Additional Pathways for Refugees: Exploring the Potential and Addressing Barriers

UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and
The Migration Policy Institute Europe

11-12 February 2016
Ghent Marriot Hotel, Korenlei 10, 9000 Ghent, Belgium

FULL SUMMARY POINTS

From February 11th to February 12th 2016, the high level roundtable *Additional Pathways for Refugees: Exploring Potential and Addressing Barriers* saw an exploration of ways in which pathways to protection and self-reliance might be strengthened and expanded. It examined the possibilities for (a) creating or establishing **new pathways** for migration and mobility; (b) expanding the scope and strengthening the protection component of **existing pathways** for migration and mobility, and (c) facilitating access for refugees to existing programmes and visa categories **within countries of first asylum**.

The meeting was attended by representatives of national governments (US, Germany, Egypt, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Sweden), NGOs (Malaysia Human Rights Committee, Federation of Evangelical Churches in Italy, UK National Refugees Welcome Board), academic institutions (Haceteppe University, University of Dar es Salaam), the private sector (German Federal Employers' Association, Talent Beyond Boundaries), and international institutions (UNHCR, IOM, ILO, AU, OECD).

The meeting comprised seven sessions which posed a variety of key questions centred on the benefits of alternative pathways to protection, the political, legal, and technical barriers preventing refugees from accessing such channels, and the factors ensuring protection and determining success in the longer term.

I.   Goals

The development of additional pathways to protection may contribute towards a number of goals.

- The overarching goal is to increase prospects of finding **durable solutions** to displacement for a greater proportion of the refugee population. UNHCR has indicated that 45 percent of the globally displaced have been in protracted situations for more than five years and, with the overall refugee population increasingannually, the challenge is urgent. There is also a pressing need to support individual refugees to **fulfil their potential** to contribute more actively to social and economic life in the countries in which they live, which may be more

readily achievable through pathways that enable them to be seen productive member of the community in which they live.

- This is also in the interests of **states** as, by developing pathways in meaningful and creative ways, governments may support the retention and acquisition of skills and the demonstration of resilience within refugee communities; reduce the reliance of refugees on state support and structures; facilitate the integration and social cohesion process; and harness the goodwill of publics through, for example, sponsorship or mentoring arrangements. By developing additional pathways, governments can demonstrate solidarity with major host countries. They can also potentially aim to limit "undesirable" outcomes – namely irregular employment outside protective systems, irregular and unsafe onward movement, and fuelling of the smuggling trade and associated crimes, though there is little current evidence to support whether this would be the case.
- It should be recognised that **refugees** may prefer to graduate from (and in some cases avoid) official refugee status where and when it is feasible. In some contexts, this is to avoid the complications and restrictions that come with the status; in others it is to benefit from being identified as a student, worker or entrepreneur. Such pathways also create new opportunities for refugees to become meaningful contributors to their host and origin societies by building professional lives, supporting family through remittance transfers, gaining skills needed at home, and otherwise find substantive outlets for their skills and abilities.
- The current context also provides an opportunity – and increased room for manoeuvre – for those managing immigration systems to address broader dysfunction that exists within their policy frameworks, capitalising upon the new political priority that has been accorded to the refugee crisis. This could be the case, for example, with respect to credential recognition and visa processing. These possibilities are elaborated in section II.

II.   Framing and Coherence

There is no 'one size fits all' policy that can be applied to government efforts to develop additional pathways to protection. Instead, the appropriateness of particular pathways and programming will depend on a range of factors including (but not limited to):

- The **nature and characteristics of the refugee population** itself, including location, security of status, education and skill levels, local opportunities, prospects for eventual return, with a robust understanding of the diversity of refugees' profiles and the potential for protection and livelihood needs to change over time and as the result of external events.
- **Pre-existing national government frameworks**, including adherence to regional and international protection norms, national systems for immigration and asylum, and participation in broader regional governance frameworks.
- The **nature of the socio-economic landscape** in host and destination countries, including labour market structures and demand, community support and public service provision, the robust existence of civil society and other non-governmental actors, and dependence upon international organisations such as UNHCR.
- Attitudes held by different actors with regard to modes of entry, early or late asylum claims, and permanent versus temporary migration.

The individual characteristics of each regional and national context, and the dynamics between them, demand a coordinated response between the numerous stakeholders and policy frameworks

at play. The short term exigencies of the immediate situation must also be considered in view of their long-term implications.

- Channels for legal mobility, or to secure status, are often developed in **separate policy fields (policy 'silos')** and according to their own internal logics and overall policy goals. A broad range of policy-makers – including those dealing not only with migration, but with labour and economic affairs, refugees, social policy and integration, and humanitarian aid and development - should be involved in ensuring that humanitarian considerations are 'mainstreamed' into the immigration system at large. Mechanisms should be designed that allow cross-fertilisation between policy categories and collaboration in the design of new pathways.
- A **coordinated approach** between institutions and government departments is essential. A whole-of-government approach to the refugee question, involving systematic dialogue between them, can lead to innovative outcomes. Working groups drawn from across government departments (such as the Swedish Parliamentary enquiry on legal channels to protection) should be considered as a first step.
- UNHCR is operating in a **politically sensitive environment**, which will involve strategic choices about how to reconcile short-term pressures stemming from the current refugee context and a longer-term vision for addressing wider protection challenges, including large-scale and protracted situations in different regions worldwide.
- Strategies to deal with displacement need simultaneously to envisage preventative measures that mitigate the root and trigger **causes of displacement**.
- New policies and initiatives should seek to **complement – and benefit from – existing initiatives**, rather than reinventing the wheel in areas such as regional development and investment strategies, regional governance frameworks, processes to harmonise skills recognition, and national integration support programming.
- States can learn from each other, in terms both of positive and negative lessons. Governments should be cognisant of the role of cross-border exchange and learning, as well as the potentially negative knock-on effects should restrictive measures become widespread (passing responsibility elsewhere).

III.   Access to Secure Status and Pathways for Mobility

In states with increasing restrictions on immigration, especially in Europe, **existing pathways** may offer the most return for advocacy efforts. In countries with large numbers of refugees and proximity to refugee producing situations, increased **security of status** might provide the greatest opportunity to expand opportunities. States which perceive themselves as immigration countries may hold more scope for the exploration of **new pathways** as well as the adaption of those already in use, but others may also have important opportunities to do more, based on various objectives and political priorities**.**

An essential precondition to exploiting pathways for mobility is the ability to acquire **appropriate documentation**, and in a timely manner.

- States should be encouraged to issue Convention Travel Documents (CTDs) to all refugees.
- States should ensure that CTDs issued are recognised by states around the world. This involves upgrading equipment to ensure CTDs are machine readable, that they remain valid, and that they can be replaced in countries of temporary residence.

- States should also ensure that their visa processes are not unduly bureaucratic and slow, and that sufficient resources are devoted to ensure timely assessment, with priority for those areas in which other partners are ready to engage and accelerate access to labour or education opportunities.
- States should ensure that consular staff receive appropriate guidelines and training so that refugees receive appropriate advice about the best course of action (for instance, in choosing between CTDs and national documentation of the country of origin), and that they do not have visa applications turned down unduly.

A second precondition to ensuring the overall sustainability of new or adapted pathways is to develop strategies for the **integration** and ongoing support for the beneficiaries of those pathways.

- The development of local networks to absorb and integrate new arrivals has been shown to be a particularly effective way of providing early support. Support for diverse sections of civil society at the most grassroots level is essential in this regard.
- Donors should consider small grants with low conditionality to facilitate access of small, volunteer-led organisations, in recognition of their pivotal role in the fabric of grassroots civil society. This may be an important capacity-building mechanism in countries with lesser developed civil society.
- Strategies for distribution and settlement of refugees should aim to promote access to support networks, labour market opportunities and services, while preventing ghettoization and isolation.
- Full use should be made of technology, including "smart" tools for integration such as smartphone applications.
- Governments and local authorities might invest in communal spaces to both strengthen the idea in local communities that refugees attract positive investment and to create the spaces of meaningful encounter and interaction that promote intercultural understanding, especially in areas of historically low immigration.
- Some of this can already be incorporated into pre-departure processes, including language support, orientation to manage expectations, and even technical training and skills development.
- More investment should be made in tools for measuring integration in order to communicate progress more explicitly to sometimes sceptical publics, but any approach should recognise that definitions of "success" vary depending on context.
- Any approach should recognise the leading role played by refugees in their own integration. The UNHCR/ICMC's resettlement ambassadors programme offers a good example of this.

Education
- Scholarships may be a **politically uncontroversial** (or less controversial) means to afford stability of status to refugees or facilitate their transfer to a third country. Where full costs cannot be covered, there may nonetheless be benefit in creating funds and fee waivers to assist in overcoming practical barriers, such as visa applications, travel etc.
- While scholarships for higher education are available in several countries, they are expensive and run on a very small scale. Placements for **vocational training** might offer more scope for scale, as well as a sharper tool with which to prepare refugees for subsequent labour market opportunities, and for the rebuilding that would come with return to origin countries.

- Grassroots initiatives springing up at universities around the world require guidance and support to connect their local knowledge and ability to garner popular, grassroots support with the gatekeepers of education and immigration policy in government.
- Facilitating access to education may be best approached in multiple steps. **Online courses** may be an effective way of delivering preparatory language modules at scale, recognising that language acquisition is essential to access education and jobs at all skill levels.
- Initial placements in specialised **"foundation" courses** may also help refugees map a pathway to mainstream scholarship opportunities.
- Partnerships between educational institutions and the private sector (particularly employers) can lead to the creation of **internships and apprenticeships**, both of which provide routes to stability locally as well as potential access to labour market opportunities, as demonstrated by the ongoing programme of the German University in Cairo, which promotes student mobility between Egypt and Germany. Strong links to industry have resulted in apprenticeship placements and vocational career development.
- Commitments to expand the **Erasmus Mundus** programme at the Valetta Summit might provide a blueprint for similar region schemes within the Arab League or elsewhere.
- Educational institutions, together with other strategic partners, might be supported in developing alternative systems for **credential recognition** that take advantage of economies of scale or systems for **skills recognition** that overcome the need for documentation. The development of such systems should take into account the disruptive elements of flight and living in exile.
- Specifically tailored opportunities might be created to address identified reasons for non-participation. The imperative to work, or family values at odds with the local community, especially regarding gender (where some families prefer girls not to attend mixed schools, for instance) might be directly relevant to why refugees may, or may not, participate actively in education. These factors might benefit from research in particular national contexts.
- A '**clearing-house' system** for scholarship and academic opportunities at the post-secondary school level, together with a rationalised application system, may reduce barriers to entry for refugees faced with making multiple applications to specific universities, and help match candidates to appropriate opportunities. Regional education platforms may be well placed to develop such systems.
- Governments might further strengthen and expand postgraduate options in order to maintain security of status for those already established at educational institutes in country. They might also allow, where not already the case, for time spent in fulltime education to count towards minimum residency requirements for family reunification, naturalisation, and other secure statuses.

Labour & Entrepreneurship

- **Temporary labour migration** may serve as a viable channel, depending on the extent to which protection can be guaranteed and countries of first asylum are open to receiving refugees at the end of their contracts. Countries of first asylum might be persuaded to explore frameworks in which they become "guarantors" of return if such programmes bring overall benefits, such as via investment in skills training and institutions, opening of migration opportunities for both refugees and host populations, and remittances to family who remain behind.
- States can enhance protection and potential of **temporary labour migration** by allowing refugees to change employers, lifting requirements to exit the country before applying for visa renewal, allowing return to the country of asylum in order to maintain contact with family, allowing labour migrant status to be held simultaneously to protection status, and

allowing temporary labour migrants to count time spent in the country towards minimum residence requirements for family reunification, naturalisation etc.

- Governments and private enterprises can benefit from, and should investigate further, the specific knowledge, whether language-based or cultural, presented by refugees that are difficult to find locally. Some evidence also points to the fact that refugees are more likely to remain for longer periods in lesser skilled jobs or where they have been provided with training by employers.

- **Permanent residence** is more usually associated with highly skilled migration. However, labour market needs are also highly contextual and mid-skilled opportunities have been proliferating. To develop a fuller understanding of global demand, a mapping of labour need across all skill levels might be combined with **skills mapping** of refugee populations in labour surplus countries, as the basis for recruiters and other organisations/businesses to develop job-matching programmes.

- As a leaner alternative, **online platforms** where refugees and employers can find each other and interact – as pursued by providers such as LinkedIn – are in development and could benefit from further support and linking with development and other partners.

- **Combining protection needs with labour mobility** accentuates the need for strong partnerships, with recruiters, employers, and trade unions, all of whom may have complex motivations. The development of the International Recruitment Integrity System (IRIS) and similar tools can play an important role.

- It is essential that where labour opportunities do not work out, refugees can access asylum status. The transition from work permit status to protection status of Syrians in Sweden, though ad-hoc and not planned, shows how this might work.

- Attention should be paid to how existing, often **informal job-matching mechanisms** might be further supported. Networks of expatriates, diaspora groups and associated NGOs already play an important role in matching refugees with labour market opportunities.

- Simple adaptations to existing legal channels might be easily made. In the European Union, there is potential to **plug into on existing proposals** to reform the Blue Card, and include channels adapted to refugee needs, whilst expression of interest systems might be adapted to ensure refugees can find opportunities (and be found by employers).

- **Special economic/ development zones** in strategic locations, combined with permission to work, brings stability to refugees. In addition to the creation of new zones, the development of those which have already been established, for example in Turkey, should continue to be monitored. These should be created with an eye to encouraging the development of viable enterprises.

- One way to do this is to provide **support for refugee entrepreneurs**, including training, seed capital, and advocating for accommodating legal frameworks, such as property rights and access to financial services**. The zones should also create employment opportunities for local populations.

- **Job-creation measures** can be targeted at refugee and refugee-hosting communities, through publically and donor-funded programmes, as well as in the private sector. Measures can be taken to strengthen the economies and labour markets of countries of first asylum, for instance through the simplification of trade rules and strategic investment from multilateral investment funds.

- Refugee-hosting states can extend **permission to work** to all persons of concern – targeting those sectors in which job demand is least likely to conflict with local interests – and regulate the job market to ensure protection against exploitation.

- While the recognition of skills is often difficult without documentation and conversion systems, those professions that lend themselves well to an **online competency check** may enable a core group of refugees to have their skills validated for one or multiple foreign labour markets.
- Development organisations and public employment agencies might work together to lay the groundwork, where the risk and expense is too great for the private sector. The German Development Agency's (GIZ) "Triple Win" project offers an example of how skills mapping, job-matching, pre-departure measures and on-arrival integration, with the support of the public employment agency, can bridge the gap between the needs of would-be labour migrants and the means of employers.

Family

- States can **expand the scope** of family reunion provisions to include extended family members of refugees, and even *de facto* family members (as permitted by Canada's concurrent processing scheme) beyond traditional definitions centred on the nuclear family. This might also include making exceptions to requirements such as length of residence, minimum income, or education level for relatives of refugees. Investigation into options for improved **DNA testing** may speed the process, reduce fraud, and build public confidence in the genuine nature of links between non-nuclear family members.
- Where family links cannot be established via official documentation, and given the expense of DNA testing, it may be possible to build links with appropriate interlocutors in civil society, and communities in country of asylum and destination to develop **other mechanisms for establishing eligibility.**
- States can increase the effectiveness of private sponsorship in encouraging orderly departure from a crisis region by **fast-tracking** refugee family members' claims for asylum or launching **procedures automatically** to trace and process family members even before the "sponsoring" refugee has formally received status (as has been undertaken in Sweden and Canada in some contexts).
- Where refugees are likely to have to make a choice between countries, those governments should seek to **harmonise** family reunion rules in order to provide similar opportunities to refugees, regardless of the state in which they have protection.
- More should be done to highlight the **link between restrictive family reunion policies and recourse to people smugglers**. Measures to **reduce the costs** and **increase information** of family reunion possibilities would reinforce this effect.
- For the children of refugees, states should continue to develop citizenship frameworks to provide safeguards against **statelessness** for children born on the territory but without prospect of gaining alternative citizenships.

Regional Mobility

- **Regional mobility frameworks** can be utilised to open pathways to secure status, as well as mobility opportunities for refugees, as seen in both the ECOWAS and MERCOSUR regions, and might potentially be seen in the East African Community. Direct advocacy with regional bodies and member governments can help make the removal of remaining obstacles to mobility a priority. For instance, in both ECOWAS and MERCOSUR, governments retain the power to unilaterally veto the entry of any group.
- Recognising the limited progress so far in developing regional mobility between ASEAN countries, governments (with the Asian Development Bank) have the opportunity to incorporate refugee mobility within nascent systems at an early stage, and mainstream displacement in discussions on the mobility of the highly-skilled.

- Differences between regional agreements and domestic implementation remain a challenge, in particular where provisions related to refugees rights and freedoms differ from those relating to the movement of other member state nationals.
- The potential to increase legal movements where **free movement legislation exists but is inactive** or under-utilised, such as in and between the MENA region and GCC countries, might be pursued subject to careful negotiation of political context and issues surrounding protection.
- **Lesser integrated regions** also see high levels of mobility. Reducing **visa** conditions, or **waiving exit fines,** can support refugees in seeking their own legal pathways. Governments might also **suspend enforcement of immigration controls** against refugee populations, **informally allow access** to universities and the labour market, and relax barriers to **internal mobility** that might otherwise impede refugees' access to appropriate consulates and embassies.

Resettlement

- While it is apparent that resettlement is not the only solution to the current levels of displacement, three key areas might increase the effectiveness of the resettlement option:
    - **Geographical:** continuing the (increasingly successful) efforts to expand the number of resettlement countries, beyond the historic core group. This might also include looking at middle income countries, perhaps in Africa (Namibia, Angola), and assessing their potential as hosts of refugees. Strategic investments might be made in countries where resettlement is politically feasible but infrastructure is lacking.
    - **Conceptual:** probing whether the current approach to resettlement based on UNHCR profiling and referrals of the most vulnerable refugees might be expanded to include other categories. This would however require a significant further investment of resources and capacity in UNHCR which might not be immediately realisable.
    - **Strategic:** there may be scope to explore the use of resettlement as a strategic tool, even at the currently relatively low levels, as a standalone gesture of solidarity or as part of a more comprehensive package of cooperation with first countries of asylum to increase the viability of other options, such as temporary labour migration.

Private sponsorship

- Governments can provide information and capacity support to interested civil society groups, in order to keep expectations realistic and maintain programme stability for the long-term by avoiding **resettlement "burnout".**
- Actors can harness the enthusiasm behind private sponsorship initiatives, and encourage the development of nascent initiatives in Europe and Australia through robust reporting, sharing of good practice and lessons learned, and **roadmaps to scale and sustainability.**
- Investing more deeply in the promotion of dialogue between governments interested in private sponsorship can **demystify the issues around cost, security, and sustainability.** Governments should also factor in the **reduced costs to integration** that can be linked with refugees arriving through private sponsorship channels, which has been the Canadian experience.
- There is scope for private sponsorship to act as a corollary to a range of other mobility pathways, especially where governments cite financial resources as the main barrier to resettlement. It may be possible to **move beyond the "usual suspects" in private sponsorship** and engage a range of private, public, third sector actors in policy innovations

in this area, which include formally- and informally-constituted religious, diaspora, and refugee groups and communities.

- Mechanisms might be built that enable one private sponsor to support the reunification of family members, where family members lack the resources to become sponsors themselves. This kind of mechanism can be rapidly realised in countries where systems already exist for the accelerated entry of refugee family members such as Canada and the US.
- Private sponsors might pledge support in non-traditional ways, for instance as guarantors of immigration bonds that underwrite conditions of entry for refugees arriving under mobility schemes.
- Private sponsorship might be used to "kick-start" a culture of providing refuge in potential new countries of resettlement.
- Logistically, investments should be made to ensure that practical obstacles to the reception of new arrivals – such as capacity at ports of entry – do not hinder otherwise promising relocation/resettlement projects.

IV. Programming

Encouraging innovation can lead to game-changing ideas. However, the highest impact innovations often do not require fundamental redesign of systems and processes, but instead require careful consideration of strengths and weaknesses in existing policy programming and intervention, whether in the development/humanitarian or other fields. The strategic use of funding and potential for scalability, the actual capacity of institutions – both state and otherwise – for implementing proposals, and the likely take-up by refugees (based on accessibility), will underpin the success of new and existing programming.

Funding & Scale

- Pilot projects provide an opportunity to test a concept. They should be robustly analysed not only for the outcomes to beneficiaries, but for their cost. Those that might achieve an acceptable level of sustainability and show promise for contributing to an enlarged protection space might be the subject of a **"roadmap to sustainability"** that details their transition from heavy institutional management to self-sufficient business model.
- While achieving **scale** is a pre-requisite to tackling displacement, the value of small-scale but visibly successful initiatives should not be discounted for their ability to build **public and political confidence** in the response.
- Projects should be **cumulative** and seek to expand on previous, or existing, efforts, and avoid duplication, except where duplication offers proof of concept.

Capacities

- State **institutions** should be supported to adapt to new programmes, especially where government agencies dealing with migration have typically focused on emigration and the diaspora, rather than influxes of migrants or refugees.
- UNHCR may be able, within its mandate and resources, to play a facilitating role to support the evaluation and development of pilots. It will also be important to bring in other actors who have the expertise, capacity and scope to contribute in substantive ways.

Accessibility

- Often barriers are **bureaucratic**. Where this is the case, efforts should be made to engage partners adept at reducing red tape. In this vein, access to funding for civil society groups and networks to enable smaller and more informal grassroots groups – as well as smaller

private sector actors – to build influence and capacity in the protection/sponsorship field might help facilitate organic growth and progress.

- Specific measures may need to be introduced into programming to avoid too much focus on "low hanging fruit"), so that opportunities are increased across the refugee spectrum. While the temptationmay be to invest exponentially in politically easy areas such as elite scholarship or highly skilled migration opportunities, their high cost and limited scope may make them less cost effective than, for instance, vocational training and skilled migration opportunities, which may more accurately reflect both the global labour market and the profiles of forcibly displaced populations.
- Online methods coupled with investment in technological infrastructure in refugee-hosting areas can be developed to improve access for geographically isolated participants from refugee and host communities.
- Improved access to quality information, in order to support awareness of existing opportunities among refugee populations, should utilise technology, where appropriate, and respond to other barriers such as language.

V.   Building Effective Partnerships

The range of actors working in areas relevant to the mission of UNHCR has widened considerably. To take advantage of this, each actor's comparative advantage must be identified and mapped in relation to other stakeholders. Effort should also be made to engage emerging, non-traditional partners, which may have the power to "make or break" projects.

Existing and Emerging partners

It is clear that **states** have distinct and changing interests, and as the lines between sending, receiving, transit, and resettlement country become blurred, they are increasingly resistant to easy categorisation. The diversity in interests and concerns exhibited by states is amplified when considering other actors. By assessing the comparative strengths of each actor (or set of actors) and corresponding concerns, UNHCR can benefit from synergies between them.

- **Interior/home affairs ministries and other actors** can work more closely with **humanitarian actors** to understand the potential impacts that extending existing channels of migration to refugee populations might have, and the simple policy tweaks that might result in expanded access to such channels by refugee groups. Examples include the inclusion of refugees as a category eligible for work, study or long-term residence visas, or other rights to stay, if they are not currently entitled to those.
- The extensive experience of **public employment agencies** in facilitating access to the labour market in the country of destination, as well as their role as brokers between employers, training providers, and other government agencies, makes them a pivotal partner in ensuring the ultimate success of labour mobility and integration.
- **Development actors** control significant financing and have extensive experience across a wide number of geographical and policy areas. They might be encouraged to align development strategies with targeted job creation, study and labour mobility aims, as well as with work to capacitate governments in specific aspects of holistic programmes.
- **International institutions** can leverage their scale and reach to encourage engagement and innovation by a wider set of partners in this area. For example, some institutions might be well placed to encourage private actors to work on the development of skills databases as a platform on which smaller actors – such as NGOs, recruiters, and businesses – can develop job-matching schemes.

- The considerable energy and specialised grassroots knowledge of **civil society** should be harnessed, though care should be taken to be realistic with expectations.
- **Refugee diasporas** and associated organisations often possess exceptional knowledge all along the migration chain: from legal and non-legal pathways to safety, access to formal and informal labour market opportunities etc. Such diasporas exist inside and outside of high income countries, and exploration of the role of diaspora communities in the south, such as Syrians in West Africa, may prove fruitful. They may be an underutilised group with respect to initiatives such as private sponsorship and labour market integration.
- The extensive reach of **religious communities, organisations and networks** can mobilise a vast network of grassroots support for an idea. Some also wield considerable political influence and are often effective incubators of "bottom-up" initiatives that subsequently reach scale.
- **Employers** can benefit from filling skills gaps and labour shortages and might be persuaded to invest more deeply in raising skill levels where the probability is high that they will reap the rewards. The launching of initiatives by LinkedIn and Adecco demonstrate the potential for experienced **private sector recruiters** to play a crucial role in promoting the labour market integration – and perhaps mobility – of refugees.
- **Educational institutions** can combine their expertise with that of employers to create programmes and pathways leading to work. As gatekeepers to many professions, they are also well-placed to work with employers in overcoming issues of skills and credentials recognition. Engagement with the umbrella national bodies can bring scale to these initiatives.
- The role of **trade unions** in protecting the rights of established workers and the new arrivals should be assessed to establish the best means through which they can be engaged as partners.
- The **media** can become valuable partners with investment in constructive relationships with journalists and an understanding of how to build stories of mutual benefit.
- **Parliamentarians** might be engaged more fully as influential partners in advocacy, along with other people of **high standing** with a mandate to or interest in engaging local constituencies.

Effective Communication
- **Ensuring clarity of message** is essential to maintaining productive partnership. A clear framing of proposed interventions, target groups (including for example, Convention refugees; others in need of international protection), identified goals, and foreseen benefits must be articulated in advance as a means of building understanding between partners and ensuring all stakeholders are on the same page.
- Where plans are made but not followed through, **trust** between partners can be undermined, as may appear to be the case between the EU and Africa, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries in their dialogue before and since the Valletta Summit. The principle extends to the resettlement and highly skilled labour migration to rich countries, which can be counterproductive as an expression of solidarity if perceived to be "cherry-picking" the most able refugees and leaving behind the most vulnerable.
- In this sense, **states' listening** to each other's concerns is important in facilitating productive dialogue. International fora should leave more space for agenda setting to middle and lower income countries to allay concerns and encourage a genuine global engagement.

- In order to maintain and build **public confidence** in new proposals, debate must take into account the concerns of publics and be sensitive to the perception in a number of countries that elite, top-down mechanisms are determining crisis response.
- Public confidence is most at risk following "shock" events, such as terrorist attacks. Shaping narratives in anticipation of such shocks may help to mitigate their effects when they do occur. Support for stories at the micro, local level may be an effective tool in this regard, and more effective in bringing the **media** onside than institutional press releases.
- The **use of technology** also has a strong role to play. Partners might encourage the development of communications approaches that take advantage of new media channels.

Understanding Motivations

- **Refugees are the principal partners** in any intervention. Aside from the prime consideration that should be afforded to their protection needs, the success of an initiative depends on refugees trusting it enough to invest their time and energy into it, rather than other (undesirable) routes such as irregular migration, irregular work, or crime.
- There is a need for other pathways to provide **certainty** and to appeal to refugees in the long-term. Refugees may shun short-term benefits if their long-term needs are better served elsewhere. This is particularly pertinent in cases where alternative pathways are intended to reduce irregular migration. Refugees must be confident that relying on official channels will bring better security in the long-term than entrusting opportunities presented by smugglers and other "bad" actors.
- There is a need for host and potential host governments to understand the **motivations and needs** of refugee populations. A refugee might prefer to move to a less prosperous – but peaceful and stable – country than to take the risks associated with moving, for example, to Europe. Investments should be made in understanding better why refugees choose to remain in countries of first asylum, particularly those who actively choose not to travel onwards (as opposed to being restricted by circumstance). This would help to reveal the extent to which temporary or permanent solutions may actually appeal, and prove sustainable.
- **Options in the region** may therefore carry more weight than many policymakers perceive.