

APRIL 2018

EXPANDING SOLUTIONS FOR REFUGEES: COMPLEMENTARY PATHWAYS OF ADMISSION TO EUROPE.

Strategic Assessment

Co-funded by the
European Union



The European Resettlement Network (ERN) is a joint initiative coordinated by the International Organization for Migration (IOM), the International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC), and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). Its current project, co-funded by the European Union under the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF), supports the further development of resettlement and complementary forms of admission to the EU for those in need of international protection. The content and conclusions of this paper cannot necessarily be taken to represent the positions of each coordinating organisation, but serve to contribute to the debate on expanding the provision of protection-sensitive, sustainable European pathways of admission for refugees.

This document was produced with the financial assistance of the European Union. The views expressed herein can in no way be taken to reflect the official opinion of the European Union.



International Organization
for Migration (IOM)



International Catholic Migration
Commission (ICMC) Europe



Office of the United Nations
High Commissioner for
Refugees (UNHCR)

Acknowledgments: The development of this paper is part of the ERN+'s series of scoping papers and policy papers on complementary pathways covering humanitarian admissions programmes, student/higher education scholarships, and private sponsorships programmes.

The ERN would like to thank all the participants of the April 2018 ERN+ Conference on Complementary Pathways of Admission to Europe for Refugees, and of the ERN+ roundtables for their substantive contributions during the events.

This paper was written by Joanne van Selm, Independent Consultant, in cooperation with IOM, ICMC, and the UNHCR.

Published by the European Resettlement Network, www.resettlement.eu, Brussels, Belgium.
Designed by Crossmark.be, Belgium.

© IOM and ICMC, 2018, in the framework of the ERN+ project (coordinated by IOM, ICMC, and UNHCR). All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior written permission of the publisher.

A full-text PDF of this document is available for free download from www.resettlement.eu/page/ern-publications

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	5	4. How To Expand Complementary Pathways: Recommendations	25
2. Complementary Pathways To Protection In Europe: The Motivating Factors	8	4.1 General	25
2.1 Complementarity to resettlement	9	4.2 The actors involved	26
2.2 Solidarity in response to refugee arrivals.	10	4.3 Funding mechanisms.	27
2.3 Enhancing community engagement and integration.	11	4.4 Getting started and knowing more	28
2.4 Core considerations underpinning complementary pathways.	11	5. Conclusion	30
2.5 Strengthening the International Protection Regime	12	References	32
2.6 The European context	13		
3. The Three Selected Complementary Pathways In Perspective: Identifying Core Features Of Safe And Sustainable Approaches	16		
3.1 Commonalities of the three pathways	16		
3.2 Differentiated focus, partners and pathways to solutions	17		
3.3 Overlapping pathways: the potential for synergies	22		
3.4 New actors and stakeholders	23		

1. Introduction

During the mid-2010s, the potential for safe and legal channels to achieving protection in Europe has been the subject of renewed attention. This focus has been influenced by various factors including the protection needs of Syrians and others in the neighbouring regions of the European Union (EU); the requirement of showing **international solidarity** and **responsibility sharing** to States neighbouring Syria in the context of a large-scale and high-profile refugee crisis, as well as the expressions of interest by large parts of European society. Europeans who adhere to **humanitarian values and traditions** broadly support finding the ways and means to make protection for refugees available in Europe and **accessible** through safe and regulated pathways. Indeed, this often overlooked hospitable cross-section of Europeans is increasingly active and willing to directly support refugees, including through financial and practical sponsorship of individuals and families.

Admission programmes offering a mechanism for protection that is in various ways different from, but still similar to, the long-standing, traditional and durable solution of resettlement, have become known as ‘complementary pathways’.¹ There is continued international, as well as European, attention, on the part of advocates and organisations involved, to the need to **expand** resettlement itself, in terms of the number of destination countries, the number of places made available and the refugee populations it is accessible to. Developing additional complementary pathways could support efforts for this expansion. Although complementary pathways are relatively new in their current conceptualisation, and particularly in the European context, some are based on

long-standing practice elsewhere (for example community-based (or private) sponsorship in Canada), and the past (such as the admission to the UK of Hungarian farmers and miners as workers when they were in search of resettlement from Austria after the 1956 uprisings).²

Complementary pathways have been the subject of international agreements and support in recent years. For example, in September 2016, 193 United Nations Member States adopted the **New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants**,³ with its annexed “Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF)”. In this landmark political declaration, directed at improving the way the international community responds to large movements of refugees and migrants, European and other States have made clear **commitments** to strengthen and enhance mechanisms to protect people on the move, including the expansion of both resettlement and complementary pathways. Similarly, the early drafts of the Global Compact on Refugees indicate that further commitments are forthcoming.⁴

A core feature of complementary pathways is their contribution to the international protection regime generally, and in particular to the search for durable solutions for refugees. This manifests itself in multiple ways as will be discussed below. Further development of, and attention to, these complementary pathways, involving **multi-stakeholder engagement, advocacy, planning and action**, should contribute to maintaining

1 Among early references to ‘complementary pathways’ the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) pointed out that “Complementary pathways will take many forms but should be part of a progressive approach to comprehensive solutions, with ongoing international protection and continuous advancement towards greater enjoyment of rights, while comprehensive, durable solutions are pursued.” See UNHCR, *The 10 point Plan in Action, chap. 7*, (Geneva: December 2016), www.unhcr.org/en-us/publications/manuals/5846d10e7/10-point-plan-action-2016-update-chapter-7-solutions-refugees.html?query=complementary%20pathways (Accessed 24 April 2018).

2 “Farming notes and comments: to aid refugees”, *The Times*, 10 December 1956, p.2, and 12 December 1956, p.6; and “3,561 miners entered the UK in 1956-7 under the National Coal Board Scheme, while 1,242 entered on individual visas, and 16,648 on ‘Bulk Schemes’”, TNA, AST7/1621, *Political and Economic Planning*, “Refugees in Britain,” 8 January 1958, pp. 25-26. This historical note is demonstrative of how what is called ‘resettlement’ has had different manifestations over time, including examples of what might today be called ‘complementary pathways’.

3 United Nations General Assembly, *New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants*, 19 September 2016, www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/71/1 and www.unhcr.org/new-york-declaration-for-refugees-and-migrants.html?query=New.

4 See the UNHCR, *Global Compact on Refugees*, Draft 1 (as at 9 March 2018), www.unhcr.org/en-us/5aa2b3287 (Accessed 02 April 2018).

broad protection space in Europe and expanding third-country solutions as part of international solidarity and responsibility-sharing efforts.

Since 2016, the European Resettlement Network's ERN+ project, '**Developing Innovative European Models for the Protection of Refugees and Providing Support to New Resettlement Countries**', co-funded by the European Union,⁵ has monitored and assessed the emergence of different pathways in addition to resettlement. The project has focused on the development of three such pathways for persons in need of international protection:⁶ private sponsorship,⁷ refugee student scholarships,⁸ and humanitarian admission programmes.⁹

In this still evolving area of policy and research, these three pathways appeared at the start of the project to hold significant promise and strong State interest. Importantly also, recent precedents existed for all three.

Other pathways could also become significant, such as increasing employment-mobility of refugees, strengthening the humanitarian visa regime,¹⁰ expanding medical evacuation opportunities in addition to the existing resettlement category of medical cases¹¹ and the broadening of family reunification beyond the scope of that included in private sponsorships and humanitarian admission programmes. While these other pathways have not been the focus of this project, they remain important areas for **further research** and consideration. Indeed, some of these other complementary pathways in some ways intersect with the three that have been the focus of this project as the lines between the various pathways are not always clear-cut and they sometimes overlap. For example, the sponsorship of family members has been part of both private sponsorship and humanitarian admission programmes, and there can also be sponsorship linked to, or combined with, student scholarship schemes, as will be discussed further below. Labour mobility may also be linked to, or combined with, education opportunities for refugees, and humanitarian visas could be used as an instrument in certain complementary pathway programmes, for example.

This policy-focused paper offers an initial **strategic assessment** of the three chosen pathways, drawing out the common features of, and main distinctions between the three pathways studied. The earlier research has produced both a 'scoping paper' and a 'feasibility study' on each of the three complementary pathways selected for study.¹² The 'scoping papers' aimed to set the scene by exploring existing programmes and practices in the relevant approach. The 'feasibility studies' set out to explore protection, policy and programming considerations with a view to supporting possible developments

5 This project is funded under the European Commission's Asylum Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF), Union Actions.

6 While acknowledging that other specific protection needs can exist in the context of mixed flows, this focus, as well as the partners' recognition of UNHCR's position and perspective on complementary pathways, means that the scope of this policy paper is defined by a discussion of complementary pathways for "persons in need of international protection".

7 Private sponsorship (sometimes referred to as community-based sponsorship) involves a public private partnership, with governments facilitating access and protection while private actors typically offer financial, social and/or emotional support to refugees to facilitate their settlement process, including, in many cases, housing. See the European Resettlement Network Scoping Paper on [Private Sponsorship in Europe: Expanding complementary pathways for refugee resettlement](#) (Sep. 2017) and the ERN+ [Feasibility Study: Towards a private sponsorship model in France](#) (April 2018), www.resettlement.eu/page/ern-publications

8 Refugee student scholarship schemes can take various forms, but generally provide scholarship opportunities for refugees at higher education institutions, allowing them to pursue qualifications with financial and other support. See the ERN+ scoping paper on [Student Scholarship for refugees: Expanding complementary pathways of admission to Europe](#) (Dec. 2017) and the ERN+ policy research, [Higher Education Scholarships for Refugees: A reference framework for expanding protection and solutions opportunities through complementary pathways of admission to Europe](#) (April 2018), www.resettlement.eu/page/ern-publications

9 Humanitarian admission programmes are relatively large-scale, with expedited processing, often, but not always, admitted refugees with an initially temporary status. See the ERN+ scoping paper on [Humanitarian Admission Programmes in Europe: Expanding complementary pathways of admission for persons in need of international protection](#) (April 2018) and the ERN+ policy research, [Humanitarian Admission Programmes: Expanding and increasing pathways to protection](#) (April 2018), www.resettlement.eu/page/ern-publications

10 The ERN+ scoping paper *Private Sponsorships in Europe* (p.34) and feasibility study (see footnote 7) deal with the use of humanitarian visas under the Humanitarian corridor programmes in France (the so called 'visa asile') and Italy (visas under the Schengen Code), and EU Member States' sovereign right to issue long-stay visas. Such visas have recently also been used in Belgium for 100 persons from Lebanon and Turkey, as well as in 2016 for some 1200 refugees in Jordan, Lebanon, Egypt and Turkey. See Myria, *Myriadocs no.4, Les Visa Humanitaires: Frontières et droits fondamentaux* (May 2017), <https://emnbelgium.be/publication/humanitarian-visa-belgium-myria>.

11 Within resettlement programmes such medical cases are often referred to as TOMs – variously Ten, Twenty or Thirty Or More.

12 See the ERN+ publications on www.resettlement.eu/page/ern-publications

either in specific national contexts or more broadly. Those six documents form the background to this Policy Paper and are the basis for the recommendations set out within. They also provide further essential and detailed assessments of what complementary pathways are or could become. The feasibility studies each set out proposals for a particular approach in the relevant pathway, taking into account key considerations for protection, design and implementation. While none claim to offer the only possible approach, they present core principles in the development of complementary pathways for persons in need of international protection.

This paper first explores the major question of the underlying motivations for pursuing complementary pathways to protection in Europe and for optimising their implementation: what is their purpose and added value? We consider the ways in which complementary pathways offer useful tools of refugee protection from various perspectives, alongside resettlement, and to Europe in particular. We then turn to the main focus of this paper, drawing out the common features of, and main distinctions between, the three complementary pathways examined in the project. Finally, we turn to some recommendations based on this research for expanding complementary pathways generally.¹³

13 Recommendations on each of the three selected Pathways can be found in the ERN+ Feasibility Studies/policy papers, as well as at the end of the ERN+ Scoping Papers. See www.resettlement.eu/page/ern-publications

2. Complementary Pathways to Protection in Europe: the motivating factors

The main objective of expanding complementary pathways is to ensure the protection and facilitate solutions for more refugees and their families. A further objective is the consequent strengthening of the overall international protection regime.

Complementary pathways increase **opportunities** and perspectives for those in need of international protection, enabling beneficiaries to live safe, secure lives. The opportunities include the possibility for self-development (emotionally, economically, academically, and in a full range of ways) for refugees and their families: in other words, the opportunity to continue life just as other people do.

Complementary pathways should feed in to **quality** protection approaches. The advantages found in increasing protection capacity will not impact refugees alone. They also affect the regions of origin and countries of first

asylum, through **greater responsibility sharing** and solidarity with those countries, and they could have a significant impact on destination States in Europe. This impact will particularly arise through the involvement of **a range of stakeholders** and from a community and development perspective. Increasing the scope and range of organised approaches and bilateral and/or regional cooperation with refugee hosting countries could relieve some of the pressure on governments and political systems. Moving towards a system involving increased opportunities for regulated pathways of admission and protection for refugees (while **fully maintaining the right to seek and enjoy asylum**) can become self-reinforcing for the protection system at large. A system including such a safe admission approach can present opportunities for a wide range of stakeholders to engage in longer-term planning as well as settlement support and welcoming activities. This welcoming and supportive atmosphere could then extend to refugees who seek asylum as well as to those who are included in regulated admission pathways and resettlement.

2.1 COMPLEMENTARITY TO RESETTLEMENT

Complementary pathways should complement, support and be additional to resettlement as an ongoing, important, and essential durable solution. In many of their mechanisms and operational procedures, some complementary pathways bear a close resemblance to resettlement although there are clearly differences as well.¹⁴

Resettlement, one of three durable solutions for refugees alongside local integration and voluntary repatriation, “involves the selection and transfer of refugees from a State in which they have sought protection to a third State which has agreed to admit them – as refugees – and grant them permanent residence status.”¹⁵ Where neither local integration nor voluntary return is possible, a third-country solution becomes necessary. Those eligible for resettlement fall within UNHCR’s submission categories.¹⁶ The three-step process of resettlement is the basis for the model of organised departures and protection:

1. Identification, referral (in most cases by UNHCR)¹⁷ and selection; followed by
2. Pre-departure measures including orientation and health assessments then transportation to the resettlement state (most frequently conducted in cooperation with IOM) and,
3. Arrival and initial reception followed by longer-term measures to assure assistance in the integration process (in which NGOs often acting as government service providers play an important role) and full access to all rights.

For complementary pathways, however, there may be divergence in terms of the actors involved at various stages, and in some pathways programmes the status offered and/or its (initial) duration may differ, and in

connection with that, access to rights and entitlements may be different.

The number of resettlement places offered globally on an annual basis falls far short of the extensive need for this solution, both for individual cases and as an act of solidarity towards countries of first asylum. UNHCR currently identifies this need at 1.2 million refugees,¹⁸ while in 2017 only 65,000 refugees were resettled globally.¹⁹ The simple statistical shortfall is, in 2018, exacerbated by the decision of the government of the United States to more than halve its refugee programme, and in practice cut admissions of Syrians and others in the Middle East.²⁰ Complementary pathways might offer **flexible** and **tailored** solutions to help Europe step up to fulfil the numerical goals, while continuing to grow resettlement.

The expansion of complementary pathways could also create the space for governments, private actors and populations to consider the possibilities for extending resettlement and protection more broadly. However, complementary pathways should not be offered instead of resettlement, or used as a basis for reducing the protection outcomes of resettlement. Rather they should offer added value. Protection outcomes should be as high as possible for all pathways, as for resettlement, and as similar as possible, to avoid double standards, and to avoid friction between arrivals on different programmes. Rights should not be limited, and a considerable level of State responsibility needs to be maintained. Certain guaranteed standards and safeguards must always be ensured. Such safeguards are necessary even when there are clearly articulated differences between the admission requirements for resettlement and the different complementary pathways, for example, and even if pathways involve initial shorter-term residence, and/or additional actors engaged in financing and support.

14 See the table which provides an overview of key aspects from the three complementary pathways at pp. 19-21.

15 UNHCR, *Resettlement Handbook* (July 2011), www.unhcr.org/46f7c0ee2.pdf.

16 *ibid*, Chapter 6.

17 For European programmes, UNHCR is normally the referral actor. The US and Canadian programmes, for example, have strong UNHCR referral elements, but also cases or situations in which there are other referral actors, including non-governmental organisations.

18 UNHCR, *Projected Global Resettlement Needs 2018* (June 2017), www.unhcr.org/593a88f27.pdf.

19 See UNHCR “Resettlement Data” on www.unhcr.org/resettlement-data.html (Accessed on 15 April 2018)

20 See, for example, International Rescue Committee, ‘Trump Administration on track to miss own Target for Refugee Admissions’ (Press Release, 25 January 2018), www.rescue.org/press-release/irc-trump-administration-track-miss-own-target-refugee-admissions

Complementary pathways can offer **additionality** beyond numbers and impact, for example by adding **methodologies** and **partnerships** other than those used in resettlement to process, receive and integrate refugees. These pathways can also add to existing resettlement programmes by offering opportunities to **diversify** the refugee populations that can benefit from such third country protection.

Experience over the years, and perhaps most visibly since 2015, has shown that refugee admissions, reception and inclusion are not only a matter for governments but can optimally involve many different actors such as civil society groups, churches and other faith-based organisations, municipalities, universities and other higher education institutions, and private businesses and (groups of) private citizens, to name a few. A multi-stakeholder approach can add to the range of opportunities, **flexibility** and **quality** of programmes while also addressing changing societies and the way they participate in receiving refugees. Complementary pathways that include partnerships with private and local actors for financial and practical sponsorship rather than relying fully on central governments should, therefore, accrue **places in addition** to government-operated programmes.

2.2 SOLIDARITY IN RESPONSE TO REFUGEE ARRIVALS

The social and economic capacity of refugee-hosting countries in regions of origin to deal with ever-growing populations of refugees has long been significantly stretched, and local communities and governments need tangible demonstrations of support to be able to maintain the active reception of refugees. Hospitality in these countries can be put to the test, and reports of tensions and discrimination between host communities and refugees have become more common.²¹ In order to continue to cope with various refugee crises, it is clear that frontline refugee-hosting countries, hosting 85% of the global refugee population, need significant support from the international community. As has long been argued, this support should be not only financial but also offer concrete measures of solidarity and responsibility-sharing, such as resettlement and other legal pathways.²² From the perspective of the impact in regions of origin, complementary pathways should be crafted to offer **substantial** support to countries of first asylum, showing that both complementary pathways and resettlement are grounded in the desire to demonstrate **international responsibility-sharing** and **solidarity**.

21 See, for example, Ellen Francis, 'Hostility Grows towards Syrian Refugees in Lebanon', Reuters, (August 28, 2017) www.reuters.com/article/us-lebanon-refugees-tension/hostility-grows-towards-syrian-refugees-in-lebanon-idUSKCN1B8128; Robert Satloff and David Schenker, 'Growing Stress on Jordan: Contingency Planning Memorandum Update', Council on Foreign Relations (10 March 2016), www.cfr.org/report/growing-stress-jordan; Laura Pitel, Asser Khatab and Erika Solomon, 'Syrian Refugees under Pressure as Neighbours' Goodwill runs out', Financial Times (5 March 2018), www.ft.com/content/bf696a82-1d47-11e8-956a-43db76e69936; Reliefweb (25 April 2018), <https://reliefweb.int/report/syrian-arab-republic/syria-brussels-conference-reactive-danish-refugee-council>. This situation is, of course, not limited to the Syrian case, see e.g. on South Sudanese in Uganda in *The Guardian* (21 May 2017), www.theguardian.com/global-development/2017/may/21/uganda-refugee-policy-breaking-point

22 See, for example, James C. Hathaway and R. Alexander Neve, 'Making International Refugee Law Relevant Again: A Proposal for Collectivized and Solution-Oriented Protection', *Harvard Human Rights Journal* 10 (1997), pp. 115-211, <https://repository.law.umich.edu/articles/1622/>; Volker Turk, UNHCR, 'Prospects for Responsibility Sharing in the Refugee Context', *Journal on Migration and Human Security*, Vol 4. No 3, 2016, pp. 45-59, jmh.s.cmsny.org/index.php/jmhs/article/download/61/50

2.3 ENHANCING COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND INTEGRATION

Whichever type of pathway for admission is used, all new arrivals will require the adequate availability of **reception** and **integration support**, being aware that what needs to be in place in this context in each destination country is likely to have some variations for each distinct group of arrivals (i.e. dependent on the situation which has caused their flight from a country of origin, or the conditions of and duration of stay in a previous country of asylum, as well as the situation under which they are arriving e.g. whether there are family members already in the destination country or refugees are arriving ready to study etc.). Private Citizen Initiatives, NGOS, churches and faith-based groups, diaspora communities, universities and other local community members have emerged as important actors in advocating for more resettlement and other channels for the admission of refugees. That welcoming element of the European population considers it appropriate for newcomers to be helped, and seeks to engage productively in assisting refugees to arrive, settle, and resume their life in safety. There are multiple ways in which beneficiaries and host populations, who ultimately form one community, can gain from strong complementary pathways. These pathways offer innovative ways to engage and develop public support for and input to integration processes. Such engagement should include links to (higher) education, skills training and employment opportunities, including for women. Private actors, often in the roles of volunteers or mentors, can enhance the acquisition of language skills, open up education opportunities and increase the prospects for refugees to acquire skills and access the labour market. The engagement of a wide **range of actors** in the process of assisting and supporting refugees can, in turn, strengthen and broaden the base of public support for protection and solutions for refugees more broadly.

For all complementary pathways it is important that **clear roles** be defined for different actors in different programmes and where there is overlap or blending (as discussed below) there needs to be clarity on which actor plays which role with transparent operating procedures and guidelines.²³

²³ European Resettlement Network, Private Sponsorship in Europe (scoping paper), p.37 (see footnote 7).

2.4 CORE CONSIDERATIONS UNDERPINNING COMPLEMENTARY PATHWAYS

The core function of complementary pathways is to **offer protection**. Regardless of the form they take, at heart they are methods and mechanisms to bring more protection to more refugees through a range of third country solutions. Even if the status offered is not directly a protection status²⁴, the complementary pathways must be **protection-sensitive**. Beyond the individual protection at their heart, the pathways should be constructed in such a way that they sustain and expand the **protection space** in Europe.

Through **transparent** programmes and policies, not only those involved (as implementing actors at the various stages, and the beneficiaries themselves) but also the population at large in the destination States will be able to clearly see and understand the policy and programme activities and outcomes. Beneficiaries of complementary pathways need **stability and clarity**, through well-defined programmes that articulate legal status, timelines, expectations and realistic integration prospects. Host populations, sponsors and organisations involved in the process require similar consistency and transparency, in terms of policy, implementation and continuity over time.

Indeed, the population in the receiving country must be made well **aware** of the programme(s), informed about the processes involved, have the possibility to be **included** in a sponsoring, financing or other capacity, and be **engaged** in debate and in activities related to the programmes. This is how complementary pathways can offer the means to foster welcoming communities as described above.

Ensuring clarity, stakeholder engagement and local support in all phases of planning and implementation is of vital importance, particularly in the current context of highly polarized opinions within certain communities across Europe concerning migration and refugee issues.

²⁴ See for example, the discussion on higher education opportunities for refugees in ERN+, [Higher Education Scholarships for Refugees](#) (see footnote 8).

Complementary pathways offer opportunities for broad, balanced programmes, based on the principle of **non-discrimination**. Eligibility criteria for different pathways might include, for example, family ties or academic promise/capability dependent on the specific programme, but they must not discriminate on grounds such as gender, race, ethnic or social origin, genetic features, language, religion or belief, political or any other opinion, disability, sexual orientation and gender identity or age.

In other words, while the different pathways might have specific eligibility criteria to facilitate selection, the application of those criteria should not be discriminatory, and the impact of the range of pathways should help in providing an overall balanced and protection-sensitive approach.

Complementary pathways as well-organised programmes offer obvious opportunities for personal planning and preparation for the move to a new country. Emphasis can be placed on the provision of information and management of expectations prior to departure, whether organised by governments through IOM, as with the majority of resettlement and past and on-going humanitarian admission programmes, or by private actors as a part of the conditions or regulations for sponsorship and other opportunities, such as study. There should be appropriate links between the pre-departure and post arrival phases; ensuring the minimum pre-departure components such as information provision, orientation, and health assessments are an integral part of a well-organised programme.

2.5 STRENGTHENING THE INTERNATIONAL PROTECTION REGIME

Expanding complementary pathways can also bring benefits from the perspective of capacity building to strengthen the international refugee **protection** regime. Some of the pathways can become **sustainable** as policy approaches which do not need to be re-created for each crisis, but are continuous programmes over time (either in one place or across different locations).

Even as a sustained policy approach, each pathway can also have the **flexibility** to adapt to changing situations and developing mechanisms, procedures (on various levels) and partnerships that can be utilized on any scale as situations require. What is more, complementary pathways can be **sustainable** programmes offering protection, solutions and opportunities not just to refugees impacted by specific high-profile conflicts, but in all refugee and forced displacement situations around the world. This should include **large-scale and protracted situations**. Such pathways then offer significant possibilities for enlarging the scope of the international refugee protection regime. As complementary pathways, as a whole and alongside resettlement, can include varied streams, for **varied** target populations with **global and diverse** reach, and with varied sources of financing, they have the potential to both spread support and increase capacity.

From an operational continuity and planning perspective complementary pathways can offer the governments and organisations involved predictable, protection-centred, safe and regulated mechanisms for **multi-year planning** (in terms of minimum target numbers or quotas) as well as the ability to target core regions (in terms of countries of first asylum and refugee populations).

Notwithstanding the need for some predictability, complementary pathways can also maintain sufficient flexibility to include new diverse refugee populations as necessary, as well as new actors or implementation mechanisms as needs arise.

The expansion of complementary pathways offers the possibility of an ongoing process **responding to an inter-play of governmental and community drivers** in reaction to both new and protracted displacement crises. Complementary pathways should be **reviewed** in terms of the countries and contexts in which they are active and the needs they seek to meet on a rolling basis. There should be consistent **monitoring** and **evaluation**, internally, at the behest of funders and externally.

2.6 THE EUROPEAN CONTEXT

European States have **varied histories and differing current situations** with regard to resettlement as well as complementary pathways of admission.²⁵ Many northern and western European States operated resettlement or admission programmes at some point between 1950 and the early 1980s. As the Comprehensive Plan of Action for the IndoChinese came to an end,²⁶ a handful of European States continued resettlement with programmes numbering in the range of 500 to 2,000 places per year, while some ceased resettlement and others operated very small programmes for medical evacuations or extremely vulnerable cases. EU Member States participated in the Humanitarian Evacuation Programme for Kosovars in Spring 1999, affording experience of evacuations on a larger-scale, for temporary protection and for strategic or political reasons (i.e. specifically to support the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia²⁷). During the 2000s some States re-engaged with resettlement, in particular programmes of varied sizes were (re-)developed in the UK and Ireland as well as in France, Germany, Spain, Portugal, and the Czech Republic.

European Commission efforts to support resettlement to the European Union started with a feasibility study in 2004.²⁸ Over the intervening fifteen years, the Commission has sought to stimulate and support resettlement, with EU

Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF) funds contributing to the resettlement of refugees in line with Union priorities²⁹, and with support to a range of additional initiatives and projects, including the European Resettlement Network. In 2016, the European Commission proposed a Union Resettlement Framework, which is the subject of current negotiations between the European Council, European Parliament and the European Commission and, if adopted, will have implications for resettlement and possibly some complementary pathways of admission.³⁰

The situation of Syrians in the Middle East and North Africa over the past seven years has resulted in a focus of attention on legal pathways to protection for Syrians. Syrians have been prioritised in the vast majority of resettlement and admissions under complementary pathway programmes to EU Member States since 2013.³¹ There has been particular attention to those who had sought refuge in Lebanon and Jordan, as well as Turkey.

25 Joanne van Selm, Tamara Woroby, Erin Patrick and Monica Matts (2004), 'Study on the Feasibility of setting up resettlement programmes in EU Member States or at EU level, against the background of the Common European Asylum System and the goal of a Common Asylum Procedure', Migration Policy Institute for the European Commission, https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/e-library/docs/pdf/resettlement_study_full_2003_en_en.pdf; and ICMC Europe, *Welcome to Europe: A comprehensive guide to resettlement* (July 2013), www.resettlement.eu/sites/icmc.ttp.eu/files/ICMC%20Europe-Welcome%20to%20Europe.pdf

26 W. C. Robinson (2004), 'The Comprehensive Plan of Action for Indochinese Refugees, 1989–1997: Sharing the Burden and Passing the Buck', *Journal of Refugee Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 3. (Oxford University press), <https://academic.oup.com/jrs/article/17/3/319/1571884>

27 See Joanne van Selm, *Kosovar Refugees in the European Union* (2000). The focus of complementary pathways on initially temporary protection can largely be understood as an extension of the desire for temporary statuses that became prevalent in Europe in the 1990s, particularly for people fleeing former Yugoslavia, but also for others with subsidiary status becoming frequently granted rather than refugee status.

28 Selm, *Study on the Feasibility of setting up resettlement programmes in EU* (see footnote 25).

29 See the Asylum Migration and Integration Fund website on https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/financing/fundings/migration-asylum-borders/asylum-migration-integration-fund_en (Accessed 5 April 2018)

30 With negotiations ongoing, it might be the case that humanitarian admission programmes are included in the EU Resettlement Framework. For an overview of where the process stands, see the European Parliament "Legislative train schedule towards a new policy on migration" on www.europarl.europa.eu/legislative-train/theme-towards-a-new-policy-on-migration/file-eu-resettlement-framework. See the European Commission "Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a Union Resettlement Framework and amending Regulation (EU) No 516/2014 of the European Parliament and the Council", www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/docs_autres_institutions/commission_europeenne/com/2016/0468/COM_COM%282016%290468_EN.pdf (COM 2016/468), and the European Parliament report "A8-0316/2017" (27 October 2017), www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=%2F%2FEP%2F%2FTEXT%2BREPORT%2BA8-2017-0316%2B0%2BDOC%2BXML%2BV0%2F%2FEN&language=EN. The Council of the EU has a mandate to start a Trilogue, see "EU resettlement framework: Council ready to start negotiations", Press Release 664/17, 15/11/2017, www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2017/11/15/eu-resettlement-framework-council-ready-to-start-negotiations/.

31 See ICMC Europe, 10% of *Refugees from Syria: Europe's Resettlement and other Admission Responses in a Global Perspective* (June 2015), www.icmc.net/sites/default/files/documents/10-percent-syrian-refugees-resettlement-2015.pdf. Also see UNHCR cumulative figures on 'Resettlement and Other Admission Pathways for Syrian refugees', (accessed 20 April 2018) www.unhcr.org/protection/resettlement/573dc82d4/resettlement-other-admission-pathways-syrian-refugees.html. Over the period 2013 to 31 March 2018, 45,973 refugees of Syrian nationality were resettled to EU Member States, while in the same period 17,582 refugees of other nationalities were admitted. See the UNHCR Resettlement Data Finder tool available on <http://rsq.unhcr.org/> (Accessed 20 April 2018).

However, it has led to a relative absence of resettlement and other admission opportunities for other refugee populations, such as those in protracted and large-scale situations, and lack of diversity in programmes, the sustainability of which will lie in being adaptable and flexible to meet the demands of a range of situations requiring international protection. With an increase in arrivals via the Central Mediterranean since 2016, particularly from Libya, resettlement and complementary pathways from Africa have again become an EU priority, with the objective of ensuring safe and regulated pathways for persons in need of international protection and preventing deaths at sea.

Within Europe, there is an increasing tendency to present resettlement as a tool of migration management, suggesting that it offers an alternative to spontaneous arrivals that can prevent irregular arrivals and deaths at sea. What is more, there is an increasing tendency to seek to attach conditionality (for example on returns and readmission or support for protection in regions of origin) to resettlement programmes. However, this approach is neither appropriate in protection terms, nor realistic in terms of the nature and scope of movements and operational feasibility, and particularly falls out of line with the obligation States have to ensure access to asylum and to safeguarding the principle of non-refoulement, and with Europe's rights-based and humanitarian principles.

As indicated at the start of this section, including resettlement and complementary pathways in broad refugee policy can provide scope for new actors and partnerships, and the fostering of a welcoming environment. In turn, those partnerships and that environment can support greater acceptance of refugees whether they apply for asylum under a territorial process in an EU Member State, or whether they arrive from a third country under an admission programme. The two means of arrival are not exclusive, but rather their combined inclusion in a robust refugee policy will be mutually reinforcing.

3. The three selected complementary pathways in perspective: Identifying core features of safe and sustainable approaches

As noted above, this ERN+ project has, since 2016, monitored and assessed the emergence of three specific pathways: humanitarian admission programmes; private or community-based sponsorship and higher education opportunities for refugees. At the start of the project it was observed that these three pathways held significant promise and strong State interest, and all had recent precedents in Europe. This section of the paper will draw out the common characteristics of the three selected pathways, highlighting core features, which may be applicable also to a broader range of complementary pathways. The differences between the selected pathways will be drawn out, demonstrating the range of pathways and how the concept can be adapted, and finally the opportunities to find synergies between pathways, and combine them to support and sustain additional protection opportunities will be briefly examined.

3.1 COMMONALITIES OF THE THREE PATHWAYS

The main unifying feature of the complementary pathways studied in this project is their overarching aim of providing **access to protection and solutions**, while also, and importantly, being expressions of **responsibility-sharing and solidarity** with countries of first asylum and transit in regions of origin.

Although some of the pathways might not grant long-term protection in the first instance (or in the case of scholarships even refugee protection as such), they all offer at least a first step on the way to solutions for persons in need of international protection; and they all

offer the prospect of a path to full protection and a longer-term solution. All of the pathways are **protection-sensitive** in their approach. While the beneficiaries of such pathways are in need of international protection, the legal status granted in student scholarship schemes, for example, might be linked to existing migration instruments rather than the international protection regime. In such cases, it is essential that refugees are protected against *refoulement* and that their stay in the country is facilitated when their protection needs require it, for example through access to asylum.

As mentioned previously, the pathways studied are all **complementary** to resettlement. Where resettlement has a particular focus on protection needs and vulnerability criteria in line with UNHCR's resettlement submission categories, complementary pathways may employ eligibility criteria in addition to such protection and vulnerability considerations. Such criteria, when applied in addition and not in lieu of these factors, can include, for example, extended family ties or suitability and preparedness to study at a higher education institution.³² The pathways do not have to have such additional criteria, but they can. For example, humanitarian admission programmes might simply be a more rapid way of identifying and admitting refugees who could otherwise qualify for a smaller resettlement programme. Also, beneficiaries may be sponsored by a community or private group, but identified by UNHCR rather than by the sponsors.

³² As discussed in the ERN+ Policy research [Higher Education Scholarships for Refugees](#) (see footnote 8), it requires careful consideration for eligibility and selection to strike the right balance between meeting the protection needs of refugees in first countries of asylum through offering third country solutions and providing education opportunities to motivated and capable candidates.

The three complementary pathways studied all **add to the protection and solutions space**: they do not infringe on existing policies, programmes or rights for refugees, for example resettlement programmes or family reunification. They should not be used as substitutes for, or have negative impacts on these existing approaches, but rather they should build **additional architecture** which serves to further **strengthen the existing system**.

It goes without saying that complementary pathways can only be developed with the **support of national governments**. No beneficiaries can be granted status or admitted without decisions and documentation from the relevant national authorities. The overall national legal framework applies, governing issues as status, obligations and entitlements, including social benefits. It is of paramount importance to have a clear understanding of the scope of national legislation and regulations governing the various types of entry arrangements.

Through complementary pathways, **new and diverse actors** can become involved, either being new to the refugee protection and assistance field, or existing actors taking on new roles in implementing complementary pathways specifically.

Wider society can be engaged particularly through private sponsorship but also through offering support to persons arriving on humanitarian admission programmes, the development of which might be motivated by popular demand that European States take action in response to a given displacement crisis or conflict. Universities and other Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and students themselves can also be sources of new actors in this field, and their engagement can encourage a new wave of **committed local stakeholders** in university towns and cities.

Complementary pathways require a **multi-stakeholder approach**, going beyond traditional, government-led resettlement. This requires significant vertical **coordination** between government, local authorities and non-governmental actors, **formal agreements**, for example for sponsoring groups or HEIs, and horizontal stakeholder **cooperation** and engagement to ensure

cooperation among local actors (education, health, social welfare, sports and cultural institutions etc.) on various levels. **Traditional refugee protection actors** should have strong roles, both continuing those activities in which they have long experience, and assisting in coordination across the various stakeholders, as well as welcoming and assisting new actors whose activities should strengthen the protection architecture in significant ways.

Building on the points made above, complementary pathways generally offer opportunities for an approach that is inclusive of a range of actors. This is exemplified by the role that civil society, including higher education institutions and family members, has played in **advocating** for such programmes to date. The actual implementation of complementary pathways offers various moments for extended **community engagement**.

Governmental actors in complementary pathways include **local authorities**, which can play vital roles in ensuring adequate housing, for example, and in coordinating various actors and activities during the integration process, as well as in making clear that the protection space at a municipal level is open and broad.³³

The three pathways addressed in this project all feature a high level of **flexibility**: they are adaptable to new situations, changing partnerships, and can be tailor-made on every level to maximise their appropriateness to the context they are created to face. As they are flexibly applied, they all also need some solid bases: **clear objectives** should be determined; **targets** should be

³³ Housing emerged as a common challenge to the three complementary pathways, a challenge that goes beyond the scope of this study. In the sponsorship programmes that have been studied sponsors are responsible for identifying and preparing housing and must contribute to the costs for an initial period (normally one to two years). The ERN+, Humanitarian Admission Programmes, p.16 (see footnote 9) suggests a subsidy to family members willing to accommodate a new arrival. A novel project in Amsterdam can be noted in this regard. This housing project accommodates Dutch youth and refugees together in community housing made of converted shipping containers located on a former sports ground. While the refugees in question are not specifically beneficiaries of any complementary pathways, the model could be explored and extended. See UNHCR, "Revolutionary housing project brings Dutch youth together with refugees" (28 March 2018), www.unhcr.org/news/stories/2018/3/5ab4dfc54/revolutionary-housing-project-brings-dutch-youth-together-refugees.html (Accessed 4 April 2018).

specified and, as they proceed, there should be appropriate **monitoring and evaluations** of all activities and partners involve.

In their implementation the pathways also share common practical aspects, in **particular in the activities** linking pre-departure and post-arrival. They all need clear **operational guidelines**, defined **target populations** with specific **protection needs**; thorough, yet relatively rapid **selection procedures**, from identification, verification of eligibility, through referral, submission and actual selection; all benefit from the provision of information about the programme prior to departures, including a basis of orientation regarding the destination State, and where possible pre-departure assistance ranging from health-screening to assistance with travel arrangements and paperwork;³⁴ beneficiaries need to be appropriately met and greeted on **arrival** and receive immediate and on-going **professional social support** as they adjust; there needs to be continued **communication** and **transparency** about the programme, and any changes, for the beneficiaries and all other actors involved.

3.2 DIFFERENTIATED FOCUS, PARTNERS AND PATHWAYS TO SOLUTIONS

Although there are commonalities to the pathways, there are of course key differences in approach. Some of these are the result of the type of pathway in question; others are the result of developments or the thinking at the start of an approach, linked to existing national or institutional structures, and many may change over time with monitoring and evaluation. Nonetheless, for conceptual policy and strategic thinking purposes it is useful to pull out a few of the major distinctions. These distinctions demonstrate how the pathways to protection are **multi-faceted**, and about

not only protection and solutions but also about **opportunities** appropriate to a person's situation.

Status: As has been mentioned above, national frameworks that provide for legal pathways offer different arrangements with respect to status granted under the different type of programmes.

Beneficiaries of private sponsorship programmes should be granted refugee status. This is the case for the UK, Italy and for those arriving under humanitarian visas in France, as described in the feasibility study on France.³⁵ Those arriving on humanitarian admission programmes should likewise ideally be granted refugee status on arrival. In both cases, as the studies in the project recommend, subsidiary status is the minimum that should be granted. However, it should be borne in mind that:

- For those arriving on humanitarian visas, there remains the need to apply for asylum upon arrival, which can lead to some protection gaps during the initial period.
- Differences in status granted (refugee status and subsidiary protection) lead to different entitlements including the right for family reunification. This has an impact on the durability of the solution being offered.
- Those who enter to join refugees already in European states in certain cases receive a different status from the family member they join, and that status may not grant the same set of rights and entitlements.
- Refugee student scholarship holders might be granted a long-term or student visa. Their actual legal status may rather correspond to the activity they are pursuing in the receiving State, even if the programme is designed and implemented with their ongoing need for international protection in mind. However, they must, as a minimum, be guaranteed protection from *refoulement* and there must be no restriction on their right to apply for and be granted asylum. It is important for beneficiaries arriving under all complementary pathway programmes that there is security and stability in their status and permission to remain, as well as full information regarding perspectives for stay beyond their studies for protection reasons.

34 Beneficiaries of both community-based sponsorship and HAPs have sometimes been both identified and referred by family members, and also had independent travel arrangements made, without any pre-departure orientation (see e.g. ERN+, [Feasibility Study on Private Sponsorship](#), p.10 (footnote 7) and ERN+ scoping paper, [Humanitarian Admission Programmes in Europe](#), p.15. The feasibility studies on both of these subjects suggest more organised pre-departure orientation – see ERN+, [Feasibility Study on Private Sponsorship](#), pp. 19-20 and ERN+ policy research, [Humanitarian Admission Programmes](#), p.19.

35 ERN+, [Feasibility Study on Private Sponsorship](#), p. 18.

Scale: This is partly in the nature of the types of programmes and to be expected. Even small programmes, whether measured by institution, municipality or country involved can add up to a significant protection contribution.³⁶ In the case of humanitarian admission programmes, however, high numbers are important for optimal impact and maximising the responsibility sharing aspect and are a defining feature of their role as being complementary to resettlement.

Roles that government and non-governmental actors play:

Private sponsorship is based on the principle of public-private partnerships and agreements, sharing the responsibilities in hosting refugees. The scope and duration of such commitments can vary, since the social welfare systems in European countries vary nationally. In general, it can be said that sponsors would as a minimum offer housing, settlement support including language learning provision, for an initial period. It is widely understood that government ensures health care coverage and education. The Humanitarian Corridors in Italy and France, for example, involve faith-based organisations and Churches under agreements signed with the relevant national government; the UK opens up the possibility for sponsoring refugees to registered charities, which must apply to the Home Office and meet a number of minimum financial and other criteria. HEIs' role in higher education scholarship schemes is similarly significant, although different as it is based not only on assistance that should be offered to scholarship holders based on their refugee background but also on the academic and counselling relationship of such institutions with their students more broadly. Under humanitarian admission programmes, NGOs have assisted in reception programmes in different States, and families have been very actively involved where extended family members have been eligible for programmes. While beneficiaries under all three pathways become eligible for a range of government run programmes linked to their status, the timing of that

eligibility can vary across the three pathways, as can the need to use those programmes.

Position of families: In private sponsorship some programmes involve identification of the beneficiary who is the family member of someone known to the prospective sponsors (although this is not always or necessarily the case). Extended family ties have been one basis for eligibility for at least part of other programmes, including the humanitarian admission programmes operated by both Germany and Austria. In the case of these latter programmes it has been expected that nuclear family members arrive together, and there has been no right to family reunification. In the case of higher education scholarships, most programmes have not allowed family members to travel and reside with the scholarship holder, although there are exceptions, such as in Germany, Japan and Spain. However, the right to family life is essential, and family presence and support is a key to fostering a sense of belonging and identity and thus successful integration, for all complementary pathways.

An overview of the key aspects of the three complementary pathways is set out in the table on pages 19-21. This presentation is non-exhaustive, but illustrative of the different pathways and the factors involved.

³⁶ On this point in relation to student scholarships in particular, see [ERN+ scoping paper on Student Scholarship for Refugees](#), p.11. A programme at Columbia University in New York, announced in March 2018 offers places for six Syrian students per year, by way of an additional example, <https://globalcenters.columbia.edu/news/columbia-scholarship-program-displaced-persons-0> (accessed on 15 April 2018).

Overview of key aspects from the three complementary pathways as described in the ERN+ feasibility and policy research³⁷

	Higher Education Scholarships for Refugees	Private Sponsorship	Humanitarian Admission (for Protection) Programmes
Identification and referral	Applications encouraged through public dissemination. Scholarship providers work with UNHCR, NGOs, schools or other groups on the ground in countries of first asylum to identify candidates. HEIs play a role in final selection, balancing need for third country scholarship with education profile and motivation of refugees.	Sponsors (e.g. in the case of family member applications). UNHCR referral or other referral actors (possibly some family identification and/or referral through embassies and other actors dependent on destination country).	Expedited procedures, UNHCR referral or other referral actors (possibly some family identification and/or referral through embassies and other actors dependent on destination country).
Status	In EU, generally a study visa or a permit for long-term stay – <i>non-refoulement</i> should be guaranteed, with no barrier to asylum. May be international protection status based on chosen project framework. Considerations made to transition to other statuses upon completion of study.	Refugee status or subsidiary protection. Beneficiaries may enter with humanitarian visa in which case they apply for asylum upon arrival. Pre-arrival although status determination by government is advisable to guarantee secure status should ideally be determined before arrival.	Refugee status or subsidiary protection. Beneficiaries enter with humanitarian visa in some countries, although status should ideally be determined before arrival.
Pre-departure measures	Pre-departure orientation and expectation management can include language and foundational study skills through distance learning or otherwise. Refugees should be supported in visa applications and acquiring travel documents, undergoing health checks etc. Connection with the scholarship provider and academic mentor in country of scholarship is encouraged.	Orientation may be conducted by sponsoring partners, or other organisations, to manage expectations and prepare refugees for departure. Sponsors should at least produce a package of information except in the case of family reunification cases. Exit visa and pre-departure health checks (fit to fly).	A pre-departure component including information provision and pre-departure health assessments similar to resettlement is key; on behalf of governments such support can be requested from IOM; pre-departure measures enable refugees to prepare themselves, manage expectations and reception and integration actors to receive adequate information to better prepare post arrival reception and integration.

³⁷ In the case of private sponsorship, some of the recommendations are drawn from the ERN+ Scoping Paper *Private Sponsorship in Europe*.

	Higher Education Scholarships for Refugees	Private Sponsorship	Humanitarian Admission (for Protection) Programmes
Movement and transportation	Cost of travel included in scholarship programme. Can be organised by student (with support) or programme management body. Arrival with adequate time to settle before starting studies.	May be paid for by government and/or by sponsors, sometimes with private airline input for free or discounted travel.	Ideally HAPPs include organised transportation for the entire caseload. It can be organised by IOM on the request of governments. Organised transportation should be considered for those who do not have the means and/or vulnerable groups; can be organised with the support of families or by own means; or and by IOM on behalf of the government particularly in the case of large groups, vulnerable beneficiaries and/or those with no means to travel.
Reception	Support in the initial phase for registration purposes; can be incorporated in general activities for incoming students. Introduction to campus, language training, counselling to be provided. Signposting relevant psycho-social services and appointment of contact point and/or academic advisor, welcoming committee from student body.	In most cases, refugees are upon arrival housed in private housing provided by sponsors. (Accommodation is (Co) funded and prepared by sponsors for an agreed, pre-determined period (one –two years).	A reception centre stay of two weeks, including further orientation activities in country, put forward as a good practice model and in order to allow large caseloads to come in on a relatively quick basis. Reception in regions and/or organised by local authorities
Settlement Support and Integration	Buddy system, matching the newcomer with other student(s) - local student or possibly former/ ongoing refugee scholarship beneficiaries. Language training and study guidance is provided initially and ideally throughout at least early study period. Mentoring beneficial, and support in future planning, career advice, preparation for employment search.	Settlement support generally delivered by volunteers, supplemented by professional services to meet medical needs and addressing specific vulnerabilities. Sponsors to be properly trained.	Professional government support to be included even if family ties are present.
Scale	Likely modest per each HEI involved but potentially scalable both at each HEI and in terms of encouraging other HEIs to establish scholarships.	The number of places should be additional to resettlement programme places, and can vary dependent on government support and commitment, sponsor capacities and how the roles and (financial) responsibilities are divided between government and sponsors, and the period during which support will be provided.	Relatively large, and could be scaled up further to be quick, significant programmes for specific situations enabling greater responsibility sharing with host countries. HAPPs could be converted to resettlement, with due alterations in different elements of the programmes.

	Higher Education Scholarships for Refugees	Private Sponsorship	Humanitarian Admission (for Protection) Programmes
Actors involved and responsibilities	<p>HEIs and relevant bodies; NGOs; student(s) (groups); government ministries and embassies.</p> <p>Designation of coordinating/ management body (new or pre-existing). Or a coordination committee comprising relevant actors to share ownership, guarantee accountability and divide roles;</p> <p>Student groups can assist with day-to-day support;</p> <p>HEI administration contact point and academic mentor;</p> <p>Professional counselling services may be required, and in general experienced NGOs on refugee protection and support;</p> <p>Government provides permits;</p> <p>UNHCR and NGOs assist in identifying candidates/promoting programmes.</p>	<p>Accredited NGOs, Churches and other faith-based groups; private citizen groups, universities, diaspora organisations or bodies with special vocation. Family members.</p> <p>Government (including local government) role in status granting and service provision for those aspects to which beneficiaries are entitled;</p> <p>Framework to ensure accreditation of sponsors with government (minimum requirements to ensure quality and safeguards) or MoUs with selected organisations.</p> <p>UNHCR role in identifying and referring, dependent on programme.</p>	<p>Governments for status, service provision etc.</p> <p>UNHCR for (some or all) referrals; other actors such as faith-based organisations; families or embassies for referrals.</p> <p>IOM in (some) pre-departure orientation, pre-departure health assistance and transportation NGOs in reception activities and other settlement support as contracted with government authorities.</p>
Funders	<p>Government (local, regional, national); existing scholarship providers; philanthropic organisations; EU funds; HEIs and individual student contributions; business/private sector.</p>	<p>Sponsoring organisations in varied financing arrangements and public/private /social finance and cost sharing arrangements with government, including with private sector and local authorities.</p>	<p>Government funded (national, regional, local); some funding can come from private actors such as families but should avoid to put a burden on families/extended families and might require government subsidies to assist those families.</p>

3.3 OVERLAPPING PATHWAYS: THE POTENTIAL FOR SYNERGIES

One function of the **flexibility** of complementary pathways is the ability to blend or **combine** them into location- and/or situation-appropriate models. Their commonalities can be seen as the basis for **synergies**, which are not necessarily as simple as taking two of the pathways and creating a new model, but which rather fuse the benefits and synergies of two or more pathways into additional approaches. This further level of additionality reinforces the utility of complementary pathways in **increasing capacity** and the scale of potential benefit to the international protection regime both broadly and in addressing resettlement needs in particular.

It is possible to **combine partnerships, actors and outcomes** from different pathways, for example.³⁸ In Canada, the World University Service of Canada (WUSC) runs a programme that enables higher education communities to sponsor refugees who will arrive in Canada to study, who are in fact resettled through private sponsorship, not entering on student visas, but entering the country as refugees with permanent residence. Their sponsorship by the HEI where they study follows the lines of other sponsorship arrangements in the Canadian system – so they are supported for one year, after which, as refugees, they have access to loans or other scholarships in the same way as Canadian nationals do. As such, students are sponsored by the sponsoring organisation for one year. Canadian students also offer language learning and other integration support activities to the sponsored students. In this case, the programme offers an integrated pathway for students offering durable solutions, because they receive refugee status with access to citizenship.³⁹ The model of refugee student scholarships put forward in the feasibility study for this project handles status differently, in a way appropriate to current European programmes offering temporary student visas. However, in the future

there seems considerable scope to further explore synergies between sponsorships and scholarships, creating an alternative pathway for refugees to become students in the receiving State.⁴⁰

Similarly, the synergy could be found in further developing partnerships and **organisational processes for a specific programme** – for example, NGOs, faith-based organisations and other volunteers might already be involved in providing support services for resettled refugees and/or persons admitted through humanitarian admission programmes offering private resources, volunteering support and preferential access to housing stock. Those same service providers could offer support to private or community-based sponsored refugees, either as the direct sponsors with financial responsibilities, or offering an additional expert input to deal with vulnerable refugees, while the official sponsors might be philanthropic organisations or businesses that can offer money but not expertise or time. Another, currently frequent, form of combined approach is seen when private sponsors agree to support refugees who are identified and referred by UNHCR under resettlement criteria, and are not identified (named) and proposed by the sponsors themselves, as indicated in the scoping paper for this project, and practised in Canada and the Community Sponsorship Scheme that forms part of the Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme (VPRS) in the UK.⁴¹ These UNHCR referred vulnerable refugees are then housed and supported by sponsors for the duration of the nationally agreed sponsorship programme, while the government maintains payment of social and housing benefits, in addition to providing healthcare and education. Again, this type of combined approach could advance the additional nature of complementary pathways, building on community **interest and motivation in active involvement** in refugee protection and assistance in multiple ways.

38 Combinations or synergies as such are not part of the ERN+ policy research although some are touched on in the scoping papers for this project. However, the potential for combining the three pathways, and others, is noted here as a forward-looking element based on the research and observations of practice elsewhere.

39 See World University Service of Canada, Student Refugee Program, <https://srp.wusc.ca> (Accessed 10 April 2018).

40 This is an example, going beyond the content of this study, and very much dependent on government will and on the advocacy of actors involved.

41 See on Canada, The Refugee Sponsorship Training Program (RSTP), Blended Visa Office Referred Program (BVOR) at www.rstp.ca/en/special-initiatives/blended-vor-program/ and on the UK, see UK Government, “Community sponsorship scheme launched for refugees in the UK”, news story, 19 July 2016, www.gov.uk/government/news/community-sponsorship-scheme-launched-for-refugees-in-the-uk

In particular, combining pathways should always result in additional places: the point is not to shift people between programmes, but to add numbers through programmes that address both protection needs (across the board) and other specific requirements or features where applicable through specific programmes.

3.4 NEW ACTORS AND STAKEHOLDERS

New attention to complementary pathways has brought new **involvement** and **roles** for non-traditional actors alongside those who are established in resettlement activities.

Traditional actors have **central roles** to play in developing programmes, grounded in their **experience** with resettlement and other forms of protection and solutions. Their contributions are the starting point and the anchor, while new interest and enthusiasm from various partners in civil society and elsewhere should be harnessed for its own contribution to **additionality** in terms of increasing the range of actors involved, as well as the support for more places and programmes.

Although policy-making is clearly a government task, it should be informed through **consultations** and other means by a range of interested and involved individuals and organisations, including relevant International Organisations, NGOs and civil society, churches and other faith-based groups, academics and other experts, as well as cities and municipalities with increasing experience of active integration programmes on the local level.⁴² Engaging and consulting a **broad range** of organisations and individuals can bring fresh ideas and new opportunities to the protection landscape.

Particularly for sponsorship and scholarship purposes, Higher Education Institutions and potentially interested parties in the **private sector** should also be included from the policy stage through to the implementation of

the complementary pathway programmes.⁴³ Private sector involvement could also include, but should not be limited to, **financial** inputs. Other private sector activities could include staff-time **volunteered** in support of refugees, and job fairs or direct employment opportunities, for example.⁴⁴ In the French and Italian Humanitarian Corridor sponsorship schemes, Air France and Alitalia have offered discounted flights to refugees, for example.⁴⁵ This reflects what is already part of the traditional approach by traditional actors.⁴⁶

(Former) Refugees themselves can also play an **active** and **engaged** role in policy-making consultations, bringing personal experience to bear on the types of admission programmes that would be beneficial to newcomers, as well as in the implementation of integration programmes, as service providers and as sponsors.⁴⁷ Several migrant diaspora organisation are already being engaged as cultural mediators in offering integration programmes, while actively engaging in offering joint housing solutions, developing micro business and entrepreneurship opportunities and raising funds for the admission of relatives and members of the wider community.

42 See, for example, the EU financed networks: ICMC's SHARE Network on www.resettlement.eu/page/welcome-share-network, and EUROCITIES network, Solidarity Cities: Cities acting for refugee integration, City of Athens, <http://solidaritycities.eu> (accessed 15 April 2018).

43 See the UN, *New York Declaration and Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework Annex* on private sector (see footnote 3).

44 There are precedents in Europe and beyond of refugee startups, as well as of long-established employers taking an interest in offering opportunities to refugees. See, for example, Kongres, 'Ambitious Job Recruitment Initiative Kicks Off at the Copenhagen Marriott Hotel' (25 May 2017), <http://kongres-magazine.eu/2017/05/ambitious-job-recruitment-initiative-newly-arrived-refugees-kicks-off-copenhagen-marriott-hotel/> (accessed 25 April 2018); UNHCR, 'Refugees Turn Cooking Skills into Tasty Success Stories' (24 April 2018), www.unhcr.org/en-us/news/stories/2018/4/5adf01cb4/refugees-turn-cooking-skills-tasty-success-stories.html (accessed 25 April 2018), IKEA, Starbucks, and more.

45 ERN+, *Private Sponsorship in Europe*, p.33. See also Eno Adeogun "France to take in Syrian Christian refugees flown in from Lebanon," Premier, 1 July 2017, www.premier.org.uk/News/World/France-to-take-in-Syrian-Christian-refugees-flown-in-from-Lebanon (accessed 4 April 2018).

46 IOM has a strong relationship with airlines, including agreements for discounted flights as well as a high level of trust, necessary for ensuring safe and well-organised flights, including the presence of escorts as appropriate.

47 For example previously resettled refugees are employed by Caritas in Germany to give orientation for newcomers. Also both Belgium and the Netherlands engage former refugees as coaches for newly arriving refugees. The Migrafrica association in Cologne is an example of a diaspora based organization providing services to newcomers, see <http://migrafrica.org> (accessed 10 April 2018).

The contribution of (former) refugees to the policy making process could be through direct consultation processes, or mediated by non-governmental or international organisations engaged with the refugee community. The key to the development and implementation of robust policies, in this area is likely to lie in employing existing expertise and capacities, but being open to innovative thinking, including from newer actors. However, incorporating a broader range of actors must involve careful coordination, and clarity on roles and responsibilities, managed in such a way that it enhances, and does not limit, useful input.

All actors involved in crafting and implementing complementary pathways should have a sense of **ownership** over the programme. While appropriate safeguards are essential, new actor interest should **not be choked by over-regulation**. The relationships between actors, whether they are new or traditional; faith-based or secular; private or public will be based on **trust** as much as formal agreements. The success of the pathways, whether measured in terms of their contributions to the protection system; the number of arrivals; solidarity with other States, or; personal protection and integration outcomes, will very much depend on the trust factor in all the relationships involved.

4. How to expand complementary pathways: Recommendations

4.1 GENERAL

- **As protection-sensitive tools**, well-crafted programmes should avoid legal, administrative or social challenges that jeopardise the protection and any durable solution contribution these pathways are intended to provide for refugees. Complementary pathways should **maximise their protection impact**, and be **coordinated** with and implemented in a way that is additional and complementary to any existing resettlement programmes. Where no resettlement programme currently exists, complementary pathways might serve as a precursor to the establishment of such a long-term programme. Protection impact can also be maximised when complementary pathways are predictable and well coordinated, rather than being a mixed bag of initiatives.
- **Eligible beneficiaries must be clearly defined:** all beneficiaries of the complementary pathways proposed in the ERN+ research should be in need of international protection.⁴⁸ Any further eligibility criteria for specific pathways should be established in a non-discriminatory way. Eligibility criteria should not challenge or substitute for existing entitlements or rights – in particular the relationship of some complementary pathways to family ties and to family reunification needs to be carefully considered, and the use of any pathways to somehow avoid or circumvent obligations to family unity must be avoided.
- **The status** provided under complementary pathways should be **appropriate** to the broader reasons for eligibility, and, where not permanent from the outside, its initial duration should be for a sufficient period to allow beneficiaries to regain a sense of normalcy in their lives. The actual status should also be **cognizant of the protection needs** of the individuals

concerned. In some cases, such as under scholarship programmes, a relevant visa might be issued, with the minimum protection of *non-refoulement* and no prejudice to any asylum application. Regardless of the actual status type, it should be predictable and beneficiaries should be fully informed about their rights and obligations prior to admission.

In the case of pathways other than those involving higher education opportunities, status should be as **streamlined** as possible, in particular to avoid the natural sense of needing to try to improve one's situation by applying for a 'better status' that would offer greater enjoyment of rights. Besides avoiding any social or economic concerns related to individual status, such streamlining should avoid unnecessary administrative time, capacity and bureaucracy handling additional applications, while maintaining **high standards** of eligibility and appropriate access to **rights and entitlements**. Beneficiaries should be made aware of the need to comply with the criteria set out in the EU long-term residence Directive in order to be able to settle in another EU Member State⁴⁹, where applicable.

- The economic, physical and psychosocial welfare needs of all beneficiaries of complementary pathways must be met. This may involve access to the national **welfare system in line with legislation** regarding beneficiaries of international protection, at least as a safety net where other arrangements are made and where difficulties arise. Any limitations on that access linked to status or sponsorship, for example, must be made clear to all concerned. If such limitations exist they should be temporary, and other mechanisms should be in place to ensure that there

48 See footnote 6

49 European Council Directive 2003/109/EC of 25 November 2003 concerning the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents, *Official Journal of the European Union*, L 16/45, 23.1.2004, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32003L0109&from=en>

is no jeopardy to the physical, economic and mental well-being of the beneficiary (for example that sponsors or other institutions involved in the pathway are responsible, or that there is insurance in place etc.).

- **The type of status and/or visa** required for entry under a complementary pathway needs to take due account of **consular and other field level capacity** with regard to visa issuance, but also the availability of national travel documents. Limits in capacity to issue the required documentation can lead to limitations on locations from which refugees can travel. In some cases, this might lead to programme limitations, in others, those could be avoided by the crafting of alternative regulations governing entry to the territory.
- **Pre-departure components should be included** for all complementary pathways in order to inform beneficiaries of the scope and nature of the programme and manage expectations as well as possible. While such elements generally involve orientation and health assessment, they should also include specific guidance to manage the expectations not only of refugees but also of (new) receiving countries, (new) stakeholders and (new) sponsors. Specific additional considerations should be made in programmes that involve education in the receiving country, in order to prepare and facilitate entry into a study programme.
- **Complementary pathways need to be crafted in broadly accessible and transparent ways**, so that potential beneficiaries can easily learn of the opportunities. Candidates should be able to **autonomously** access pathways as appropriate, and be able to understand and follow the procedures involved. They should be assisted with the management of their own expectations at each step of the procedure and journey.
- **Transparency** is also a key both to the understanding and acceptance of the pathways on the part of the receiving population and to ensuring that different complementary pathways are operated in a way that is coherent with other protection policies including resettlement and the asylum system.
- **Sufficiently large** programmes, in appropriate

situations, will be needed to contribute to meeting changing global needs for protection and solutions in order to fulfil aspirations of international solidarity and responsibility-sharing over time.

- **The expansion** of complementary pathways offers the possibility of an on-going process **responding to an inter-play of governmental and community drivers** in reaction to both new and protracted displacement crises. Complementary pathways should be **reviewed** in terms of the countries and contexts in which they are active and the needs they seek to meet on a rolling basis. There should be consistent **monitoring** and **evaluation**, internally, at the behest of funders and externally.

4.2 THE ACTORS INVOLVED

- **Complementary pathways should maximise the use of support from the population** at large, ensuring that there is widespread awareness of the programmes. Government involvement is essential for status issues and for a range of regulations, and there should be full openness to community willingness to support and initiate programmes. **Civil Society** can also be mobilised and **private sector actors** encouraged, including in countries where the culture and background might not (yet) include such philanthropic and active support. In trying to inspire such support the net needs to be cast **widely and creatively** to engage a range of actors, including less usual ones, and achieve momentum to start and continue programmes. **Appropriate and necessary training should be available and required for new actors to ensure safeguards are in place.** Diverse groups and organisations can use **sensitization and advocacy initiatives**, as serious actors can take various steps to convince sceptical counterparts. Activities such as those already underway in the UK to inform potential community sponsors and ensure their full awareness of the background of the refugee population they will receive are important and should be widespread.⁵⁰

⁵⁰ See UK Government community sponsorship promotional material on www.gov.uk/government/publications/community-sponsorship-how-you-can-make-it-happen

Complementary pathways offer a means to **foster** welcoming communities, as well as a way to encourage **diaspora** and organisations made up of former refugees, who can play important roles in receiving newcomers and shaping programmes for them on various levels.

- **Appropriate safeguards must be in place, and standards set** to facilitate the incorporation of new and more actors, e.g. diaspora organisations; NGOs including those that are not faith-based, but have direct access to refugees; groups of individuals who might gradually form organisations, but start out more ad hoc to sponsor; education institutions; business of various sorts and their organizing bodies etc. Regular **multilevel** and **multi-stakeholder** dialogue involving all relevant actors is essential not only for such standard setting, monitoring and evaluation exercises, but also for sustainability.

Either individual pathways or the collective approach of complementary pathways could benefit from the establishment of **Advisory Councils** involving a full range of actors including relevant government departments, UNHCR, IOM and other relevant international organisations, NGOs, the private sector, relevant HEIs and others involved as employers or sponsors, as well as refugees, in particular previous programme beneficiaries over time. Such Councils could advise on general programme development and expansion, safeguards and specific details related to diverse elements in programme design.

- **Clear guidelines and operating procedures** need to be in place establishing which actors can fulfil which roles in complementary pathways. This extends to clear programme management, and relevant institutional lines of communication and overview within organisations involved and in any coordinating groups or bodies that are established specifically for these complementary pathway programmes.
- **Coordination is key** to any programmes with a variety of actors involved, each fulfilling their own role in the development and implementation of complementary pathways. Such coordination might be multi-level,

such as between State and non-State actors, between NGOs and communities participating in sponsorship programmes or among HEIs participating in higher education scholarship programmes. It might also be multi-stage, as actors will overlap or hand on responsibility at various stages in an individual beneficiary's progression from application to integration. As so many actors are involved, developing their **mutual trust** is an important element in policy and programme design.

Where approaches are combined, further thought should be given to the roles of stakeholders who might already be active in other complementary pathways, and for which the approach might be (at least slightly) different under any blended programme.

4.3 FUNDING MECHANISMS

- **Various EU support mechanisms** could be used, dependent on the exact nature of the pathways developed, including, for example, the AMIF⁵¹ as is currently the case on a per capita basis for resettlement meeting certain criteria. Programme support to specific pathways, such as scholarships, might be found through applications to expand the Erasmus Programme,⁵² or submissions to the Horizon 2020⁵³ calls for proposals on Science With and For Society.⁵⁴ Beneficiaries or those assisting them could be eligible for various EU funding tools, as set out in the relevant toolkit.⁵⁵

51 The Asylum Migration and Integration Fund, https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/financing/fundings/migration-asylum-borders/asylum-migration-integration-fund_en

52 Proposal for an Erasmus+ grant to welcome international talent, www.eua.be/Libraries/default-document-library/erasmus-for-refugees---draft-proposal_eua-web.pdf?sfvrsn=4

53 <http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/>

54 <http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/calls/h2020-swafs-2018-2020.html#c.topics=callIdentifier/t/H2020-SwafS-2018-2020/1/1/1/default-group&callStatus/t/Forthcoming/1/1/0/default-group&callStatus/t/Open/1/1/0/default-group&callStatus/t/Closed/1/1/0/default-group&+identifier/desc>

55 http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/information/publications/guides/2018/toolkit-on-the-use-of-eu-funds-for-the-integration-of-people-with-a-migrant-background

- **Community-Based Sponsors as well as HEIs could be required to provide financial support to the relevant pathways themselves.**⁵⁶ However, sponsorship could also be based on the contribution of time and expertise, while funding might come from government or the private sector, or from crowd-funding sources that could be established.
- **Subsidies could be made available** to recognise the contribution and offset some costs in those pathways that might involve an element of hosts offering housing in their own homes (be they family members or volunteers). It should be acknowledged that such a subsidy is likely to be much lower than the cost of housing a newly arriving beneficiary would be. (In such cases additional oversight as to the circumstances of the housing would be needed over time to ensure continued suitability).
- **Adequate funding should be foreseen for a defined period of time**, which should be long enough to reasonably allow for settlement, and might depend on the specific pathway or eligibility criteria for it. This should be the case whatever the source of financial support, be it on government programmes or through sponsorship or scholarship mechanisms. It is vital to keep in mind that safety nets will be required, which may go beyond what is generally covered by State social assistance programmes. Sponsorship and scholarships, for example, will only last for a certain period of time. In the event that the refugee has not been able to find employment and settled circumstances at the end of that time, government supported mechanisms must be in place to ensure adequate and ongoing support.

4.4 GETTING STARTED AND KNOWING MORE

- **Pilot programmes and other small start-up initiatives** are important for gaining experience and learning lessons from others.⁵⁷ Mechanisms then need to be in place, including good monitoring and evaluation, to ensure lessons learned are captured and applied going forward as well as shared with peers in relevant fora. Pilot programmes should always include safeguards and guarantee protection, but precise programme goals or criteria, for example, can be worked out through early pilot projects before a larger-scale initiative with clear objectives is launched. Particularly where new actors and new programmes are concerned, and if they are starting small or as pilots, it might be preferable to **embark** on the protection activity or initiative, and firmly categorise it as a particular pathway, or part of resettlement only later.⁵⁸

Many complementary pathways can, in principle, **start small and build up**: an appropriate scale will differ according to the type of approach (as can be seen between the three considered in this project). For some pathways, scaling up to a significant level very quickly might be an essential element to effectiveness (as indicated for Humanitarian Admission and Protection Programmes in the feasibility study), but, for other pathways, even low-level contributions of places will build to a whole that can become a significant part of protecting refugees and finding solutions.

Projects that can support the development of resettlement and complementary pathways in Europe include the Canadian-led Global Refugee Sponsorship Initiative (GRSI)⁵⁹, a partnership between the government of Canada, UNHCR, the Open Society Foundations, the Radcliffe Foundation and the University of Ottawa that shares know-how

⁵⁶ See ERN+, [Higher Education Scholarships for refugees](#), p.9, and ERN+, [Feasibility Study: Towards a private sponsorship model in France](#), p. 29.

⁵⁷ See Hanne Beirens and Aliyyah Ahad, *Scaling up Refugee Resettlement in Europe: The Role of Institutional Peer Support*, (Brussels, Migration Policy Institute Europe: 2018), www.migrationpolicy.org/research/scaling-refugee-resettlement-europe-role-institutional-peer-support

⁵⁸ See ERN+, [Feasibility Study: Towards a private sponsorship model in France \(April 2018\)](#), p. 3 (see footnote 7)

⁵⁹ www.refugeesponsorship.org

about the establishment of community-based sponsorship programmes. This has, to date, mostly been active in the UK, Ireland and Spain (as well as some Latin American countries) where community meetings and networks are taking place underpinning new and expanding sponsorship initiatives.

The European Commission, in its Communication on the Delivery of the European Agenda on Migration⁶⁰ of September 2017, invited EASO to coordinate a pilot project on private sponsorship with interested Member States. This will run in parallel with the feasibility study which the Commission has requested be undertaken on the feasibility and added value of private sponsorship for admission of refugees in Europe. The pilot aims to engage a wide variety of stakeholders including civil society, international organisations and potential private sponsors in cooperation with EU Member States.

- **Further policy-focused studies**, both at national and EU level, could be engaged to investigate what works well, and come up with innovative approaches. In all cases, there is the need for political will, but, as noted above, advocacy and initiatives from the ground up can inspire new programmes, greater efforts and more collaboration. All three complementary pathways studied in this project have been based on such mobilisation from various actors as set out in the Scoping Papers and Feasibility Studies.

60 European Commission, COM(2017) 558 final (27 September 2017), https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/20170927_communication_on_the_delivery_of_the_eam_en.pdf

5. Conclusion

The moment is ripe for expanding complementary pathways. The momentum towards both broader community involvement in refugee protection and organised arrival mechanisms started by the reaction to the Syrian crisis should be harnessed. Complementary pathways (and expanded resettlement) have been demonstrated in practice to be effective tools of refugee protection that European States can further develop and expand.

These pathways in general, not only the three studied in this project, present Europe, and the international refugee protection system, with manifold opportunities:

- To strengthen refugee protection and policy broadly;
- To add new and alternative mechanisms for protection and solutions that can complement, strengthen and reinforce traditional durable solutions for refugees;
- To incorporate new, willing and eager actors in processes of refugee protection, assistance and integration;
- To acknowledge the fact that a large part of the European population is willing to welcome refugees not only to their country and community, but sometimes also to their homes;⁶¹
- To demonstrate solidarity and responsibility-sharing with countries of first asylum;
- To recognise that the skills and abilities of newcomers who have arrived because of their protection needs can be nourished and grow, to the benefit of those individuals and the communities in which they live;

The ERN+ project, which has engaged some 400 stakeholders in various ways during its implementation (in conferences, webinars, roundtables, interviews etc.), has developed and presented some of the possible approaches to implementing the three selected complementary pathways. This research has reached the 4500 members of the European Resettlement Network (ERN+) network.⁶² These approaches can be expanded through further research into other pathways, and States and advocates can move towards implementing the types of programmes recommended in this project. Indeed, the type of engagement that the ERN+ has employed during this project (and on other resettlement related activities) demonstrates how awareness and support for complementary pathways and action on refugee protection in Europe can be increased. As a unique platform gathering a wide range of stakeholders, disseminating knowledge and organising targeted meetings, the ERN+ coordinating partners will seek to continue with follow up activities looking further into these three models and other complementary pathways, including combined approaches.

The most important work now is:

- To continue to expand complementary pathways, without jeopardy to either resettlement or asylum systems;
- To bring ever more civil society actors into the refugee protection fold to partner with governments in making protection and integration a reality;
- To continue to support countries of first asylum through responsibility sharing;
- To expand the target groups in order to address more crises, both new and protracted, providing appropriate and meaningful protection to a greater number of refugees.

⁶¹ See, for example, Refugee Welcome International on www.refugees-welcome.net/#countries

⁶² www.resettlement.eu/

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AMIF	Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund
CRRF	Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework
ERN	European Resettlement Network
ERN+	European Resettlement Network Project ERN+ on complementary pathways
EU	European Union
EP	European Parliament
HAP	Humanitarian Admission Programme
HAPP	Humanitarian Admission and Protection Programme
HEI	Higher Education Institutions
ICMC	International Catholic Migration Commission
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
IOM	International Organization for Migration
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
SRP	Student Refugee Program
UNHCR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
VHAS	Voluntary Humanitarian Admission Scheme with Turkey
VPRS	Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme (UK)
WUSC	World University Service of Canada

REFERENCES

- Adeogun, Eno (2018). France to take in Syrian Christian refugees flown in from Lebanon. *Premier*, 1 July. Available from www.premier.org.uk/News/World/France-to-take-in-Syrian-Christian-refugees-flown-in-from-Lebanon
- Beirens, Hanne, and Aliyyah Ahad (2018). *Scaling up Refugee Resettlement in Europe: The Role of Institutional Peer Support*. Brussels. Migration Policy Institute Europe: Brussels. Available from www.migrationpolicy.org/research/scaling-refugee-resettlement-europe-role-institutional-peer-support
- Council of the EU, The (2017). *EU resettlement framework: Council ready to start negotiations*. Press Release 664/17, 15 November 2017. Available from www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2017/11/15/eu-resettlement-framework-council-ready-to-start-negotiations/.
- Danish Refugee Council (2018). *Syria Brussels Conference reactive from the Danish Refugee Council*. Report, 25 April. Available from <https://reliefweb.int/report/syrian-arab-republic/syria-brussels-conference-reactive-danish-refugee-council>.
- European Council (2004). Directive 2003/109/EC of 25 November 2003 concerning the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents. *Official Journal of the European Union*, L 16/45, 23.1.2004, Available from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32003L0109&from=en>
- European Commission (2017). *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the Delivery of the European Agenda on Migration*. COM (2017) 558 final. 27 September. Available at https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/20170927_communication_on_the_delivery_of_the_eam_en.pdf
- _____ (2015). *Commission presents Recommendation for a Voluntary Humanitarian Admission Scheme with Turkey for refugees from Syria*. Press release, P/15/6330, 15 December. Available from http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-15-6330_en.htm
- _____ (2017). *EU-Turkey statement: one year on*. 17 March. Available from https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/home-affairs/files/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/background-information/eu_turkey_statement_17032017_en.pdf
- _____ (2016). *Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a Union Resettlement Framework and amending Regulation (EU) No 516/2014 of the European Parliament and the Council*. COM 2016/468. Available from www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/docs_autres_institutions/commission_europeenne/com/2016/0468/COM_COM%282016%290468_EN.pdf
- European Parliament (2017). *Report on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a Union Resettlement Framework and amending Regulation (EU) No 516/2014 of the European Parliament and the Council*. COM (2016)0468 – C8-0325/2016 – 2016/0225(COD) . 23 October. Available from www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2F%2FEPF%2F%2FTEXT%2FBREPORT%2BA8-2017-0316%2B0%2BDOC%2BXML%2BV0%2F%2FEN&language=EN.
- European Resettlement Network (2018). *Feasibility Study: Towards a private sponsorship model in France*. Brussels. Available from www.resettlement.eu/page/ern-publications
- _____ (2018). *Higher Education Scholarships for Refugees: A reference framework for expanding protection and solutions opportunities through complementary pathways of admission to Europe*. Brussels. Available from www.resettlement.eu/page/ern-publications

- _____ (2018). *Humanitarian Admission Programmes: Expanding and increasing pathways to protection*. Brussels. Available from www.resettlement.eu/page/ern-publications
- _____ (2018). *Humanitarian Admission Programmes in Europe: Expanding complementary pathways of admission for persons in need of international protection (ERN+ Scoping Paper)*. Brussels. Available from www.resettlement.eu/page/ern-publications
- _____ (2017). *Private Sponsorship in Europe: Expanding complementary pathways for refugee resettlement (ERN+ Scoping Paper)*. Brussels. Available from www.resettlement.eu/page/ern-publications
- _____ (2017). *Student Scholarship for refugees: Expanding complementary pathways of admission to Europe (ERN+ Scoping Paper)*. Brussels. Available from www.resettlement.eu/page/ern-publications
- Francis, Ellen (2017). Hostility Grows towards Syrian Refugees in Lebanon. *Reuters*. August 28. Available from www.reuters.com/article/us-lebanon-refugees-tension/hostility-grows-towards-syrian-refugees-in-lebanon-idUSKCN1B8128;
- The Guardian* (2017), Tensions rise as Uganda neighbourly refugee policy starts to feel the strain. 21 May. Available from www.theguardian.com/global-development/2017/may/21/uganda-refugee-policy-breaking-point
- Hathaway James C. and R. Alexander Neve (1997). Making International Refugee Law Relevant Again: A Proposal for Collectivized and Solution-Oriented Protection, *Harvard Human Rights Journal* 10, pp. 115-211. Available from <https://repository.law.umich.edu/articles/1622/>
- International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC) Europe (2015), *10% of Refugees from Syria: Europe's Resettlement and other Admission Responses in a Global Perspective*. Brussels. Available from www.icmc.net/sites/default/files/documents/10-percent-syrian-refugees-resettlement-2015.pdf
- _____ (2013). *Welcome to Europe: A comprehensive guide to resettlement*. Brussels. Available from www.resettlement.eu/sites/icmc.tttt.eu/files/ICMC%20Europe-Welcome%20to%20Europe.pdf
- International Rescue Committee (2018). Trump Administration on track to miss own Target for Refugee Admissions. Press Release, 25 January. Available from www.rescue.org/press-release/irc-trump-administration-track-miss-own-target-refugee-admissions
- Myria (2017), *Les Visa Humanitaires: Frontières et droits fondamentaux*. Myriadocs no. 4 Mai 2017, Brussels. Available from <https://emnbelgium.be/publication/humanitarian-visa-belgium-myria>.
- United Kingdom Government (2016). Community sponsorship scheme launched for refugees in the UK, news story, 19 July. Available from www.gov.uk/government/news/community-sponsorship-scheme-launched-for-refugees-in-the-uk
- United Nations General Assembly (2016). *New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants*, 19 September. Available from www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/71/1
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (2016). *The 10 Point Plan in Action*. Geneva. Available from www.unhcr.org/en-us/publications/manuals/5846d10e7/10-point-plan-action-2016-update-chapter-7-solutions-refugees.html?query=complementary%20pathways .
- _____ (2017). *Projected Global Resettlement Needs 2018, 23rd Annual Tripartite Consultations on Resettlement, 12-14 June*. Geneva. Available from www.unhcr.org/593a88f27.pdf
- _____ (2011). *Resettlement Handbook*. Geneva. Available from www.unhcr.org/46f7c0ee2.pdf.
- _____ (2018). Revolutionary housing project brings Dutch youth together with refugees. 28 March. Available from www.unhcr.org/news/stories/2018/3/5ab4dfc54/revolutionary-housing-project-brings-dutch-youth-together-refugees.html

- _____ (2018). *Resettlement and Other Admission Pathways for Syrian refugees*. UNHCR cumulative figures. (Accessed 15 April 2018). Available from www.unhcr.org/protection/resettlement/573dc82d4/resettlement-other-admission-pathways-syrian-refugees.html.
- _____ (2018). *Global Compact on Refugees, Draft 1*. (Accessed 02 April 2018). Available on www.unhcr.org/en-us/5aa2b3287
- _____ (2017). *Projected Global Resettlement Needs 2018*. Available from www.unhcr.org/593a88f27.pdf
- Pitel, Laura, Asser Khatab and Erika Solomon (2018). Syrian Refugees under Pressure as Neighbours' Goodwill runs out. *Financial Times*, 5 March. Available from www.ft.com/content/bf696a82-1d47-11e8-956a-43db76e69936.
- Robinson, W. Courtland (2004). The Comprehensive Plan of Action for Indochinese Refugees, 1989–1997: Sharing the Burden and Passing the Buck. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 3. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available from <https://academic.oup.com/jrs/article/17/3/319/1571884>
- Satloff, Robert and David Schenker (2016). Growing Stress on Jordan: Contingency Planning Memorandum Update. *Council on Foreign Relations*. 10 March. Available from www.cfr.org/report/growing-stress-jordan
- Selm, Joanne van, Tamara Woroby, Erin Patrick and Monica Matts (2004). *Study on the Feasibility of setting up resettlement programmes in EU Member States or at EU level, against the background of the Common European Asylum System and the goal of a Common Asylum Procedure*. Migration Policy Institute for the European Commission. Brussels. Available from https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/e-library/docs/pdf/resettlement_study_full_2003_en_en.pdf;
- Selm, Joanne van (ed) (2000). *Kosovar Refugees in the European Union*. London: Continuum.
- The Times* (1956), Farming notes and comments: to aid refugees. 10 December. London.
- Turk, Volker, UNHCR (2016). Prospects for Responsibility Sharing in the Refugee Context. *Journal on Migration and Human Security*. Vol 4. No 3, pp. 45-59. Available from jmhs.cmsny.org/index.php/jmhs/article/download/61/50

Co-funded by the
European Union

