. Overall, participants rated Session 1: Understanding Climate Justice positively. Around 92.9% of participants agreed or strongly agreed with the evaluation statements. The highest ratings were for the trainer's expertise and overall satisfaction with the session, with 71.4% selecting Strongly Agree for both statements. A small percentage (7.1%) selected Neutral for each statement.

6.3.2. Evaluation of Session 2: Climate Mobility & Environmental Migration Displacement (Mr. Thiti, IOM Thailand)

Evaluation Statement	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)
1. The trainer demonstrated expertise and provided valuable insights.	57.1	28.6	7.1	7.1	0.0
2. The speaker presented the topic clearly and effectively.	57.1	28.6	7.1	7.1	0.0
3. The content presented was relevant to the workshop theme and objectives.	57.1	28.6	7.1	7.1	0.0
4. Overall, I am satisfied with the session.	53.9	30.8	7.7	7.7	0.0

Overall, participants provided positive feedback on Session 2: Climate Mobility & Environmental Migration Displacement, delivered by Mr. Thiti from IOM Thailand. Across the four evaluation criteria, between 84.7% and 85.7% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that the trainer demonstrated expertise, presented the topic clearly, delivered relevant content, and provided a satisfactory session.

6.3.3. Evaluation of Session 3: Feminist Perspective to Climate Justice (Ms. Joan Salvador, APWLD)

Evaluation Statement	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)
1. The trainer demonstrated expertise and provided valuable insights.	42.9	28.6	21.4	0.0	7.1
2. The speaker presented the topic clearly and effectively.	50.0	7.1	35.7	0.0	7.1
3. The content presented was relevant to the workshop theme and objectives.	35.7	35.7	21.4	0.0	7.1
4. Overall, I am satisfied with the session.	35.7	21.4	35.7	0.0	7.1

Overall, participants provided a positive evaluation of Session 3: Feminist Perspective to Climate Justice. Across the four evaluation criteria, between 64.2% and 78.6% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that the trainer demonstrated expertise, presented the topic clearly, delivered relevant content, and provided a satisfactory session. The highest positive ratings were for the trainer's expertise and the relevance of the content, while 21.4% to 35.7% of participants selected Neutral.

6.3.4. Evaluation of Session 4: Climate, Environment and Displacement (Dr. Sirada)

Evaluation Statement	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)
1. The trainer demonstrated expertise and provided valuable insights.	35.7	35.7	28.6	0.0	0.0
2. The speaker presented the topic clearly and effectively.	57.1	14.3	28.6	0.0	0.0
3. The content presented was relevant to the workshop theme and objectives.	57.1	21.4	21.4	0.0	0.0
4. Overall, I am satisfied with the session.	50.0	21.4	28.6	0.0	0.0

Overall, participants provided positive feedback on Session 4: Climate, Environment and Displacement. Between 71.4% and 78.5% of participants agreed or strongly agreed across the four evaluation criteria. The highest positive rating was for the relevance of the content, with 78.5% agreeing or strongly agreeing. The clarity of the presentation also received positive feedback, with 57.1% selecting Strongly Agree. Between 21.4% and 28.6% of participants selected Neutral across the four statements.

6.3.5. Evaluation of Session 5: Documenting Qualitative Cases (Dr. Sudarat)

Evaluation Statement	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)
1. The trainer demonstrated expertise and provided valuable insights.	64.2	28.6	7.1	0.0	0.0
2. The speaker presented the topic clearly and effectively.	71.4	21.4	7.1	0.0	0.0
3. The content presented was relevant to the workshop theme and objectives.	64.2	28.6	7.1	0.0	0.0
4. Overall, I am satisfied with the session.	64.2	28.6	7.1	0.0	0.0

Overall, participants evaluated Session 5: Documenting Qualitative Cases very positively. Around 92.9% of participants agreed or strongly agreed across all four evaluation criteria. The highest rating was for the clarity and effectiveness of the speaker's presentation, with 71.4% selecting Strongly Agree. More than 64% of participants strongly agreed that the trainer demonstrated expertise, provided valuable insights, delivered relevant content, and conducted a satisfactory session. Only 7.1% of participants selected Neutral for each statement.

6.3.6. Evaluation of Session 6: Making Use of the Report – Policy Advocacy, Campaign and Communications (Mr. Tom)

Evaluation Statement	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)
1. The trainer demonstrated expertise and provided valuable insights.	64.3	21.4	14.3	0.0	0.0
2. The speaker presented the topic clearly and effectively.	64.3	28.6	7.1	0.0	0.0
3. The content presented was relevant to the workshop theme and objectives.	64.3	21.4	7.1	0.0	0.0
4. Overall, I am satisfied with the session.	57.1	21.4	21.4	0.0	0.0

Overall, participants provided positive feedback on Session 6: Making Use of the Report – Policy Advocacy, Campaign and Communications. Based on the revised figures, between 78.5% and

92.9% of participants agreed or strongly agreed across the four evaluation criteria. The highest positive rating was for the clarity and effectiveness of the presentation, with 92.9% selecting Agree or Strongly Agree. More than half of the participants strongly agreed that the trainer demonstrated expertise, presented the topic clearly, delivered relevant content, and conducted a satisfactory session. Between 7.1% and 21.4% of participants selected Neutral across the four statements.

6.3.7. Evaluation of Session 7: OECD, World Bank, and Asian Development Bank Development Finance Accountability (Mr. Tom)

Evaluation Statement	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)
1. The trainer demonstrated expertise and provided valuable insights.	64.3	21.4	14.3	0.0	0.0
2. The speaker presented the topic clearly and effectively.	64.3	21.4	14.3	0.0	0.0
3. The content presented was relevant to the workshop theme and objectives.	64.3	21.4	14.3	0.0	0.0
4. Overall, I am satisfied with the session.	64.3	21.4	14.3	0.0	0.0

Overall, participants evaluated Session 7: OECD, World Bank, and Asian Development Bank Development Finance Accountability: What & How to Document? positively. Across all four evaluation criteria, 85.7% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that the trainer demonstrated expertise, presented the topic clearly, delivered relevant content, and conducted a satisfactory session. Most participants (64.3%) selected Strongly Agree for each statement, while 21.4% selected Agree. The remaining 14.3% selected Neutral.

6.3.8. Participants' Evaluation of Group Activities

Evaluation Statement	Very High (%)	High (%)	Average (%)	Low (%)	Very Low (%)
1. The discussions and activities encouraged active participation.	42.9	35.7	21.4	0.0	0.0
2. Participants had equal opportunities to contribute and discuss.	42.9	21.4	35.7	0.0	0.0
3. Overall, I am satisfied with the group activities/exercises.	57.1	21.4	21.4	0.0	0.0

Participants provided positive feedback on the group discussions and activities. 78.6% of participants rated the discussions and activities as High or Very High in encouraging active participation, while 64.3% felt that participants had High or Very High opportunities to contribute and engage in discussions. Overall satisfaction with the group activities was particularly strong, with 57.1% rating it Very High and 21.4% rating it High, resulting in 78.5% positive responses.

6.3.9. Participants' Interest in Future Training Topics

Participants expressed strong interest in continuing their learning through future capacity-building activities. The most frequently selected topic was data visualization and climate migration, identified by 57.1% (n = 8) of participants, followed by grant writing in climate migration (50.0%, n = 7). Interest was also high in intensive seminars or conferences on climate and environmental rights in Thailand (42.9%, n = 6) and migrants' rights in Thailand (35.7%, n = 5).

7. Additional Comments and Suggestions

Participants' additional comments reflected a high level of appreciation for the workshop while providing constructive recommendations for future training. Several participants expressed their gratitude to the organizers and facilitators, describing the workshop as a valuable learning experience and thanking the team for the opportunity to participate. Four participants did not provide additional comments or indicated that they had no further suggestions.

The most common recommendation was to extend the duration of the workshop. One participant suggested expanding the training to four or five days, explaining that the current two-day schedule was insufficient to cover all topics in adequate depth and that several sessions felt rushed. Participants expressed a desire for more time to explore the content, ask questions, and engage in discussions with the speakers. In addition, one participant suggested including a speaker experience-sharing session, allowing facilitators to share practical experiences and lessons learned from their professional work. Overall, the feedback demonstrates that participants highly valued

the workshop and were interested in more comprehensive, interactive, and practice-oriented learning opportunities in future capacity-building programmes.

8. Conclusion

The Climate Justice and Migration Concerns: Human Rights Documentation and Reporting Workshop, held on 17-18 July, successfully strengthened participants' knowledge and practical skills in climate justice, climate-induced migration, human rights documentation, reporting, and evidence-based advocacy. The positive improvements observed in the pre- and post-test results, together with participants' evaluation feedback, demonstrate that the workshop enhanced participants' understanding of key concepts and increased their confidence in applying these skills to research, documentation, and advocacy. Participants also expressed strong interest in future capacity-building activities and recommended more time for practical exercises, discussions, and case-based learning.

To build on the knowledge and skills gained during the workshop, an online writing workshop will be organized in August 2026 as a follow-up activity for interested participants. Through mentorship and feedback, participants will be supported in developing reports, policy briefs, research briefs, and other documentation on climate-induced migration from a human rights perspective. This follow-up workshop aims to strengthen participants' analytical writing, improve the use of evidence, and enhance their ability to communicate research findings effectively for advocacy and policy engagement.

9. Annexes

9.1. Annex 1: Training Agenda

Time	Topics	Notes
Day 1 (17 July 2026)		
08:45–09:00	RegistrationKnowledge Pre-test	
09:00–09:15	Welcoming Remarks, PDPA	Representatives from RCSD, IPSR and IHRP
09:15–09:30	Introduction to the WorkshopWhat is Human Rights Reporting?	Dr. Mike Hayes and Dr. Bencharat Sae Chua, Institute of Human Rights and Peace Studies (IHRP), Mahidol University
09:30–09:50	Introduction(Sharing how participants' work is related to climate justice and migration)	Dr. Sudarat Musikawong (Institute for Population and

		Social Research, Mahidol University) and Participants
09:50–10:45	Understanding Climate Justice	Dr. Elliot Sean Turner Lodge, Faculty of Social Sciences, Chiang Mai University
10:45–11:00	BREAK	
11:00–12:00	Climate Mobility & Environmental Migration Displacement: IOM concepts on operationalizing climate/environment-induced migration and technical discussion	Mr. Thiti Ratchadatikun, MECC Project Officer, IOM Thailand
12:00–13:00	Feminist Perspective to Climate Justice	Ms. Joan May Salvador, Regional Coordinator, Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development (APWLD)
13:00–14:00	LUNCH	
14:00–15:00	Climate, Environment and Displacement	Dr. Sirada Khemanitthathai, Faculty of Political Science and Public Administration, Chiang Mai University
15:00–16:00	Documenting Qualitative Cases	Dr. Sudarat Musikawong, Institute for Population and Social Research, Mahidol University
16:00–16:15	BREAK	
16:15–17:15	Work Preparation for Day 2: Roundtables• Evidence-based advocacy• Incorporating intersectionality• Using human rights and environmental sources• Addressing specific audiences	Each speaker facilitated the discussion according to their area of expertise.
17:15–17:30	Wrap-up	Dr. Mike Hayes and Dr. Sudarat Musikawong
Day 2 (18 July 2026)		
Time	**Topics**	**Notes**

09:00–10:00	Good Reporting Practices	Dr. Mike Hayes and Dr. Bencharat Sae Chua
10:00–10:45	Group Work (continued)	Dr. Mike Hayes, Dr. Bencharat Sae Chua, Dr. Sudarat Musikawong, Dr. Andrew Wai Phyo Kyaw, and Dr. Sirada Khemanitthathai
10:45–11:00	BREAK	
11:00–12:00	Making Use of the Report: Policy Advocacy, Campaigns and Communications	Mr. Tom Weerachat, International Accountability Project
12:00–13:00	LUNCH	
13:00–14:00	OECD, World Bank and Asian Development Bank Reporting Development Finance Accountability: What and How to Document?	Mr. Tom Weerachat, International Accountability Project
14:00–14:15	BREAK	
14:15–15:45	Exercise: Stakeholder Mapping	Four Breakout Groups (Facilitated by Dr. Andrew Wai Phyo Kyaw)
15:45–16:00	Wrap-up, Post-test and Workshop Evaluation	

9.2. Annex 2: Training Activity Photos



Figure 1Mr.Tom's session on Making Use of the Report: Policy Advocacy, Campaigns and Communications



Figure 2 International Accountability Project exercise on transforming data/ processing into actionable community-led demands for climate justice.



Figure 3 Dr.Sirada's Session on Climate, Environment and Displacement



Figure 4 Group Work on Climate Mobility & Environmental Migration Displacement: IOM concepts on operationalizing



Figure 5 Group work on human rights documentation and reporting