

## **Summary of EMN Ad-Hoc Query on Resettlement Programmes (OPEN)**

In November 2015, the UK NCP launched two Ad-Hoc Queries to build on and update knowledge on resettlement practices across EU Member States (MS).

Out of the 28 MS plus Norway, 20 countries responded to the query, answering one or both sections (BE, BG, CZ, EE, FI, FR, DE, HU, IT, LV, LU, MT, NL, SI, SK, ES, SE, UK, HR, NO)<sup>1</sup>.

### **Executive Summary**

#### **1. Establishment of resettlement programmes**

- Four MS had long running official resettlement programmes established in 1980s or 1990s (FI, SE, NO, NE)
- Eight Member States (BE, BG, CZ, FR, DE, HU, IT, UK) had resettlement programmes that had been established in the previous ten years.
- Two MS (LU, ES) had also provided ad-hoc resettlement, either as their sole resettlement provision or running in conjunction with official programmes.
- Six MS had no resettlement programme as of November 2015 (MT, HR, SI, EE, LV, SK). Of these, three MS (EE, LV, SI) had created a programme but have not began resettling people, as of yet.

#### **2. Refugee quotas**

- The resettlement quotas have increased for every country that has a programme since they began. For example, the number of people resettled under Finland's established programme has increased from 750 to 1,050 over the last two years. The numbers resettled under Ad hoc programmes have similarly increased, for instance, Spain increased their quota from 80 in 2011 to 724 in 2015.

#### **3. What are your selection criteria for resettling quota refugees?**

- Resettling families or reuniting a family unit is the most common selection criteria across seven MS (BG, EE, CZ, DE, LV, LU, SI).

#### **4. What support do you provide quota refugees pre-departure?**

- Pre-departure support predominantly takes the form of cultural orientation seminars, delivered usually by IOM, together with a spectrum of state involvement. Each seminar ranges in length (from three hours to eight and a half days) and topics (from daily life, standards of living, healthcare provision to education opportunities, leisure activities and money management).

#### **5. What integration support do you provide quota refugees post-arrival?**

- Integration support is provided through mainstream services or through support for refugees, in general (FI, SE, BE, CZ, EE, IT, LI, LU, NO). This was particularly common for education, health and employment. Finland provided the most support specifically for resettled refugees (Housing, language and cultural).

---

<sup>1</sup> One country did not want their information disclosed publically.

## **6. How long after arrival is this support provided?**

- Eleven countries (BE, BG, CZ, EE, FR, FI, LV, SL, ES, NO, UK) have a time limit on the support provided after arrival ranging from six months to four years. However, most countries stated that this is not fixed and can be modified based on the level of need.

## **7. What are the key factors and barriers to successful quota refugee integration in your Member State?**

- The factors leading to successful integration and barriers often mirrored each other. For instance, one of the main facilitators of integration was language proficiency while a barrier to integration was a lack of language skills.

- Other factors that were reported to be influential in integration included; employment (access to work experience/volunteering- BE, CZ, FI, FR, DE, HU, LU, NL, ES, UK), education (schools, ability to improve on qualifications- CZ, FI, DE, HU, LV, LU, NL, NO), pre-arrival orientation (expectation management –BE, FI, DE, ES) and valuable communication between state actors and local services (matching with local businesses- BE, DE, HU, IT, NO).

### **Part 1: Resettlement Programme Figures** (see Appendix 1 for more detail)

Out of the 28 countries who were asked to review a completed table, 20 countries (BE, BG, CZ, EE, FI, FR, DE, HU, IT, LV, MT, LU, NL, SK, SI, ES, SE, UK, NO, HR) responded. Appendix 1 demonstrates the up-to-date completed table that has been reviewed by these countries.

The longest running resettlement programmes among the MS were set up in the 1980s and 1990s. These long running programmes are prominently in Scandinavian countries (FI, SE, NO) and have quite high quotas in comparison to other MS, including resettlement figures of 2,000 (SE) and 2,620 (NO) in 2015. Netherlands (2,000 as their current quota) also has had a resettlement programme for over 15 years. In contrast, the majority of other countries (BE, BG, CZ, FR, DE, HU, IT, UK) are more newly established resettlement programmes, usually transitioning from ad-hoc format to an official programme between 2004 and 2013. The figures for the numbers of people resettled under the more newly established programmes are generally lower. For example, current quotas for more recent programmes include; Bulgaria (20), Hungary (20) and Czech Republic (100), However, UK (750), Germany (1,600) and Italy (1,989) have notably higher resettlement figures for more newly established programmes.

Six countries do not have any form of resettlement programmes currently in place (EE, LV, SK, SI, MT, HR). However, three MS (SI, LV, EE) have resettlements negotiated but not yet carried out. Two further countries (LU, ES) have provided resettlement but only within ad hoc quotas. In 2015, Luxembourg took in 46 Syrian nationals coming from Jordan and in 2014, 28 Syrian nationals from Turkey.

All countries that provided figures of current, previous and ad hoc resettlement, demonstrated an increase in the numbers of people resettled since they began. This has accelerated in the last 5 years. For example, Hungary stated their quota to be ten in 2012, but increased to 20 in 2015. Finland increased its quota from 750 in 2013 to 1,050 in 2015.

Most MS with a more established and long-term resettlement plan indicated a range of nationalities that had been resettled in their country. The most reoccurring nationalities across MS were; Middle Eastern (Iraqi, Afghan, Syrian, Iranian), South East Asian (Burmese), East African (Somali, Ethiopian,

Eritrean) and South American (Colombian). Colombians were resettled in order for them to escape the guerrilla violence during the late 90s and early 00s. Accordingly, more recent programmes do not include Colombians. Ten MS reported that they resettled Syrian nationals under their resettlement programmes (BE, BG, FR, HU, IT, LU, NL, ES, SE, NO).

## **Part 2: Detail of resettlement programmes**

Within part 2, out of the 27 MS plus Norway that were asked, 17 provided details of their planned or current resettlement programme (BE, BG, CZ, EE<sup>2</sup>, FI, FR, DE, HU, IT, LV<sup>3</sup>, LU, NL, SI<sup>4</sup>, ES, SE, UK, NO). MT, HR and SK responded but could not provide any detail of projects as there was not programme in place and/or the initial programme is at a very early part of development.

### **1. What are your selection criteria on the resettlement programme?**

Out of the 17 responses, eight highlighted that all those resettled under their resettlement programme had to be recognised and/or suggested by the UNHCR (BE, EE, FR, DE, HU, LU, SE, NO).

Some responding states indicated that they preferred to resettle those in a family unit, or those for whom resettlement reunites their family unit. Seven countries cited that this is essential or preferential in the resettlement process (BG, EE, CZ, DE, LV, LU, SI). Both Slovenia and Germany indicated that family units were the only type of groups they resettle. Furthermore, Germany and Hungary consider family ties in the destination country as also important. A small proportion of countries indicated that they generally exclude individuals with severe medical needs (BG, DE, LV), however this may be overlooked if this will break up a family unit (DE). Finally, cultural compatibility and integration criteria including language skills and level of education were also cited by Italy and Latvia.

### **2. What support do you provide quota refugees pre-departure?**

All 17 countries (BE, BG, CZ, EE, FI, FR, DE, HU, IT, LV, LU, NL, ES, SE, SI, UK, NO) indicated that they provided some sort of pre-departure support for the resettled people. The two main types of support provided prior to resettlement were a form of cultural orientation/training and medical screenings.

Cultural orientation seminars were the most common support provided to the resettled group. Out of the 17 countries that had active resettlement programmes, 13 indicated that they provided cultural orientation prior to resettlement (BG, BE, CZ, FI, FR, DE, HU, IT, LV, NL, SE, UK, NO). The length of this training varied from one day (UK), 20 intense hours (NO), three days (FI), 28 hours over five days (DE) to three weeks of four days training (NE), depending on the country. This included information on daily life, standards of living, health and education as well as opportunities to meet previously resettled persons to hear their experiences. Seven countries (FI, FR, HU, LU, ES, NO, NL) stated that they carried out medical screenings and 'fit to travel' health examinations as part of their resettlement support.

The IOM played a role in helping to provide support in ten out of the 17 countries (BG, CZ, FI, DE, HU, LU, SV, ES, UK, NL). This can be in several forms; being commissioned to provide all support outlined (IT, LU, SV, ES) or specific types of support, for example, medical examinations (FI, HU), Logistics (BG), Orientation Programmes (DE), and Travel and Visas (UK).

---

<sup>2</sup> Estonia is at the negotiation stages of implementing their resettlement plan.

<sup>3</sup> Latvia is at the negotiation stages of implementing their resettlement plan.

<sup>4</sup> Slovenia is at the negotiation stages of implementing their resettlement plan.

UNHCR carries out pre-departure support in Norway.

### **3. What integration support do you provide quota refugees post-arrival?**

Support provision offered by the 17 countries with active or planned resettlement programmes was often not provided specifically for resettled people, but provided through mainstream services (i.e. those that can be accessed by the general population), or through services that were targeted at refugees or recipients of international protection generally. The extent to which support was provided specifically to resettled persons varied by MS and for different areas of support.

In the area of health, in addition to mainstream provision, some member states reported that they offered services specifically targeted at resettled refugees. For example, Finland offered enhanced screening on arrival, the UK and Hungary gave post-arrival counselling, if necessary. Italy provided health professionals in its reception centres while Spain integrated its mental health support within its social adaptation programme for resettled persons.

Language provision was usually tailored to refugees (BG, CZ, EE, FR, IT, LT, NO) or specifically resettled persons (HU, LU, NL, SV, ES). The UK, Sweden and Finland also provide language provision through mainstream language services, depending on the needs of the resettled individual. Employment integration included CV drafting, vocational training, job search support and preparation for interviews. These could be offered through services tailored to refugees through mainstream integration schemes (BG, CZ, EE, IT, NL) or specifically to resettled groups (FR, HU, NL, UK, NO). Part of this provision could include familiarising resettled groups with the host country job market (HU, LV). Only Finland, Germany, Sweden and Luxembourg indicated that they offered their support primarily through mainstream services. Czech Republic and Slovenia use specific integration asylum centres to help facilitate individuals finding their accommodation over a period of time. The length of time any financial housing support or accommodation is provided varies from 12 months (UK, BE, SI), 18 months (CZ) or two years (EE). Two countries offered cultural courses (Norway offered 50 hours, Latvia and Spain offered an opportunity for each individual attend a workshop. Netherlands provided cultural orientation mixed with language courses.

The caseworker or support worker model was reported as being used by seven countries (EE, FR, HU, LV, SV, ES, UK) in various different ways. In a few countries their remit was limited to particular areas such as supporting with household management tasks (EE) or employment and cultural integration (FR). All other countries which offered such support, however, used caseworkers and specialists to support individuals across almost all aspects of their integration.

### **4. For how long after arrival is this support provided?**

Eleven out of seventeen countries with active or planned resettlement programmes imposed time limits on the length of provision provided (BE, BG, CZ, EE, FR, FI, LV, SL, ES, NO, UK) while six (CZ, HU, FI, LU, NL, SE) indicated they offered indefinite provision until individuals could cope with everyday life or achieved economic independence.

Where time limits were imposed, the length of time that support was provided varied from a minimum of six months (IT) to potentially over four years (FI, ES). Of the 11 countries with time limits, four varied the length of their provision, extending it based on need (BL, EE, IT, UK).

## **5. What are the key factors associated with successful quota refugee integration in your Member State? <sup>5</sup>**

The most frequently cited factor for successful quota refugee integration was individuals accessing the labour market and gaining employment. This was mentioned by eight countries (CZ, FR, DE, HU, LT, LU, UK, NO). The ability to provide individuals with future career opportunities was deemed central to the integration process. Norway specifically mentions the successes of programmes matching with suitable local businesses to facilitate this. Furthermore learning the national language, mentioned by six countries (CZ, FR, DE, HU, LV, LU), was also identified as useful to the integration process.

The successes of pre-orientation arrival and the value of preparation was mentioned by five countries (BE, FI, FR, ES, NO). This was particularly important as providing accurate and clear information about resettlement managed expectations and informed resettlement decisions (highlighted by BE and ES).

Forming relationships with NGOs and local organisations was identified as a useful way to improve the integration process. Identified by six countries (BE, FR, HU, IT, UK, NO), these relationships allowed for the exchange of knowledge and efficient practices between the programme and experienced NGOs. By establishing useful contacts with local services and people in communities can ensure integration is not slowed down and integration support maintains with the individual and their movements. Hungary emphasises the success of resettling Syrian nationals within the Budapest area, in which the Syrian diaspora resides and such local services are readily available.

The success of temporary reception facilities was mentioned by two countries (BE and IT). The ability to carry out vulnerability assessments and administrative tasks was useful to the integration process. Both Belgium and Italy mention that this time is used as an opportunity to inform local services of resettled individuals, as well as direct the group to the local centres. This referral ensures the group have access to services to continue the integration process on their own.

## **6. What are the key barriers to successful quota refugee integration in your Member State?**

In line with factors that lead to successful integration, the most common barriers identified as hindering integration were a lack of language proficiency (CZ, DE, HU, LV, ES) and difficulty in accessing employment which was identified by five countries (FI, DE, HU, LV, ES, UK).

Three countries (DE, ES, LV) cited an overall low level in education as making it harder for individuals to integrate. The presence of illiteracy or a poor educational background with no qualifications can hinder integration also.

The arrangement of childcare acting as a barrier was identified by the UK and Spain. In particular, gender equality within integration was difficult to achieve as child care roles was usually left to the women in the families. This then showed to be restrictive in their ability to engage in employment/volunteering and generally feeling safe within their local community.

Furthermore, Hungary highlighted difficulty when lack of certification of previous qualifications achieved in their home country forces resettled groups to enter employment based on

---

<sup>5</sup> For questions 5 & 6 SE, EE, BG & SI joined MT, HR, SK in not being able to respond as the programme had yet to be carried out or evaluated.

competencies rather than qualifications, or education. Also, competition within the labour market, particularly in more deprived areas, has been identified to create very small proportions of individuals in the labour market within the UK.

Another common barrier were issues with organising local organisations; making local contacts across the country to implement integration strategies, identified by five countries (BG, IT, LU, NO, NL). These countries have identified that problems with internal cooperation and national logistics can slow down integration processes. Resettled persons previous experience of trauma and possible mental health issues were identified as a barrier towards their ability to integrate (NL, FR, ES). Finally, other noteworthy, less common barriers include being perceived as a transitional country in which resettled persons will further migrate (HU) and cultural differences (ES). Luxembourg was the only country to identify public perception of resettlement as a barrier. They particularly highlighted that these perceptions arose from; the populism of social networks, the misunderstanding and criticism of resettled groups, and the fear of the Other.

**Appendix 1- Table demonstrating the reviewed and up-to-date resettlement programme figures  
(Countries are grouped in their resettlement type categories)**

Country <sup>6</sup>	Resettlement Programme (ongoing and/or previous) (Y/N)	Year quota programme started (please state start and finish year if ad hoc scheme)	Number of quota refugees resettled a year (please state current quota, previous quotas and ad hoc quotas)	Nationalities resettled (and specific ethnicity/religion if relevant)
Finland	Y	1985	<b>Current Quota:</b> 2014-15- 1,050 <b>Previous Quota:</b> 2001-2013- 750	Afghan, Iraqi, Iranian, Somali, Congolese, Sudanese, Burmese
Sweden	Y	1950	<b>Current Quota:</b> 2014-2015: 1,900	Syrians, Palestinians (from Syria), Lebanese, Iraqi, Egyptian, Jordanians, Somali (in Kenya), Afghan (in Iran) Congolese (in Uganda)
Netherlands	Y	1983	<b>Current Quota:</b> 2012-2015: 2000 <sup>7</sup>	Eritrean, Congolese, Ethiopian, Iraqi, Burmese, Colombian, Bhutanese, , Syrian
Norway	Y	1980s, ad hoc from 1945	Current Quota: 2015: 2,620 2014: 1620 Previous Quota: 2009-2013: 1,120	Afghan, Somali, Eritrean, Congolese, Colombian, Iranian, Burmese, Bhutanese, Iraqi, Syrian
Belgium	Y	2013 Ad hoc: 2009 and 2011	<b>Current quota</b> 2016-2017: 1,100 <b>Previous quotas</b> 2015: 300 2013 – 2014: 100 <b>Ad hoc quotas</b> 2011: 25 2009: 47	Syrian, Congolese, Burundian, Eritrean, Iraqi, Palestinian
Bulgaria	Y	1 year pilot: 2013-2014	<b>Previous Quota:</b> 2013-2014: 20	Syrian
Czech Republic	Y	2008	<b>Current Quota:</b> 2014-2015: 100 <b>Previous Quota:</b>	Burmese (Chin, Kachin, Tamil, Karen, Tavoyan), Afghan, Russian (Chechen), Iranian, Uzbek

<sup>7</sup> The Dutch authorities do not determine quota annually, but for a four-year' cycle. The authorities are currently debating the quota for the next four years, but we cannot deliver these figures yet.

			2012: 25	
<b>France</b>	Y	2008 Ad hoc program since 2014 (Syrian nationals)	<b>Current Quota:</b> 2008- 2015- 1,0740 <b>Ad hoc quota:</b> 800	<b>Current Quota:</b> Afghan, Somali, Palestinian, Congolese, Ethiopian and other nationalities <b>Ad hoc program :</b> Syrian and Palestinian nationals from Syria
<b>Germany</b>	Y	2012, ad hoc before this time	<b>Current Quota:</b> 2016-2017: 1.600 <b>Previous Quota:</b> 2015: 500, 2014: 300	Sudanese; Sri Lankan, Afghan, Chinese, Stateless, Somali, Eritrean, Ethiopian, Iraqi, Iranian
<b>Hungary</b>	Y	2012	<b>Current Quota:</b> 2015- 20 <b>Previous Quota:</b> 2014- 20 2013: 10 2012: 10	Syrian
<b>Italy</b>	Y	2007-2009 2015-2017	2015-2017: 1.989 2009: 173	Iraqi, Palestinian Syrian, Eritrean
<b>UK</b>	Y	2004	<b>Current quota</b> 2009 – 2015: 750 <b>Previous quotas</b> 2004 – 2008: 500	Sudanese, Somalis, Bhutanese, Eritrean, Ethiopian, Iraqi Burmese (Karen and Rohingya), Palestinian, Liberian, Mauritanian, Sierra Leonean, Congolese
<b>Spain</b>	Y	ad hoc from 1999 2011 (implemented in 2012), 2012 and 2013 (implemented in 2013 and 2014) 2014 and 2015 (to be implemented in 2016)	<b>Current Quota:</b> 2015: 724 <b>Previous Quota:</b> 2014: 130 2013: 100 2012: 30 2011: 80	Eritrean, Sudanese, Somali, Syrian
<b>Luxembourg</b>	N.		<b>Ad Hoc Quota:</b> 2015: 46 refugees were resettled. 2014: 28 refugees were resettled.	Syrian  Iraqi (Muslim and Christian)

			2013: Government council decision (13.09.2013) to resettle 60 Syrian refugees: 2009: 20	
Latvia	N			
Malta	N			
Estonia	N			
Croatia	N			
Slovak Republic	N			
Slovenia	N			
Lithuania	This EMN NCP has provided a response to the requesting EMN NCP. However, they have requested that it is not disseminated further.			
Greece*	N			
Cyprus*	N			
Ireland*	Y	1999	<b>Current Quota:</b> 2015 – 100 <b>Previous Quota:</b> 2014 - 90	Congolese (Bembe), Sudanese, Burmese (Karen), (Rohingya, Bembe)
Denmark*	Y	1979	<b>Current Quota:</b> 500	Bhutanese, Congolese, Colombian, Afghan, Somali, Burmese
Poland*	N			
Portugal*	Y	2007, ad hoc from 2006	<b>Current Quota:</b> 2014-15: 45 <b>Previous Quota:</b> 2007- 2013: 30	Sudanese, Eritrean, Iraqi, Senegalese, Congolese, Afghan, Somali, Ugandan, Ethiopian, Iranian
Romania*	Y	2008	<b>Current Quota:</b> 2014-15: 40	Iraqi, Burmese (Kachin)
Austria*	Y	2013 Ad hoc: 2010-2012	<b>Current quota</b> 2014-2015: 1000 <b>Previous quotas</b> 2013: 500 <b>Ad hoc quota</b> 2010: 31	Syrian, Iraqi (Christians)

**\*Sources Used:**

**Main Source:** <http://www.resettlement.eu/>

**Other:** <http://www.resettlement.eu/sites/icmc.ttp.eu/files/UNHCR%20EU%20Resettlement%20Fact%20Sheet%2024.07.14.pdf>

<http://www.migrationpolicycentre.eu/docs/Know-Reset-RR-2013-03.pdf>