Network resilience against the consequences of a global crisis - A case study on the UN Network on Migration and its resilience to the Covid19-Pandemic

First Supervisor: Prof. Dr. René Torenvlied
Second Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Le Anh Nguyen Long
Name: Sarah Mustafa
Studentnumber: 2598922
Program: Public Governance across Borders, B. Sc.
Date: 29 June 2022
Word count: 11251

Abstract

This bachelor thesis deals with the research question *"What was the reaction of the UN Network on Migration on the consequences of the Covid19-Pandemic and how can we explain this reaction from the theoretical perspectives on Network Resilience?"*. The research was conducted by establishing four expectations regarding the level of success of the network in managing the impacts of the crisis.

The first one suggests that the success of the network's resilience is dependent upon its activity after the start of the pandemic. The second one discusses the importance of evaluations in the network for their response to the crisis' impacts, which is followed by the third, anticipating the rearrangement of priorities as an indicator of the network's success in staying resilient. And the last one proposes that the level of success in resilience against the pandemic's effects is dependent upon the inclusion of all levels and sectors, especially the local, in the decision-making process.

The data was collected from several publications by the network and its stakeholders, including policy briefs, discussion papers, statements, and workplans.

The results have shown that all expectations are somewhat met, yet the last two seemed to have a greater impact on the network's resilience level.

List of Abbreviations

IOM - International Organization for Migration

GCM - Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration

ILO - International Labor Organization

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

The pandemic has had enormous impacts on all our lives, whether this means wearing masks at any place, social distancing or quarantine, job losses, or the loss of those around us. But, what has not been enough at the center of attention, is the effects it had on networks and how they have been able to respond to and manage the crisis. A network's ability, and success of, staying resilient to and dealing with situations as such, is highly important, and to observe whether or not they were prepared or capable of adapting immediately to what they were faced with, is in need of examination.

This bachelor thesis' objective is to find an answer to the research question *"What was the reaction of the UN Network on Migration to the consequences of the Covid19-Pandemic and how can we explain this reaction from the theoretical perspectives on network resilience?"*. Therefore, the focus is laid upon the different theoretical perspectives on network resilience, and how crises may lead to this phenomenon's increase or decrease.

1.1 Scientific and societal relevance

The resilience of networks and how it is maintained and secured is of high importance and should be viewed as such. Literature concerning this phenomenon is not as broad as it needs to be. There is a lot of missing research on factors possibly affecting resilience that could otherwise help networks improve their performance in emergencies.

This may include organizational or managing factors, structural ones, or ones related to their content of work. Therefore this research is specifically chosen to fill knowledge gaps as such.

Other perspectives on network resilience exist, regarding for instance natural disasters (Day, 2014) or the establishment of technologies and AI (Ibrahimpašić, 2021). Yet, views on the, most importantly negative, as these are relevant to this research because they have influenced the network's work processes inherently, impacts of global crises have not been the central focus as of now. These negative impacts include for instance financial issues, job, and human losses, or anything that has impacted the lives of migrants negatively, and by that adding to the issues, the network has to deal with since the beginning of the crisis. Because the network has made it its responsibility to ensure the safety and protection of migrants' lives and basic rights. Other than that the network in itself may be influenced negatively by the crisis, in its working environment and structure, with regards to social distancing measures or vaccine and health regulations concerning the staff members.

Choosing to conduct the research on the case of the UN Network on Migration connected to the Covid19 crisis reflects the relevance for us as a society. It is important to understand the difficulties a network has to deal with when facing a global crisis that is affecting everyone but on a different level and some more than others. We can see how it is affecting us and those around us, but observing and fully comprehending how a network has to act fast, efficiently, and professionally to these sudden changes and hardships needs to be acknowledged more, specifically not forgetting that those working for the network, participating in the decision-making, are occupied with the effects the pandemic has on them privately while also being responsible for the impacts the network is working against at the same time.

Especially, when looking at the intensity migrants have been affected, which is more than those that are native-born to the country they are living in (Newland, 2020), it is clear that finding solutions to these issues is exceptionally difficult, which should also be done in the most efficient, fast, and best possible way.

So, understanding what may increase or decrease network resilience, and how we can contribute to one or the other, is more important than ever during times of covid.

1.2 Research question and subquestions

The research question this bachelor thesis is concerned with is *"What was the reaction of the UN Network on Migration to the consequences of the Covid19 pandemic and how can we explain this reaction from the*

theoretical perspectives on network resilience?". To further reach a clear outcome three sub-questions are to be investigated which are as follows:

Subquestion 1:
What are the most prominent theoretical perspectives on network resilience?
Subquestion 2a:
What is the structure of and what does the UN Network on Migration look like and how does it operate?
Subquestion 2b:
How did the Covid-19 crisis affect the (success of) operations of the UN Network on Migration?
Subquestion 2c:
How did the UN Network on Migration respond to the impact of the Covid19 outbreak?
Subquestion 3:
What (integration of) theoretical perspectives on network resilience provide the best explanation for the observed network response?

As can be seen by observing the sub-questions, this thesis is not only discussing descriptive questions, such as the first and 2a, but explanatory as well, as seen in 2b, 2c, and 3.
Subquestions 1 to 2c are responded to in the third chapter of the study, and an answer to the third and last subquestion is found in the analysis and conclusion chapter.

1.3 Outline of the study

After this introduction, the theory and hypotheses section is presented. This consists of a literature review, a conceptualization part, conceptualizing the term network resilience, and the four expectations the research is based on. That is followed by the section concerning the UN Network on Migration, its structure, and operations as well as the impacts of the Covid19 pandemic.
The next chapter comprises the presentation of the research design of this study, describing the methods used to collect and analyze the data, as well as the literature and concepts that are used to find sufficient results to the previously mentioned expectations. Followed by that, is the analysis chapter applying data found to the expectations and finding out whether or not they can be verified.
Ultimately, the conclusion is formed in the sixth chapter, summarizing the results and findings, while going back to the research and subquestions.

2. Theory and expectations (Literature review)

The following sections will provide an overview and discussion of the already existing literature on the theory of network resilience presented as a literature review, which is then followed by the conceptualization of the theory to adjust it further to the specific case this research is about. Lastly, the hypotheses and expectations are proposed as results of the discussed theory.

2.1 Literature review

The theoretical framework of this bachelor thesis is concerned with the phenomenon of network resilience. The literature review at hand provides a brief, critical overview of the relevant theoretical approaches to the phenomenon of network resilience.
Newman and Dale (2005) discussed network resilience as a response to authors who claim that networks are always able to build strong resilience against unforeseen events. Named scholars review this statement critically and suggest that a network is not simply resilient by itself but has to offer certain strengths, which may include resources, connections on different levels, and so on, to increase resilience (Newman and Dale., 2005).

Newman and Dale (2005) discuss resilience as the network's ability to manage adaptive behavior against any sudden changes that could otherwise lead to some kind of damage, not being overthrown by these sudden developments in its external environment. It is claimed that rather than trying to tell in advance what kind of developments or situations are going to occur it would be of greater benefit to work with the unforeseen change in a way and learn something new through them (Newman and Dale, 2005). It simply should not lead to the network not being able to continue its work because of an unpredictable circumstance.

Furthermore, the concept of different ties is presented as it was addressed in the article by Tompkins and Adger to which they are addressing this paper (Newman and Dale, 2005). Here, Newman and Dale (2005) distinguish between bonding ties and bridging ties. This is a helpful concept suggesting why a network may or may not be strong or weak concerning its resilience. Specifically, regarding the relations or connections, a network is built upon.

The first tie includes the connections or relations in the private sense, such as those between family members or neighbors and so on (Newman and Dale, 2005). Ultimately, this kind of tie results in a restriction tied to the local level and not being able to go beyond that, perhaps not only the missing availability but also the absence of interest in working or communicating outside of the local community (Newman and Dale, 2005).

However, other authors, such as Carlsson and Sandström (2008) emphasize the importance and benefits of working collaboratively between sectors and levels. That is for instance because of the increasing possibilities of gaining resources or at least an improved access to them with the assistance of other stakeholders and actors on other levels (Carlsson & Sandström, 2008). Therefore, it is obvious that this kind of approach may bring about both advantages as well as disadvantages. Yet, it is important to mention that any action may cause negative outcomes and therefore has its risks, it is just important to be aware of them. Also, simply including the local level in decision-making is not going to restrict the network inherently or without a doubt. It seems that the merits of engaging in collective action at the local level are a lot higher than the less possible negative outcomes may be.

Bonding ties result in a lack of openness to external actors or outsiders, those that are unknown or unfamiliar to one (Newman and Dale, 2005). That being the case, a strong amount of trust is dedicated to your locals whilst a lack of trust is directed at those that are strangers (Newman and Dale, 2005). Therefore, this type of tie can not assist in increasing resilience but more so prevents it as it is bound to social ties and norms that constrain the network from improving itself (Newman and Dale, 2005). Improvements and advancements could usually be made by acquiring new information or knowledge and trying to gain access to various types of capital but none of that is available to a network that focuses and bases itself entirely on bonding ties that prevent connections that could assist in gaining all of the possible aforementioned improvements (Newman and Dale, 2005).

This weakness must be mentioned, yet one can not forget that we are first able to build ties on a local level and can widen and expand from then on. Strong local ties are not necessarily resulting in distrust and deficits in sociability. A good local connection can surely provide possibilities for further connections and relationships that strengthen resilience. Another scholar, Newland (2020) agrees with the argument that starting at the local level with measures against the crisis may be more effective than immediately responding on an international or even national level. Du et al. (2020) also highlight the point in which stakeholders, actors, and bodies on all levels should stay in dialogue and exchange the information they have to improve their responses to crises, therefore working collectively.

The second type of tie, the bridging tie, is built outside of the barriers of the local level with other networks or stakeholders (Newman and Dale, 2005). An increase in access to new information and different capital as well as resources is built together with the connections which can assist in making more progress in adapting to unforeseen crises which means that consequently more possibilities and chances are created to build a stronger resilience (Newman and Dale, 2005).

This tie does overlook the local level too much and its potential to further strengthen resilience even if it does seem restricting at first. Local connections can offer insight into information that could perhaps

assist in assessing problems that may start in this sphere or can best be acted against there. Besides that, local connections may portray the basis for engaging in further relationships.

It is claimed that neither tie can efficiently and fully assist resilience on its own but a combination of both is what ends up with the most efficient results concerning resilience (Newman and Dale, 2005). This portrays a very important point because as I already mentioned both ties have their advantages and disadvantages making them mostly insufficient for being useful on their own.

Other authors, Juhola and Westerhoff (2011), suggest that the amount or level of resilience depends on what kind of network and at what level, meaning local, national, and so on, it works. That is since, for instance, the sphere may influence the increase or decrease in resilience due to the interdependent relationships and ties of the involved institutions or actors (Juhola and Westerhoff, 2011). Especially important to increase and strengthen resilience of a network is access to resources, building and keeping important connections and relationships, and good communication (Juhola and Westerhoff, 2011).

This does more or less relate to what Newman has said about resilience. Although the factors they have mentioned do help or hinder resilience in some ways, I suggest that assessing what exactly may be the causes in detail, would be helpful to fully know or understand what may prevent resilience entirely.

Booher and Innes (2010) suggest an entirely new lead, which is concerned with the principle of self-organization. Meant by that is, one could call it, teamwork, in which those participating share their varying knowledge and information while finding new perspectives on certain speculations or presuppositions to thoroughly analyze the situations and circumstances at hand (Booher and Innes, 2010). This collective work management, examination, and investigation of certain problems, the "joint-fact-finding" (Booher and Innes, 2010) strengthens and increases resilience most efficiently according to them. Adapting to new situations, or being resilient to unforeseen crises, is therefore managed through group work, including diverse perspectives and information sources, where new developments are steadily reviewed and improved as well as new and creative ideas are brought up and tested to find new ways of improving the network's adaptation management (Booher and Innes, 2010).

This presents a very interesting and innovative perspective to explain the decrease or increase in Network resilience. Incorporating the organization, structure, and people in the theory seems to provide new insights as to what could lead to deficits and what may not.

It seems very apparent that especially a wide, broad range of information that requires some creativity and diversity, which should not be restricted to a limited realm, is what enhances resilience or adaptation to challenging situations.

Others, such as van den Oord et al. (2020), suggest that strong network resilience is characterized by a well-structured network that creates motivations for the actors to work cooperatively with sufficient control and an overview of all that is being done. In addition to that, anything that could potentially harm or put limits on joint actions or the system in its different smaller units should be refrained from (van den Oord et al., 2020).

This approach again puts emphasis on collective and purposeful work, to create an environment that is filled with many varying perspectives that can help strengthen resilience of the team's network. Because, as it seems, individual work that is not sufficiently and correctly coordinated, and having no clear observation of what is being done, can potentially make the network more vulnerable to sudden changes or influences and results in more damage. Besides that, it may indicate that consistency, in general, is what makes networks more resilient towards crises, therefore meaning that having regular evaluation and discussion of the environment perhaps strengthens the needed resilience.

2.2 Conceptualization

The following part is concerned with the conceptualization of certain aspects of the network resilience theory exemplified by the case of the UN Network on Migration impacted by the Covid19 crisis.

For this bachelor thesis, I am going to part the phenomenon of network resilience into three different aspects or concepts that I propose to build strong resilience in a network or reflect it otherwise. Three

important concepts are applied: collective work and communication, regular meetings and evaluations, as well as the third and last, resources and access.

2.2.1 Collective Work and communication

The first concept is concerned with the concept of joint or collective work and communication, which is characterized by different perspectives, a certain amount of interdependency between actors and bodies, that create an environment in which expertise and information are shared, and evaluations, reviews, and corrections are made to ensure the best possible results, solutions and efficient decision-making and action-taking. This especially is important to find the necessary alternatives to former procedures that are not easily carried out anymore due to the crisis.

2.2.2 Regular meetings and evaluations

Next, the second concept involves regular meetings and reviews of the efficiency of the work of a network. That is to say, an evaluation of past work and ongoing measures improves future decision-making and responses to unforeseen events, because of the knowledge gained as to what is supposedly an efficient approach and what may not be anymore depending on the circumstances.
This concept may include the transition to meetings online instead of meeting face-to-face, or the latter but adapted to the new regulations on social distancing, the change in the number of people participating, and so on. Other than that the information exchange and discussions also present important factors for this concept, reflecting on the information given by different actors. A large variety of changes and aspects can be connected to this concept.

2.2.3 Resources and access

Lastly, the concept of resources and access indicates the increase in resilience or a strong level of resilience in a network. That results from the many possibilities and opportunities connected to the availability of resources.
These resources can be divided into either technical, financial, or human resources that are made obtainable to the UN Network on Migration, its members, and bodies especially those responsible for decision-making and the actions taken by the network. That can also include the different levels the network is able to work at and has connections in. This may include sponsoring, financial aid, expertise or support given by certain bodies or actors externally, access to resources that would otherwise be difficult to receive, and generally anything that provides the network with more and new ways to improve their efficiency and meet their goals.

2.3 Expectations

Here, I propose four expectations concerning the reactions of the UN Network on Migration to the impacts of the Covid19 pandemic, which I will be analyzing in the fifth chapter. This is done by collecting and using data from a variety of primary resources, such as discussion papers, policy briefs, or other publications of the UN Network on Migration itself.

2.3.1 Expectation I: Meetings and consistency

The level of success of the UN Network on Migration's response to the Covid19 pandemic depended on the UN Network on Migration's ability to hold consistent meetings and remain active during the Covid19 outbreak by finding new ways to meet, other than in-person.

This first expectation is based on the concept of regular meetings and evaluations. In order to find out whether this expectation turns out to be true or false, I need to search for changes in the structure of their meetings after the pandemic has started. This means looking at data explaining how meetings and

informational exchange and so on were before the Covid19 outbreak compared to how it is now after its start.

The regularity has perhaps changed, the way the members are meeting or the number of participants, and so on. Or whether there might have been another way of continuing the informational exchange and provision of expertise and news between the stakeholders and bodies. All of that should be considered in order to examine the expectation.

2.3.2 Expectation II: Adaptation and reviews

The level of success of the UN Network on Migration's response to the Covid19 pandemic was dependent on the UN Network on Migration's ability to shift its primary focus towards a constant review of efficiency in the light of the impact of the crisis.

This expectation is connected to the second concept with regards to evaluations of work and the first concept concerning collective work. Efficient here would mean that they respond to the crisis as soon as possible while still aiming at finding the best possible solution. And to review this work includes for instance whether past choices and approaches have been successful in meeting the aspired goals or not. In this case, one of the goals would be, for instance, the safety and protection of migrants' rights and the fulfillment of their basic needs, such as their labor rights, safety, shelter, healthcare, and so on.

2.3.3 Expectation III: Arranging priorities

The level of success of the UN Network on Migration's response to the Covid19 pandemic was dependent upon the network's ability to rearrange priorities ensuring that decision-making was according to the level of importance/urgency required.

The third expectation is based on the concept of evaluations. The evaluation here means reviewing whether the approaches of the network needed to be changed according to the situation. The situation here is presented as the Covid19 outbreak, its effects on migration and the network, and how the chosen network is reacting to them.

This is requiring me to pay attention to their mentioning of priorities, or what they classify as important, relevant, or even irrelevant. Also important is to identify what issue was responded to first, that is to say, seen as most urgent and in need of immediate reaction.

2.3.4 Expectation IV: Decision-making and action on all levels

The level of success of the UN Network on Migration's response to the Covid19 pandemic was dependent on the UN Network on Migration's ability to include the regional and local level to respond to the impact of the pandemic.

Hypothesis four is related to the third concept of resources and access which also includes the availability of work relationships at different levels as well as the concept of collective work. Here, local is to be understood as the regional area, or one of the smallest units at which approaches against the pandemic's influences are planned. These influences comprise negative impacts on migrants' lives leading to difficulties and challenges for the network. If the network can be more resilient against these impacts that would mean they manage to withstand crisis-induced hardships and mass issues all connected to health and care systems, financial, job, and human losses, and so on. Therefore being able to meet the objectives of the network.

3. Research design and methodology

The aim of this research is to answer the research question *"What was the reaction of the UN Network on Migration to the consequences of the Covid19-Pandemic and how can we explain this reaction from the theoretical perspectives on network resilience?"*. The following parts describe the way this research is conducted, the empirical data and literature that was used as well as explanations of the previously established concepts.

3.1 Research design

This qualitative descriptive research is conducted as a single case study. As the research question already suggests, the chosen case is the UN Network on Migration's reaction to the consequences of the Covid19 crisis. This was chosen since it portrays a very recent and important issue, which requires more research and information.
Due to the fact that single cases are used when a researcher needs to go into the depth of a specific case and examine whether there are processes that give insight into the reason for the situation (George & Bennett, 2005), this type of method fits my research the most due to its application of the UN Network on Migration during the Corona-crisis to acquire more knowledge on the topic of Network resilience. Therefore the units of analysis are publications of the UN Network on Migration in the specific case of the Covid19-Pandemic. Qualitative data is used in this scope of research.
Case Studies are used to test and develop theories, as these theoretical approaches are tested in an empirical setting (George & Bennett, 2005).
This specific type of case study, a single case, is concerned with specific circumstances while laying the focus on answering one specific research question without certainty about what the answer may be (George & Bennett, 2005). For that, I need at least two explanations to falsify possible responses and need to identify the main actors as well as their traits and decide which theories should be reviewed in the literature review section (George & Bennett, 2005).

3.2 Empirical Data

The main literature used to find the necessary data which needs to be analyzed in the next chapter compiles a variety of published documents by the UN Network on Migration. This includes the policy brief "Will International Migration Governance Survive the COVID-19 Pandemic?" by Kathleen Newland, the report "Tackling the Socio-Economic Consequences of COVID-19 on Migrants and Communities: Why Integration Matters" and the policy brief of the Working Group on Access to Services "Enhancing Access to Services for Migrants in the Context of COVID-19 Preparedness, Prevention, and Response and Beyond". Another important statement of the network is "Standing in Solidarity with Migrants: Supporting Civil Society & other Stakeholders in Responding to the COVID-19 Pandemic" published on the network's website.
The first document concentrates essentially on the most important or affected aspects of migrants' lives because of the crisis and what the first initial reaction of the UN Network on Migration was to that. Due to its publication in 2020 October, there is only a limited amount of information provided as the pandemic has only been ongoing since March 2020. That means that the data gathered and used at the time of publishing was only based on a period of about six to seven months.
Additionally, the discussion paper published by the network together with several stakeholders, all of them being members of the network's Executive Committee, such as the International Organization for Migration (IOM) or the International Labor Organization (ILO) and many more, examines the impacts the crisis had on migrants over the course of about two years. It refers to the issues migrants have been dealing with even before the crisis, which are now worse because of it, also highlighting job losses along with the additional financial issues, and fear of not being able to provide for one's family. It is also emphasized that both migrants in destination countries as well as those brought back into their country of origin and those that are in the process of arriving or leaving are severely affected. All of that and many

more issues are underlined and responded to with ideas and measures of reintegration, meeting their basic needs and protecting their human rights, as well as fast but also orderly decision-making that needs to be sustainable in the long run and not simply solutions for the present situation. This paper was published in January of 2022, which means that it has gathered information on the topic for almost two years since the pandemic began.

And lastly, the Working Group's policy brief from June 2020, gives information on how the responses of the network, as well as its members and stakeholders, looked like and what can be done to sustainably and effectively prevent further damages and be resilient to the pandemic's influence. Their recommendations generally require the members and stakeholders to guarantee that their basic needs are met and human rights are protected through their active partaking. The Global Compact is emphasized here as a crucial tool to find the most effective way of ensuring the safety and provision of basic services to migrants, therefore guiding the response to the impacts of the pandemic.

However, it is important to mention that their other resources, beyond these previously described documents, are used for the analysis as well.

These documents are primarily used to find data on how action-taking and decision-making have changed due to the occurrence of the pandemic and throughout it. Yet, the immediate responses at the beginning of the pandemic seem more relevant to this research than those that are more recent. That is because seeing how the network managed the crisis in the very first instance shows its resilience against situations as such. Yet, this does not mean that the network's initiatives over time are insignificant. These are relevant as well since there can still be an improvement or even deterioration. The document that is used as a comparison to how it was before the crisis started is the terms of reference of the network.

3.3 Concepts

The first concept dealing with collective work and communication can be related to the thoughts of Booher and Innes (2010).

They especially discuss this phenomenon of collaborative working environments increasing or ensuring resilience in a network. Therefore, I derive this concept from their ideas and adjust it to my case and theory. This is needed to be able to analyze the data for this case specifically, which is also important for the following concepts.

For this concept, I focus on finding any indication of strong communicative behavior, joint actions or discussions, and so on. Anything that might induce the exchange of ideas and teamwork, within the network as well as externally with other stakeholders, bodies, and states.

The following concept on regular meetings and evaluations can be extracted from van den Oord et al.'s (2020) ideas about resistance networks discussing efficient and consistent management and organization.

I will be focussing on what may have changed concerning the regularity of the UN Network on Migration after the outbreak of Covid19. Primarily this will require searching for information on what their terms have implied to be necessary after the establishment of the network compared to new regulations or requirements stated for this part of the network's organization.

The last concept regarding resources and access is derived from Newman and Dale's literature on network resilience as well as Juhola and Westerhoff (2011).

Newman and Dale (2005) primarily focus on this concept and the availability of resources for a network to increase its resilience towards new, perhaps unpredictable, threats, yet concerned with their approach to connectivity and relationships of networks. Whereas Juhola and Westerhoff (2011) discuss the significance of taking into account at what level the network is working or including in its decision-making. And the availability of resources can vary and depend on what kind of level the network is concerned with.

To assess the resilience of the UN Network on Migration regarding the concept of resources, information will be derived from publications of the UN Network on Migration clearly stating their primarily used resources and anything that is attached to it. This could include how they are made accessible to the network or for instance how often they are used and similar. Further, to correctly conclude the increase or

decrease in resilience attached to this concept, I have to find information in publications of the network after the Covid19-Pandemic has started, as to how resource management may have changed, in what way, and what its influences have caused to the network's resilience. Only then can a sufficient conclusion be made on the concept of resources and access.

4. UN Network on Migration

This section will focus on the UN Network on Migration; its structure and operation and the Covid19-Pandemic and its influences or impacts. Therefore, in this part, I try to gather information in response to some of the sub-questions that were mentioned earlier.

Primarily, the information that is gathered in the following is taken from the Terms of reference by the network itself, as well as its official website (UN Network on Migration, n.d.), and the publications found on it.

4.1 Structure

In this subchapter, the structure of as well as the operations carried out by the UN Network on Migration are presented.

As for the structure, there are several things to be considered. First, the membership is not compulsory but voluntary, meaning that whoever does decide to join and wishes to prioritize the issue of migration can take action as a member (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). These members have their responsibilities and tasks to accomplish. Included in these are that they need to assist in setting the goals of the network as well as their application, ensure consistency concerning migration, meaning no irregular or illegal migration and such, and function as advisors for the Executive Committee (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). They can take part in the Working Groups as members and their leader or co-leader while having the purpose of being asked about certain issues concerning the groups, such as their evaluation or their center of attention (UN Network on Migration, 2021b).

Besides that, there is the Executive Committee which consists of expert bodies with resources concerning everything that has to do with migration and explicit mandates (UN Network on Migration, 2021b) and this body will be elaborated on further in this subchapter. The network's coordinator and the secretariat are presented through the IOM, especially serving the network's Working Groups (UN Network on Migration, 2021b).

These Working Groups function as advisors and providers of technical information and other essential input for the UN Network on Migration while concentrating on certain problems and working in a goal-oriented manner (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). In addition to that, they also present helpful guidelines and tools, as well as collective work that is carried out at not only the regional but also the state level (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). In partnership with the Executive Committee and in coherence with the orders of the network's general work plan, action plans are made that direct their steps (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). Improvements are made within the Working Groups in order to match new possibilities and needs (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). A review is made regularly in periods of four years after the International Migration Review Forum, by the Executive Committee together with members of the network, to ensure their pertinence (UN Network on Migration, 2021b).

Another important component of the UN Network on Migration is the aforementioned Executive Committee which is responsible for evaluating and updating the main focus of the UN Network on Migration, which is the intergovernmental agreement "Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration" (GCM), whose principles guide the work of the network (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). Moreover, it is assisting the IOM when it comes to organizing the network's work and the support it receives on the regional- and state level as well as making sure that efficiency is secured in cooperating actions taken (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). The Committee sets focus points to help members navigate implementation, especially during the International Migration Review forum taking place every four years which was settled in the GCM (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). Furthermore, the yearly

work plan of the network is also developed by the Executive Committee in collaboration with other members, as well as anything that concerns the Working Group's organization, action, and structure (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). This also includes, as mentioned before, evaluating whether their usefulness and significance still prevail (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). Reports created by the network are directed by the Committee as well and then sent to the Secretary-General (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). Furthermore, because of the Executive Committee's responsibility to ensure that the network is achieving its goals, there is the possibility, if needed, to supply the Secretariat with any necessities related to resources, whether human or technical (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). And lastly, it is important to mention that the network attempts to decide everything through common consent, while these decisions are made by the committee, there is the possibility that there is no general agreement possible on an issue, which brings about other procedures for further decision-making (UN Network on Migration, 2021b).

The alternative starts with the Coordinator of the network discussing together with the principals of the committee and the whole network the next most efficient steps to be taken and what could be done (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). And if that is not successful, another step is taken which is about the Executive Committee and its Coordinator entrusting or assigning the issue to the Secretary-General, where conclusions are decided upon in the interest of every member's mandate (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). Furthermore, if there is any necessity to use any further tools or methods for their work, they can be taken (UN Network on Migration, 2021b).

The previously mentioned Network Coordinator is another important body of the UN Network on Migration that should be taken into account in the scope of this analysis.

The IOM represents the Coordinator, specifically, it is the agency's Director General that is responsible for encouraging the members in cooperation and mutual agreements, as well as joint work with these members to recognize prime concerns and chances to act (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). Furthermore, the Coordinator makes sure that the network works efficiently including the Secretariat and its work, as well as managing the "Capacity Building Mechanism", which will be elaborated on later (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). They are responsible for enabling the consistent exchange of the Principals of the committee and with the committee's assistance they should recognize where possibilities may lie for new funds to support the actions of the network (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). Finally, the Coordinator needs to inform the members, as well as the system of the UN and other collaborators about the pursuits of the UN Network on Migration (UN Network on Migration, 2021b).

The last body that is going to be elaborated on is the Secretariat.

The Director General of the International Organization for Migration founded the Secretariat of the network and is, besides that, authoritative over it as well (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). They also choose who is part of the body but can be advised by other partners of the network (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). Furthermore, there are many responsibilities the Secretariat has to fulfill regarding the assistance to the network's work (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). These include for instance supporting the network and all its bodies in their actions whether by themselves or in cooperation between each other or with others (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). Other tasks involve giving suggestions of problems that may need to be addressed and confronted with actions, as well as organizing and creating the yearly work plan the network needs that also respects the ideas that are given by the members (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). The UN Network on Migration (2021) also expects the Secretariat to prepare the meetings that are held with or without the Executive Committee, and to assist the network in accomplishing the Capacity Building Mechanism. Additionally, they also have to observe the application of resolutions or conclusions, as well as supervise what the network has prepared as reports for the Secretary-General coming from ideas by the members (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). Finally, their task is also to assist the network in helping members when evaluating the GCM as well as the research on it (UN Network on Migration, 2021b).

4.2 Operations

Next, the operations of the UN Network on Migration are elaborated on.

The first one is the Capacity Building Mechanism (CBM) which has already been mentioned in the previous subchapter. It was established in the previously mentioned intergovernmental agreement GCM and is assisting in aiding in providing resources of financial assistance, and technical and human nature (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). The CBM is primarily focused on increasing the capacities of the network by doing that and by advancing the collaborations and joint work during the application of the GCM (UN Network on Migration, 2021b).

The components of the mechanism can be divided into three important parts. The first one is the connection hub which is used to provide solutions that are applied to what is being requested, they are integrated and made specifically for certain purposes (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). Secondly, it incorporates an online open data source which represents a server for knowledge around the globe (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). Lastly, it comprises a start-up fund that is used to finance projects and similar as that are utilized as solutions to issues (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). The UN Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office is the manager of the mechanism which has a decision-making authority that is composed of many partners and led by the Coordinator (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). Also assisted by the Network Secretariat, this has the intention of guaranteeing that the Fund is working efficiently and that its functions are fulfilled (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). It is composed of the UN Network's members, countries functioning as either benefactors or beneficiaries, and more stakeholders or collaborators, acting in sequence (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). A plan is formed by the UN Network on Migration that provides the best basis for the network's system to assist the elements of the knowledge platform of the CBM and its connection center (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). And lastly, this group is evaluated by the Executive Committee jointly with the decision-making body yearly (UN Network on Migration, 2021b).

Next is the Engagement on the regional and state level which needs to be described briefly.

It is connected to the GCM in the sense that the members of the network are helped when it comes to their implementations of the agreement on the regional and state level, which is abreast with the UN Development System (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). The regional body or the Resident Coordinator is responsible supports the coordination mechanisms on both levels of the UN's system, whereas concerning the national level, actions as such are secured or connected to the UN Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs) for secured national ownership (UN Network on Migration, 2021b).

Lastly, the rest of this subchapter illustrates the reviews and annual meetings of the network.

Official evaluations of the network's functional alignments are made by the Secretary-General every second year (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). Collectively, the Executive Committee as assistance, the members of the networks as consultants work together with the Network Coordinator to make sure that the network's work evaluations are sufficiently and regularly provided to help the network efficiently and effectively achieve its set goals while always paying attention to new circumstances (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). The evaluations have to be provided yearly (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). This assembly also holds meetings every year about the network's complete membership, also taking into account discussions with other collaborators and stakeholders before an agenda is set (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). Meetings as such are incentivized to evaluate the advancements of the network, as well as new actions to increase cooperative behavior, decide upon new resolutions where they are needed, and lastly, recognize what kind of problems may occur (UN Network on Migration, 2021b).

4.3 Covid19 and its impacts on the network

The following section is going to deal with the impacts the Covid19-Pandemic has had on the network and its general response to it seen in its immediate reaction and decision-making.

After the establishment of the UN Network on Migration as a linked body to the foundation of the GCM, it was the plan to arrange all implementations of actions in 2020 (Newland, 2020). Yet, this did not work out as was planned, because of the Covid19 outbreak, creating issues or intensifying others that have been

present before, without any forewarning (Newland, 2020). This led the UN Network on Migration to have no other choice but to adapt to the situation they are confronted with and work with the resources that are at hand, while acknowledging all aspects of the lives of migrants that are affected besides their health, including for instance job loss, or their high exposure to the virus related to their common service occupations, language barriers, to name a few (Newland, 2020 & UN Network on Migration, 2022). Also acknowledging the fact that these issues have been existing even before the pandemic but were increased because of it (UN Network on Migration, 2022).

First and foremost, it seems that their immediate reaction was to rearrange the principles of the Global Compact by ranking it according to its importance and urgency, therefore creating new priorities (Newland, 2020). These are sorted first into issues that need immediate attention, followed by issues that ensure the orderly and ongoing process of migration after the pandemic ends, and lastly, problems that remain significant (Newland, 2020).

One of the highest priorities for the network is to provide access to basic needs for the migrants, which may include health care, accommodation, and so on (Newland, 2020). Another one that is emphasized strongly is the strengthening of cooperation on an international and global level to ensure orderly and safe migration, also including teamwork when it comes to secure border control (Newland, 2020). Similarly important is the discussion and consultation between the states to have a better comprehension of the interests of the other (Newland, 2020). Lastly, in order to relieve migrants, detention is, even more than before, only instrumentalized as a last expedient (Newland, 2020). That is because detention centers may portray unnecessary endangerment to the migrant as there is a lack of support and the possibility of being separated from their families in such facilities (Newland, 2020).

Another important result is the financial issues the network was confronted with at the emergence of the pandemic (Newland, 2020). That is due to the difficulties they faced with fundraising, which had been burdensome even before Covid happened when members did not give financial aid as was expected from them in the guidelines of the compact, whether this was due to their unwillingness or their inability to do so (Newland, 2020).

Certain guidelines for emergency or urgent situations were missing when the pandemic started because the UN Network is not established for situations as such, which means that the guidelines of another initiative may be of help (Newland, 2020). The "Migrants in Countries in Crisis" (MCIC), which is an initiative of the Philippines and the US (IOM UN Migration, n.d.), is prepared to ensure the safety of migrants faced with natural disasters and classifying the pandemic as such may have been of assistance to the network to use the suggestions of the MCIC (Newland, 2020).

The network and the states especially focused on implementing new policies, actions, and programs that are sustainable in the long run to prevent future events from being as damaging as the Covid19 pandemic has been (UN Network on Migration, 2022). Many stakeholders, bodies, and actors were involved in working against the pandemic's socio-economic impacts on migration, which means that cooperation was an important factor in building resilience against the crisis (UN Network on Migration, 2022).

As mentioned before, it was of high importance for the Network to ensure the migrants' basic needs (UN Network on Migration, 2022).

5. Analysis

This section aims to examine the expectations stated in the previous chapter in an effort to answer the overall research question. Hence the qualitative data and literature presented in the research design of this thesis will be analyzed. The responses found here are then used to finally answer the research question in the conclusion chapter.

5.1 Expectation I: Meetings and consistency

Here, it is expected that the network's success in responding to the pandemic's impacts depended on its ability to meet regularly and remain active after the start of the crisis.

As can be derived from the previous chapter, the GCM has different kinds of meetings, either annually, or every two years, and at other time intervals, depending on which meeting is planned and held by which bodies or members (UN Network on Migration, 2021b). This is how it was regulated before the Covid19 outbreak.

Later, after the start of the pandemic, the importance of discussions and interest exchange of the members of the network and other stakeholders and actors is highly emphasized (Newland, 2020). A requirement and obligation that the network itself wants to be fulfilled regularly, in order to manage the issues the crisis has created sufficiently.

Some of the initiatives that were launched by a variety of stakeholders and actors connected to the UN Network on Migration, such as the IOM and IOL, and others, are very helpful mechanisms assisting the decision-making processes during the pandemic (UN Network on Migration, 2022). These include for instance databases or tools providing essential information, knowledge, data, and more on migration-related issues and topics, that can help improve further approaches in striving against the influences of the crisis (UN Network on Migration, 2022). Most importantly, it is a way of sharing and exchanging information that can not be disturbed by the effects of the Covid19 outbreak, as they are of digital nature and therefore, do not require any direct contact.

In the workplan for 2021 and 2022, the UN Network on Migration makes mentions of the importance of consistency (UN Network on Migration, 2021a). It is said that this consistency as well as the access to information and knowledge exchange, as well as approaching the Global Compact's aims thoroughly and comprehensively, is an obligation that must be fulfilled to ensure efficient action-taking against the crisis' impacts (UN Network on Migration, 2021a).

The results and data regarding this expectation are very limited, due to the network not providing as much information on these aspects as the following ones. This could be explained by saying that this was an issue that was easy to solve and did not require as much attention as the following ones and therefore did not provide as much data as the others.

5.2 Expectation II: Adaptation and reviews

It is expected that the level of success of the UN Network on Migration's response to the Covid19 pandemic was dependent on the network's ability to shift its primary focus toward a constant review of efficiency in the light of the impact of the crisis.

With the start of the pandemic, new hardships were observable. One of these challenges was shown in missing information and data that was essential to providing a sustainable and efficient way of integrating or reintegrating migrants or those returning (UN Network on Migration, 2022). This knowledge gap was immensely hindering the work of the network trying to respond to the Covid19 outbreak's effects (UN Network on Migration, 2022). But because of that, decision-making and coming to conclusions regarding policies and programs were impeded (UN Network on Migration, 2022).

In order to overcome this difficulty, several new initiatives were formed by either the network itself or other stakeholders working in cooperation with the network, such as the IOM (UN Network on Migration, 2022). These initiatives compiled for instance the "Migration Network Hub" established by the IOM in 2021, facilitating expertise and knowledge and such, to members, other stakeholders, and the whole UN, on anything related to the topic of migration (UN Network on Migration, 2022). In addition to that, there is also the ILO, providing a database with information on labor migration of more than 120 states (UN Network on Migration, 2022).

The Working Group on Alternatives to Immigration Detention (2021) also mentions the approach of reviewing their past actions to improve further steps. That is done with regard to finding the best alternatives to the unnecessary detention of migrants during the Covid19 pandemic (Working Group on Alternatives to Immigration Detention, 2021). It is seen as a crucial approach of utmost importance, assisting in protecting the human and basic rights of migrants during times of crisis by not letting them and their families be exposed to avoidable harm (Working Group on Alternatives to Immigration Detention, 2021).

Here again, it can be observed that the information provided for this expectation is not as broad as it could be to find generalizable results.

5.3 Expectation III: Arranging priorities

I anticipate that the network's success in responding to the pandemic was dependent upon its capability to rearrange priorities ensuring that decision-making was performed according to the level of importance or urgency required.

The GCM includes a list of 23 objectives that need to be met to ensure safe and orderly migration which was used by the UN Network on Migration to set a new order of priorities trying to manage the impacts Covid19 had on migrant groups after the virus broke out (Newland, 2020). That is also due to the similarities between the challenges or negative experiences migrants have had until now (UN Network on Migration, 2022). Meaning that the issues they have dealt with before the pandemic after its start, are the same, but increased and worse than before (UN Network on Migration, 2022). Therefore, issues such as xenophobia, discrimination based on gender, and such, have been intensified with the Covid19 outbreak (UN Network on Migration, 2022). This is observable when looking at the living conditions these migrant workers are provided, or the working conditions they are most likely to be put in, including, for instance, service jobs, meaning places in which they are more vulnerable to being infected with the virus, or denying them access to goods and services and many more issues they are faced with (IOM UN Migration, 2020).

The approach was to classify first urgent aims that require immediate work, followed by very important matters, however more so to the repairing of migration after the pandemic, and lastly, objects that remain important but are not of highest priority for the moment (Newland, 2020). The prioritization could be dependent on what part exactly and how intensely the lives of migrants are affected and therefore the issue's urgency is calculated. This rearrangement was then used as a way of guiding decision-making and further approaches against the damages of the crisis. For instance, the last point of the objectives, number 23 calling for an increase in cooperation on an international and global level, was then categorized as an urgent matter and a step to be taken as an immediate response to the pandemic (Newland, 2020).

Besides this objective, four additional objectives were classified to be in need of immediate reaction. At the top of the list, was the object of addressing and reducing vulnerabilities in migration (Newland, 2020). Before the pandemic, this was the seventh objective in the GCM, now viewing it as one of the most urgent matters (Newland, 2020). Another objective classified as an urgent matter is the aim of only utilizing the option of detention as a last measure instead of finding other ways or alternatives for it (Newland, 2020). Previously, this objective, along with the two upcoming ones, belonged to the thirteenth to fifteenth point of the GCM's list of objectives (Newland, 2020). The subsequent targets were to, first of all, enhance foreign protection, collaboration, and support for the whole of the migration process, and second, facilitate migrants with access to services that fulfill their basic needs (Newland, 2020).

Additionally, it is also notable that, because of the prioritization of not using detention as a measure as long as there are alternatives to it, the network worked on priorities, used as other resorts, specifically to avoid the detention of migrants (Working Group on Alternatives to Immigration Detention, 2021). Therefore, they emphasized that any alternative action, that would respect the human rights of the migrants and not further aggravate their lives during times of crisis and vulnerability, are and need to be perceived as priorities (Working Group on Alternatives to Immigration Detention, 2021). Here, the Working Group emphasizes the importance of this, by saying that the process of these evaluations of the alternatives they have tried instead of detention, helps improve further approaches and actions against the impacts of the crisis (Working Group on Alternatives to Immigration Detention, 2021). That is, because of the collective or peer learning through reflecting on past decisions and actions (Working Group on Alternatives to Immigration Detention, 2021).

5.4 Expectation IV: Decision-making and action on all levels

In this fourth and last expectation, I propose that the level of success of the UN Network on Migration's response to the Covid19 pandemic was dependent on the UN Network on Migration's ability to include the regional and local level to respond to the impact of the pandemic.

The GCM has always emphasized the relevance of working cooperatively and finding solutions on all levels (UN Network on Migration, 2020). Yet, it may be that before the circumstances have not required this engagement by lower units as much as it is needed now (UN Network on Migration, 2020).

That is because the way societies have reacted to the outbreak of the virus damaged the migrants and migrant groups just as much as the pandemic itself, by violations of their human rights through for instance discrimination based on ethnicity or gender and such (UN Network on Migration, 2020). New policies also led to more difficulties for migrants to access and receive basic services making migrant groups more vulnerable than ever and other groups during the pandemic (UN Network on Migration, 2020).

A solution chosen by the UN Network on Migration was to hold discussions with actors of lower levels, such as the local and national sectors, listening to their ideas, advice, and suggestions on how to further act against the most prominent threats the virus outbreak has caused in migrant groups (UN Network on Migration, 2020). Based on this approach the network managed to include the smaller unit at the regional or local level in the decision-making process and to acknowledge their involvement as an enrichment to their work against the crisis' induced negative consequences to migrant's lives (UN Network on Migration, 2020). And as much as the network is praising and appreciating the commitment of the local stakeholders, it is still stressed that the states are first and foremost responsible for the security and protection of the rights of the migrants and providing them with their needs and that they should also equally as much engage in taking action against the crisis' impacts (UN Network on Migration, 2020).

However, it is highly important to acknowledge the initiated consultation of the local level, seen as a great contribution to responding to the pandemic's impacts effectively by the network, is an indication of valuing the regional and local areas as important factors to further resilience in their network. The UN Network on Migration emphasizes the effectiveness and merits of acting collaboratively and through dialogue between all the levels and sectors, whether national, international, regional, or global, which is why they also included this approach in their workplan established in April of 2021, thoroughly discussing their priorities set for the ongoing actions against the pandemic's impacts for 2021 and 2022 (UN Network on Migration, 2021a).

When it comes to the local level and its inclusion in approaches against the crisis, it is also important to strengthen community-based approaches through the help of the network or other stakeholders (UN Network on Migration, 2022). That said, the actors, stakeholders, or bodies on local levels trying to find ways of dealing with the crisis should also be supported in that, giving them the means to help themselves through these difficult times and hardships (UN Network on Migration, 2022). That way, actions can be taken directly at the lower units, by those that are more inclined to understand the circumstances and know how to approach the situation specifically in the most efficient way.

Another way in which the collaboration of different sectors, levels, and stakeholders, is strongly needed as well, would be the reintegration of migrants (UN Network on Migration, 2022). The act of reintegrating migrants is seen as an important factor in finding fitting approaches to the impacts of the coronavirus outbreak (UN Network on Migration, 2022). That is because this strategy is dealing with these challenges in the longer term, providing the migrants and their families with safety and secured life, ensuring a sustainable socio-economic integration during times of crisis and uncertainty, whether this may concern the labor market, social life, education and such (UN Network on Migration, 2022).

6. Conclusion

The research question of this bachelor thesis was *"What was the reaction of the UN Network on Migration on the consequences of the Covid19-Pandemic and how can we explain this reaction from the theoretical perspectives on Network Resilience?"*. After conducting this research, one can come to the conclusion that the immediate reaction of the network was to ensure the safety and protection of migrants' basic rights and to provide them access to their basic services. That was done by primarily classifying this as their priority and fulfilling this objective through different approaches such as collective work on national, international, global, and particularly local levels. Especially the theoretical perspective concerned with the inclusion of the local level and collective work leading to an increase in resilience through expanding expertise, resources, connections, and so on, is a fitting approach to the research question. This was examined in the fourth expectation and concerned with the first concept, which was concerned with collective work, and the third concept regarding resources and access.

Nevertheless, in order to answer this question, four subquestions were established providing a structure for this research. Following the structure of the subquestions, first, the theories on network resilience were presented in the literature review, followed by the structure and operations of the UN Network on Migration, and after that the impacts of the pandemic on the network. Subsequent to that was the response to these effects found in the analysis. Now, the final subquestion is answered with this conclusion, answering whether the theoretical perspectives can explain the way the network has reacted to the crisis and if so, which one may be the most fitting to respond to the research question.

There were four different expectations conducted for this research derived from the theory and concepts dealt with in this thesis. These include the concept of collective work, second, the concept of regular meetings and evaluations, and lastly, the concept of resources and access. All the expectations are concerned with the level of success of the network in responding to the Covid19 pandemic and how it is influenced by these factors examined in the expectations.

The first expectation suggests a relation between the level of success and the network's ability to consistently meet and stay active during the pandemic. Secondly, it was expected that the constant evaluations and reviews of the network were an indicator of success. The third expectation concerned the network's ability to rearrange priorities according to their urgency or need for a response. Lastly, the fourth led to expect that the inclusion of all levels, particularly the local, influenced the level of success positively. These expectations all showed that all the theoretical perspectives discussed in this research have led to results, yet they were not weighted evenly. The factors in the first two expectations were not considered as much as the following ones, due to the limited information provided by the network. This does not mean that the theories are invalid or inaccurate, this particular case just does not support them as much as they could be supported in other case studies which would provide more detailed information. Yet, data that is consistent with theories of the first two, namely the relation between network resilience and first, remaining activity of the network during the pandemic and second, constant evaluations and reviews of past actions, has shown that there seems to be some truth to it. This suggests that further research should be conducted to have a better understanding of the possible relationship between the variables apart from this specific case presented in this research.

Therefore, to come back to the research question and the subquestions, it is possible to conclude that the theories discussed all seem to explain parts of why network resilience may increase or decrease in the light of the impacts of global crises. However, it is obvious that especially the inclusion of the local level, which turned out to be an essential factor in a successful response to the pandemic's impacts, has been emphasized most by the network, showing its value and weight in reacting to the impacts of the crisis.

Because this is a single case study, the results may have limited generalizability, which is why the results of the analysis may only be applicable to the specific case this research has derived its results from, portrayed in the case of the UN Network on Migration reacting to the impacts of the Covid19 pandemic. That is due to the differences in networks, how they may operate, their structure, work environment, their preparedness for crises, and so on. Results that are acquired through research on one specific case can not

be applied to the general case. Even the crisis may be different from the circumstances presented here. Meaning that any global crisis is simply not comparable to the Covid19 crisis this research is conducted on.

Nonetheless, after reviewing the several important theoretical approaches to network resilience and analyzing whether they apply to the research, it is clear that emphasis and relevance laid upon working on and with all sectors as well as the rearrangement of priorities is an important factor influencing the level of success in a network responding to crises.

Overall, it is important to acknowledge that all expectations were met, to the extent that every factor was mentioned by the network as an essential element to succeeding in finding the best approaches against the pandemic's effects.

However, missing and limited information and data presented a great weakness in this research. That may be due to the recentness of the case, as the case depicted here is concerned with the still ongoing Covid19 pandemic. Additionally, it seems that the network does not vary much in the information it provides. Rather, the same approaches, ideas, information, and so on, are given multiple times in different formats, by different bodies, in varying publications. Therefore, the data offered is limited for different parts of the analysis.

Yet, the strengths of this research are also important to mention. The greatest to be seen in the contribution to the research on network resilience and insights into the factors increasing or decreasing it.

Lastly, the possible brief recommendations for further research on the phenomenon are explored in the following. Now, what I would suggest to future approaches regarding research on network resilience is that the use of other methods, other than a case study, would give new insights into the phenomenon of network resilience. That is due to the limits attached to a case study, especially when looking at the generalizability of the results, which are first and foremost derived from the research on one particular case. Also, the approach of using interviews as a means to collect new data could also be very helpful in creating new perspectives and information on network resilience. That may be one way to overcome limitations regarding missing or limited data.

And to conclude, I would suggest that for a network, strengthening and improving the ability to include and engage in all levels and sectors, is a beneficial approach, increasing resilience against unforeseen events, through collective work, a broader range of resources and connections, as well as different perspectives and expertise. However, again, this is not an absolute guarantee because, as already mentioned, no universal and definite statements can be made based on the analysis, besides recommendations on what could be effective to the network's resilience.

List of References and Sources

Berthod, O., Grothe-Hammer, M., Müller-Seitz, G., Raab, J., & Sydow, J. (2017). From high-reliability organizations to high-reliability networks: the dynamics of network governance in the face of emergency. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 27(2), 352-371.

Booher, D. E., & Innes, J. E. (2010). Governance for resilience: CALFED as a complex adaptive network for resource management. Ecology and Society, 15(3).

Carlsson, L., & Sandström, A. (2008). Network governance of the commons. International Journal of the Commons, 2(1), 33-54.

Day, J. M. (2014). Fostering emergent resilience: the complex adaptive supply network of disaster relief. International Journal of Production Research, 52(7), 1970-1988.

Du, L., Feng, Y., Tang, L. Y., Kang, W., & Lu, W. (2020). Networks in disaster emergency management: a systematic review. Natural Hazards, 103(1), 1-27.

George, A. L., & Bennett, A. (2005). Case studies and theory development in the social sciences. MIT Press.

Ibrahimpašić, A. L., Han, B., & Schotten, H. D. (2021). Ai-empowered vnf migration as a cost-loss-effective solution for network resilience. In 2021 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference Workshops (WCNCW) (pp. 1-6). IEEE.

IOM, UN Migration (2020). COVID-19 and the transformation of migration and mobility globally. Quarantined! Xenophobia and migrant workers during the COVID-19 pandemic.

IOM, UN Migration (n.d.). MICIC Initiative and Guidelines. URL: https://micicinitiative.iom.int/micic-initiative-and-guidelines Retrieved 27.06.2022

Juhola, S., & Westerhoff, L. (2011). Challenges of adaptation to climate change across multiple scales: a case study of network governance in two European countries. Environmental science & policy, 14(3), 239-247.

Newland, Kathleen (2020). Will International Migration Governance Survive the COVID-19 Pandemic?. The Migration Policy Institute.

Newman, L., & Dale, A. (2005). Network structure, diversity, and proactive resilience building: a response to Tompkins and Adger. Ecology and society, 10(1).

UN Network on Migration (2020). Standing in Solidarity with Migrants: Supporting Civil Society & other Stakeholders in Responding to the COVID-19 Pandemic. URL: https://migrationnetwork.un.org/statements/standing-solidarity-migrants-supporting-civil-society-other-stakeholders-responding Retrieved 19.06.2022

UN Network on Migration (2021a). NETWORK WORKPLAN. 2021–2022 PRIORITIES. URL: https://migrationnetwork.un.org/sites/g/files/tmzbdl416/files/docs/network_-_workplan_2021-2022_final.pdf

UN Network on Migration (n.d.). Policy Documents. URL: https://migrationnetwork.un.org/policy-documents

UN Network on Migration (2021b). Terms of Reference for the United Nations Network on Migration. URL: https://migrationnetwork.un.org/sites/g/files/tmzbdl416/files/docs/un_network_on_migration_tor_1_0.pdf

UN Network on Migration (2022). Tackling the Socio-Economic Consequences of COVID-19 on Migrants and Communities: Why Integration Matters.

van den Oord, S., Vanlaer, N., Marynissen, H., Brugghemans, B., Van Roey, J., Albers, S. & Kenis, P. (2020). Network of networks: preliminary lessons from the Antwerp Port Authority on crisis management and network governance to deal with the COVID‑19 pandemic. Public administration review, 80(5), 880-894.

Working Group on Access to Services (2020). Enhancing Access to Services for Migrants in the Context of COVID-19 Preparedness, Prevention, and Response and Beyond.

Working Group on Alternatives to Immigration Detention (2021). COVID-19 & Immigration Detention: What Can Governments and Other Stakeholders Do?