

NEW ISSUES IN REFUGEE RESEARCH

Research Paper No. 158

Local integration: an under-reported solution to protracted refugee situations

Alexandra Fielden

Intern,
Policy Development and Evaluation Service,
UNHCR

E-mail: alexandrafielden@googlemail.com

June 2008



UNHCR
The UN Refugee Agency

Policy Development and Evaluation Service

**Policy Development and Evaluation Service
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
P.O. Box 2500, 1211 Geneva 2
Switzerland**

**E-mail: hqpd00@unhcr.org
Web Site: www.unhcr.org**

These papers provide a means for UNHCR staff, consultants, interns and associates, as well as external researchers, to publish the preliminary results of their research on refugee-related issues. The papers do not represent the official views of UNHCR. They are also available online under 'publications' at <www.unhcr.org>.

ISSN 1020-7473

Introduction

Local integration has a largely unrecognized potential to resolve the plight of refugee populations across the globe, many of whom have been living in exile for years on end. In recent years there has been relatively little attention paid to the process of local integration and its consequences for refugees and their hosts. This can perhaps largely be attributed to voluntary repatriation being the globally preferred refugee policy.¹

An initial distinction to be drawn is the difference between local integration in the country of first asylum and integration in a third resettlement country. It is relatively common for resettled refugees to obtain citizenship in the receiving (usually industrialized and wealthy) state, but exact figures are difficult to obtain.²

This paper will seek to examine and highlight the role of local integration as a durable solution to refugee influxes in countries of first asylum, which are generally developing or transitional societies. It concludes that local integration is actually not a forgotten solution,³ but an undocumented one. It is also suggested that local integration has great potential as a solution where repatriation or resettlement are not viable options; particularly in protracted refugee situations.

Although local integration has been termed a “non-solution”,⁴ examples are in fact numerous enough to be worthy of synthesis. This document seeks to provide an inventory of local integration case studies from all continents. It must be noted that each local integration process has had varying degrees of success, but an in-depth analysis and evaluation of each is beyond the scope of this paper. The inventory aims to provide a crucial starting point for further research into local integration, and its future role in international refugee policy.

Defining local integration

Local integration as a durable solution combines three dimensions. Firstly, it is a legal process, whereby refugees attain a wider range of rights in the host state. Secondly, it is an economic process of establishing sustainable livelihoods and a standard of living comparable to the host community. Thirdly, it is a social and cultural process of adaptation and acceptance that enables the refugees to contribute to the social life of the host country and live without fear of discrimination.⁵

Using a narrow conception of local integration, it could be argued that the process becomes a durable solution only at the point when a refugee becomes a naturalized citizen of his or her asylum country.⁶ The broader, multi-dimensional definition,

¹ For example, ExCom Conclusions No. 79 (XLVII) 1996, No. 81 (XLVIII) 1997, No. 87 (L) 1999, No. 89 (LI) 2000, No. 90 (LII) 2001, No. 95 (LIV) 2003.

² Since 1990, 1.7 million refugees were naturalized, 1.3 million in the USA alone (76%). In many countries, in particular Europe, it is not possible to find out how many refugees actually obtained citizenship simply because refugees are not distinguished in national statistics from other foreigners.

³ Jacobsen, K., (2001). ‘The forgotten solution: local integration for refugees in developing countries’, *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Working Paper No.45, (UNHCR: Geneva).

⁴ “Although local integration is always listed among the three durable solutions, in fact it is rarely used in cases of mass influx and has, in that context, almost become a “non-solution.”” NGO Statement on Local Integration Global Consultations on International Protection 22-24 May 2002. Available at <<http://www.icva.ch/doc00000865.html>>

⁵ Crisp, J., (2004). ‘The local integration and local settlement of refugees: a conceptual and historical analysis’, *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Working Paper No.102, (UNHCR: Geneva), p. 1.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

however, would suggest that it is possible for a refugee to acquire the three elements of local integration without actually being naturalized. Thus, for the purposes of this paper, the process of local integration will be broadly outlined by the assumption that “refugees will remain indefinitely in their country of asylum and find a solution to their plight in that state. Ideally, but not necessarily, that will involve the acquisition of citizenship.”⁷ Therefore, each of the case studies looked at in this paper will involve attainment of legal rights, economic rights and/or social and cultural rights for refugees in the host country.

The principle of local integration is firmly established in international refugee law. The 1951 UN Refugee Convention acknowledged the role of local integration, focusing on the importance of citizenship in achieving durable solutions. According to article 34 of the Convention, “the contracting states shall as far as possible facilitate the assimilation and naturalization of refugees. They shall in particular make every effort to expedite naturalization proceedings.”⁸

The difference between assimilation and local integration should be clarified. The Refugee Convention uses the concept of assimilation alongside integration. UNHCR endorses local integration as a more useful term, however. UNHCR has stated that “the international community has always rejected the notion that refugees should be expected to abandon their own culture and way of life, so as to become indistinguishable from nationals of the host community.”⁹ UNHCR thus promotes local integration, as opposed to assimilation, as one of three ‘durable solutions’ available to refugees.

In developing countries, local integration has been widely utilised, although not commensurately reported. In several countries across Africa and Asia, large populations of refugees have been successfully locally integrated, naturalised, or have been given the opportunity to achieve self-reliance as a prelude to full local integration. It seems that local integration has not always been a high priority within UNHCR, however. In 1995, for example, the organization published a book entitled *The State of the World’s Refugees: In Search of Solutions*, which remarkably failed to make any substantive or positive references to local integration.

More recently, the potential of local integration has been emphasized by its increased significance within UNHCR policy. In 2005, the organization’s Executive Committee reached conclusion No. 104 (LVI) on local integration. This conclusion highlighted the importance of local integration as a burden sharing activity and clarified “UNHCR’s catalytic role in assisting and supporting countries receiving refugees...and in mobilizing financial assistance and other forms of support, including development assistance from the international community.” It also outlined the need for the refugees to be prepared to adapt to their new community and promoted self-reliance as a strategy to facilitate local integration.

⁷ Ibid., p. 3.

⁸ Article 34 of the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, Adopted on 28 July 1951 by the United Nations Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Status of Refugees and Stateless Persons convened under General Assembly resolution 429 (V) of 14 December 1950; entry into force 22 April 1954, in accordance with article 43.

⁹ UNHCR, (2002). “4th Meeting: Global Consultations on International Protection” *EC/GC/02/6*, 25 April 2002.

Local integration: benefits and obstacles

Local integration as a process has many potential benefits for both the refugees and host population. While huge refugee influxes have often been termed a “burden” by host countries, they also offer a great opportunity for economic development. The refugees constitute a new labour force with skills that can be utilized to benefit the host community by developing under-populated areas. Seen in Tanzania with the influx of Burundian refugees in 1972, the development of land for farming in the country’s remote Western periphery enabled the refugees to contribute substantially to the local and national economy.

Hosting refugees can also result in the long-term benefits of access to new infrastructure. The building of roads, schools and hospitals financed by international refugee aid are permanent and usually open to refugees and locals alike. The hosting of refugees can also be a show of good will, solidarity, and burden sharing. It can provide host governments with international aid, whilst bolstering their status as a responsible member of the international community. Thus, the political motivations for refugee-hosting should not be overlooked.

The notion of local integration also holds additional appeal for those who believe that that keeping refugees in camps violates their rights. Freedom of movement and the right to work are two fundamental human rights that are often denied to refugees confined to camp situations, sometimes for years on end.

Resistance to the local integration of refugee populations is seen amongst host governments and locals alike, with opposition being based on a number of contributory factors, both real and perceived. Refugee camps have experienced direct attacks and militarization has sometimes become acute. Petty and organized crime has indeed flourished in some refugee hosting areas. These real and perceived security threats can cause resentment and clashes between locals and refugees, diminishing chances for successful local integration.

Refugee hosting can also take a toll on the environment. The increased use of natural resources in activities like charcoal making, fishing, firewood and thatch grass selling, and the cultivation of hillsides can have a substantial impact. Refugee influxes also increase competition for land and jobs, as well as pressure on infrastructure such as schools, roads and health centres.

The attitude of the host country is not the only obstacle to local integration as a durable solution, however. The blurred line between humanitarian and development aid for local integration projects has often resulted in protection ‘gaps’, where refugees are left without institutional and material support. This has, in turn, diminished the viability of local integration programmes and wider policy development.

Historically, it has proven difficult to secure funding for local integration projects. Donors are not attracted to longer-term activities encompassing refugee integration, and making refugees less visible is neither psychologically nor politically satisfying to international or national organizations. Furthermore, local integration has been a difficult solution to sell to refugees that hold on to idea of eventually returning home. Host states also hold that by limiting the potential for local settlement and integration, there is a greater chance to promote repatriation.

Although local integration is not always welcomed by host governments in theory, in practice provincial authorities often recognize the *de facto* integration of refugee populations. For example, in pursuing a local integration programme, authorities in Sierra Leone have preferred to use the term 'self reliance strategy'. This perhaps highlights the influence of politics and public perceptions on refugee hosting policy and practice.

The degree of linguistic, ethnic, and cultural similarities between the host and refugee population (sometimes referred to as "psychological compatibility") is a significant factor in the initiation of a local integration process. In some cases, very different policies have been applied for different ethnic refugee communities within the same country. Although cultural similarities undoubtedly smooth integration, the ethnicity of a refugee population should not predicate the durable solutions available to them.

The length of time a refugee population has spent in a host country is another significant factor in local integration. As stated, protracted refugee situations often seem to be the most appropriate for local integration. Extended stays contribute to *de facto* integration, especially through language and education assimilation. Furthermore, these adjustments, particularly strong amongst the younger generations, tend to diminish the locals' xenophobia towards the refugees.

The changing policy environment

The re-emergence of local integration as a durable solution cannot be attributed to a single factor. Indeed, the political, economic and social conditions that allow for such a solution are many and varied. It is difficult to clearly identify specific catalysts for the local integration process, as each example seems to take place under different circumstances. What can be more readily assessed are general historical trends, political situations and global population changes.

UNHCR and the international community

Several developments have enabled UNHCR and the international community to take a more proactive role in protracted refugee situations in recent years. This has, in turn, contributed to the re-emergence of local integration as a durable solution. Although a few new refugee emergencies have erupted in the new millennium (such as in Iraq and Darfur), the number of major refugee situations has diminished significantly. This has allowed UNHCR and others to focus more attention on previously neglected crises, especially protracted situations.

Secondly, there is an accumulating body of research and evidence about the negative consequences of extended refugee hosting. Situations where refugees are 'warehoused' for years on end, without opportunities for self-reliance, have been shown to trigger a number of interrelated problems. Refugees in camp situations are often susceptible to disease, poor nutrition status, mental health problems, and sexual and gender based violence. In addition, these refugees are also more likely to engage in onward movements. Deteriorating conditions and a lack of prospects increase the numbers leaving the camps for urban areas, or seeking asylum in more distant parts of the world.

These realisations prompted further research and lobbying efforts. In 1999, UNHCR's Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit launched the 'Protracted Refugee Situations Project', which published a wide range of reports and papers on this issue. Subsequently there have been a number of internet-based initiatives set up, such as the

'Refugee Livelihoods Network' and the US Committee for Refugees and Immigrants campaign against the 'warehousing' of refugees.

Research and advocacy efforts on protracted refugee situations have also increased the dialogue on alternative approaches for this particular type of refugees. As a direct result, local integration has re-emerged to once again take prominence in the discussion of durable solutions on the international stage; this paper seeks to further promote this valuable dialogue.

Declining refugee numbers

As mentioned, the size of the population of concern to UNHCR has declined in recent years. Since the spate of armed conflicts and refugee movements of the early 1990s, global refugee numbers have gone down. In particular, the number of protracted refugee situations has declined in the last eight years, from 39 in 1998, to 30 in 2006. The number of refugees affected has also declined from approximately 8 million at the end of 1998 to just over 5 million at the end of 2006.

Many of the conflicts at the centre of refugee crises have been brought to an end, and millions of refugees have repatriated. In 2005 and 2006, more than 1.8 million long-term refugees returned to their country of origin, more than a million of them to Afghanistan alone. Substantial numbers were also repatriated in Africa, particularly Angola, Burundi, Liberia and Sudan. In these cases, when a relatively small number of 'residual caseload' refugees remain in the host country, governments are more open to their local integration.

With only small refugee populations remaining, competition for opportunities in the local economy and labour market is reduced. This creates an environment that facilitates the economic participation of refugees in both a local and national setting. The availability of inputs, particularly in the form of land available for settlement and farming, is another crucial factor. As seen in Tanzania and Zambia, the abundance of land for refugee settlement provided the opportunity for their self-sufficiency.

Migration

The recent and significant increase in the movement of people across countries and continents must also be taken into account within the context of local integration. These developments have raised new challenges in the field of asylum and migration, in turn having an impact upon the durable solutions available to refugees. UNHCR has reiterated that it is not a migration organization,¹⁰ but has also recently acknowledged that refugee and migration policies should be mutually reinforcing.

There appears to be an emerging consensus concerning the ineffectiveness of policies which insist that everyone should live in their country of origin and, if they have been forced into exile, return to that country. In protracted refugee situations, it is in fact often the case that the people concerned have never lived in their putative 'homeland'. For example, 85 per cent of the registered '1972' Burundian refugees in Tanzania was born and grew up in the host state. In this context, local integration becomes the most forward-thinking and realistic refugee solution.

Continued globalisation is a relevant factor that appears to be finally creeping into policy-makers' agendas. Mixed movements of refugees and other migrants have

¹⁰ UNHCR, (2007). *Discussion Paper: Refugee protection and durable solutions in the context of international migration*, UNHCR/DPC/2007/Doc. 02. (UNHCR: Geneva)

blurred the distinction between refugees and migrants in public and political opinion. In addition, refugee movements can over time become secondary, mixed or irregular movements. There has been a recognition that it would be unwise to continue to confine durable solutions to the concept that the mobility of refugees would represent a failure for local integration processes.

By looking at case studies we may attempt to clarify the role of local integration in past, present and future refugee situations. The case studies outlined below are an indicative sample, aimed at covering the most significant local integration achievements of recent decades.

Africa

Africa is home to approximately 9,753,000 people of concern to UNHCR in 2007/8.¹¹ It is a region that has been plagued by armed conflict since the decolonization period of the 1960s, and subsequently by civil war and violent ethnic battles. These conflicts, in addition to famine and other problems, have resulted in massive refugee movements across, and beyond the continent. Nonetheless, Africa has also shown some of the most open borders and welcoming policies towards refugees anywhere in the world. The case studies for local integration in Africa are numerous, and provide some examples of the benefits of refugee hosting. The success of the local integration programmes of the past may also provide a valuable opportunity to promote local integration as a durable solution for those currently displaced, especially the millions trapped in protracted refugee situations.

Angola

For the last 30 years, Angola has hosted a population of over 13,000 DR Congolese refugees who fled the violence of a secessionist movement in 1977. The refugees were given land in non-urban areas to settle and cultivate. They have since attained a considerable degree of socio-economic integration, and are largely self-sufficient. In a country where half the population is under the age of 15, the vast majority of Congolese refugees have never seen their homeland. They speak Portuguese like the local population, while only the older refugees know the French they spoke in the DRC.

In 2005 the UNHCR reported that “positive signs came from the authorities for the provision of legally secure local integration possibilities in the form of a permanent residence permit under the Immigration Act or naturalization under the Nationality Act.”¹² On 15 February 2006, Angolan authorities made an announcement of their commitment to finalize a local integration policy for the Congolese. They have indicated the possibility of residency rights as a prelude to full legal local integration for the 90% of refugees who have indicated they would choose to remain indefinitely in Angola.¹³

Côte d’Ivoire

Liberians started fleeing to Côte d’Ivoire in 1989 when civil war in their home country. At the height of the war, over 400,000 Liberians had fled to Côte d’Ivoire and renewed violent conflict caused further population displacement in 1998 and

¹¹ UNHCR, (2007). *Protecting Refugees and the Role of UNHCR*. (UNHCR, Geneva), p. 13.

¹² UNHCR, (2006). *Angola 2005 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR: Geneva), p. 4.

¹³ MINARS Survey, 2005. See UNHCR, (2006). *Angola 2005 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR: Geneva).

2001. In contrast to many other low-income host countries, Côte d'Ivoire has allowed refugees to settle among the local population rather than housing them separately in camps.

Many Liberian refugees began to return home in 1996 following a reduction in violence. UNHCR did not begin its organized repatriation programme until 1997, however. By the end of 2000, 70,500 refugees had been repatriated with UNHCR assistance and larger numbers had returned to Liberia of their own accord.¹⁴

The emphasis of assistance for refugees in Côte d'Ivoire until 1997 was on care and maintenance rather than local integration. The reduced size of the refugee population has prompted UNHCR to promote the local integration of those Liberians remaining. The smaller number of refugees has meant that available funds have also diminished. Furthermore, Côte d'Ivoire itself has recently been coping with economic decline and ethnic tensions, thus reducing opportunities to integrate refugees locally.

In 2006, some progress towards local integration was achieved as the Tabou refugee transit centre was closed and its 2,400 Liberian inhabitants were locally integrated in nearby villages. The Ivorian government and local officials are also working with UNHCR to transition the Niela refugee camp into an Ivorian village, to be called Zaaglo, the name of the surrounding community.¹⁵

Gabon

Until mid-1999, Gabon was one of a handful of African states that had little experience with refugee influxes. But civil conflict in the neighbouring Republic of Congo produced thousands of refugees that poured into Gabon in the second half of 1999.

Most of the Congolese arrivals self-settled within or near existing villages in rural areas and some in urban or peri-urban areas. Little assistance was provided by international relief and aid organizations; there are no formal refugee camps in Gabon.¹⁶ Ethnic similarities and substantial cross-border interactions facilitated the Congolese in settling amongst the local population. Gabonese communities and refugees today share infrastructure such as health services, schools and water boreholes. The locals have even adopted some Congolese traditional agricultural practices and techniques.¹⁷

Despite a ceasefire, a new constitution and electoral process, voluntary repatriation to the Republic of Congo has been slow and small in scale. Since many refugees are reluctant to repatriate, there exists a good opportunity for their local integration. Although the government has agreed to work out a local integration policy, no actual steps have yet been taken.

Refugees are required to carry identity documents, and currently residence permits and citizenship can be only acquired through a "long and onerous process".¹⁸ The Government of Gabon began issuing identity cards in Libreville in May 2007, making

¹⁴ Kuhlman, T., (2002). *Responding to protracted refugee situations: A case study of Liberian refugees in Côte d'Ivoire*, EPAU Report. (UNHCR: Geneva), p. 12.

¹⁵ Refugees International Bulletin, (2006). *Cote d'Ivoire: Support Local Integration for Liberian Refugees*, available at < <http://www.refugeesinternational.org/content/article/detail/9645/>>.

¹⁶ Stone, D. and De Vriese, M., (2004). *Refugee livelihoods: Livelihood strategies and options for Congolese refugees in Gabon. A case study for possible local integration*. EPAU Report. (UNHCR, Geneva), p. 6.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 8.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 9.

it easier for refugees to gain employment. A micro-credit scheme and a women's co-operative project have also been set up to promote financial independence, a necessary condition for their full local integration.

It seems that the possibility of local integration for the Congolese has long been on the agenda; supportive statements were made by Gabonese officials at the 2003 UNHCR ExCom meeting in Geneva.¹⁹ The successful local settlement of Chadian refugees in eastern Gabon provides a further boost to local integration prospects for the Congolese, since the former integrated with little assistance from the government. The opportunity now exists to capitalize on the possibility of the local integration of the remaining Congolese in Gabon.

Guinea

Guinea has hosted a number of refugee populations since the early 1990s. Refugees from Liberia, Côte D'Ivoire and Sierra Leone were allowed to settle in local villages and given access to local welfare services. Existing local infrastructure was rehabilitated and bolstered by international relief and development programs, benefiting both refugee and the host populations.

Over 43,000 Liberian refugees have returned to Liberia through facilitated voluntary repatriation; with 5000-6000 remaining in Guinée Forestière at the end of assisted repatriation in June 2007. 93,000 Sierra Leoneans opted for repatriation with the assistance of UNHCR in 2001-4.²⁰ For the group of about 1,300 unable or unwilling to return, local integration is seen as a possible durable solution. A local assistance programme has targeted refugees remaining at the old refugee site, in addition to those settled in urban areas.

The prospects for local integration of Sierra Leonean and Liberian refugees in Guinea are good. Cultural similarities and common local languages and ethnicities encourage cooperation between refugees and the host community. The legal process also looks promising; the Guinean Minister of Territorial Administration and Decentralization has said that refugees would be given a chance to obtain permanent residence and nationality, since these "refugees are all citizens of countries of the ECOWAS."

Projects to facilitate local integration include building and rehabilitation of facilities such as latrines, bathrooms and water points. Environmental protection is also ensured through tree planting and environmental training. The primary education programme has been also shifted towards the Guinean curriculum to encourage social integration.²¹

About 200 Sierra Leonean refugees remain on the old site of the Boreah camp and cultivate the land. These refugees have received agricultural assistance such as seeds, tools and technical expertise. Another 400 refugees opted for integration into urban settings and were given skills training, education and documentation to facilitate sustainable urban integration.²²

¹⁹ Stone, D. and De Vriese, M., (2004). *Refugee livelihoods: Livelihood strategies and options for Congolese refugees in Gabon. A case study for possible local integration*. EPAU Report. (UNHCR, Geneva), p. 12.

²⁰ UNHCR, (2006). *Task Force on Local Integration, Africa Report*. (UNHCR, Geneva), p. 29.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

²² *Ibid.*, p 31-2.

Liberia

Refugees from Sierra Leone arrived in Liberia in several waves beginning in March 1991, when civil war broke out across the country. The successive waves of internal disturbances and tensions in Sierra Leone forced some 120,000 refugees to flee to Liberia.

UNHCR facilitated and promoted voluntary repatriation to Sierra Leone and renewed civil war in Liberia further encouraged tens of thousands of refugees to return to Sierra Leone. The official close of the voluntary repatriation exercise came in June 2004, with 3,563 refugees remaining in Liberia, for whom local integration is being sought. A survey was taken in October 2006, in which 2,155 refugees participated. Of the respondents, about 69% (1,487) expressed the desire to become naturalized Liberian citizens and 31% (668) opted for resident alien status.²³

The Government of Liberia has expressed its political will to support local integration, for example by the “Pact on good neighbourhood, stability and solidarity” between the Mano River Union (Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia). The pact recognised local integration as a durable solution for refugees in the region. Furthermore, the Liberian Government has agreed to offer land to the refugees to settle and farm.²⁴

The Liberia Refugee Repatriation and Resettlement Commission (LRRRC) in partnership with UNHCR held a one day stakeholders’ conference on local integration in February 2008. The conference aimed to present a broader perspective about the government’s responsibility in the local integration initiative and also to reach a consensus on the way forward.²⁵

Namibia

Namibia is host to refugees mainly from Angola, but also houses populations from the DRC, Rwanda and Burundi. All Angolans have refugee status while all of the Great Lakes population are asylum-seekers. The durable solutions available to these populations are also very different, largely due to ethnic and political affinities.²⁶

Although the Government of Namibia has traditionally been sceptical about local integration, recent discussions with UNHCR indicate a potential opening. The Permanent Secretary of Foreign Affairs has suggested a local integration pilot project targeting 500 refugees. The Prime Minister has also indicated that he would be open to the local integration of the majority of Angolans. He has stipulated, however, that it should not be all of the population, land cannot be given and that significant donor funding would be required.²⁷

Sierra Leone

As well as having massive refugee outflows, Sierra Leone also hosts refugees from Liberia. The ‘old caseload’ of refugees that fled Liberia in the early nineties resides in eight rural camps. Following the end of UNHCR’s repatriation programme in June 2007, there remains approximately 6,000 refugees in these camps that will be considered for local integration.

²³ UNHCR, (2007). *Liberia 2006 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR: Geneva), p. 23.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

²⁵ The Analyst Newspaper, Monrovia (2008). *Liberia: LRRRC, UNHCR Hold Sierra Leonean Refugees’ Local Integration Confab*. Available at < <http://allafrica.com/stories/200802150817.html>>.

²⁶ UNHCR, (2006). *Task Force on Local Integration, Africa Report*. (UNHCR, Geneva), p. 26.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

The Government has granted Liberian refugees *prima facie* recognition and as ECOWAS citizens, Liberian refugees also have additional rights of entry to and residence in Sierra Leone. Since 2002, UNHCR has been engaged in formulating a draft Refugee Act for the country. Section 8 of the Sierra Leone Citizenship Act may also provide the opportunity for attainment of citizenship to many of the old caseload.²⁸

Authorities in Sierra Leone remain amenable to local integration as a durable solution for the Liberian refugees, with certain caveats. The government has clarified the need for resources to come from the international community and also that the approach should be to empower the refugees to be self-reliant.²⁹ Indeed, authorities in Sierra Leone have preferred to use the term ‘self reliance strategy’ to that of ‘local integration’ *per se*.

There also exist restrictions to the local integration process. Sierra Leone remains a poor country, and insecurity and corruption are still problems within governmental structures and broader civil society. These issues restrict investor confidence and also make many refugees reluctant to accept local integration as a solution to their plight.

Tanzania

Tanzania has been one of the most generous refugee hosting countries in Africa over the last 45 years. During this time, the government has also issued several invitations for the mass naturalization of refugees. Tanzania thus provides a positive example of local integration and naturalization as a durable solution to refugee situations.

In the 1960s, refugees in Tanzania were naturalized as the country pursued a rural village settlement scheme, *ujaama*. While refugee settlements were separate from local ones, they were well supplied with services. Successes were due largely to the attitude and policies of the host government, as Tanzanian leader Julius Nyerere transformed his belief in communal economics and African solidarity into open door refugee policies. From the early 1970s, Tanzania began to respond to the request for naturalization made by increasingly large numbers of Rwandese refugees. In 1981, approximately 25,000 Rwandese refugees were granted Tanzanian citizenship. More recently, in 2003, the government offered approximately 3,000 Somali refugees living in the Chogo Settlement permanent settlement with the possibility of naturalization. The Government also reduced naturalization fees from US \$800 to US\$ 50.

In 2007, the government of Tanzania dramatically changed its approach to the Burundian refugees that have been living in planned settlements in three regions of western Tanzania for over 35 years. Authorities have recently expressed willingness to consider the naturalization of these ‘old Caseload’ Burundians. The majority (79 per cent, 171,600 people) has expressed their wish to become naturalized Tanzanian citizens.³⁰ The voluntary repatriation of the remaining 21 per cent (45,500 people), to run concurrently with the naturalization, began in March 2008.

Uganda

Uganda borders the DRC and Sudan, and there is a long history of forced migration in both directions between the three countries. In 1999, UNHCR and the Government of Uganda began to implement an assistance strategy aimed at self-reliance for the

²⁸ UNHCR, (2007). *Sierra Leone 2006 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR: Geneva), p. 22.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

³⁰ See SA3 Team, (2007). *Study of Tanzania’s Old Settlements Hosting the 1972 Refugees from Burundi*.

Sudanese refugees who arrived in northern Uganda in 1988.³¹ The goal was to promote refugee self-sufficiency and also to integrate refugee assistance into national systems of development.

The initial provision of land to refugees in the local settlement scheme enabled them to become self-reliant. Uganda allows refugees free access to the employment market, including the right to sell produce in local markets. Refugees in settlements were limited in their freedom of movement, however.³² Ugandan authorities have recently drafted a new refugee bill that addresses legal issues like taxation, freedom of movement and employment, which may provide a positive contribution to local integration efforts. The Jesuit Refugee Service runs schools in refugee settlements, which are attended by refugee and local children. Thus the two groups come into contact and share improved educational services that in turn promote local collaboration, kinship and integration.

An interesting dimension in the case of Uganda is the government's realistic approach to the refugees. Authorities recognized the diminished donor interest in funding a protracted refugee assistance program, and also that self-reliant refugees would cost less in food and other support services. Ugandan officials also noted that programs targeting both refugees and locals would encourage support from development agencies such as the World Bank and UNDP. The Ugandan example thus provides a good model for local integration, especially in light of progress being made despite national security problems.³³

Zambia

Large populations of refugees from Angola, DRC, Burundi and Rwanda currently reside in Zambia. The Citizenship of Zambia Act makes it extremely difficult for refugees to become naturalised citizens of Zambia, however. Furthermore, the Act does not accord citizenship to refugee children born in Zambia.³⁴ Although there is currently no legal framework for integration, the government has prepared draft legislation which offers the possibility of naturalization for refugees.

The Zambia Initiative (ZI) is one example of a policy designed to facilitate the local integration of refugees. It has operated in Zambia since 2002 with the aim of meshing the needs of refugees with the long-term development of the host community. The ZI has supported micro-finance schemes such as one that enabled the community to earn three times more money than before the scheme.³⁵ The project has also supported agricultural credit, animal husbandry, construction, and infrastructure development.

The Zambia Initiative has proven to be problematic, however. While the project got off to a promising start, the mass repatriation of Angolans in 2002 hampered the project as many refugees left Zambia. Furthermore, in the Western Province, local traditional authorities have indicated their preference for Angolan refugees to return

³¹ Office of the Prime Minister/UNHCR Uganda, (1999). *Strategy Paper: Self Reliance for Refugee Hosting Areas in Moyo, Arua, and Adjumani Districts, 1999-2005*.

³² Section 8 of the Control of Alien Refugees Act (CARA) specifically requires refugees to live in settlements. Also see Dryden-Petersen and Hovil, (2003). 'Local integration as a durable solution: refugees, host populations and education in Uganda', *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Working Paper No.93, (UNHCR: Geneva)

³³ See Refugee Law Project, (2005). 'We are all stranded here together: The local settlement system, freedom of movement, and livelihood opportunities in Arua and Moyo districts', *Refugee Law Project Working Paper Number 14*. (Kampala, Uganda).

³⁴ UNHCR, (2007). *Zambia 2006 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR: Geneva), p. 10.

³⁵ Low, Ana (2006). 'Local Integration: a durable solution for refugees?', *Forced Migration Review* 25, May 2006., p. 64-5.

home, rather than integrate locally. Moreover, according to UNHCR, government authorities have also been indicating that the remaining number of Angolan refugees is too big for local integration.³⁶

The Americas

Central America was plagued with conflict in the 1970s and 1980s. Violence and repression created a number of refugee movements in the region. The complicating factor in refugee policy in Central America over the last thirty years has been the wide spectrum of refugee population types, as well as the combination of refugee influx and outflow among the Central American states.

One of the most important developments for refugees in this region was the International Conference on Central American Refugees (CIREFCA). Its underlying aim was to find solutions to close the 'gap' between relief and development. The Conference outlined projects based in various countries of Central America, which had varying degrees of success. The achievements of CIREFCA were largely attributable to the strong donor support of the European Community; the EC provided US \$110m for CIREFCA projects between 1989 and 1993.³⁷

Looking at Central America as a region, it can be noted that despite massive forced displacement, combined with economic migration, an open-door policy was upheld by most countries in the 1970s and 1980s. Furthermore, the welcoming and integration of displaced people in the 1990s contributed to the overall stability of the region. The case of Guatemalan refugees in Mexico serves as a positive example of local integration for a large population in a protracted refugee situation. This may also set a useful precedent for encouraging other governments that local integration can be a successful and beneficial solution for refugees and their hosts.

Belize

The majority of refugees in Belize came from rural areas of El Salvador and Guatemala, as a result of conflict within the two states. Most arrivals to Belize were farmers or farm labourers. In 1982, the Belizean government began to resettle refugees on more than 6,000 hectares of uncleared forest in the upper Belize River Valley. The project, named the Valley of Peace, was initially funded with US\$910,000 from the United Nations.³⁸

In Belize the CIREFCA project focused on improving self-reliance and local integration opportunities for refugees by bolstering the Valley of Peace project and improving infrastructure in the Northern Orange Walk and Western Cayo Districts.³⁹ By 2003, some 300 families had been integrated alongside the Belizeans. Many of the refugees now work in the tourism industry or in local employment and receive social services alongside the Belizean community.⁴⁰

³⁶ UNHCR, (2007). *Zambia 2006 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR: Geneva), p. 11.

³⁷ Betts, A., (2006). 'Comprehensive Plans of Action: Insights from CIREFCA and the Indochinese CPA', *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Working Paper No. 120 (UNHCR: Geneva), p. 27.

³⁸ Collins, Charles O., (1995). 'Refugee Resettlement in Belize', *Geographical Review*, Vol. 85, No. 1. (Jan., 1995), pp. 20-30. p. 21.

³⁹ Betts, A., (2006). 'Comprehensive Plans of Action: Insights from CIREFCA and the Indochinese CPA', *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Working Paper No. 120 (UNHCR: Geneva), p. 11.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

Refugees qualify for permanent residency after one year of legal stay in Belize.⁴¹ Five years after obtaining permanent residency status, refugees may qualify for Belizean nationality. Fees for applying for nationality are BZE\$300 (US\$150) and BZE\$100 (US\$50) for adults and minors respectively.⁴² Between 2003 and 2006, a total of 505 refugees obtained Belizean nationality and a significant percentage of the remaining refugees have been granted permanent residency.

The NGO *Help for Progress* has provided legal assistance to refugees for filing permanent residence or naturalization applications. Help for Progress reported that refugee men tend to more actively pursue permanent residency and naturalization, due to the fact that having such status helps them to access income generating activities.⁴³

Costa Rica

Costa Rica hosts some 9,600 recent refugee arrivals from Colombia. In addition, Costa Rica has locally integrated thousands of long-staying refugees from El Salvador and Nicaragua. International assistance in the early 1990s encouraged the government to permit permanent residency for displaced families from El Salvador and Nicaragua wishing to remain in the country. This took place after the repatriation process left Costa Rica with a relatively small number of residual refugees.

A November 1992 government decree expedited the issuance of proper immigration papers for refugees. All recognized Central American refugees were offered the opportunity to change their immigration status to temporary or permanent resident, and were also exempted from paying overdue taxes for immigration procedures. By 31 May 1995, a total of 10,200 refugees had been granted resident status in Costa Rica.

UNHCR has set up local integration initiatives including a micro-credit program, job placements and income-generating activities.⁴⁴ Refugees also have access to a UNDP project called SISBEN (System for Selecting Beneficiaries of Social Expenditures) which offers assistance to low-income people. The availability of such schemes further facilitates self-sufficiency and local economic integration of the refugees.

Mexico

Between 1981 and 1983 approximately 200,000 people fled to Mexico to escape the escalating conflict in Guatemala.⁴⁵ According to UNHCR, only 46,000 were officially registered and assisted by the UN Refugee Agency.

Refugees first arrived in the border region of Chiapas, but in July 1981 the Mexican authorities granted asylum to only 58 of two thousand Guatemalans. The remainder

⁴¹ Criteria for permanent residency include: 12 months of uninterrupted legal status, presentation of a valid national passport, a reference from a Belizean sponsor, the results of a Belizean police record request, and the results of tests for HIV and other sexually-transmitted diseases. Fees for the permanent residency application vary by nationality. Fees for Central American nationals are USD \$187.50 and fees for other nationalities vary, up to USD \$500. See UNHCR *Belize 2006 Annual Protection Report*, p. 7.

⁴² UNHCR, (2007). *Belize 2006 Annual Protection Report*, (UNHCR: Geneva), p. 11.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁴⁴ UNHCR, (2007). *Costa Rica 2006 Annual Protection Report*, (UNHCR: Geneva), p. 12.

⁴⁵ Cheng, C. and Chudoba, J. (2003). 'Moving beyond long-term refugee situations: The case of Guatemala', *New Issues In Refugee Research*, Working Paper No. 86 (UNHCR: Geneva), p. 9.

was returned to Guatemala.⁴⁶ Gradually, the government changed its position and, in November 1982, stated that the refugees would be allowed to stay within Mexican territory. The authorities still promoted repatriation at the earliest opportunity, however.

It soon became clear that the likely protracted nature of the conflict and refugee situation would require durable long-term solutions. In 1984 a decision was made to relocate the Guatemalan refugees to permanent settlements in the sparsely populated region of Yucatan. Although living conditions there were more challenging, the settlements at Campeche and Quintana Roo provided refugees with physical security and valuable access to land. Several CIREFCA projects were focused on these areas, which aided the self-sufficiency and local integration of the refugee population by providing education, health services, access to markets and sustainable livelihoods.

By 1996, the number of Guatemalan refugees had declined significantly as a result of repatriation. As was seen in Costa Rica, with only a small refugee population remaining in Mexico, the government began considering making the legal status of the Guatemalan refugees more permanent. This offer was initially extended only to refugees in Campeche and Quintana Roo. In Chiapas, local integration began in 1998. Since the Migratory Stabilisation Programme started (in 1996 in Campeche and Quintana Roo, 1999 in Chiapas), 9,595 Guatemalan rural refugees have been naturalized (2004 figure).⁴⁷ In addition, many refugees have been assisted by COMAR (Mexican Commission for Refugees) to initiate the procedure to obtain “inmigrado” (permanent residency) status. UNHCR is currently engaged in a local integration program for urban refugees, to create new options for refugees to integrate outside of Mexico City.

Central Asia

Kyrgyzstan

Tajik refugees fled to Kyrgyzstan during the 1992-1997 Tajik Civil War and the resulting economic and social collapse. The repatriation programme led by UNHCR began in 1998. While many have returned, 1,129 still remained in Kyrgyzstan at the end of 2006. It is estimated that more than 90% of remaining Tajik refugees are of Kyrgyz ethnicity and the vast majority have expressed a wish to become naturalized Kyrgyz citizens. The government of Kyrgyzstan has implemented a simplified naturalization procedure for Tajik refugees, which facilitated the naturalization of 9,310 persons by the end of 2006.⁴⁸

Several waves of Afghan refugees entered Kyrgyzstan beginning in the mid-1980s, after the ouster of Communist government. Two further influxes occurred in 1992 and 1996 as a result of political turmoil and regime change. UNHCR is not aware of any recent cases of Afghan refugees’ naturalisation in the Kyrgyz Republic. Moreover, the Law on Citizenship of the Kyrgyz Republic declares renunciation of the foreign citizenship as a condition to obtain Kyrgyz citizenship for this group.⁴⁹ Thus, the possibility of local integration and naturalisation is severely limited for Afghan refugees.

⁴⁶ UNRISD, (1987). *Social and Cultural Conditions and Prospects of Guatemalan Refugees in Mexico*, (UNRISD, Geneva), p. 21.

⁴⁷ UNHCR, (2006). *Costa Rica 2005 Annual Protection Report*, (UNHCR: Geneva), p. 20.

⁴⁸ UNHCR, (2007). *Kyrgyz Republic 2006 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR, Geneva), p. 32.

⁴⁹ UNHCR, (2006). *Kyrgyz Republic 2005 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR, Geneva), p. 27.

UNHCR is currently engaged in local integration programmes such as vocational trainings, medical insurance, development of women's centres, computer training and Russian and Dari language courses. In cooperation with partners, refugee children are given the opportunity to attend accelerated education programmes to enable them to integrate in local schools.⁵⁰

Tajikistan

Afghan refugees are also hosted in Tajikistan, where they have enjoyed greater rights than in Kyrgyzstan. The vast majority of Afghan refugees in Tajikistan are ethnic Tajiks who speak the same language, exercise the same religion and are culturally close to Tajik nationals.⁵¹ These similarities have thus facilitated good relations between refugees and hosts and in turn contributed to social integration.

In addition, resettlement programs to Canada and the United States since 2004 have reduced the number from around 2500 to about 1000, dramatically reducing the burden on the host country.⁵² These processes have very recently culminated in a significant show of good will on the part of the Tajikistan government. On 1st April 2008, UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) António Guterres and Tajik Foreign Minister Hamrokhon Zarifi signed a joint communiqué that allows some 1000 Afghans to apply for citizenship, as well as measures to make them more self-sufficient,⁵³ an important development for a nationality that has been largely ignored by protection initiatives in many other countries.

Turkmenistan

Many refugees also fled to Turkmenistan as a result of the Tajik civil war. The vast majority of Tajik refugees are well integrated in the host nation, largely self-sufficient and economically empowered. During the 1990s, the government gave refugees land to settle and cultivate and refugee children were allowed to attend and graduate from Turkmen schools.

On 20 April 2005, the Government announced its decision to grant citizenship to Tajik refugees. The major breakthrough for local integration as a durable solution in the region came on 4 August 2005. The Turkmen President adopted two legal acts granting citizenship to 10,158 persons arrived from Tajikistan of Turkmen ethnicity, including 8,780 registered refugees, and residence permits to 2,341 Tajik refugees of other ethnicities. By the end of 2006, 95% eligible refugees had received citizenship certificates and all eligible refugees had been issued residence permits.⁵⁴ In addition, 709 Afghan refugees have received permanent residence permits, although there has been little or no opportunity for naturalization for this group.

East, South and South-East Asia

China

Although lacking formal Chinese citizenship, the situation of the almost 300,000 Indo-Chinese refugees in China is one of *de facto* local integration. The Chinese

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 28.

⁵¹ UNHCR, (2007). *Tajikistan 2006 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR, Geneva), p. 20.

⁵² Ibid., p. 81.

⁵³ UN News Centre, (April 2008). "Tajikistan and UN agency agree on deal to integrate Afghan refugees". Available at < <http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=26179&Cr=tajik&Cr1=>>.

⁵⁴ UNHCR, (2007). *Turkmenistan 2006 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR: Geneva), p. 62

government has maintained that full naturalization is not possible until the voluntary repatriation of those who wish to return to Vietnam.⁵⁵

The Indo-Chinese refugees arrived in the early 1980s and were settled in rural and urban centres. A shared language and ethnic background smoothed the integration process with the local community. The Chinese authorities have issued the refugees with identity cards that enable them to generally enjoy the same rights as Chinese nationals. Indeed, UN High Commissioner for Refugees António Guterres has said that their experience has been “one of the most successful integration programmes in the world.”⁵⁶

India

India has refugee policies that vary dramatically according to the origin and background of the refugees concerned. A number of Hindu/Sikh Afghan refugees have already been naturalized and a further 7,135 Afghan refugees (84% of the total) are now eligible to apply for Indian citizenship. In contrast, Muslim Afghans have been consistently denied access to naturalization.⁵⁷ Ethnic Afghan and Myanmar refugees also find it difficult to integrate due to differences in culture, language and religion. Local integration is not available to refugees of African, Middle Eastern or other origin, despite in some instances having been married to Indians.⁵⁸

Local integration through registration and naturalization has been possible for large numbers of Tibetan and Pakistani refugees in India. Sri Lankan refugees living in camps, though integrated in many instances, are not encouraged to apply for naturalization and individual applications are confined to the wealthy.

Malaysia

More than 57,000 Filipino Muslim refugees currently reside in Malaysia, primarily in Sabah, having fled fighting between the armed forces of the Philippines and Muslim insurgents in the 1970s. UNHCR assisted them between 1977 and 1987. The Malaysian government regards the 57,000 Filipinos as refugees and permits them to reside legally. They hold annually renewable passes that allow the refugees to work, attend school, and receive basic social and medical services. However, they do not have permanent residence status, and the government must approve their movements outside of Sabah on a case-by-case basis. In July 2001, Malaysia announced that it had revoked their refugee status. According to UNHCR, however, the official change has had no practical impact.

Papua New Guinea

Papua New Guinea hosts a few thousand Irian Jayan/West Papuan refugees. Many reside at a settlement site at East Awin, near Kuinga in Western Province. In May 1996, the government introduced a ‘Limited Integration’ policy for this group. This entailed the grant of Permissive Residency Permits (PRPs). The PRPs allowed refugees to continue to live in the settlement or relocate to other areas of the country.

⁵⁵ UNHCR, (2007). *Mainland China 2006 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR, Geneva), p. 1.

⁵⁶ UN High Commissioner for Refugees António Guterres on a visit to China in March 2006, according to UNHCR News, (2007). “Vietnamese refugees well settled in China, await citizenship”, available at < <http://www.unhcr.org/news/NEWS/464302994.html>>.

⁵⁷ UNHCR, (2007). *India 2006 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR, Geneva), p. 22.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

In 2004, UNHCR was successful in lobbying the government to ensure the issuing of PRPs not only to adult male refugees, but to women refugees as well.⁵⁹

The rights of PRP holders are significantly more extensive than those of other refugees. They include free movement within PNG except to and in the border areas, engagement in business activities, access to banking facilities, employment, and enrolment in schools, access to health services and to courts, freedom of worship, marriage, eligibility for naturalization and freedom to repatriate to Indonesia.

According to UNHCR, all but approximately 800 Irian Jayans at East Awin had been granted permissive residency by the end of 2002. For a number of years, UNHCR no longer considered permissive residency holders as refugees. However, there have been a number of problems inherent in the PRP system that UNHCR is investigating.⁶⁰

Europe

Armenia

The dissolution of the Soviet Union was marked by intensive migratory movements. Some 360,000 ethnic Armenian refugees from Azerbaijan arrived in Armenia between 1988 and 1993 as a result of the conflict over the disputed territory of Nagorno-Karabakh. The persistence of socio-economic conflict and with no resolution in sight, local integration was viewed as the only available durable solution for this population.⁶¹

Naturalization became an option for the refugees in 1995 with the enactment of a citizenship law which made the naturalization process more straightforward for this group. Lack of awareness resulted in initially low naturalization numbers, but an information campaign was set up in 1999 to better inform refugees of this option. Another incentive for naturalization came after July 2000, as former Soviet passports could no longer be used for travel outside of Armenia. In January 2004, the total number of naturalizations since 1995 reached 65,000.

Besides access to an Armenian passport, naturalization brings a number of additional rights to the refugees, including the right to vote in national elections and the right to own land. Armenia's legal provisions give the refugee population almost the same basic rights to refugees as those accorded to citizens.⁶²

Although granted substantial legal integration, refugees are constrained by a lack of economic opportunities and general impoverishment.⁶³ The poor socio-economic conditions in Armenia restrict the capacity of the refugees to become self-reliant and while refugees have access to the national social services, the system is not able to adequately meet their needs.⁶⁴ The point that naturalization itself does not directly

⁵⁹ UNHCR, (2007). *Papua New Guinea 2006 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR: Geneva), p. 17.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

⁶¹ See Ghazaryan, Y., (????). *Obstacles to the Integration and Naturalization of Refugees: A Case Study of Ethnic Armenian Refugees in Armenia*. (American University of Armenia Department of Political Science and International Affairs, Center for Policy Analysis).

⁶² UNHCR, (2005). *Armenia 2004 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR, Geneva), p. 23.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

⁶⁴ UNHCR, (2005). *Armenia 2005 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR, Geneva), p. 24.

improve the living conditions of refugees has been highlighted by several different actors.⁶⁵

Serbia

Although many years have passed since the cessation of conflict in the former Yugoslavia, there are still durable solutions needed for thousands of refugees in Serbia. In January 2005, the governments of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia and Montenegro signed the Sarajevo declaration that sought to resolve the refugee problems of the region.⁶⁶

There has been some progress in local integration in the region. By 2005, some 143,000 former refugees had acquired Serbian citizenship and identity cards. Approximately 50,000 of these were refugees from Bosnia and Herzegovina, and 93,000 were from Croatia. There still exist challenges to their final and full integration, however.⁶⁷

Conclusion

This paper has outlined local integration initiatives and prospects in a variety of country settings. What remains to be analyzed are the similarities between the case studies, in order that future opportunities for pursuing this durable solution might best be seized. Further research is required into the conditions necessary for the local integration of refugee populations to become both viable and utilised.⁶⁸ This study will hopefully provide a background and starting point for advocacy to contribute to the active promotion of local integration in the future.

These examples represent a range of different circumstances and differing approaches towards, and results of, local integration. In some cases, refugees have attained a degree of self-sufficiency, *de facto* integration, or even full *de jure* integration in the form of naturalization and citizenship. What is clear is that local integration has indeed been pursued and successfully implemented in numerous countries across several continents. This strongly contradicts claims that local integration is a “non-solution” that has very rarely been used as a durable solution, as suggested by a council of NGOs in 2002.⁶⁹ It also demonstrates the latent ability of such a strategy in solving present and future refugee crises.

Having catalogued the use of local integration in refugee settings over the last 50 years, it remains to capitalise on its previously undocumented successes and largely unrecognized potential. It is apparent that the current policy focus on repatriation is not a viable solution for a large number of refugees today, and resettlement is an option available to a very small minority. Therefore, it is logical for local integration as to be more widely encouraged and pursued. Protracted refugee situations are in particular need of a fresh and new approach as it is acknowledged that long-term care-

⁶⁵ For example, Ghazaryan, Y.

⁶⁶ UNHCR, (2007). *Local Integration of Refugees in Serbia: Law, Practice, Recommendations*. (UNHCR, OSCE, HCIT), p. 3.

⁶⁷ UNHCR, (2007). *Local Integration of Refugees in Serbia: Law, Practice, Recommendations*. (UNHCR, OSCE, HCIT), p. 8.

⁶⁸ For a good summary of obstacles and conditions necessary for local integration see Jacobsen, K., (2001). ‘The forgotten solution: local integration for refugees in developing countries’, *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Working Paper No.45, (UNHCR: Geneva).

⁶⁹ NGO Statement on Local Integration Global Consultations on International Protection 22-24 May 2002. Available at <<http://www.icva.ch/doc00000865.html>>.

and-maintenance programmes bring few lasting benefits to host countries, donor states or to refugees themselves.⁷⁰

A number of the case studies have shown that as a prelude to naturalization, local integration, local settlement, self-reliance can be an appropriate and viable means of addressing the plight of long-term refugees. Thus, the opportunity now exists to further strengthen the re-emergence of local integration as a multitude of factors facilitate its revival. The international community, donors and host states today hold both the ability and, to an increasing extent, the will to pursue this durable solution for the benefit of millions of across the globe.

⁷⁰ Crisp, J. (2004). 'The local integration and local settlement of refugees: a conceptual and historical analysis', *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Working Paper No.102, (UNHCR: Geneva), p. 1.

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, A., (1987). 'Refugee settlement schemes in Tanzania,' *Land Reform* pp. 83-108.
- Armstrong, A., (1988). 'Aspects of Refugee Well-being in Settlement Schemes: An Examination of the Tanzanian Case,' *Journal of Refugee Studies*. Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 57-73.
- Betts, Alexander, (2006). 'Comprehensive Plans of Action: Insights from CIREFCA and the Indochinese CPA', *New Issues In Refugee Research*, Working Paper No. 120, (UNHCR: Geneva).
- Bulcha, M., (1988). *Flight and Integration: Causes of Mass Exodus from Ethiopia and Problems of Integration in the Sudan*, (Uppsala: Scandinavian Institute of African Studies).
- Cheng, C. and Chudoba, J., (2003). 'Moving beyond long-term refugee situations: the case of Guatemala', *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Working Paper No. 86, (UNHCR: Geneva).
- Chimni, B. S., (1999). 'From resettlement to involuntary repatriation: towards a critical history of durable solutions to refugee problems', *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Working Paper no. 2, (UNHCR Geneva).
- Collins, C. O., (1995). 'Refugee Resettlement in Belize', *Geographical Review*, Vol. 85, No. 1., pp. 20-30.
- Crisp, J., (2004). 'The local integration and local settlement of refugees: a conceptual and historical analysis', *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Working Paper No.102, (UNHCR: Geneva).
- Dryden-Petersen, S. and Hovil, L., (2003). 'Local integration as a durable solution: refugees, host populations and education in Uganda', *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Working Paper No.93, (UNHCR: Geneva).
- Jacobsen, K., (2001). 'The forgotten solution: local integration for refugees in developing countries', *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Working Paper No.45, (UNHCR: Geneva).
- Gasarasi, Charles P., (1990). 'The Mass Naturalization and Further Integration of Rwandese Refugees in Tanzania: Process, Problems and Prospects,' *Journal of Refugee Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 88-109.
- Ghazaryan, Y., (????). *Obstacles to the Integration and Naturalization of Refugees: A Case Study of Ethnic Armenian Refugees in Armenia*. (American University of Armenia Department of Political Science and International Affairs, Center for Policy Analysis).
- Kuhlman, T., (2002). *Responding to protracted refugee situations: A case study of Liberian refugees in Côte d'Ivoire*, EPAU Report. (UNHCR: Geneva).
- Low, Ana (2006). 'Local Integration: a durable solution for refugees?', *Forced Migration Review* 25, May 2006., pp. 64-5.
- Office of the Prime Minister/UNHCR Uganda, (1999). *Strategy Paper: Self Reliance for Refugee Hosting Areas in Moyo, Arua, and Adjumani Districts, 1999-2005*. (UNHCR: Geneva).
- Refugees International Bulletin, (2006). *Cote d'Ivoire: Support Local Integration for Liberian Refugees*, available at <
<http://www.refugeesinternational.org/content/article/detail/9645/>>.
- Refugee Law Project, (2005). 'We are all stranded here together: The local settlement system, freedom of movement, and livelihood opportunities in Arua and Moyo districts,' *Refugee Law Project Working Paper Number 14*, (Kampala, Uganda).
- SA3 Team, (2007). *Study of Tanzania's Old Settlements Hosting the 1972 Refugees from Burundi*. (UNHCR: Geneva).

- Stein, B. N. and Clark, L., (1990). *Refugee Integration and Older Refugee Settlements in Africa*, Paper presented at the 1990 meeting of the American Anthropological Association, New Orleans, 28 November 1990. Available at <<http://www.msu.edu/course/pls/461/stein/FINAL.htm>>.
- Stone, D. and De Vriese, M., (2004). *Refugee livelihoods: Livelihood strategies and options for Congolese refugees in Gabon. A case study for possible local integration*. EPAU Report, (UNHCR: Geneva).
- The Analyst Newspaper, Monrovia (2008). *Liberia: LRRRC, UNHCR Hold Sierra Leonean Refugees' Local Integration Confab*. Available at <<http://allafrica.com/stories/200802150817.html>>.
- Whitaker, B., (1999). 'Changing Opportunities: Refugees and Host Communities in Western Tanzania', *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Working Paper No. 11, (UNHCR: Geneva).
- UNHCR, (2007). *Discussion Paper: Refugee protection and durable solutions in the context of international migration, UNHCR/DPC/2007/Doc. 02*. (UNHCR: Geneva).
- UNHCR, (2002). *4th Meeting: Global Consultations on International Protection, EC/GC/02/6*, 25 April 2002.
- UNHCR, (2007). *Protecting Refugees and the Role of UNHCR*. (UNHCR: Geneva).
- UNHCR, (2006). *Task Force on Local Integration, Africa Report*. (UNHCR: Geneva).
- UNHCR, (2007). *Local Integration of Refugees in Serbia: Law, Practice, Recommendations*. (UNHCR, OSCE, HCIT).
- UNHCR, (various). ExCom Conclusions No. 79 (XLVII) 1996, No. 81 (XLVIII) 1997, No. 87 (L) 1999, No. 89 (LI) 2000, No. 90 (LII) 2001, No. 95 (LIV) 2003.
- UNHCR, (2006). *Angola 2005 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR: Geneva).
- UNHCR, (2005). *Armenia 2004 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR: Geneva).
- UNHCR, (2007). *Belize 2006 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR: Geneva).
- UNHCR, (2006). *Costa Rica 2005 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR: Geneva).
- UNHCR, (2007). *Costa Rica 2006 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR: Geneva).
- UNHCR, (2007). *India 2006 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR: Geneva).
- UNHCR, (2007). *Kyrgyz Republic 2006 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR: Geneva).
- UNHCR, (2006). *Kyrgyz Republic 2005 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR: Geneva).
- UNHCR, (2007). *Liberia 2006 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR: Geneva).
- UNHCR, (2007). *Mainland China 2006 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR: Geneva).
- UNHCR, (2007). *Papua New Guinea 2006 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR, Geneva).
- UNHCR, (2007). *Sierra Leone 2006 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR: Geneva).
- UNHCR, (2007). *Tajikistan 2006 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR: Geneva).
- UNHCR, (2007). *Turkmenistan 2006 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR: Geneva).
- UNHCR, (2007). *Zambia 2006 Annual Protection Report*. (UNHCR: Geneva)
- UNRISD, (1987). *Social and Cultural Conditions and Prospects of Guatemalan Refugees in Mexico*, (UNRISD: Geneva).
- UNHCR News, (2007). "Vietnamese refugees well settled in China, await citizenship", available at <<http://www.unhcr.org/news/NEWS/464302994.html>>.
- UN News Centre, (April 2008). "Tajikistan and UN agency agree on deal to integrate Afghan refugees". Available at <<http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=26179&Cr=tajik&Cr1=>>>.