

ANNUAL TRIPARTITE CONSULTATIONS ON RESETTLEMENT  
Geneva, 20-21 June 2001

---

**Background Note for the Agenda Item:  
THE USE OF RESETTLEMENT TO ADDRESS  
DURABLE SOLUTION NEEDS**

**I. THE CORE FUNCTIONS OF RESETTLEMENT**

1. Resettlement under the auspices of UNHCR has three core and equally important functions. *First*, it serves as a tool to provide international protection and meet the special needs of refugees whose life, liberty, safety, health or other fundamental rights are at risk in the country where they have sought refuge. *Second*, it is a durable solution for refugees to address the need to reinstate national protection, to restore basic dignity and safety, and to secure a future where refugees can enjoy life again. And *third*, it is a means for international responsibility sharing, whereby States assist each other in addressing these issues in the spirit of international solidarity, thus assuring that refugees do not unduly impact the country of first refuge.

2. UNHCR resettlement policy has evolved in recent years within the context of a changed environment, and has gained renewed importance within the whole governance structure for refugees. It is now a sophisticated tool used to address complex protection situations in countries of first refuge and to respond to the increasing need to find a durable solution for refugees in many parts of the world. This evolution of resettlement brings new challenges and opportunities. To be able to lead this process further and to give strategic directions for the future, creative thinking will have to be coupled with a continued commitment to UNHCR's mandate and international principles. Resettlement is a concrete expression of the mandate of the organization to find durable solutions to the plight of refugees.

**II. PROTECTION IS AN OBLIGATION**

3. Achieving a durable solution for refugees is the most comprehensive way to ensure that all of their protection problems are addressed and resolved. Resettlement, as part of the comprehensive range of responses available to UNHCR, is one of the ways the organization fulfils its mandate to secure a safe and dignified future for refugees and to ensure that their need for international protection may cease. The achievement of durable solutions for refugees forms the second responsibility under the UNHCR Statute and is equally central to the protection mandate of the organization.

4. While the quality of resettlement as a durable solution is important, so is consideration of the use of resettlement as a vital tool of international protection. The decision to resettle refugees on the basis of protection needs is not optional; it is fundamental to UNHCR's mandate to ensure international protection for refugees.

### III. DURABLE SOLUTIONS HAVE NO INHERENT HIERARCHY

5. Neither the Statute of UNHCR nor any other international instrument relating to refugees indicates that durable solutions have an inherent hierarchy.<sup>1</sup> The use of the various durable solutions over the past decades shows that views about which solution is preferable or in some cases realistic can vary greatly. Any *a priori* assumption of a hierarchy of durable solutions neglects the political realities and practical experiences of this century. It also ignores the important need to do a comprehensive analysis of each situation in order to determine the appropriate durable solution for a refugee population or for groups and individuals within it.

6. The great majority of refugees consider voluntary return to be the most beneficial solution, as it enables them to resume their lives in a familiar setting under the protection and care of their home country.<sup>2</sup> This generalisation should not, however, lead to a conclusion that some groups and individuals with distinctive backgrounds have differentiated needs. Some refugees, for example, have gone through such horrific forms of persecution that they cannot imagine returning to the country in which they have experienced severe trauma. Others, while longing to be back home, cannot return due to continued tensions affecting their particular circumstances or ethnic communities.

7. In situations of mass influx it is often difficult to see beyond a presumably homogeneous population to the individual person, his or her particular circumstances and unique needs. In large refugee situations the choice of durable solutions appears limited, and the option of voluntary repatriation seems to be the evident, straightforward and simple solution. However, experience in the last decades has shown that in some cases the very definition of “voluntary” has come into question, and some have doubted how “durable” some repatriations are, given continued difficult circumstances in the home country.<sup>3</sup>

#### A glance back

8. In the aftermath of the Second World War hundreds of thousands of refugees had the minimal benefit of asylum in the refugee camps of Europe. Their principal need was for resettlement,<sup>4</sup> and the General Assembly repeatedly called upon immigration countries to allow refugees access to their programmes.<sup>5</sup> Starting in the 1970s, resettlement was used to respond to the actions of certain Southeast Asian states that refused asylum-seekers permission to land and grant anything but strictly temporary refuge. In 1979, at the peak of the refugee movements in Southeast Asia, many viewed

---

<sup>1</sup> “Existing international instruments relating to the status of refugees do not prioritize voluntary repatriation. The solutions to the refugee problem stipulated by such instruments are twofold, namely, voluntary repatriation and ‘assimilation within new national communities’ (Article 8[c], Statute of UNHCR 1950). Neither of these two solutions has primacy over the other.” Gaim Kibreab, *Revisiting the Debate on People, Place, Identity and Displacement*, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, December 1999, at 389.

<sup>2</sup> However, “for second-generation refugees, such as now exist in many parts of Africa, return to their country of ‘origin’ does not always necessarily mean ‘going home’.” John R. Rogge, at 1.

<sup>3</sup> See Marjolein Zieck, *UNHCR and Voluntary Repatriation of Refugees: A Legal Analysis*, The Hague, 1997, and John R. Rogge, *Repatriation of Refugees: A not-so-simple “Optimum” Solution*, Winnipeg, 1991, at 1.

<sup>4</sup> Over a period of five years, from 1947 to 1951, the IRO resettled well over a million people, four-fifths of them outside Europe.

<sup>5</sup> See, for example, UNGA res. 430(V), 14 Dec. 1950, urgently appealing to all States to assist the IRO with resettlement; UNGA res. 538(VI), 2 Feb. 1952, appealing specially to States interested in migration.

resettlement as the only viable durable solution.

9. However, the long-term impact of the Southeast Asian resettlement programme on UNHCR has been significant and wide-ranging. Viewed as a life-saving exercise in the early days, the programme was soon characterized by many as an “automatic resettlement machine”. This resulted in widespread disenchantment within the organisation with the concept of resettlement. At the same time, major resettlement countries began focussing their efforts on other refugees and refugee-like populations, and not on cases identified by UNHCR.

10. The impact manifested itself not only in a progressive decline in resettlement offers, but also in the terminology used to describe resettlement as the “least desirable” or a “last resort” solution.<sup>6</sup> After a number of initiatives taken in defence of resettlement through the course of the following years, the concept of resettlement as a “tool of protection” re-emerged in 1991. This new approach to resettlement policy was reaffirmed by the Executive Committee in subsequent years.<sup>7</sup>

### **The “least preferred solution”: Least preferred by whom?**

11. The notion of resettlement as the “least desirable” and a “last resort” solution was revisited by High Commissioner Sadako Ogata in 1997, when she clarified that “the description of resettlement as a ‘last resort’ should not be interpreted to mean that there is a hierarchy of solutions and that resettlement is the *least* valuable or needed among them. For many refugees, resettlement is, in fact, the best - or perhaps, *only* - alternative.”<sup>8</sup>

12. Different perceptions as to the desirability of one or another solution have been influenced by political and economic factors, including ethnic pressures on the country of first refuge and concerns for the security of refugees. In most of the developing world, voluntary return may be prioritised not so much because it is considered the best solution under all circumstances, but rather because many States cannot or refuse to accept refugees on a permanent basis.<sup>9</sup> Nevertheless, it should be recognized that resettling refugees from countries of temporary refuge will not resolve all the challenges faced by these States; what is needed is a comprehensive analysis to determine the most appropriate solution available for a refugee population, including prospects for local integration.

---

<sup>6</sup> One example for this was a paper on durable solutions presented to the Executive Committee in 1985, which stated: “If voluntary repatriation is the happiest of durable solutions, resettlement in third countries may be termed in contrast the solution of last resort.”

<sup>7</sup> See “Resettlement as an Instrument of Protection: Traditional Problems in Achieving this Durable Solution and New Directions in the 1990s” Executive Committee document EC/SCP/65, 9 July 1991; see also compilation of relevant Executive Committee Conclusions in Annex 1 of the *Resettlement Handbook*, UNHCR Division of International Protection, Geneva, April 1998.

<sup>8</sup> Speech by High Commissioner Sadako Ogata at the Annual Tripartite Consultations on Resettlement, UNHCR, Geneva, June 1997.

<sup>9</sup> See Gaim Kibreab, at 389.

#### **IV. IMPEDIMENTS TO PROTECTION AND DURABLE SOLUTIONS**

13. In complex humanitarian emergencies, ensuring the protection of refugees and finding durable solutions for them is increasingly difficult to attain. In many of these situations combatants roam freely terrorizing refugees and humanitarian workers alike.<sup>10</sup> Under such circumstances, carrying out protection activities becomes particularly challenging, as even basic assistance of food and shelter programmes are very complicated to implement. Similarly, plans and strategies for voluntary repatriation are often frustrated in these difficult circumstances.<sup>11</sup>

14. Similarly, the fact that the durable solution of local integration in the country of refuge is often hard to achieve<sup>12</sup> does not mean that UNHCR ceases to work with States in this regard. UNHCR is promoting, in the context of the Global Consultations on International Protection, closer attention to “rehabilitating” local integration, which has lately fallen into some disuse. At the same time, UNHCR is also looking at actively employing resettlement as a responsibility sharing mechanism in order to encourage efforts on local integration.

#### **Setting priorities and adjusting thresholds – not abdicating responsibilities**

15. The process of resettlement has unique challenges and problems, both in operational response and programme implementation. Often under-resourced and misunderstood, buffeted by value judgements and contradictory expectations affecting field staff and refugees alike, resettlement is sometimes held responsible for a host of problems facing humanitarian agencies at the local level.

16. Particularly in large and complex refugee situations, the aim of ensuring the protection of refugees - including through resettlement - may become difficult to fully achieve. Nevertheless, every possible effort should be made to uphold protection principles and to meet responsibilities that flow from the mandate of the organization. Rather than changing standards and thus narrowing the already difficult protection response by the exclusion of a resettlement option, the setting of priorities should help to ensure the protection of, and to provide a durable solution for, those most at risk.

17. From a narrow protection perspective, the longer a refugee situation lasts, the less apparent the need becomes to intervene and rescue an individual through resettlement. Yet, from a durable solution perspective, with the passage of time the need for resettlement to restore the basic dignity, reinstate legal protection at a national level and safeguard the quality of life for refugees becomes clearer and obvious. Therefore, resettlement is in many cases the “right” solution for refugees who have specific needs, whether for protection reasons or to achieve a durable solution.

18. In response to these impediments, UNHCR places emphasis on the worldwide use of resettlement as part of comprehensive protection and durable solutions strategies,

---

<sup>10</sup> See “Safety and Security Issues”, Standing Committee, 20<sup>th</sup> meeting, Conference Room Paper EC51/SC/CRP.8, Feb 2001.

<sup>11</sup> See The State of the World’s Refugees: A Humanitarian Agenda, Oxford, 1997, Chapter 4 “Return and reintegration”, at 143ff.

<sup>12</sup> See the critique of the treatment of refugees in East Africa by Binaifer Nowrojee, “In the Name of Security: Erosion of Refugee Rights in East Africa”, World Refugee Survey 2000, USCR Washington, D.C., at 48-53.

promoting the active identification and assessment of cases of refugees in need of resettlement under established criteria and encouraging partnerships with Governments and non-governmental organizations.

## V. THE COMPLEMENTARY NATURE OF DURABLE SOLUTIONS

19. To achieve a comprehensive approach in order to resolve refugee problems, it is important to recognize the complementary nature of the three durable solutions. In the context of the Global Consultations, UNHCR has stated that “in devising burden and responsibility sharing measures, the international community should recognize the importance of addressing durable solutions at an early stage.” Moreover, the international community should also provide closer attention to the “relationship of resettlement with other solutions and [its role] as a burden and responsibility sharing tool.”<sup>13</sup>

20. The complementary nature of the three durable solutions was illustrated particularly well in the programmes for Bosnian refugees during the mid 1990’s. While acknowledging that the need for temporary protection had ended and asserting the primacy of voluntary return, UNHCR also continued to advocate with States to provide protection to refugees from former Yugoslavia in the form of local integration and resettlement to third countries.<sup>14</sup> States were encouraged to increase or maintain resettlement quotas for specific groups of Bosnians who could not return, even though UNHCR was promoting voluntary repatriation for large parts of the refugee population. The emphasis was on the need for simultaneous responses in implementing durable solutions, as opposed to more mechanical, sequential or hierarchical approaches that put repatriation and resettlement as opposite and potentially incompatible programmes.

## VI. THE USE OF RESETTLEMENT TO ADDRESS DURABLE SOLUTION NEEDS

21. Current policy on the use of resettlement to address durable solution needs is concretised in the context of criteria outlined in the UNHCR *Resettlement Handbook* for refugees with a “Lack of Local Integration Prospects”.<sup>15</sup> These criteria emphasize that, within the context of a consultative process, refugees who lack local integration prospects should be assisted with resettlement efforts only where the opportunity arises (in the form of resettlement quotas or places being offered), and when resources including staff and program funding are available. The principle is that refugees who lack integration prospects may have an on-going need for resettlement, while cases with immediate protection concerns have an urgent need for this solution and they must be prioritised.

---

<sup>13</sup> See “Mechanisms of International Cooperation to Share Responsibilities and Burdens in Mass Influx Situations” UNHCR Global Consultations on International Protection (EC/GC/01/7), February 2001, paragraphs 17 and 18.

<sup>14</sup> Statement by High Commissioner Sadako Ogata to the Plenary Session of the [Dayton] Peace Implementation Council, London, 4-5 December 1996.

<sup>15</sup> See *Resettlement Handbook*, Chapter 4.9.

### **A qualitative analysis**

22. When the emphasis is on the durable solution component of resettlement, the focus should be on determining what difference resettlement may or may not make in addressing the current problems and needs of the refugees in question. The aim of this qualitative analysis should be to provide a realistic and comparative prognosis as to the viability and the protection impact of each of the durable solutions in the foreseeable future.

23. When doing this qualitative analysis, it is important to identify factors which may indicate whether return is a viable option in the near future. For example, are peace talks underway in the country of origin? Have there been any spontaneous returns of refugees or internally displaced persons? Has the security situation in the country of origin improved? Are the minimum safeguards and conditions required in the country of origin to promote voluntary repatriation being met? Similarly, specific considerations have to be looked at when determining prospects of local integration and resettlement.

24. This does not, however, imply a mechanical process where certain steps have to be taken one after the other over an extended period of time. The potential for all three durable solutions may be reviewed at the same time and it may not be necessary that each be tried in a consecutive manner to see whether they are likely to be successful.

25. The decision to strive for one particular durable solution needs to be taken in light of the prospects for the other durable solutions and, as appropriate, any approach taken must be reviewed regularly to accommodate changes in the circumstances on which the decision is based. By only pursuing one particular solution such as voluntary repatriation at the exclusion of others, one could risk a considerable delay in directing efforts to achieve the goal of ending the need for international protection. Similarly, pursuing resettlement without a careful and comprehensive analysis can lead to substantial operational problems and a deterioration of asylum for all refugees in a given situation.

26. Experience has shown that refugees who benefit from resettlement or local integration may eventually choose to repatriate, even after years of exile and adjustment in their host societies. In these circumstances, resettlement also provides significant potential for the development of a resource base for the return of professional and skilled personnel at some future time when repatriation may become viable. Refugee returns to Uganda, El Salvador, Chile and South Africa, are but a few examples of this complementary benefit of resettlement.

### **Different needs require diverse responses**

27. A differentiation of need should be made based on objective criteria and categorizations. Among the larger refugee groups in a big scale operation, for example, there are often sub-groups and sub-categories of persons for whom resettlement as a durable solution is more appropriate than for the entire refugee population. This same methodology is evident in the strategic approach UNHCR uses with assistance programmes to enhance protection for refugee women and children.

28. Resettlement as a durable solution can play an important role in situations involving inter-ethnic or communal conflict. In many post-conflict situations, the underlying causes of refugee flight may not be resolved fully even after a peace settlement has been

reached. While recognizing the primacy of social and ethnic tolerance, and the benefits of ethnic pluralism and multicultural societies, the realities of partition and ethnic separatist tendencies are self-evident. Experience has demonstrated in the last decade that even with the intervention and on-going support of the international community some post-conflict societies have not realised peaceful co-existence of previously adversarial groupings, rival ethnic minorities or ideological foes. With a careful analysis of the conditions and political realities of the post-conflict period, more precise decisions can be made about refugees for whom return is not the best durable solution and, consequently, for whom resettlement may be the most appropriate course of action.<sup>16</sup>

### **Refugees need to be consulted - informed decision-making**

29. A new approach to refugee participation is evolving within UNHCR. Aptly named “Reinforcing A Community Based Approach”<sup>17</sup>, this effort seeks to empower refugees to be active and resourceful partners as the “subjects” in the search for durable solutions, rather than simply passive “objects” of assistance.

30. While there is no right of an individual to resettlement,<sup>18</sup> there is a need to take refugees’ views and concerns into consideration when considering the need for this durable solution. Such a principle has already been established in the context of voluntary repatriation, where it is understood that in order for a decision on the return to one’s country of origin to be voluntary, it has, in the first instance, to be an informed decision. A similar - and linked - approach should be taken with regard to other durable solutions. Evidently, this approach requires that refugees be counselled with regard to unrealistic expectations about access to and conditions upon resettlement.

31. In order to address the many operational challenges posed by resettlement at the field level, it is important to involve refugees as partners in the process. Refugees approaching UNHCR offices searching for resettlement opportunities are unfortunately often perceived as persistent and bothersome self-advocates who want the benefits of economic migration, de-linked from protection concerns. The *Resettlement Handbook* addresses this issue, by stressing the need for a more coordinated and consistent approach.<sup>19</sup>

### **The resettlement and integration continuum**

32. For resettlement to be truly effective both as a tool of international protection *and* as a durable solution, it cannot be approached in a compartmentalised manner. Rather, it must be viewed as a *continuum* beginning with the identification and assessment of cases of refugees requiring protection and ultimately leading to a durable solution. In this respect, resettlement should not only be narrowly defined in terms of approval for admission and safe passage to the receiving country, but also in terms of successful reception *and* settlement upon arrival.

---

<sup>16</sup> For a fuller discussion, see John Fredriksson, “Revitalizing Resettlement as a Durable Solution”, *1997 World Refugee Survey*, US Committee for Refugees, Washington D.C., at 48-55.

<sup>17</sup> Standing Committee, 20<sup>th</sup> meeting, paper DC/51/SC/CRP.6, February 2001.

<sup>18</sup> UNHCR *Resettlement Handbook*, Geneva, 1998, Chapter 4.1.

<sup>19</sup> UNHCR *Resettlement Handbook*, Geneva, 1998, Chapter 6.

33. To complete the *continuum* of resettlement as a truly durable solution for refugees, UNHCR must be responsive to quality-of-life issues arising in the context of integration in the new location. In this respect, UNHCR recognises that its role cannot be that of integration expert, but rather as facilitator for professionals in the resettlement countries to regularly analyse and exchange “best practices” in the reception and integration of resettled refugees.

34. It must also be stressed that individuals or groups whose refugee status has been determined and who have been identified as being in need of resettlement, should never be excluded merely because of their background or because of a general and ill-defined notion of what has been termed “integration potential.”

35. The *International Conference on the Reception and Integration of Resettled Refugees*, convened in Norrköping, Sweden on 25-27 April 2001, served to build support for a larger integration initiative undertaken by UNHCR and its resettlement partners over the course of the past twelve months.<sup>20</sup> Hosted by the Government of Sweden<sup>21</sup>, the Conference was structured to provide an international forum for the exchange and examination of ideas and means to support refugee resettlement between both the traditional and emerging countries.<sup>22</sup> As a result of the Conference, a set of principles to guide the successful development and implementation of reception and integration practices was endorsed by all 18 resettlement countries and UNHCR.<sup>23</sup> By the end of 2001, a reception and integration addendum to the UNHCR *Resettlement Handbook*, based on the conclusions and recommendations of the Conference, will also be completed to assist both traditional and emerging resettlement countries to strengthen their respective reception and integration programmes.

## VII. FUTURE CHALLENGES

36. Flowing from this integration initiative, UNHCR's tripartite resettlement partners will need to give careful thought to future directions for the resettlement programme, particularly its use as a durable solution. Resettlement is now being debated by and among States at the policy planning level, as they confront and examine the complex relationship between asylum systems and international migration.<sup>24</sup> A critical issue will be to examine how much further resettlement should move from being the *exceptional* response to specific individual situations, to which it was relegated after the Southeast Asian programmes. This is an important, open question for UNHCR and its partners in resettlement to address in the immediate future.

37. Policy development on the durable solution character of resettlement needs to be further enhanced. Too often decisions in this regard are made without structured guidance and consistent application of cross-cutting principles. Specific efforts are required to better define objective criteria and set parameters for field staff to implement programmes, involving a broad base of experts from governments, NGOs and refugee communities in this endeavour.

---

<sup>20</sup> General information and 25 framework discussion papers are available at <http://www.unhcr.org/resettle/news.htm>.

<sup>21</sup> The Swedish National Integration Office.

<sup>22</sup> Argentina, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, Iceland, Ireland and Spain

<sup>23</sup> These ‘Principles’ are reproduced in Annex I of this note.

<sup>24</sup> See “Background Note for the Agenda Item: Strategic Utilisation of Resettlement to Enhance Asylum and Protection Prospects”, Annual Tripartite Consultations on Resettlement, Geneva, 20-21 June 2001.

38. The fundamental achievements of recent years need to be complemented by further commitment and action. It will be important to ensure that sufficient places are available to meet the worldwide resettlement needs of refugees. In addition, systems and procedures have to be responsive and address urgent resettlement needs, which in recent years are increasingly diverse and evolving.

39. The *effectiveness* of resettlement cannot just be measured in numbers. The *integrity* of resettlement is very much defined by the profile of cases submitted and accepted – that is, their adherence to international standards of protection and well accepted criteria of the urgency and quality of the special need for resettlement. Equally important to the integrity of resettlement are the speed of the processing system, and the measures taken to address vulnerabilities that make it susceptible to some misuse. The *quality* of resettlement as a durable solution will be enhanced by the on-going consultative process of the broader integration initiative.

### **Diversification in the use of resettlement**

40. The worldwide use of resettlement as a tool of international protection and as a durable solution, combined with more systematic and active case identification, has inevitably brought about a fundamental change in field operations. Resettlement is no longer confined to a few large groups of refugees. At present, resettlement involves a highly diversified and individualized approach, geared as a flexible response to specific protection and durable solution needs.<sup>25</sup>

41. This change has had an important impact on UNHCR in two ways: *first*, as it concerns operational challenges and the need to tightly integrate resettlement into overall protection and durable solutions strategies and, *second*, as it relates to the substantive increase in the need for coordination with Governments, NGOs and UNHCR field offices.

42. The broadening of the base of resettlement countries, increases in resettlement quotas in other countries, combined with an enhanced system for identification of needs have all led to a substantive boost in the number of resettlement submissions in many regions. Beyond the mere numbers, this trend is even more pronounced by the generally more complicated nature of cases and processing. While well aware of UNHCR's limitations in the delivery of resettlement services due to staff and resource constraints, the close collaboration with Governments and NGOs has made it possible to build on the momentum gained.

### **Priority resettlement and responsiveness of systems**

43. UNHCR continues to make a concerted effort to use existing resettlement places and is working with States to encourage more responsive and speedy processing to better address urgent resettlement needs. In a most welcome development, several countries – in addition to those already implementing emergency procedures - have

---

<sup>25</sup> For example, as recently as 1997 more than three-quarters of the refugees resettled from Africa were Somalis in Kenya. In 2000, refugees of well over 30 nationalities in Africa were resettled from some 35 countries on the continent and numerous other locations around the world. The number of active cases for Africa alone increased from 3,922 (12,462 refugees) in 1996 to 8,254 (21,111 refugees) in 1999.

established special arrangements to ensure rapid response to priority resettlement submissions.<sup>26</sup>

44. Furthermore and particularly when identifying resettlement needs which are linked to durable solutions needs of refugees, resettlement systems have to be responsive to the protection mandate of UNHCR. This means that refugees, when their *bona fides* have been determined and who have been identified as being in need of resettlement, should not be excluded merely because of their background or a perception of lack of “integration potential”.

### **Harmonisation and standardisation of systems**

45. UNHCR’s effort to refocus resettlement policy and criteria has been a joint undertaking by all resettlement partners. It is encouraging to see that resettlement policies of States are more closely focussing on what the ultimate considerations for all resettlement activities should be: seeking the protection of and durable solutions for refugees. These collaborative efforts need to be continually fine-tuned to ensure that while extending the resettlement base with new emerging countries, the systems, criteria and procedures of resettlement are further aligned and standardized. Such harmonization will be essential to meet the future targets set for the programme.

46. Harmonisation and standardisation is also important to ensure that resettlement opportunities are viable regardless of where the refugee may be located. In order to avoid “asylum shopping”, magnet effects, pull factors, or irregular migration in search of durable solutions, resettlement must be a realistic option and available in several places, simultaneously. Likewise, by a thorough and consistent use of resettlement based on worldwide norms, standards and criteria, the likelihood that resettlement is misused or abused will decrease.

## **VIII. CONCLUSION**

47. Joint efforts by all partners are needed to consolidate comprehensive approaches, building on the significant advancements made in UNHCR resettlement policy and practice in recent years. As the international community continues to focus on the role of resettlement as a vital tool of protection, resettlement is being restored to its rightful place among the three durable solutions. The new initiative on the integration of resettled refugees will enhance the life-saving opportunities of this important component of the mandate of the UNHCR.

48. Resettlement is an important tool of international protection, providing a durable solution for refugees and a means of responsibility sharing among States. Being a resettlement country goes far beyond the crucial help to individuals or even larger numbers of refugees. By resettling refugees on its territory, a State provides the world a clear manifestation of its commitment to refugee protection and a powerful demonstration of its support to the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. It is hoped that more States will find ways to join in these efforts.

---

<sup>26</sup> Of particular note are the ‘Urgent Protection Pilot’ introduced by Canada in 2000 and an emergency resettlement protocol established in 2001 by the United States of America.