EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Turkey, Uganda, and Colombia are among the top receiving countries of refugees. All three nations have shown great generosity and resolve in accepting, aiding, and integrating refugees, which has simultaneously resulted in successes and created enormous strain on social, political, and economic systems. Lessons gleaned from these three cases can inform policy to support refugee integration at the global, national, and local levels.

RECOMMENDATIONS

• Temporary displacement tends to become protracted, so governments should consider at the onset of a refugee influx implementing policies that support integration, including thorough registration and conferring legal status, freedom of movement, and access to the labor market and services (health care, education, housing).

• Municipal governments, which are always on the front lines of responding to a refugee influx, should be supported and provided with resources, involved in (inter)national policy discussions, and engaged on local political, economic, and security concerns.

• There should be a “whole of society” approach to refugee support and integration, and a commitment to sustained and coordinated efforts across governmental, non-governmental, and civil society actors.

• Efforts must strengthen global responsibility sharing, both through international organizations and through non-host countries, who should see their support of host countries (financial and other) as part of their commitment to global norms and global governance.
INTRODUCTION

The large-scale movement of people is one of the most burning issues of our time. Newspaper headlines and social media alike are dominated by accounts of desperate people turning up at borders that are increasingly restrictive. Yet relatively little attention is paid to understanding the ways in which refugees integrate into the societies which host them, especially in the local communities in which they live.

For communities that receive refugees, the challenges to incorporate people with different skills, national origins, languages, and needs are many, including provision of housing, education, employment, and social services. Receiving communities face these responsibilities in an era of rising political polarization and xenophobia fueling religious, ethnic, and racial tensions.

This brief considers the policies and practices that support the successful reception and integration of refugees and forced migrants in three of the world’s most affected countries: Turkey, which hosts more than 3.5 million Syrian refugees; Uganda, with over a million refugees from South Sudan; and Colombia, which has received more than one million Venezuelans in the last year. While each of these host countries has its own specific political, social, and economic contexts, they have all struggled with the pressures of accepting large numbers of refugees.

Informed by a policy consultation with representatives from all three of the aforementioned countries, this policy brief describes the challenges and successes in each country, discusses common lessons for the successful integration of refugees, and considers what those lessons mean for policymaking. Although the focus is on refugees, many of the lessons learned are also applicable to migrants arriving in a new country. Similarly, while the focus is on countries hosting large numbers of refugees, rather than developed countries with smaller numbers of refugees, most of the lessons and policy implications apply to countries hosting refugees and asylum seekers. Ultimately, we hope that these best practices will be helpful to other communities seeking to integrate refugees into their economic, social, and cultural life.

WHAT IS REFUGEE INTEGRATION AND WHY IS IT IMPORTANT?

Refugee integration does not have a formal definition in international refugee law and different actors use different definitions. Integration is generally understood as the end-product of a dynamic two-way process with three interrelated dimensions: legal, economic, and sociocultural. It is two-way because it requires preparedness on the part of refugees to adapt to the host society without having to forego their own cultural identity and a corresponding readiness on the part of host communities and public institutions to welcome refugees and to meet the needs of a diverse population.

Integration is the process that refugees, upon arrival or resettlement, begin in host countries and includes legal rights. As Karen Jacobsen explains,

“Refugees…enjoy a range of human and civil rights, often referred to as ‘refugee rights,’ which are set out in the 1951 Convention and other international instruments, and include the right to marry, to practice one’s own religion, to own property, to work and seek employment, and to have access to education and to housing.”

While the gold standard of integration is citizenship, most of the world’s refugees are not on a track to become citizens. Instead, they have some type of legal status which enables them to live legally in a host country. In fact, there are very few cases where refugees who have arrived spontaneously rather than being selected for resettlement have become naturalized citizens in recent years.

But even without citizenship, refugees often integrate into their host communities and become self-reliant.
They can sustain livelihoods through access to land or employment, and/or to education or vocational training, health facilities, and housing. They are likely to become socially networked into the host community, such that intermarriage is common, and there is little distinction between refugees’ and hosts’ standards of living. To a considerable degree, these are positive outcomes of refugees as agents of development and self-sustainability, and they happen autonomously rather than as the product of explicit policy interventions.⁴

Success stories demonstrate that, if integration is done well, refugees can both benefit from and contribute to host countries. Several studies on integration reveal the positive economic impacts that refugees make when provided the opportunity to integrate into a host community.⁵ For example, a European Commission study found that if well-integrated, refugees contribute to greater market flexibility, help to address demographic challenges, and improve fiscal sustainability.⁶ As refugees access opportunities to become entrepreneurs, innovators, taxpayers, consumers, and investors, they create jobs, raise the productivity and wages of local workers, lift capital returns, stimulate international trade and investment, and boost innovation, enterprise, and growth.⁷ A World Bank study on Kenya also found that refugees are an economic benefit through the multiplier impact of the international aid that they attract.⁸ Other examples in Albania, Jordan, Macedonia, Malawi, Pakistan, and Tanzania reveal that refugees have had positive effects, either through camps stimulating local economies by increasing demand for goods and services, or by attracting international organizations that bring resources, technology, and jobs to an otherwise poor or remote area.⁹

Politically, local integration is heralded as a good potential avenue to unlocking protracted situations—cases where 25,000 refugees have been displaced for five years or more. Given that the majority of the world’s refugee situations are now considered protracted (and that return is increasingly not an option while resettlement spaces are shrinking), local integration is generally considered an important solution for long-term refugee situations.¹⁰

Ultimately, refugees’ level of integration and adaptation depends on a number of factors, including their experiences before they leave, the journey itself, and their experiences when they arrive. Many refugees and asylum seekers have experienced severe pre-migration trauma, including mental and physical torture, mass violence and genocide, witnessing the killings of family members and friends, sexual abuse, kidnapping of children, destruction and looting of personal property, starvation, and lack of water and shelter.¹¹ The journey itself is too often associated with life-threatening risks. Although arrival in a safe place provides initial relief, frustration can develop as new problems emerge, such as family separation, language barriers, legal status, unemployment, homelessness, or lack of access to education and health care.¹² When integration is not successfully facilitated through a combination of robust policies, protection, and services, tensions between hosts and refugees may emerge, opening up a multitude of other challenges.

CHALLENGES AND SUCCESSES: TURKEY, UGANDA, AND COLOMBIA

Turkey

Once a country of emigration (6.5 million Turks currently live outside the country), Turkey continues to host the highest number of refugees in the world for the fifth year in a row: some 3.5 million Syrian refugees¹³ and around 350,000 refugees from other countries.¹⁴ As the situation is now considered protracted,¹⁵ government agencies, international organizations, development actors, civil society, and refugees themselves are increasingly shifting their focus toward building resilience and considering that local integration may be the most viable solution to their displacement. More than half of the Syrian refugees in Turkey have said that they will not return to Syria. The sheer scale of Turkey’s refugee population makes...
it among the most important examples for learning about what is effective when it comes to responding to refugee needs—both from relief and development perspectives.

The Turkish government has evolved in its response and legislation toward refugees since the early days of the crisis. During the emergency phase, Syrian refugees were viewed as guests and later were given temporary protection permits. By 2016, they were granted the ability to obtain work permits—a significant step in their access to the formal labor market and in achieving self-reliance—and to date Syrians have established over 20,000 new businesses in Turkey. While many refugees still find work permits challenging to obtain, the Turkish government is seeking to make it easier for employers to sponsor Syrian refugee workers to obtain work permits. Syrian refugees are also able to participate in entrepreneurship opportunities, vocational trainings, apprenticeship programs, and other skills trainings, and the International Labor Organization in Turkey partners with job placement firms to help refugees find employment.

In spite of these programs, serious challenges in the labor market persist. Most Syrians work informally and in low-skilled jobs, such as seasonal agricultural work, construction, manufacturing, and textiles. They struggle to access services, which affects their ability to provide food, housing, health and trauma care, and other basic needs for their families. Many have depleted any savings they arrived with, and now face poverty and debt. Of the 800,000 to 1.1 million who do work, many receive below minimum wage rates and work in unsafe conditions. The language barrier also remains a major challenge to Syrian refugees’ access to the formal labor market.\(^\text{16}\)

The Turkish government—and particularly local municipalities—are also strained on the housing and education fronts. Fewer and fewer refugees live in temporary accommodation centers. Currently, only 4 percent of the refugee population, compared with 30 percent in 2014, live in these centers.\(^\text{17}\) Having refugees residing in urban areas and non-camp settings has meant that local municipalities are now at the forefront of supporting refugees in Turkey. Local governments have also faced serious pressure to provide education to refugee children. The Syrian refugee population in Turkey is young: more than 2.1 million are of working age, and around 65 percent are women and children.\(^\text{18}\) In spite of the fact that 650,000 Syrian children are in schools, close to half of the school-aged refugee population is outside of the school system.

Despite these challenges, surveys indicate that Turkish acceptance of Syrian refugees is high, with more than half of Turkish society agreeing that Syrian refugees should be accepted, largely due to solidarity with those suffering the effects of the conflict. Yet surveys also indicate that this acceptance is fragile. The public is concerned with job loss, criminality, reduction of public services, and threats to Turkish identity as a result of the presence of the Syrian refugees. One particular issue of concern is the status of the 425 Syrian babies born in Turkey every day who lack either Syrian or Turkish citizenship. Estimates now suggest that 140,000 Syrian children are presently stateless—a figure that is growing every day. Another issue of concern is Turkey’s hardening of its border with Syria by constructing a 1,000-kilometer wall.

**Uganda**

By February 2019, Uganda had received 1.2 million refugees, primarily from South Sudan (800,000) and the Democratic Republic of Congo (320,000), as well as smaller numbers from Burundi, Rwanda, Somalia, and Sudan. Uganda has a long history of receiving refugees from South Sudan, particularly from 1979 to 1987, many of whom returned after 2008, following South Sudan’s independence.

Uganda is well-known for its generous policies toward refugees, including the right to work and establish businesses, access to social services, allocation of plots of land to refugees living in settlements, and freedom of movement. The 2006 Refugee Act and Uganda’s
Settlement Policy allow refugees the choice of where to live—either to self-settle with the national population, or to live in a settlement. The law was intended to encourage self-sufficiency, and has had mixed results. Some refugees have chosen to move to Kampala or other cities, whereas others have chosen to remain in settlements and continue to receive some assistance. For many refugees, Uganda’s approach has meant the opportunity to support themselves and avoid long-term reliance on aid. It was also supposed to be a departure from long-term encampment, and meant to assist in the shift from emergency relief to development. More importantly, the approach facilitates refugee integration with the host population to a greater extent than if they remained in camps. Those who chose to remain in settlements live in one of 12 refugee-hosting districts; these settlements are poor, arid, and dry, and agricultural production is low—primarily because the land is of poor quality and land plots are small.

On a global level, Uganda has received praise for its relatively open and progressive approach in comparison to other refugee-hosting states. Uganda’s 2010 law guarantees freedom of movement and treatment of refugees comparable to that of citizens (except for the right to vote or ownership of land). Not surprisingly, Uganda’s best practices were the basis for UNHCR’s 2006 Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework. Uganda has also sought to integrate services that benefit both refugees and host communities, and has recently received $150 million in funding—on top of $50 million in 2017—from the World Bank’s IDA18 refugee sub-window to incorporate refugees into the national development plan and carry out other projects intended to benefit both local residents and refugees.

Despite this international recognition, Uganda still faces a number of challenges such as restrictions about the legal status of mixed marriages, permanent residency, and naturalized citizenship. Social services are weak and the quality of schools and health care is limited. One consequence is that refugees have—at best—limited access to post-primary education. People can only be registered in the settlements, but there are many unregistered refugees living in Kampala. There is also tension between central and local governments over refugees; for example, local governments did not participate in designing the World Bank-funded projects.

There is also some resentment toward refugees among Ugandans. Some blame refugees for the drought that plagues the settlement areas, and report that they do not feel safe because of the South Sudanese. Uganda’s political leaders have supported refugees, as most were refugees themselves in the past; although, if this leadership changes, support could be called into question. However, the main challenge facing Uganda is protracted hosting of refugees where it is unclear when or if they will ever be able to return home and whether and how funding will sustain refugee support programs.

Colombia

As of January 2019, more than 3.4 million Venezuelans have fled the country, with 1.1 million in Colombia, 500,000 in Peru, 300,000 in Chile, 221,000 in Ecuador, 130,000 in Argentina, and 100,000 in Brazil. Colombia has very little experience with migrants, and the arrival of so many Venezuelans has been a huge challenge for the country—which is already facing difficulties in implementing its own peace agreement and finding solutions for its 7.7 million internally displaced persons (IDPs).

Despite the challenges of large numbers of Venezuelans and its own post-conflict situation, Colombia has taken impressive steps to ensure freedom of movement and to provide legal avenues to remain and access basic rights for those fleeing Venezuela. In 2016, Venezuelans could obtain temporary border-crossing permits (Tarjeta de Movilidad Fronteriza), which allowed them to cross legally and stay in the Colombian border area for up to seven days. In 2017, the Colombian government also implemented special permits (Permiso Especial de Permanencia) for Venezuelans, which were valid for 90 days and renewable for up to two years. Displaced
Venezuelans could obtain health, education, and work opportunities.

Offering work permits has come with its own challenges and successes. On the one hand, ensuring access to employment in the formal sector puts pressure on an already strained system. Venezuelans, especially women, experience extreme vulnerability in employment. On the other hand, if properly integrated, Venezuelans will not only help Colombia “break even” for supporting them, but also create a net positive impact on economy. Arriving Venezuelans are younger than the aging Colombian population and the country needs a young active workforce to support social services for its population. Nevertheless, the Colombian government does not want to talk about the possibility of refugees remaining permanently in the country, even as the political situation in Venezuela remains volatile. Instead of using available legal instruments, such as the Cartagena Declaration, the Colombian government has created temporary legal mechanisms, and there are mounting concerns about the sustainability of this practice. All of the various scenarios for Venezuela—the current stalemate, a democratic breakthrough, or implosion and civil war—project a significant number of Venezuelans living outside the country for extended periods of time or even permanently.

Furthermore, the Venezuelan-Colombian border is incredibly porous and is increasingly militarized as guerilla activity, drug trafficking, and illegal mining take place in the area. Even more significant is the fact that Colombia faces an extremely challenging task of implementing its peace accord and reintegrating IDPs. Signs of tension between IDPs and newly arrived Venezuelans have emerged over the sharing of resources. Although IDP organizations are not receiving any additional assistance, they are sharing what they have with Venezuelans, though it is unclear if the goodwill will continue as time passes and resources become scarcer.

LESSONS LEARNED

Although these three refugee-hosting countries face different pressures, they are all struggling to provide both basic rights and access to services for large numbers of refugees who have arrived on their borders. In all three cases, the governments have provided some form of temporary legal status and some degree of freedom of movement, although these are more limited in Uganda and Turkey than in Colombia. In all three cases, most refugees do not live in camps but rather in urban areas or rural settlements. Drawing from these three cases and prior studies on refugee integration, a number of lessons learned can be identified.

1. Temporary displacement tends to become protracted. Decisions made in the initial period of refugee arrival have long-lasting consequences. In Colombia and Turkey, for example, there was an expectation that refugees would return to their countries as soon as the situation stabilized. However, conflicts tend to drag on much longer than anticipated and the longer displacement lasts, the more likely that refugees will remain permanently. This means that policies to support their integration should begin immediately, although in practice this is difficult for most host governments.

   Policy implications: Governments of host countries should consider, from the onset of refugee arrivals, how to ensure that refugees are fully integrated into the communities where they settle. International organizations should include support for long-term integration in their contributions to emergency refugee response.

2. Reception is distinct from integration but affects the way in which refugees become integrated in society. Early access to a legal status, even if temporary, can convey great benefits to refugees and the receiving community by providing a degree of protection against harassment and exploitation, and improving access to employment and essential services such
as medical care and education. The registration of refugees is a valuable tool for security and for the planning of immediate assistance and longer-term economic development. Hosts need to know data and accurate information about the people in their territory and refugees need regular status—a visa, asylum claim, or some type of status to better assert their rights.

Policy implications: Governments, with the support of the international community, should register refugees with a view toward long-term integration. This means collecting information on refugees’ educational and employment backgrounds, and issuing globally recognized identity documents for refugees.

3. Laws and policies—particularly those providing legal status, freedom of movement, access to services and to the formal labor market—facilitate integration, but laws are not enough. They must be implemented and sufficiently resourced. Good laws, good implementation policies, and sufficient resourcing are all critical for integration success. In particular, laws and policies to facilitate the integration of refugees should allow for the right to return. However, refugee return and integration are not mutually exclusive solutions.

Policy implication: Governments should, from the onset of a refugee emergency, review their existing laws and policies to determine if they need revision or if new policies need to be introduced to facilitate the integration of refugees.

4. Freedom of movement from the time of arrival is a key factor in supporting integration because it increases the ability of refugees to act on their own behalf to improve their well-being and to achieve self-sufficiency. Closed camp settings do not foster integration and should be avoided. Camps limit refugees’ freedom of movement, make self-reliance very difficult (thus forcing reliance on aid), and are not designed to be long-term solutions. Avoiding encampment is not just important for respecting refugee rights; it also makes security and economic sense. Keeping large numbers of vulnerable people next to porous borders of often conflict-ridden states can exacerbate tensions between groups and endanger refugees, host communities, and those responding to refugees. In a few cases, it may also foster refugee warriors, who may use camps as a base to regroup before crossing back over to fight.

Policy implications: Refugee camps should not be established, but rather refugees should be allowed to move freely in the host country.

5. Municipal and state/provincial engagement is critical. Most refugees interact with the host government through local organizations that are often excluded from decision-making at the national level. Supporting local governments with adequate resources, training, and policies is critical. It is especially important to consult local municipalities and service providers in the development of national policies and to improve funding mechanisms to support local assistance efforts.

Policy implications: National governments should review existing mechanisms for supporting state and municipal authorities in areas where refugees are arriving and ensure that they have the resources they need to both respond to the needs of newly arriving refugees and work toward integration. These efforts should be supported by international organizations.

6. There is a need for a “whole of society” approach to refugees. Successful social and economic policies to deal with the refugee crisis demand collaborative planning, monitoring, and assessment efforts to successfully implement initiatives. Interagency cooperation in the public sector is essential for these activities’ success. Coordination and empowerment of local public offices (for example, community, city, municipality, and/or province) can help implement policies adequate
to specific contexts. Partnerships between public agencies, private institutions, and civil society—including religious communities—can provide job and language training, work permits, and employment creation, among other activities, to improve refugee integration.28

Policy implications: Just as governments should regularly review their existing laws and policies related to refugees, they should also review policies and practices for interagency coordination to ensure that all relevant ministries are involved from the beginning and that municipal and state-level authorities are included in the planning process.

7. **Early access to employment, preferably through legal work authorization, is key to promoting self-sufficiency,** allowing refugees to contribute to their own support, and increasing their sense of integration into the local community. The contacts created by participation in the workforce can also be a bridge to understanding and help prevent marginalization. Where refugees work primarily in the informal economy, thought must be given to offering transition into the regular workplace, and to avoiding refugee exploitation and abuse.

Employment is among the most important factors that foster refugee integration, helping refugees to be self-reliant, but also increasing opportunities for cultural exchange with hosts, language learning, and renewed confidence.29 Indeed, the inability to find work and underemployment are the most significant barriers to successful integration of refugees into society. Refugees may struggle to find work that matches their skills and background, forcing downward professional mobility. States like Sweden and Norway have created integration programs that focus on language acquisition, employment, and housing.

Policy implications: Governments should develop simple mechanisms for issuing work permits to refugees. As this is often controversial, governments should ensure that representatives of both employers’ associations and trade unions are brought into the policymaking process.

8. **Access to land in rural situations is of great benefit to promoting refugee self-sufficiency.** Land distribution needs to be carried out with reference to existing legal and traditional norms of land tenure to avoid creating tensions between residents and newcomers.

Policy implications: Governments should consider the possibility of facilitating access to land for refugees coming from an agricultural background, in accord with existing land policies.

9. **The education of refugee children is essential if refugees are to reach their full potential to contribute to their new society.** Access to education for refugee children and youth on a basis of equality with local children is usually best achieved through the enrollment of children in local school systems. In addition to increased capacity in local schools, transitional accommodations may be needed such as language training and remedial education for those who have been out of school, and financial assistance for families who rely on the labor of their children for subsistence. Many refugee children have already missed long periods of time in their education, and it is essential that they be able to quickly access education. At the same time, expanding educational systems to meet the needs of large numbers of refugee children is a daunting task for governments, and external support is needed.

Policy implications: Governments, including municipal authorities, should assess the best ways of incorporating refugee children into existing educational institutions rather than establishing new schools for refugees. Integrating children into existing schools will require substantial resources, particularly when large numbers of refugees arrive, and international organizations should consider how to support these efforts most effectively.
10. Access to health and social services for refugees should be the same as for the native population.
In providing services to refugees, care should be taken not to create duplicate structures which are both expensive and can lead to tension with host communities if they perceive refugees as receiving preferential treatment. This will minimize tensions and foster integration between groups.³⁰ Social service and health care professionals should also try to familiarize themselves with the cultural background of the refugees they are working with, and should work in coordination with other social workers, refugee organizations, and housing and employment agencies where possible.³¹

Policy implications: Rather than providing services separately to refugees, governments should take the necessary actions, including strengthening their own social and health institutions, to provide services to refugees.

11. Political and security issues cannot be ignored.
Integration is not just a legal or social issue, but also a political and, sometimes, a security issue. Mistrust between the refugee and host communities can contribute to marginalization and impede integration. This can lead to serious tensions potentially rising to frustration and hostility on both sides, and ultimately it can lead to coercive policies to ill effect. Local authorities and refugee leaders must be engaged to create a mutual understanding of perceived threats and develop mechanisms for conflict resolution. At the same time, authorities must recognize that refugees are almost always fleeing conflicts and armed groups.

Policy implications: Governments should consider the political and security implications of both their reception and integration policies toward refugees.

12. International conventions and institutions greatly foster integration by establishing norms and providing resources. Existing definitions, however, such as the traditional separation of refugees and migrants, may nonetheless be an impediment to a fair and equitable response to current human needs. The attempt to broaden the response to forced migration beyond the duty toward refugees holds the danger of watering down existing protections. Efforts to involve non-traditional actors such as the World Bank in integration efforts also raise questions of boundaries and intentions.

Policy implications: International organizations should provide the necessary support—both financial and technical expertise—to host governments to support their efforts to integrate refugees, whether they are formally recognized as such or not. Traditional development actors—such as the World Bank, UN Development Program, and International Labor Organization—have already made efforts to support refugee integration, but these need to be strengthened and mainstreamed into their operations.

13. Global responsibility sharing must underpin integration plans. There are important linkages between responsibility sharing and integration. Host countries should not be expected to integrate refugees they are hosting without support from the rest of the international community. Successful responsibility sharing needs tools to overcome the collective action failures of the current global refugee regime. Many tools are already spelled out in the recently adopted Global Compact on Refugees.

Policy implications: Governments of both refugee-hosting and donor countries should support the implementation of the Global Compact on Refugees, recognize that host countries are performing a global public good, and see their support for host countries as part of their commitment to global norms and global governance.

14. Integration takes work and time. Even in relatively positive environments with favorable policy regimes, initial support from the local
community and an initial sense of relief in the refugee community can begin to break down if it becomes clear that what was once perceived to be a temporary situation will last indefinitely.

Harmony between the host and refugee community, where it exists, should not be taken for granted, and opportunities to forge positive ties between local people and refugees should be actively encouraged. Governments and organizations serving refugees should be prepared to recognize and overcome existing or increasing xenophobia by counteracting false characterizations with accurate information, and encouraging inclusive planning processes that engage both the refugee and host communities to ensure transparency, particularly where access to resources is at stake. Ample evidence exists of the benefits refugees bring to their new communities. Affirmative efforts should be made to identify refugee successes and to build on them to celebrate their contributions to society.

Policy implications: Governments of refugee-hosting countries should plan for the long-term integration of refugees and should reach out to civil society organizations to play their roles in supporting the integration of refugees. Faith-based organizations in particular have a role to play in facilitating refugee-host community interaction. Governments and civil society organizations alike should counter xenophobic attitudes and affirm the positive contributions that refugees make.

NOTES

1. The following individuals participated in the policy consultation: Meryem Aslam, Mitzi Schroeder Brooks, Shaun Casey, Katharine Donato, M. Murat Erdogan, Elizabeth Ferris, Miryam Hazan, David Hollenbach, Kemal Kirisci, Katherine Marshall, Guilla McPherson, Devota Nuwe, Lauren Post, Matthew Reynolds, Roberta Romano, Gimena Sanchez, Mona Yacoubian, Gisela Zapata.


12. Ibid.

13. Turkey is party to the 1951 Refugee Convention and the 1967 Protocol, but maintains the original geographical limitations of the definition of a refugee, meaning that only those fleeing events in Europe are considered refugees. Those fleeing from other countries may receive temporary and international protection status — whereas Syrians receive temporary protection — and hence, they do not enjoy refugee status according to the Geneva Convention. However, throughout this report, holders of temporary and international protection status will be referred to as refugees.


15. UNHCR considers a refugee situation to be protracted if it has 25,000 people or more who have been in exile for five years or more. For more, see: Executive Committee of the High Commissioner’s Programme, “Protracted Refugee Situations” (paper presented at the 30th meeting of UNHCR Standing Committee, June 2004), http://www.unhcr.org/en-us/excom/standcom/40c982172/protracted-refugee-situations.html.


18. See note 14 above.


22. Uganda was disappointed by the Solidarity Conference organized in May 2017, when less than $4 million was raised to support the country’s hosting of refugees.


24. All Venezuelan children receive primary and secondary education, but those without status cannot graduate and receive a high school diploma.


31. Craig, Jajua, Warfa, “Mental health care needs.”
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