

# CALL TO ACTION

Recognising Lived Experience as  
Expertise: Inclusion in Research on  
Movement and Exploitation

**SEPT 2025**

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was produced by a team of researchers from Asylos and the Human Trafficking Research Network: Fatima Ali, Dr Gillian Kane, Jo Pettitt, Carolina Albuerne, Dr Cherisse Francis, Dr Maria Turda, and Dr Yelyzaveta Monastyrova. The authors wish to acknowledge the contribution of workshop panellists and participants who attended and provided feedback on an earlier draft of the call to action, as well as Dr Maja Grundler and Neiha Lasharie who provided valuable input on a draft of this report, and Emma Avilés for helping with the layout of this report.

The workshop was made possible through the financial support of Clifford Chance, Asylos, and Ulster University's Social Justice Observatory.

## A NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY

*For the purpose of this Call to Action, we understand lived experience to be firsthand, personal knowledge and understanding that a person gains through directly experiencing events, situations or conditions in their own life. It is shaped by an individual's unique background, identity, and circumstances. Learned experience refers to knowledge, skills, or understanding that a person acquires through education, training, observation, or the experiences of others, rather than through direct personal involvement. We recognise that in the context of our research and practice people may bring either or both lived and learned experience of the matter that is the focus of our work.*



# CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	2
Introduction	4
Principle 1: Pursue honest and transparent conversations	6
Principle 2: Implement a 'beginning to end' approach when involving lived experience expertise	7
Principle 3: Fair and open discussion about remuneration and development	8
Principle 4: Provide clarity on what expertise and skills are required for any given project	9
Principle 5: Ethical Engagement	10
Principle 6: Enhancing credibility in Country of Origin Information Research	12
Conclusion	14
Sign the pledge	15

# INTRODUCTION

On 6 June 2025, Asylos and the Human Trafficking Research Network (HTRN) co-hosted a hybrid event titled 'Recognising Lived Experience as Expertise: A Workshop on Inclusion in Research on Movement and Exploitation.' The in-person element of the event took place in London at the offices of Clifford Chance in Canary Wharf, London. Across the online and in-person environments, the workshop brought together 90 lived-experience experts, researchers, and practitioners to collectively explore how lived experience can and should be recognised as legitimate expertise in the fields of asylum, human trafficking, statelessness, and in Country of Origin Information research.

'Lived experience' is a term that is used in a range of fields, from medicine and healthcare studies, to human rights practice, the work of NGOs, academic research, and beyond.<sup>1</sup> Asylos' working definition of lived experience is geared towards the context of migration and asylum, and provides a useful starting point in understanding what is meant by 'lived experience' particularly when it comes to research on movement and exploitation. The working definition states that:

Lived Experience includes direct experiences of i) asylum systems, statelessness procedures or protection procedures for trafficked persons or ii) living in or forced migration from countries of origin of refugees or iii) migration from the Global Majority countries. We recognise that factors such as gender, sexual orientation, age, disability and other factors shape these and other lived experiences.<sup>2</sup>

Approaches to research and practice that engage 'lived experience' are becoming ever more common. Alongside this, some emerging approaches also provide critical reflection on the inherent power dynamics that are often at play in the relationship between those with lived and learned experience.<sup>3</sup> Yet, despite these developments, within both Country of Origin Information research and academic research on movement and exploitation, lived experience can often be undervalued or overlooked in favour of traditional forms of expertise, such as academic credentials or professional backgrounds. Both Asylos and the HTRN acknowledge that this imbalance can marginalise those with direct experience of displacement or exploitation, and in doing so, limit the depth, nuance, and credibility of the evidence produced.

1. See, eg Lula Dembele and others, 'Researching with Lived Experience: A Shared Critical Reflection between Co-Researchers' (2024) 23 International Journal of Qualitative Methods 1; Wendy Asquith, Allen Kiconco, and Alex Balch, 'A Review of Current Promising Practices in the Engagement of People with Lived Experience to address Modern Slavery and Human Trafficking' (MSPEC, 2022), available at: <<https://files.modernslaverypec.org/production/assets/downloads/Engagement-lived-experience-full-report.pdf?dm=1736268031>> accessed 8 September 2025; Chris Bailey, Researching Virtual Play Experiences: Visual Methods in Education Research (Palgrave MacMillan 2021) 89-178; Rathna Bharathi Seetharaman, Joanna Fox and Gavin Millar, 'Exploring the Impact of Lived Experience Contributions to Social Work and Healthcare Programmes: A Scoping Review' (2025) 14 Social Sciences 367; Survivor Alliance, 'Building Access to Action Through Collective Movement' (Survivor Alliance, 2024) available at: <<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5ee517995ce62276749898ed/t/67938fc2cec68e21f70ef069/1737723848993/Empowering+Survivor-Led+Advocacy.pdf>> accessed 11 September 2025.

2. This working definition is utilised internally within Asylos.

3. See Dembele and others (n 1).

In line with Asylos' working definition, we view lived experience as a powerful and legitimate form of expertise. Yet in practice, the voices of those with lived experience<sup>4</sup> continue to be silenced or excluded, reinforcing hierarchies of knowledge that overlook the vital insights of people with first-hand understanding of the event or issue being studied. This understanding is rooted in Asylos' guidance on how to conduct Country of Origin Information research, and previous HTRN initiatives on survivor inclusion, which align with the principle of *'Nothing about us, without us.'*<sup>5</sup> Failing to recognise lived experience as a valid and essential form of expertise directly contradicts this principle. It excludes those most impacted from having a voice in shaping the research, policies and decisions that affect their lives, and in doing so, denies Country of Origin Information researchers, legal representatives, decision-makers and academics access to vital, experience-based insights that cannot be replaced by professional or academic knowledge or 'learned experience' alone.

Against this backdrop, Asylos and the HTRN organised the workshop to further explore how lived experience expertise could and should be incorporated into both Country of Origin Information and academic work on movement and exploitation. The aim was to create a space to explore together – as researchers and practitioners, with both lived and learned experience. The workshop was conducted under the Chatham House Rule, to provide a safe space for open and honest conversations. After exploring a range of themes related to the inclusion of lived experience expertise in research on movement in exploitation, workshop participants worked together to develop principles that could guide researchers and practitioners in their work.

This call to action is directed at those working in research and practice on issues relating to movement and exploitation. The action points are interrelated and, if pursued together, can contribute towards a fairer, more transparent approach to the inclusion of lived experience expertise in research on movement and exploitation. Each action point is accompanied by a short explanatory section. **We call on researchers, decision makers, policymakers, and practitioners to sign the Call and pledge to work towards implementing the actions it contains. We view the Call to Action as a starting point, and not the last word on recognising lived experience as expertise. We look forward to continuing the conversation!**

4. The principle is echoed in the context of modern slavery and human trafficking.

5. This phrase has been widely used within the disability rights movement since the 1990s. See eg, James Charlton, *Nothing About Us Without Us: Disability, Oppression and Empowerment* (OUP 1998). The principle is echoed in the context of modern slavery and human trafficking. See eg, 'Nothing About Us, Without Us. Survivor Involvement in Anti-Slavery Policy Making: Guidance for Policy Makers' (Rights Lab & Survivor Alliance, 2020) 3, available at: <[Nothing about us, without us](#)> accessed 8 September 2025.

## PRINCIPLE 1

### PURSUE HONEST AND TRANSPARENT CONVERSATIONS

**We commit to honest and transparent conversations about all aspects of the research process. This includes a willingness to listen to the perspectives, needs, and concerns of those with lived experience and those with 'learned' experience. It also includes a commitment to sharing feedback honestly, candidly, and with care. In pursuing honesty from the outset, we also commit to being transparent with all those involved about the research funding process during the bid development stage.**

Throughout the workshop, the need for honest and transparent communication emerged as a central and overarching theme, which impacts all of the other principles within the call to action. The pursuit of honesty and transparency should sit at the core of any research process. This is all the more pertinent in research that engages lived experience expertise.

Those with 'learned' experience will often have differing experiences and perspectives from lived experience experts. Those with 'learned' experience may be much more familiar with institutional processes, requirements, and terminology within research processes. Approaching the research process with honesty and transparency requires a commitment to ensure that everyone involved is equipped with the understanding required to meaningfully contribute.

An honest and transparent process should result in all participants in a research project understanding what is required of them, with clearly defined expectations on all sides. Adopting a 'beginning to end' approach (principle 2), having an open discussion about remuneration (principle 3), and clearly establishing what skills are required for a given project (principle 4) will assist in establishing the required clarity.

Alongside clarity regarding the research process, workshop participants also highlighted the need for honest and transparent feedback on all sides. While recognising the inherent power imbalances that persist in relationships between learned and lived experience experts, workshop participants pointed to a desire on all sides for accountability mechanisms and transparent feedback processes. This means that researchers with learned experience should be open to receiving feedback about the way lived experience expertise is drawn upon and included within the research. In addition, those with lived experience must be open to receiving honest and transparent feedback throughout the research process.

These processes will be most effective where the conversations are pursued from a place of trust, with a willingness to understand the needs and perspectives of all involved. As such, researchers should actively explore how trust can be built and strengthened throughout the research process.

## PRINCIPLE 2

### IMPLEMENT A 'BEGINNING TO END' APPROACH WHEN INVOLVING LIVED EXPERIENCE EXPERTISE

**While each project will have different needs, and the role of lived experience expertise may vary, by clearly communicating the intentions and overall approach from the outset, expectations can be set and managed in ways that respect their autonomy, meet their needs and add value to the project.**

**We commit to considering what role lived experience expertise may play in a project, from the design stage, through to dissemination and evaluation. We commit to challenging the hierarchies and challenges that exist in research on exploitation. Where research teams do include participation from lived experience experts, we commit to ensuring that such experts are involved in the project as early as possible in a way that feels acceptable to them.** Linked to the need for honest and transparent conversations, another core theme that emerged from the workshop speaks to the idea of a 'beginning to end' approach. As outlined above, this involves exploring whether and how lived experience expertise should be incorporated at each stage of the research process, and clearly communicating expectations. This may be best achieved by drafting an agreed set of guidelines and patterns of working that establish how everyone involved should interact, cooperate, and collaborate with each other. The guidelines should include ethical considerations guided by those with lived experience who understand the potential risks and re-traumatisation. In particular, researchers should clarify if lived experience experts will be involved as: (a) research participants, e.g. through engaging in key informant interviews, (b) co-researchers, participating in project design, data collection, analysis, and dissemination, (c) advisory panel members or (d) co-authors of any research outputs. It is likely that some projects will include different experts in all four of these areas.

A 'beginning to end approach' may also be achieved by co-creating research priorities, when practical, to reflect what matters most to those directly affected and research methods that are culturally appropriate, trauma-informed, and accessible. Where lived experience is drawn upon at any stage of the project, it should be appropriately acknowledged in a way that recognises the importance and value of such input as equal to that of other forms of expertise. Moreover, a beginning to end approach requires honest conversations regarding fair compensation (principle 3).

Ensuring the early inclusion of lived experience experts in projects that will involve them can contribute to meaningful inclusion. Such inclusion could entail clearly communicating what expertise, resources and skills are required for individual projects. It could also include the provision feedback and updates – in appropriate formats – on the progress and outcome of the project; appropriately crediting all contributions when reporting or publishing; and considering how to return findings to individuals and communities who have contributed in appropriate formats.

## PRINCIPLE 3

### FAIR AND OPEN DISCUSSION ABOUT REMUNERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

**As part of an honest conversation, we commit to engaging in a fair and open discussion about remuneration and development opportunities with all experts involved in a project. This may require us to be realistic about institutional, and right to work limitations. Where such limitations exist, we commit to exploring alternatives, including investment in skills development, and assisting with advocacy relating to right to work limitations. The outcome of remuneration and development discussions should be clearly recorded and agreed to by all parties.**

The need for fair remuneration and development opportunities emerged at various stages of the workshop as an important consideration in any meaningful approach to inclusion of lived experience as expertise. This theme aligns with recent work that aims to address potential power imbalances, and recognise the risks of extractive practices.<sup>6</sup> The bulk of this work is centred around co-production in its broader sense (e.g. projects, service delivery approaches) and also on the co-production of research. Supporting this call to action, and in alignment with our principles, the Kaldor Centre's *'Guidelines for Co-Produced Research with Refugees and Other People with Lived Experience of Displacement'* offers helpful insights: 'co-produced research (also) aims to provide tangible benefits to the individuals and communities who participate in the research... in forms determined by participants themselves.'<sup>7</sup>

Reflection on what remuneration and development opportunities can be provided is all the more important in contexts where right to work restrictions may be in place. This is particularly pertinent in asylum settings. In the workshop, several participants noted the challenge of fair recognition and compensation for those who do not have a formal right to work in the country where they currently stay. Examples of remuneration and development opportunities are found in some guidance materials, such as Migration Yorkshire's Refugee Participation Toolkit which points to cash remuneration alongside methods such as vouchers, job references, and training opportunities, among others.<sup>8</sup> The guidance also acknowledges regulatory challenges and recommends good practice in the UK context, noting that '[i]f you consider providing compensation to people who do not have the right to work in the UK, payments by vouchers are preferred to cash-based rewards', and highlighting that it is 'best to obtain guidance and advice' for such situations.<sup>9</sup> This – and other – guidance should not be viewed as exhaustive, but as a starting point of good practice that should continuously evolve to avoid static and power-imbalanced interpretations of how lived experience is to be recognised.

6. See, eg Dembele and others (n 1).

7. Tristan Harley and Najeeba Wazefadost, *Guidelines for Co-Produced Research with Refugees and Other People with Lived Experience of Displacement* (Kaldor Centre for International Refugee Law, Asia Pacific Network of Refugees and Act for Peace, May 2023), available at: < <https://unsworks.unsw.edu.au/entities/publication/106070fa-0847-4fbc-802d-06f0da3f363a>> accessed 8 September 2025.

8. Refugee Participation Toolkit (Migration Yorkshire) available at: <<https://www.migrationyorkshire.org.uk/refugee-integration-yorkshire-and-humber/our-toolkits/refugee-participation-toolkit>> accessed 8 September 2025.

9. *ibid.*



Through fair and honest discussions, it is possible to continue evaluating and challenging what is understood to be 'remuneration and development' to ensure that such understanding both reflects any limitations and meets the evolving, different and unique needs of experts in both Country of Origin Information and academic research contexts.

## PRINCIPLE 4

### PROVIDE CLARITY ON WHAT EXPERTISE AND SKILLS ARE REQUIRED FOR ANY GIVEN PROJECT

**We commit to pursuing a detailed and expansive approach to the articulation of the skills and experiences that may be required for a particular project. This may include lived experience expertise, learned experience expertise, administrative skills, research skills, language skills, and cultural mediation skills, among others. We commit to clarifying, as early as possible in the project design stage, what expertise and skills are required for the successful delivery of the project. Such transparency offers lived experience experts the capacity to make an informed decision – together with other members of the project team – about whether and how they may contribute to the research. We commit to exploring, together with lived experience experts, how to embed skills development within projects.**

In many research contexts, the distinction is often made between expertise and knowledge derived from lived experience and that which comes from learned experience. There may be an implicit or explicit hierarchy attached to these forms of expertise and knowledge, with professional and academic expertise assumed to be of higher value, and with greater credibility attached to it. We recognise that the expertise, knowledge and skills required for any given project will be varied and potentially wide ranging, and that a range of people with different backgrounds will be needed to meet all these requirements. Skills and knowledge might include, for example, lived experience of the topics that are the subject of the research, learned expertise and knowledge of the topics, research skills, project management skills, communications skills, administrative skills, language and cultural mediation skills, etc. As such, instead of attaching hierarchy to these skill sets and forms of knowledge, they should all be recognised and described in the project design in terms of their contribution to the overall outcome.

It is often assumed that the expertise and knowledge that people with lived experience bring derives from their lived experience alone, and they may be labelled as 'lived experience expert' or 'refugee researcher', with other forms of knowledge and expertise that they bring being overlooked. Throughout the workshop, participants noted that people from a range of backgrounds and identities bring a range of skills and knowledge. By clearly and transparently articulating what is required for any given project, we offer people the opportunity to make an informed decision on whether and how they wish to engage, and in what capacity.

Those joining a project team should be supported to represent any lived experience in the way that they choose. If they choose to introduce themselves with reference to their lived experience and bring this into the conversation and the work, they should be allowed to speak from their own perspective and not expected to speak for a whole community.

Skills development should be an important element of project design and embedded within a project brief, enabling all members of a project team, including those with lived experience, to expand their skill set and build on the knowledge and expertise that they have. For people with lived experience who are not able to be properly recompensed for their work, for example due to their immigration status, providing the opportunity for skills development and training leading to recognised qualifications should be explored from the outset.

## PRINCIPLE 5

### ETHICAL ENGAGEMENT

**We commit to ethical engagement with all members of our research teams, research participants, and communities in which we are conducting research. This includes fully adhering to institutional and funder requirements for research ethics. In particular, we commit to actively considering the safety needs of lived experience experts, cultural mediators, and translators, particularly in communities where such individuals are more known, or may be at heightened risk due to their engagement with academic or country of origin research. Furthermore, we commit to ongoing risk-based and informed conversations and decisions regarding the participation of any partners/collaborators in our work.**

**While recognising the need to adhere to institutional and funder ethics processes, we also commit to engaging with ethics committees to explore how to overcome some of the procedures that may work in practice to exclude lived experience expertise from research. In advancing this Principle, we commit to upholding these values and invite others across research, policy, and practice to join us in building a more inclusive and ethically sound field.**

Meaningful ethical engagement requires a collective and sustained approach that engages with all individuals involved in research on movement and exploitation, including members of research teams, lived experience experts, community collaborators, translators, and cultural mediators. This commitment goes beyond compliance with institutional or funder-mandated ethical review processes. It is grounded in an ethos of care, reflexivity, and justice, requiring attention to both the processes required and the relationships involved.

As highlighted throughout the workshop, ethical engagement in this context demands a dynamic approach that takes account of the context. Ethics must be understood not only as static approvals or forms, but as a continuous, negotiated process shaped by trust, transparency, and care.

This involves ongoing conversations before, during, and after fieldwork, around safety, visibility, authorship, data ownership, and the implications of participation. These conversations should be guided by the needs and preferences of those with lived experience, ensuring participation is never extractive and that people retain agency over how their knowledge and stories are used. Inclusion must be grounded in transparent, equitable, and ethically sound principles that uphold the dignity and autonomy of all contributors.

In parallel, we must interrogate and challenge how ethics procedures, though designed to protect, can become mechanisms of exclusion. Too often, these frameworks inadvertently disqualify those with lived experience from formal research roles or prevent them from being equitably recognised as co-producers of knowledge. We therefore commit to working constructively with ethics committees to identify where these exclusions arise and to co-develop flexible, risk-informed alternatives that support rather than restrict participation. Central to this work is recognising both lived and learned forms of knowledge as valid, valuable, and deserving of ethical attention and scholarly credit.

Beyond this, it is important to acknowledge the role of **accountability** as key to ethical research practice. Ethical engagement is about both creating opportunities for inclusion and ensuring that individuals have the right to voice concerns and shape the process. We recognise that ethical participation must be accompanied by the ability to hold processes to account.

This commitment calls for more reflection and structural changes across research and practice. We urge researchers to develop inclusive ethics protocols in collaboration with those affected. We encourage ethics committees to move beyond rigid templates and foster participatory review processes that prioritise contextual nuance and the voices of contributors. Funders, likewise, must play their part by supporting timelines, resources, and methodological approaches that allow for deeper ethical engagement. Practitioners and policy actors have a vital role in ensuring that safeguarding policies are co-created with lived experience experts and embedded within organisational culture.

Ethical engagement, when undertaken in this spirit, becomes more than a requirement; it becomes a transformative practice. It signals a shift toward justice, transparency, and the redistribution of power in knowledge production.

## PRINCIPLE 6

### ENHANCING CREDIBILITY IN COUNTRY OF ORIGIN INFORMATION RESEARCH

**We commit to pursuing a dialogue with producers and users of Country of Origin Information research, recognising that expertise based on lived experience is key to filling information gaps and to providing reliability and a balance of sources in accordance with accepted quality standards for Country of Origin research.<sup>10</sup> We acknowledge that people with lived experience may assist at all stages of Country of Origin Information research, including with research design and review, or as research respondents, cultural mediators or translators. Such involvement may assist in addressing political and cultural biases and omissions that are sometimes found in Country of Origin reports and ultimately assist asylum decision-makers to make well-informed decisions.**

**We commit to actively considering the safety needs of experts with lived experience when conducting Country of Origin Information research, and to working in full compliance with ethics principles and other principles set out in this call to action. We also commit to working with research respondents in their mother tongue wherever possible and to presenting their credentials and the richness, nuance and authenticity of their account in the final research output, to ensure that it is treated as credible.**

Country of Origin Information research collates information about the situation in home countries of people seeking asylum and is used by government decision-makers, the judiciary and legal representatives of applicants in procedures that assess these applications. It is also used by governments to make policy decisions that potentially include or exclude people from claiming refugee status or other forms of international protection.<sup>11</sup> Country of Origin Information may include human rights questions, the security situation, the political, societal and legal situation, events and incidents, as well as the humanitarian, economic, cultural and geographical conditions in a given country.<sup>12</sup>

Research principles and standards for Country of Origin Information, as defined by the Austrian Red Cross/ACCORD, include neutrality and impartiality, and transparency of sources, as well as reliability and balance of sources, with the acknowledgement that 'as each source has its own perspective and focus, different sources and different types of source should be consulted to achieve the most comprehensive and balanced picture possible.'<sup>13</sup>

10. Researching Country of Origin Information: Training Manual 2024 Edition' (Austrian Red Cross/ACCORD, 2024) 37-42, available at:

[https://www.coi-<training.net/site/assets/files/1036/accord\\_researching\\_country\\_of\\_origin\\_information\\_2024.pdf](https://www.coi-<training.net/site/assets/files/1036/accord_researching_country_of_origin_information_2024.pdf)> accessed 8 September 2025.

11. *ibid*, 14.

12. *ibid*, 26.

13. *ibid*, 38.

Country of Origin Information can be any information from any source, provided it is relevant and the reliability of the source is taken into account.<sup>14</sup> Research is normally based on published secondary sources, including reports from a range of institutions or individuals from international, intergovernmental or governmental organisations, academia, media or NGOs/civil society, or on primary sources, which provide first-hand testimony or observations on the event or issue in question. Expert 'oral' sources may be consulted when information is unavailable, ambiguous, biased, or outdated, and experts may be expected to provide interpretation and analysis in topics such as law, culture, or traditions. Experts may be drawn from academia, journalism, legal practice, government, or international and local organisations.<sup>15</sup>

People with lived experience of conflict, persecution, or human rights violations may be producers of secondary source material that is used as Country of Origin Information, because of their work for an organisation or institution that reports on relevant issues. They may also be interviewed directly to obtain specific information about a topic that is not available in published sources, whether in an expert or professional capacity or not. However, as participants in our workshop observed, knowledge or information derived from persons with lived experience of an issue is often not sought directly, or considered to be reliable, by producers and users of Country of Origin Information, whether they are legal representatives, government decision makers or the judiciary. They question if people with lived experience can be reliable sources of impartial, unbiased or credible information and the question of 'source hierarchy' arises, with knowledge and information obtained from people with direct and lived experience of an issue given less weight than information provided by, for example, an international organisation, academic or government agency. Proximity to the issue often leads to an assumption of bias and impartiality without a proper and holistic assessment of the individual as a source, as is required in Country of Origin research methodology for all sources.<sup>16</sup>

Dialogue with producers and users of Country of Origin Information should be rooted in a shared understanding of principles and standards of Country of Origin Information research, and focused on recognition of the key value that people with lived experience can bring to this research. It should also promote a proper assessment of the weight and credibility of such sources of information based on objective factors that are applied to all sources.

We recognise that the presentation of source material such as interview testimony from people with lived experience is crucial, including the language and format in which it is presented. As an example, when people are not interviewed in their mother tongue, the way they express themselves may be limited by vocabulary, grammar, or cultural translation gaps. As a result, their testimony can appear fragmented or unclear and may lack the polish or precision associated with 'professional' sources, leading to it being treated as less credible.

14. *ibid*, 84.

15. *ibid*, 136.

16. *ibid*. See section 4, for a full discussion of source assessment.

Interviewing people in their mother tongue, whenever possible, preserves the richness, nuance, and authenticity of their account and reduces the risk of it being dismissed or given little weight. According to one of our contributors, a UK lawyer, the adversarial nature of asylum proceedings means that credibility assessments often prioritise formal presentation standards over authenticity of the information provided.

As highlighted in Principle 5, ensuring safety is key to ethical engagement in the production of Country of Origin Research. This is particularly important where people with lived experience may be in, or maintain ties with, communities where they are at heightened risk due to their engagement with academic or country of origin research. By protecting the anonymity of participants if needed, and committing to open and honest conversations about the possibility of pausing or ending engagement when necessary, we uphold the principles of informed consent and do no harm, ensuring the safety and dignity of all involved. Even anonymised accounts may carry risks of 'jigsaw' identification, potentially endangering participants and their families. As a result, some critical information may need to be excluded from reports, leaving the Country of Origin Information incomplete. This information gap may frustrate legal representatives and caseworkers, who are aware of relevant but inaccessible information, but is necessary in order to ensure ethical engagement.

## CONCLUSION

This initiative was born out of the shared understanding, by Asylos and HTRN, that meaningful inclusion of lived experience expertise in research, practice and decision-making on movement and exploitation requires sustained, comprehensive and earnest commitment by experts with both lived and learned experience. The principles elaborated in this Call to Action attest to this commitment and are meant to map the emerging space in which our aspirations may be brought to life. We depart from a joint conviction that transparency and openness are vital in research involving lived experience expertise and should be present from beginning to end. This encompasses all aspects of research from design to implementation: from clarity on the skills and knowledge that lived experience experts are expected to and ready to bring in, to fair remuneration and development opportunities; and from adhering to the ethics of care, trust and accountability, to ensuring the safety of lived experience experts and proper recognition and representation of their contribution. We are aware that this is a learning process which demands reflection, flexibility and humility. We therefore hope that the conversation that we started at the workshop in June 2025 and continued in this Call, will go on, fostering honest and ethical inclusion of lived experience expertise. We welcome debate building on the six principles and developing them through critique, new ideas and good practice examples.

Furthermore, we acknowledge that at least some of these actions require structural change in the ways research on exploitation, mobility and Country of Origin Information is organised and conducted in and beyond academia, and how lived experience expertise is integrated across policies and practice. This is why we believe that lived experience inclusion is only achievable as a collective effort. We invite and encourage everyone who identifies with the agenda advanced in this Call to Action to sign up to the pledge and share it widely.

***INTERESTED TO KNOW MORE?  
READ THE [FULL CALL TO ACTION REPORT HERE.](#)***

***READY TO [SIGN THE PLEDGE? HEAD HERE.](#)***