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Foreword

This December, stakeholders from around the world, including refugees, will gather both virtually and in person, for a High-Level Crucial Meeting – an event designed to reinvigorate the Global Compact on Refugees to take stock of progress towards advancing burden- and responsibility-sharing to increase support, self-reliance, and access to solutions for refugees.

To pave the way for this important milestone, I am pleased to share the first indicator report for the Global Compact on Refugees. This report contributes to the evidence base needed to guide the discussions in December. It charts how far the international community has come since the development and implementation of the compact and how far we need to go in realizing its vision. This will also inform the development of new contributions for the next Global Refugee Forum in 2023.

This report comes at an important time. In a world where displacement has continued to grow, durable solutions are in short supply, and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic is being felt acutely in countries that host the largest populations of refugees, the message that emerges from data is clear. While much has been achieved, responsibility-sharing must be stepped up to meet the challenges we are facing – both now and in the years to come, not least as we prepare for the medium to long-term impacts of the pandemic.

The Global Compact on Refugees, with the multi-stakeholder approach and practical arrangements that it provides, is now more crucial than ever.

Filippo Grandi
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
Introduction

On 17 December 2018, the General Assembly of the United Nations (UN) adopted the Global Compact on Refugees (GCR), whereby the international community committed to do its utmost to mobilize support for the achievement of its four objectives, on an equal footing, through more predictable and equitable burden- and responsibility-sharing, and (4) enhance refugee self-reliance. (5) improve access to third country solutions; and (6) support conditions in countries of origin for return in safety and dignity.

Indicators and data are tools to inform burden- and responsibility-sharing arrangements. The GCR-specific indicator framework, against these objectives, through indicators. In July 2019, UNHCR, after extensive multi-stakeholder consultations, published the GCR indicator framework. It is comprised of 15 indicators identified under eight areas linked to the four GCR objectives. To develop the GCR indicator report, the UNHCR indicator framework and the agreed indicator framework in order to measure and monitor progress towards the GCR objectives and their cross-cutting principle of burden- and responsibility-sharing.

This report, like the framework of indicators on which it relies, makes no claim to being comprehensive. It is but one tool to inform periodic stocktaking of GCR progress, and is complemented, for example, by the tracking of pledges announced at the Global Refugee Forum and the ICPs and the process to measure the impact of hosting, protecting, and assisting refugees.

The report seeks to apply and promote the use of quality, comparable, and timely data based on international statistical standards and practices. The collection of data for the report is a human right, and the process of doing so must be inclusive. National face-to-face surveys could not take place as planned, for example. Populating the GCR indicator framework revealed important data gaps.

The best possible solutions for the care and protection of refugees and other displaced people, to be effective at a global level, require a shared understanding of the needs of the displaced and the resources available to provide support.

The current report, like the framework of indicators on which it relies, makes no claim to being comprehensive. It is but one tool to inform periodic stocktaking of GCR progress, and is complemented, for example, by the tracking of pledges announced at the Global Refugee Forum and the ICPs and the process to measure the impact of hosting, protecting, and assisting refugees. The report seeks to apply and promote the use of quality, comparable, and timely data based on international statistical standards and practices. The collection of data for the report is a human right, and the process of doing so must be inclusive. National face-to-face surveys could not take place as planned, for example. Populating the GCR indicator framework revealed important data gaps.

The best possible solutions for the care and protection of refugees and other displaced people, to be effective at a global level, require a shared understanding of the needs of the displaced and the resources available to provide support.
Key findings and recommendations

1. Tangible progress towards the GCR objectives. The report provides evidence of tangible progress, including increased funding in bilateral ODA to refugee-hosting countries with low- and middle-income economies. National education systems and local integration have continued to grow since 2016, the year of the adoption of the New York Declaration. By the end of 2020, nine out of ten refugees continued to be hosted in countries with developing economies.

2. New increases in the scale of the burden and responsibility call for more equitable and predictable sharing. The report shows that the scale of the burden and responsibility to provide protection for refugees and their host communities has continued to grow since 2016. The number of refugees crossing into countries has almost doubled since 2016, reaching historically low levels. At the end of 2020, 1.6 million refugees lived in a protracted situation: four million more than in 2016. In addition, although data are scarce, there is evidence that the resilience and resiliency of both refugees and host communities have deteriorated in the context of the pandemic.

3. Several trends consistent with GCR objectives need to be addressed. Beyond the tangible progress underlined by the data, some GCR indicators also show some trends that are inconsistent with the GCR objectives. Some negative trends began before the pandemic, which has only amplified them. In particular, the annual number of refugees accessing durable solutions (settlement, voluntary repatriation, and local integration) has continued to decline since 2016, reaching historically low levels. At the end of 2020, 1.6 million refugees lived in a protracted situation: four million more than in 2016. In addition, although data are scarce, there is evidence that the resilience and resiliency of both refugees and host communities have deteriorated in the context of the pandemic.

4. Increasing the security of refugee situations in countries with lower income economies increased, and in-donor refugee costs decreased. Based on available evidence, it appears that there was a general upward trend in bilateral ODA to refugee-hosting countries with low- and middle-income economies between 2016 and 2018. During the same period, donors’ domestic spending for hosting refugees (in-donor refugee costs) steadily declined after a peak in 2015, owing to fewer arrivals of asylum-seekers and refugees in donor countries and new rules limiting the definition of what can be included in the calculation of in-donor refugee costs.

5. Accelerating progress towards inclusive education is both necessary and doable. Although a large share of countries has legislation and policies granting explicit access for refugees to national education systems on par with nationals – particularly at the primary level – important practical barriers remain. At the secondary level, many barriers – most notably costs – are severely hampering access. However, recent research led by the World Bank and UNHCR on the costing of education for refugees shows that this objective is doable with the collective effort of the international community and host governments.

6. Need for further targeted support to reduce poverty and mitigate the impact of the pandemic on refugees and host communities. Refugee poverty is a reality in many contexts. Continued effort to promote inclusion, as well as targeted support to address specific vulnerabilities, are needed to promote self-reliance and address poverty. Policies to enhance freedom of movement, the right to work, property rights, and other aspects of the regulatory and institutional environment are especially important where refugees are in unsatisfactory or economically dependent situations. Building on progress achieved through the International Development Association’s investments in host communities and refugees (IDAB and IDAS), the Refugee Policy Review Framework, developed by the World Bank in close consultation with UNHCR and others, aims to identify and support institutional reform processes further. A growing body of evidence shows that mitigating the long-term socio-economic impacts of displacement and addressing poverty require targeted health (including mental health), educational and other basic services, particularly for women and children.
GCR Trends at a Glance

+3.5 million refugees
under UNHCR’s mandate at the end of 2020

NEARLY
1 OUT OF 5
refugees lives in Turkey

9 IN 10
refugees continue to
be hosted in countries
with developing economies

16 million
refugees
By the end of 2020, there were
4 MILLION MORE REFUGEES
in protracted situations than in 2016.

WHILE THERE IS
1 REFUGEE FOR EVERY 400
PEOPLE IN THE WORLD,
LEBANON HAS
1 FOR EVERY 8.

1 in 100
while more refugees received
solutions between 2016 and
2020 than in the previous 5 years, only 1 in 100 found a
durable solution in 2020.

CHAPTER 2
GCR Trends at a Glance

**OBJECTIVE 2: ENHANCE REFUGEE SELF-RELIANCE**

- **THREE-QUARTERS** of refugees have access to key attributes of decent work.
- **CLOSER TO TWO-THIRDS** of refugees enjoy freedom of movement under the law.

**MUCH FEWER REFUGEES ENJOY ACCESS TO DECENT WORK AND FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT IN PRACTICE** - a situation aggravated by the COVID-19 pandemic.

**POVERTY**

Following two decades of progress, global poverty is projected to rise again in 2020 and 2021 with the pandemic-related economic downturn, pushing some

- **100 million or MORE PEOPLE** into extreme poverty, including many refugees.

**EDUCATION**

Refugees can access primary education on the same terms as nationals in three-quarters of surveyed countries and secondary education in two-thirds of surveyed countries.

- **Almost HALF OF REFUGEE STUDENTS** are out of school.
- **68%** Gross enrollment rates of refugee children at the Primary Level.
- **34%** Gross enrollment rates of refugee children at the Secondary Level.

**OBJECTIVE 3: EXPAND ACCESS TO THIRD COUNTRY SOLUTIONS**

- **1.4 million** Between 2016 and 2020, close to 1.4 million refugees accessed third country solutions - 286,900 more than during the five previous years.

**4:1** Assistance provided by humanitarian agencies, development partners, and governments has been shown to mitigate or reduce exposure to poverty among refugees.

**OBJECTIVE 4: SUPPORT CONDITIONS IN COUNTRIES OF ORIGIN FOR RETURN IN SAFETY AND DIGNITY**

- **Some 2.0 million REFUGEES HAVE RETURNED TO THEIR COUNTRY OF ORIGIN** since 2016 compared to 1.8 million between 2011 and 2015. Three quarters of the solutions accessed by refugees were returns. In 2020, only one per cent of refugees was able to return to their country of origin compared to three per cent in 2016.

**COUNTRIES OF ORIGIN HAVE FEWER DONORS** than countries of asylum.

QDA provided in support of refugee returns in countries of origin decreased from USD 764 million in 2018 to USD 584 million in 2019.

- Data available for a few countries show big differences in access to civil documentation for refugee returnees.

- The number of countries receiving UNHCR resettlement submissions declined from 35 in 2016 to 25 in 2020.

- **<1%** The percentage of the world’s refugee population with access to third-country solutions declined from 2% in 2016 to less than 1% in 2020.

- In 2021, **1.4 MILLION REFUGEES ARE IN NEED OF URGENT RESETTLEMENT** - an increase of 25% from 2016.
The GCR calls for more equitable sharing of the burden and responsibility for hosting and supporting the world’s refugees, while taking into account varying contributions and the differing capacities and resources among States. This chapter provides an overview of the scale of the burden and responsibility, focusing on the period since the adoption of the New York Declaration in 2016, which led to the adoption of the GCR in 2018.

Globally, the scale of the burden and responsibility has continued to grow since 2016

By the end of 2020, the total number of refugees was estimated at 26.4 million, including 20.7 million refugees under UNHCR’s mandate and 5.7 million Palestine refugees under UNRWA’s mandate (Figure 1). There were 3.5 million (~20%) more refugees under UNHCR’s mandate in 2020 than in the year of the adoption of the New York Declaration. The increase is 7.3 million (~43%) if the Venezuelans displaced abroad are added.

The growth of the burden and responsibility has slowed since 2018

There was a relative reduction in annual refugee numbers in 2020. The slowdown observed in 2020 is partially due to a series of travel restrictions or closures of borders and asylum institutions in the face of the COVID-19 pandemic, which prevented people seeking to flee persecution, conflict, and human rights violations from accessing asylum. Some 12 million individual asylum applications were registered in 2020, one million fewer than in 2019.

![Graph showing the scale of refugees and asylum seekers from 2010 to 2020](image)

**Figure 1:** Refugees, Venezuelans displaced abroad and asylum-seekers, 2010 – 2020 (end year)
Apart from a decrease in the Middle East and North Africa, all regions hosted more refugees in 2020 than in 2016. Between 2016 and 2020, the number of refugees hosted (Figure 2) increased in the East and Horn of Africa and Great Lakes region (+33%), Southern Africa (+5%), West and Central Africa (+25%), and the Americas (+10%; refugees; and +600% when adding Venezuelans displaced abroad), Asia and the Pacific (+1%), and in Europe (-32%, excluding Turkey). Only the Middle East and North Africa region hosted slightly fewer refugees in 2020 compared to 2016 (+4%).

Nine out of ten refugees continue to be hosted in countries with developing economies. By the end of 2020, 86% of people displaced across borders lived in countries with developing economies.1 According to the World Bank’s country-income classification, low-income countries (e.g., Uganda, Sudan, and Ethiopia), accounting for less than one per cent of the world’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP), host 18% per cent of the world’s people displaced across border (Figure 3).2 Countries with high-income economies host 17% per cent, while they account for 63 per cent of global GDP.3 Nearly two-thirds of these displaced across borders (65%) lived in middle-income countries, including upper-middle-income countries (e.g., Turkey, Colombia, and Lebanon) and lower-middle-income countries (e.g., Pakistan, Bangladesh, and the Islamic Republic of Iran). Compared to 2016, the share of refugees hosted by countries with higher income economies increased slightly (by three percentage points for high-income countries and one percentage point for upper-middle-income countries).4

Figure 3. Number of refugees and Venezuelans displaced abroad by region, 2016 and 2020 (end-year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>3,079,000</td>
<td>3,978,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East and Horn of Africa and Great Lakes</td>
<td>3,168,000</td>
<td>4,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe excluding Turkey</td>
<td>3,179,000</td>
<td>4,330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East and North Africa</td>
<td>1,360,000</td>
<td>1,140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America / Latin America</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Caribbean</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West and Central Africa</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 shows the 20 countries hosting the largest number of refugees in 2016 and 2020, accounting for more than three-quarters of the world’s refugees.5 Sixteen countries remain in both the 2016 and 2020 lists. New countries appearing in 2020 are Colombia, Peru, Ecuador, and Chile, for hosting large numbers of Venezuelans displaced abroad. In terms of income levels, more than three-quarters

Figure 4. Top 20 countries hosting refugees and Venezuelans displaced abroad, in absolute terms, end 2016 and end 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Hosting people displaced across borders by countries’ income level (end-year), 2010-2020

* Data are not comparable across years due to differences in statistical and data collection methods.
of the top 20 hosting countries are low- or middle-income economies. Three countries with high-income economies, Germany, France, and the United States of America, were in the top 20 in both 2016 and 2020. They were joined by another high-income country, Chile, in 2020. Of the top 10 hosting countries in 2016, eight had more refugees in 2020 (Turkey, Pakistan, Uganda, Ethiopia, Germany, Jordan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Kenya). Lebanon and the Islamic Republic of Iran had fewer refugees in 2020. Nearly one in five refugees from these two countries had resettled to other countries during the period. 

Ten countries are among the top 20 refugee-hosting countries in both absolute and relative terms, and almost all are low- or middle-income countries.

Comparing the size of the refugee population with that of the host country provides a complementary measure of the impact of hosting refugees and the scale of the burden. Figure 5 shows the top 20 host countries in relative terms, i.e., the number of refugees per 1,000 inhabitants, in 2016 and 2020. In 2016, the countries in the top 20 hosted, both in absolute and relative terms, were Lebanon, Jordan, Turkey, Chad, South Sudan, Uganda, Cameroon, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Sudan, and Kenya. In 2020, Lebanon, Jordan, Turkey, Colombia, Uganda, Chad, Ecuador, Chile, Sudan, and Cameroon appeared on both lists in absolute and relative terms. The only high-income country was Chile.12

Figure 5: Top 20 countries hosting refugees and Venezuela displaced abroad per 1,000 host country inhabitants, end 2016 and end 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Congo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Refugee-hosting, Worldwide and Lebanon, 2020

While there is one refugee for every 400 people in the world, Lebanon has one for every eight.

Despite a decrease during the period, the number of refugees per 1,000 inhabitants remains high by international comparison in Lebanon, with 151 in 2016 and 128 in 2020. In 2020, this was still equivalent to one refugee per eight inhabitants.13

Meanwhile, the influx of Venezuelan refugees abroad in recent years, Arabia recorded an increase with 159 refugees per 1,000 inhabitants in 2020. In contrast, worldwide, there is one refugee for every 400 people (Figure 6).
16 million refugees are in protracted situations, 4 million more than in 2016

Based on UNHCR’s definition of a protracted refugee situation, where 25,000 or more refugees from the same nationality have been in exile for at least five consecutive years in a given host country, it is estimated that some 15.7 million refugees (76%) were in a protracted situation at the end of 2020.11 Compared to 2016, when 69 per cent of all refugees were in protracted situations, there were 4.1 million more in 2020. There were nine more protracted situations in 2020 (49) than in 2016 (40).

One in two refugees is a woman or girl, a constant over the reporting period, requiring commensurate gender-based responses

In 2020, 11.5 million of all people displaced across borders are estimated to be women or girls (47%).12 Some 41 per cent of refugees and Venezuelans displaced abroad were children, or 10.1 million at the end of 2020.13 Several million refugees are likely to have disabilities or other characteristics requiring specific responses, although available data do not currently allow for the establishment of further global aggregates.14 The need for measures to ensure protection and livelihoods for women, girls, boys, persons with disabilities, older persons, and other groups at risk has intensified with the COVID-19 pandemic.

More refugees found a solution between 2016 and 2020 than in the previous five years

The three durable solutions are voluntary repatriation, resettlement, and local integration. If more refugees return voluntarily in conditions of safety and dignity to their country of origin, access third country solutions, or integrate locally, then the overall scale of the burden and responsibility decreases. As data about the local integration of refugees remain elusive, naturalization – the legal act or process by which a non-citizen in a country may acquire citizenship or nationality of that country – is used as a proxy measure of local integration.15 Since 2016, 2.8 million refugees have found a solution (Figure 7). This was 435,000 more (+15%) than in the previous five years (2014-2019).

In 2020, only one refugee in 100 found a solution, and this cannot only be attributed to the pandemic

A significant factor in the decline in solutions in 2020 relates to the COVID-19 pandemic response, including measures that have been found to be contrary to international law, the right to protection from refoulement, and the spirit of the GCR.16 At the end of 2020, the rate of refugees who found a solution was 15 per cent, the lowest rate over the last 20 years. The number of persons resettled with UNHCR assistance in 2020 was 82 per cent lower than in 2016. The number of returns declined by 55 per cent. The pandemic has, however, exacerbated a downward trend that started earlier. In 2019, just before the pandemic, the rate of refugees finding a solution was only moderately higher (24%). The rate has continued to decline since its relative peak in 2016 (46%).

Voluntary return accounted for 75 per cent of solutions

From 2016 to 2020, voluntary returns accounted for almost seven out of 10.5 million of all solutions, followed by resettlement (16%), and naturalization (9%). The most significant increase happened during the last five years in terms of durable solutions.17 Their cumulative number of 96,000 between 2015 and 2019 contrasts with the 250,000 naturalizations recorded over the following five years (+157%). Bearing in mind data limitations, regional disaggregation of the naturalizations shows that their number was highest in Europe, with 154,000, followed by the Americas at 82,000, West and Central Africa at 50,000, and Asia and the Pacific, Southern Africa, and the East and Horn of Africa and Great Lakes region with less than 10,000 between 2016 and 2020.18 There were 253,000 more returns (+14%) and 35,000 more refugees resettled (+4%) over the same two periods.

Figure 7: Refugees accessing durable solutions, 2010-2020
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4.1 Global Compact on Refugees

Objective 1: Ease pressures on host countries

While contributions to burden- and responsibility-sharing by the international community as a whole go beyond funding, the mobilisation of timely, predictable, adequate and sustainable public and private funding is key to the successful implementation of the global compact.

GCR, para. 32
The OECD survey asked donors to distinguish bilateral ODA to refugee situations in countries of asylum (GCR indicator 11.4%) and ODA for refugee returnees in the country of origin (GCR indicator 41.8%). Between 2018 and 2019, bilateral ODA provided to countries of asylum with lower incomes increased by 17 per cent. They accounted for 40 per cent of the total bilateral ODA, equivalent to USD 13.8 billion, over the two years. Unmet needs in core contributions to multilateral organizations, funding provided by multilateral development banks, and "in-donor refugee costs" not included in the above figures, are reported separately in this chapter.

Five out of seven regions received more bilateral ODA to refugee situations in 2019

All but two regions received more bilateral ODA in 2019 than in 2018 (Figure 9). While ODA decreased by 27 per cent in West and Central Africa and nine per cent in the Middle East and North Africa, it grew in Southern Asia (3%) and the Pacific.

![Figure 9: Regional distribution of bilateral ODA to refugee situations, 2018-2019 (OECD Financing for Refugee Situations Survey 2020, gross disbursement, 2019 constant prices)](image)

(55%), the East and Horn of Africa and Great Lakes region (19%), the Americas (10%), and Europe (17%), including Turkey. Both in 2018 and 2019, the Middle East and North Africa region nonetheless received the largest portion of bilateral ODA to refugee situations.107

Countries hosting the most refugees are generally among the largest recipients of ODA to refugee situations, with Turkey being the largest recipient.

From 2018 to 2019, Turkey, which hosts the largest number of refugees worldwide, received cumulatively USD 1.8 billion or eight per cent of total ODA to refugee situations. Lebanon and Jordan both received USD 1.6 billion (7%) over the two-year period.108 ODA to the top 20 recipients (Figure 10) accounted for around 60 per cent of total ODA to refugee situations captured by the survey.

Although ODA, for the most part, was provided to the contexts where it was most needed, there are refugee situations that did not receive commensurate assistance from the donor community. For example, countries like Cameroon, Colombia, Ecuador, Pakistan, Peru, and the Islamic Republic of Iran were not included in the list of top ODA recipients, even though they were among the top hosting countries (refugees and Venezuelans displaced abroad), in absolute terms, at the end of 2020.109

After a peak in 2016, in-donor refugee costs steadily decreased

ODA disbursement from Development Assistance Committee (DAC) donors for the first 12 months of resettlement of refugees hosted by OECD countries are commonly referred to as "in-donor refugee costs." A significant and steady arrival of refugees in OECD countries, particularly in Europe, in-donor refugee
costs of DAC countries peaked in 2018 (Figure 11), reaching USD 16.8 billion (in 2019 constant prices). Since then, these costs have continued to decline, coinciding with the arrival of fewer refugees in developed countries and new rules narrowing the definition of what can be classified as “in-donor refugee costs.” Between 2018 and 2019, these expenditures declined by USD 0.88 billion (-8%). In 2020, they amounted to USD 8.7 billion, namely about half (-48%) of their value in 2018.

Adding in-donor refugee costs to bilateral ODA to refugee situations provided to countries with low- and middle-income economies, the total volume of ODA amounted to USD 21.4 billion in 2018 and USD 21.5 billion in 2019. This corresponds to a 0.4 per cent increase.

Trend analysis between 2015 and 2019 is difficult due to the lack of comparable data between the 2018 and 2019 OECD surveys on financing to refugee situations. Notwithstanding these limitations, based on available data, there was an overall decline in in-donor refugee costs between 2016 and 2019 (-42% or USD 71 billion) and an increase in ODA to refugee situations in low- and middle-income countries (approximately +10% or USD 11 billion).

Figure 11: In-donor refugee costs, 2010-2020, OECD data, 2019 constant prices

More donors usually means ‘more funding’

To enhance burden- and responsibility-sharing, the GCF calls for broadening the support base, including the number and type of donors. The data collected via the 2020 OECD survey does not allow for comparisons to be drawn about the evolution of numbers of donors. The data does not tell which donors are ‘in-donor’ or bilateral and donors per recipient. Although “more donors” does not necessarily mean “more funds,” Figure 12 shows that the top recipients of ODA are generally also in the list of countries with the higher numbers of donors.

Figure 12: Number of donors of bilateral ODA to refugee situations, 2019 (OECD Financing for Refugee Situations Survey 2020)

ODA to refugee situations continues to focus heavily on humanitarian assistance

The nine per cent increase in bilateral ODA to refugee situations in 2018 and 2019 was driven by a surge in humanitarian aid (+29%). During the period, development assistance decreased by 15 per cent. As a result, 74 per cent of bilateral ODA going to refugee situations was in the form of humanitarian assistance in 2019 (a rise of 7 percentage points compared to 2018).
The proportion of ODA to refugee situations in development aid is higher in Africa

The distribution of humanitarian and development assistance to refugee situations varies across regions (Figure 13). In 2019, humanitarian assistance comprised 85 per cent of ODA in Europe, and in West and Central Africa (53%), Middle East and North Africa (62%), East and Horn of Africa and Great Lakes (52%), Asia and the Pacific (78%), the Americas (73%), and Southern Africa (74%). Between 2018 and 2019, the most notable changes were in West and Central Africa, where the share of humanitarian assistance climbed from 49 to 63 per cent, and in Europe where the share of humanitarian assistance was 49 per cent in 2018 and 85 per cent in 2019. This increase was mainly due to the share of humanitarian assistance received by Turkey, which rose from 51 per cent in 2018 to 90 per cent in 2019.

While some donors continued to focus on short-term funding, others significantly increased their share of longer-term assistance

Among the donors that provided the information in the OECD survey, almost half allocated between 50 and 100 per cent of their bilateral ODA to refugee situations in projects and programmes with associated durations of one year or less.12 While short-term funding remains significant among donors, some donors are providing sizeable shares of their assistance for longer-term projects, enhancing the predictability of burden- and responsibility-sharing. For example, the proportion of ODA to refugee situations with durations 12-24 months and five years or more increased to 96 per cent for Germany, 91 per cent for Sweden, and 84 per cent for Poland in 2019.

While important improvements in terms of data comparability are still necessary, these data provide useful benchmarks in relation to the GCR’s commitment to improve the predictability of burden- and responsibility-sharing, especially when considering the protracted nature of many refugee situations.

All donors’ ODA contributions, in absolute or relative terms, matter

In 2019, the top 10 donors of ODA for refugee and host communities in refugee-hosting countries were, in absolute terms and USD billions, the United States of America (5.6), Germany (2.4), European Union Institutions (2.3), the United Kingdom (0.95), Norway (0.55), Japan (0.39), Sweden (0.36), the Netherlands (0.35), Canada (0.28) and Australia (0.21).13 In proportion to the Gross National Income (GNI) of donor countries, the top 10 donors (in descending order) are estimated to be Norway, Sweden, Germany, Denmark, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, the United States of America, Australia, Hungary, and Iceland.14 It is worth noting that in 2020, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and the United Kingdom were also the countries that met or exceeded the internationally agreed and SDG target of 0.7 per cent of GNI for ODA.

Unearmarked core contributions decreased, hampering the flexibility called for by the GCR

Core contributions are defined in the OECD survey as funds provided on an unearmarked basis to international refugee-mandated agencies, such as UNHCR and UNRWA, or other entities whose principal activity is to provide assistance to refugees and host communities. The core contributions reported by donors as part of the survey amounted to USD 710 million in 2019. Compared to their level in 2018 (USD 753 million), the reported unearmarked funds declined by 3.2 per cent. While keeping in mind data limitations, this tendency is consistent with reductions in the share of unearmarked or softly earmarked voluntary contributions received by UNHCR (55%, 33%, and 30% in 2017, 2018, and 2019 respectively).15 These relative decreases in unearmarked contributions limit the important role that core contributions can play in financing responses to emergencies and forgotten crises.16

Despite an overall increase in ODA to refugee situations, a large portion of funding needs for comprehensive responses to refugees and host communities remains unmet

To have a comprehensive picture of the levels of assistance and the sharing of burden and responsibility, it is also necessary to consider the actual needs for external assistance. This kind of analysis relates to the process called for by the GCR (para. 48) regarding the measurement of the impact arising from hosting, protecting, and assisting refugees. As this is beyond the scope of this GCR indicator report, only some preliminary observations based on available complementary data and analysis are provided here. Despite the increase in international assistance observed between 2016 and 2019, substantial funding gaps persisted and may even be widening in several instances. A few illustrations are provided here based on available evidence.

Filling the resource gap for inclusive refugee education is both necessary and doable

According to the joint World Bank-UNHCR report on the cost of inclusive refugee education,17 the annual cost of providing access to basic education to refugee children in low- and middle-income countries is estimated at USD 4.85 billion.18 Save the Children19 cited by the report, estimated that approximately 55 per cent of the funding for refugee education would have to be financed from new sources. This leaves only USD 2.17 billion of the total funding envelope needed to be funded through international assistance. This would amount to almost three times the level of external financing for refugee education that was provided in 2016.20 The report concludes that “funding to ensure education should not be out of reach.” The average annual cost of educating refugees would represent less than 5 per cent of public education expenditures in nations with low- and middle-income economies which are hosting 85 per cent of the world’s refugees.21

Data-based approaches are significant and even growing funding gaps

As part of the regional application of the GCR, the seven countries (Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador,
Honduras, Guatemala, Mexico, and Panama) have engaged in quantifying the resources required to implement comprehensive refugee responses at the national level. Drawing on the process on measuring the impact arising from hosting, protecting, and assisting refugees, and with the technical assistance of UNHCR, a funding gap of $3.1 billion (USD 2.7 billion) across all countries that are part of the Comprehensive Regional Protection and Solutions Framework for Central America and Mexico ("CRPF"). Within this average, funding gaps varied considerably from country to country, ranging from 30 to 99 per cent (Belize 99%, Costa Rica 76%, El Salvador 85%, Guatemala 98%, Honduras 45%, Mexico 27%, and Panama 32%), depending upon the size of the concerned population, local costs, the scope of support, and other context-specific parameters.

UNHCR’s preliminary situation also illustrates the persistence and evolution of funding gaps at global level. Between 2015 and 2020, the gap between budgeted needs and available funds hovered around 42 per cent, ranging from USD 3.1 billion to 3.8 billion. Despite a significant 22 per cent increase in funding received in the period following the adoption of the New York Declaration and the GCR, there was a substantial shortfall in meeting protection and livelihood needs in 2020, with $ 3.7 billion more than half a billion higher than in 2016 (USD 3.1 billion).

Preliminary data indicate that donors either maintained or increased ODA contributions to help countries with lower incomes respond to COVID-19 and refugee situations.

Due to a lack of data for 2020 and 2021, it is too early to assess the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on ODA to refugee situations. In terms of humanitarian assistance in support of refugees, 26 out of 17 donors indicated that they were either maintaining (7) or increasing (19) funds in 2020. A broadly consistent trend for development assistance was also emerging, with a majority (6) maintaining the same levels and some (2) increases. Several donors noted that a substantial share of their contribution to refugee situations was going to be allocated to the response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The unprecedented humanitarian, social, and economic crisis caused by the pandemic will continue to test the solidarity called for in the GCR. It is hard to know what the future holds for the pandemic, and for international assistance from donors also affected transitonally, likely to continue, however, is that considerable needs remain unmet, and the pandemic has revealed glaring inequalities between countries in terms of the response they are able to provide given their resources. In this context, it may be worth noting that bilateral ODA to refugee situations in countries with low, lower-middle, and upper-middle-income countries amounted to approximately $51 per cent of the amount donors mobilized over the past year in economic stimulus measures to help their own societies recover from the COVID-19 crisis.

**OUTCOME 2: National Arrangements and coordinated refugee responses are supported.**

The overall proportion of ODA to refugee and host communities channelled directly through national actors reported by the 2020 OECD survey decreased (Figure 14) during the period, with levels at 8 per cent in 2018 and 4 per cent in 2019. The percentages are well below the target agreed by major donors and aid organisations under the Grand Bargain in 2016, to provide 25 per cent of global humanitarian funding to local and national responders "as directly as possible" by 2020.

There are, however, data limitations for this indicator, especially on the extent to which the OECD survey captures the real-allocation of ODA received by UN and other multilateral actors to national actors. In 2019, UNHCR allocated USD 1.376 billion to over 1,100 partners, including USD 752.6 million to local responders, national NGOs, and governments. As a result, UNHCR met the Grand Bargain target by transferring 25.8 per cent of its annual programme expenditure to national actors.

Disaggregating this GCR indicator, Figure 15 reveals that the proportion of ODA delivered through national actors is highest in countries in the Middle East and North Africa region (32%) and Europe (9%). It is lower in sub-Saharan Africa (4%), Latin America and the Caribbean (3%), Eastern and Horn of Africa and the Great Lakes region (2%), Southern Africa (2%) and West and Central Africa (7%). However, there were notable changes during the period (Figure 15). In 2019, donors reduced bilateral ODA channelled to national actors in the Middle East and North Africa region and Europe, while they increased it in Latin America and the Caribbean, and the Americas, where the proportion rose significantly.
GLOBAL COMPACT ON REFUGEES COUNTRY PROFILE: JORDAN

As the Syrian refugee crisis continues into its second decade, Jordan remains the third-largest host country to coordinate and implement efforts of all relevant stakeholders working to achieve a comprehensive response. So far, Jordan has supported the development of a comprehensive plan under national leadership, in line with national policies and priorities, with the assistance of UNHCR and other relevant stakeholders.

GCR, para. 20-21

Instead of a direct measurement of GCR indicator 12.2 on the number of partners supporting national arrangements in the refugee-hosting country, UNHCR compiled a proxy (or indirect) indicator on the number of partners listed per country in Refugee Response Plans (RRPs). This indicator is defined as the total number of partners, including UN agencies, NGOs, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), listed in publicly available RRPs, which are developed under UNHCR’s leadership or co-leadership.

RRPs may be developed at country level to reflect the needs of the entire refugee population in a given country (Country RRPs) or at regional level, involving multiple countries, to respond to the needs of a specific refugee population which fled to neighboring countries (Regional RRPs). In the latter case, they present individual response plans for each country, within the framework of a regional response strategy. Regional and country-based RRPs contribute to the implementation of the GCR by articulating priorities, multinational, and multistakeholder responses for the benefit of refugees and host communities. Support for the RRPs is also provided by bilateral and multilateral cooperation.

The number of partners contributing to responses increased significantly between 2016 and 2020, by strengthening partnerships and promoting inter-agency coordination for large-scale or complex refugee situations, including for mixed movements. UNHCR coordinated six regional RRPs. These included Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Nigeria, and South Sudan RRPs, as well as the regional refugee and resilience plan in response to the Syria crisis (R2P), co-led with the UN Development Programme (UNDP), and the regional refugee and migrant response plan for refugees and migrants from Venezuela, co-led with IOM. In addition, UNHCR and IOM continued to co-lead the joint response plan (JRP) for the Rohingya humanitarian crisis in Bangladesh. These regional inter-agency responses were implemented in 37 refugee-hosting countries.17

Figure 16: Total number of partners listed in Refugee Response Plans, 2016 – 2020
Each response plan explicitly lists the national and international partners supporting the RRPs. Between 2016 and 2020, the number of such partners rose from 364 to 1,036, a steady and almost threshold increase (Figure 16). An important factor in the growth of partners was a near two and a half-fold increase in the number of country refugee plans from 17 in 2016 to 42 in 2020 – due to the establishment of new regional RRs during this period for the DRC and Venezuela situations. While the level of participation of partners varies, with the majority providing continuous support and some providing intermittent support, the data demonstrate a continuous upward trend in the number of partners engaged in inter-agency responses in support of refugee-hosting countries.

The growth in number of partners is distributed across different stakeholder groups.

Available data demonstrate trends in relation to two main categories of partners – UN partners and NGOs (including the IFRC). Instances of UN partners being listed in country plans stood at 143 in 2016 and more than doubled to 315 in 2020. Instances of NGOs being named in country plans more than tripled from 221 in 2016 to 678 in 2020.

The number of refugee situations supported by the World Bank increased significantly since 2016.

Another important stakeholder group is international financial institutions (IFIs), such as the World Bank and regional development banks. These are of particular interest due to their ability to leverage development capacities and resources in support of country-level refugee responses, their direct engagement with refugee-hosting governments, and the broad and sustained nature of their contributions – which support the strengthening of national systems and the capacity of affected countries to benefit from IRPs as well as refugees. Typically, IFIs are not named partners in RRPs. However, available data on the World Bank’s support to refugee-hosting countries through mechanisms specifically designed to contribute to burden- and responsibility-sharing – such as the Concessional Financing Facility (CFF) and the Refugee Sub-Window (RSW) – demonstrate that this support increased steadily from 2016 to 2020.

The number of countries in which the World Bank supported refugee responses in this way rose from two in 2016 to 19 in 2020.

The major proportion of the pledges of support to refugee-hosting countries focus on protection capacity (22%) and education (21%). Support in the area of statelessness and jobs and livelihoods also received a substantial commitment from donors and other stakeholders with 18 per cent and 15 per cent respectively (Figure 18). NGOs made the largest number of pledges and commitments, followed by traditional donor States, development actors, and other international organizations (IFIs). The private sector entities also engaged and made significant contributions to the pressure on host countries with close to 80 pledges targeting various regions.

The health sector: notable progress was made towards the implementation of global pledges from entities such as the Global Fund, GAVI, and The Vaccine Alliance, and UN agencies. Pledges relating to refugee inclusion in wider health systems or health insurance schemes that were not yet being implemented before the onset of the pandemic have seen limited progress in several countries. Conversely, the inclusion of refugees in national health systems requires additional (financing) and technical support, including matching pledges of support from the donor community.
CHAPTER 4

GLOBAL COMPACT ON REFUGEES SUPPORT PLATFORMS

Support Platforms reinforce regional refugee protection efforts. As of May 2021, three support platforms were launched: the platform for the Solutions Strategy for Afghan Refugees (SSAR) supporting Afghanistan, the Islamic Republic of Iran, and Pakistan; a Multi-Country Solution Platform for the Western Balkans (WB); and the UNHCR/IEA AARs Platform for the Groanal and Asielregionen Regional Protection Initiative in the Northern Mediterranean (NMRP) countries. Since their launch, progress was made in identifying the best of support, including through greater involvement of development actors. Multiple stakeholders are actively contributing to a Platform as Members and in the Core Groups.

Since their launch, Platforms have been used to promote a coordinated regional response, gathering all relevant stakeholders and identifying the most relevant humanitarian, development, peacebuilding, and public and private sector initiatives. Despite their regional focus, these Platforms are global in nature, as they are State-led groupings of Governments and other key actors that place refugees and their hosts at the centre, with donors and other key stakeholders rallying around them.

Through an initiative of the SSAR Support Platform, over 2.2 million Afghan refugees were supported with inclusive national policies in health, education, and livelihoods in Pakistan and the Islamic Republic of Iran. At the country level, Core Groups were established to drive localized priorities and kinds of support at the platform level. Challenges remain in funding and resource allocations, which integrate refugees into national planning frameworks. A UNHCR Global Platform for Solutions Initiative for Sudan and South Sudan, which highlights the commitment of IGAD Member States to pursue durable solutions for over 7 million forcibly displaced Sudanese and South Sudanese in the region. This initiative expands the scope of the IGAD-led Nairobi Process and leverages a regional approach to durable solutions in line with the GCR, the peace agreements in both countries, the AU Agenda 2063, and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Going forward, there will be a focus on shared learning and building an evidence base across the three Support Platforms to inform future platforms.

ASYLUM CAPACITY SUPPORT GROUP

As outlined in the UN Secretary-General’s report on Our Common Agenda, legal identity and status for asylum-seekers and refugees is fundamental to the realization of their human rights. The Asylum Capacity Support Group (ACSG) aims to help States strengthen any aspect of their national asylum/refugee status determination (ASD) processes, and increase their efficiency and effectiveness.

In relation to the humanitarian and development nexus called for in the GCR, the efforts of the Group of States, including the European Union, have been essential to supporting more inclusive, progressive, and sustainable policies of refugee-hosting countries. This requires early identification, legal aid, and access to justice, and broader humanitarian and development strategies to address the root causes of the refugee crisis. The Group of States has played a critical role in highlighting and addressing these needs to address the socio-economic fallout of the COVID-19 pandemic and to prevent further displacement. Among the notable challenges at the Global Refugee Forum (GRF), the World Bank pledged a USD 2.2 billion scale-up for refugees and host communities. As of May 2021, nine projects were approved under the Window for Host Communities and Refugees (WHCR) project portfolio as part of the World Bank’s International Development Assistance (IDA) 17.

As evidenced by the progress reported on pledges under objective 1, many private sector partners trust and support the Group of States’ work and its outcomes, and in some cases even increased their support. Some private sector companies have expressed interest in increasing their support to the Group of States, and in some cases even increased their support. Some countries and cities have also been interested in converting their support into long-term partnerships.

In relation to the humanitarian and development nexus called for in the GCR, the efforts of the Group of States, including the European Union, have been essential to supporting more inclusive, progressive, and sustainable policies of refugee-hosting countries. This requires early identification, legal aid, and access to justice, and broader humanitarian and development strategies to address the root causes of the refugee crisis. The Group of States has played a critical role in highlighting and addressing these needs to address the socio-economic fallout of the COVID-19 pandemic and to prevent further displacement. Among the notable challenges at the Global Refugee Forum (GRF), the World Bank pledged a USD 2.2 billion scale-up for refugees and host communities. As of May 2021, nine projects were approved under the Window for Host Communities and Refugees (WHCR) project portfolio as part of the World Bank’s International Development Assistance (IDA) 17.

As evidenced by the progress reported on pledges under objective 1, many private sector partners trust and support the Group of States’ work and its outcomes, and in some cases even increased their support. Some private sector companies have expressed interest in increasing their support to the Group of States, and in some cases even increased their support. Some countries and cities have also been interested in converting their support into long-term partnerships.

In relation to the humanitarian and development nexus called for in the GCR, the efforts of the Group of States, including the European Union, have been essential to supporting more inclusive, progressive, and sustainable policies of refugee-hosting countries. This requires early identification, legal aid, and access to justice, and broader humanitarian and development strategies to address the root causes of the refugee crisis. The Group of States has played a critical role in highlighting and addressing these needs to address the socio-economic fallout of the COVID-19 pandemic and to prevent further displacement. Among the notable challenges at the Global Refugee Forum (GRF), the World Bank pledged a USD 2.2 billion scale-up for refugees and host communities. As of May 2021, nine projects were approved under the Window for Host Communities and Refugees (WHCR) project portfolio as part of the World Bank’s International Development Assistance (IDA) 17.

As evidenced by the progress reported on pledges under objective 1, many private sector partners trust and support the Group of States’ work and its outcomes, and in some cases even increased their support. Some private sector companies have expressed interest in increasing their support to the Group of States, and in some cases even increased their support. Some countries and cities have also been interested in converting their support into long-term partnerships.
4.2 Global Compact on Refugees

Objective 2: Enhance refugee self-reliance

To foster inclusive economic growth for host communities and refugees, in support of host countries and subject to their relevant national laws and policies, States and relevant stakeholders will contribute resources and expertise to promote economic opportunities, decent work, job creation and entrepreneurship programmes for host community members and refugees, including women, young adults, older persons and persons with disabilities.

GCR, para. 70

OUTCOME 1: Refugees are able to actively participate in the social and economic life of host countries

The GCR is grounded in the international refugee protection regime. At its core, the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees recognizes refugees’ need for access to decent work and calls for accessing wage-earning employment, self-employment, and practicing liberal professions as well as access to labour rights and social protection. Access to work and participation in the social and economic life of the country is also dependent on the ability of refugees to move freely in the host country, which is another freedom recognized in the 1951 Convention.

Decent work involves opportunities for work that is productive and delivers a fair income; security in the workplace; social protection for families; prospects for personal development and social integration; freedom for people to express their concerns, organize, and participate in decisions that affect their lives; and equality of opportunity and treatment for people of all genders. Decent work for refugees is fundamental to their resilience, benefiting both refugees and host economies and societies, and enhancing prospects for durable solutions.

The GCR indicators developed under this outcome measure refugees’ access to decent work and free movement rights in law (as of June) only. It must be borne in mind that the situation may be different in practice since the laws may not be fully implemented. The results outlined in this report merely capture the de jure situation and not the day-to-day realities that may exist for many refugees. They also do not capture the full spectrum of entitlements covered by the concept of decent work.

A total of 25 countries, across all regions, were covered by the UNHCR survey. These 25 countries account for more than 8.5 million refugees, which represent more than half (54%) of the world’s refugees. Twenty of these countries are States Party to the 1951 Convention and/or its 1967 Protocol (hereafter referred to as “Contracting States”).

Three-quarters of refugees have access in law to decent work

Out of the 11.2 million refugees covered by the survey, 8.4 million have either full (52%) or partial (23%) access to decent work in law (Figure 19). Seventeen of the 20 Contracting States surveyed allow refugees full access to decent work under their laws (14 Contracting States, covering 5.7 million refugees), or with restrictions (3 Contracting States, covering 1.7 million refugees). In addition, two non-Contracting States provide partial access to decent work for refugees under their laws, affecting more than 1.5 million refugees. One Contracting State surveyed does not allow under its law refugee access to decent work, affecting more than 210,000 refugees, whereas two other Contracting States allow refugees in law to access the labour market, but no data were available as to workplace protection. The three remaining countries surveyed were not Contracting States and do not allow refugees under their laws to access decent work, affecting more than 2.3 million refugees.

Figure 19: Proportion of refugees for the surveyed countries with access to decent work in law, 2021

At least 10 countries surveyed explicitly provide under their laws refugee access to decent work. In countries whose laws do not explicitly provide refugees access to decent work, but where refugees’ access is based on a general reference to non-nationals or foreigners, access to decent work may be difficult since employers may be reluctant to hire refugees, based on perceived lack of clarity about whether they are lawfully permitted to work. Moreover, the lack of clarity in law may result in authorities not issuing business licences to refugees, based on the same absence of specific authorization. Where countries grant refugees access to the labour market based on explicit provisions in their asylum or refugee laws, it is important that their treatment is further regulated in the countries’ labour laws or by enacting further implementing regulations, avoiding gaps and inconsistencies in the legal framework. In at least two countries surveyed, refugees are only partially provided access to
GLOBAL COMPACT ON REFUGEES COUNTRY PROFILE: DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO

The Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) has a history of hosting refugees since before its independence. Among the first were those arriving in the aftermath of events in Rwanda in 1957 and Burundi in 1959, followed by the arrival of the “1972 Burundians” and successive waves from other neighbours. As of the end of July 2021, the DRC hosted more than half a million (590,200) refugees, the largest number in Southern Africa. The National Institute of Statistics (INS) and other State authorities, with the assistance of UNICEF, conduct household surveys to estimate the number of refugees in the country. However, these surveys are not comprehensive and do not cover all areas where refugees are present.

DECD data show a 79% increase in bilateral ODA disbursed to refugees and host communities in the DRC between 2018 and 2019. No bilateral ODA was channelled directly through national actors during the period under review. According to UNHCR’s country presence, the number of partners participating in the refugee response led by the Government more than doubled, from 13 in 2016 to 29 in 2020. The law grants refugees the right to work, move and settle freely, and access services on the same basis as nationals. However, there is no formal integration policy framework through which inclusion can be supported. In addition, the quality of services is generally low, both for refugees and host communities. At the DRC’s border, the number of refugees crossing it daily is estimated at 3,000, with a pathway to nationality for Rwandans who opt to remain after the invocation of the cessation clause. A total of 27,000 children were enrolled in primary and secondary schools. Lack of data prevents calculation of proportions. The national level poverty rate was 64% per cent in 2012. According to the INS and UNHCR, the ratio is most likely to be higher for refugees. The number of refugees who departed from the DRC on resettlement reduced considerably, from 19 in 2016 to one in 2020, and no refugee departed in 2021 (as of August). From 2018 to 2021 (August), DRC, with the support of its partners, facilitated the voluntary departure of 20,000 refugees to their countries of origin, including 6,900 due to the pandemic.

Refugees as well as host communities’ access to work has deteriorated further with the COVID-19 pandemic. This jeopardizes efforts to support refugees’ self-reliance, improve their skills to become competitive on the job market, and include them in local and national development plans. As a result, refugees may only have access to low or unskilled work or may resort to work in the informal economy. According to UNHCR’s Global Livelihoods Survey from 2021, globally only 38 per cent of refugees live in countries with unrestricted access to practice formal employment, including wage-earning or self-employment. However, this is a rough estimate, and measuring access to decent work in practice would benefit from data collected through household surveys (e.g., inclusion of refugees in labour force surveys) to know more about the daily experiences of refugees and host communities.

Close to two-thirds of refugees enjoy freedom of movement under the law.

Refugee participation in the social and economic life of host countries depends on the refugees’ freedom of movement and freedom of choice of residence. Out of the 11.2 million refugees covered by the survey, 8 million had either full (64%) or partial (7%) access to free movement rights, and more than 3 million (28%) have no freedom of movement (Figure 20). Of the 20 Contracting States surveyed, 17 countries provide full access in law to freedom movement rights. One non-Contracting State also provides in law full access to free movement rights. Combined, this affects close to 72 million refugees. Three countries surveyed provide partial access to free movement rights, including in one non-Contracting State. This affects close to 800,000 refugees. Two Contracting States do not provide refugees in law access to free movement rights, affecting more than 2.2 million refugees. Two non-Contracting States surveyed do not provide refugees in law access to free movement rights, affecting close to another 1 million refugees.

In at least one country, free movement requires refugees to prove that they meet certain criteria indicating that they can support themselves, whether through self-reliance, sponsorship, or holding a work permit allowing them to work legally. Urban assistance programmes, which can support the self-reliance of refugees, may require that refugees have a permit to reside in urban areas, which is subject to security, medical, or humanitarian considerations.

decent work under their laws, making a distinction based on the country of origin of the refugee. In contrast, at least one country surveyed provides preferential treatment to refugees compared to other non-nationals. In at least seven countries surveyed, refugees are required, as other non-nationals, to obtain a work permit before entering the labour market. Obtaining a work permit may require payment of fees and a minimal duration of prior lawful residence, thereby possibly excluding refugees in practice from accessing the labour market. Where obtaining work permits is not clearly regulated, the authorities have wide discretion as to when and to whom a work permit is provided. In 18 countries surveyed, refugees are explicitly allowed to start their own businesses.

In practice, far fewer refugees have access to decent work.

Notwithstanding laws providing access to decent work for refugees, the situation in practice is often very different from what is allowed. High unemployment rates, informal economies, and the lack of opportunities for resettling refugees make it difficult for refugees to have access to decent work. Furthermore, employers may not be aware of refugees’ right to work.

Figure 20: Proportion of refugees for the surveyed countries with freedom of movement in law, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In at least one country, free movement requires refugees to prove that they meet certain criteria indicating that they can support themselves, whether through self-reliance, sponsorship, or holding a work permit allowing them to work legally. Urban assistance programmes, which can support the self-reliance of refugees, may require that refugees have a permit to reside in urban areas, which is subject to security, medical, or humanitarian considerations.
Refugees can access secondary education on the same terms as nationals in two-thirds of countries

A total of 66 per cent of reporting countries have a national education policy or other relevant policies explicitly indicating that refugees can access secondary education under the same conditions as nationals (Figure 24). Twenty-eight per cent indicated that refugees could access education, but face limitations. In two per cent of countries there is no official policy for refugees, and in three per cent of reporting countries, refugees cannot access education.

At the secondary level, it is noticeable that there is a larger share of countries where refugee students can access education but face limitations (28%) in comparison to the primary level (23%). Financial constraints constitute an important barrier to accessing secondary education across many contexts. This is partly related to the higher costs associated with the provision of secondary education in comparison to primary education.  

Inclusion in primary education varies considerably by regions

The regions with the highest proportion of countries where refugees can access primary education under the same conditions as nationals (Figure 25) are Europe (74%), West and Central Africa (50%), the Americas (48%), and the East and Horn of Africa and South Asia (40%). Significant lower proportions are in Asia and the Pacific (54%), Southern Africa (25%), and the Middle East and North Africa (17%).

Although limited, data on learning outcomes of refugee children reveal significant gaps

While data on education access for refugee learners are limited, data on learning for this population group are practically non-existent. In contexts of inclusion, where refugee students are integrated in national education systems, students are participating in national assessments. However, without disaggregated data by protection status, it is impossible to know how refugee children are performing or to make comparisons with host country students.

Figure 24. Secondary education inclusion, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Number of countries as percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With limits</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not included</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The World Bank has called attention to the ‘learning crisis’, highlighting that access to school does not automatically translate into children acquiring knowledge and skills. Fifty-three per cent of children in low- and middle-income countries cannot read and understand a simple story by the end of primary school. In low-income countries, the level is as high as 80 per cent.12 Although there is a lack of evidence on the performance of refugee children specifically, select assessments have found that refugee learners perform worse13 or about the same14 in comparison to host-country students. It indicates the reality that refugee children constitute some of the most vulnerable learners.

Overall global poverty was declining before the pandemic, but refugees were still more likely to be poor. During the pandemic the socio-economic well-being of both forcibly displaced and host populations has deteriorated in most countries.

Following two decades of progress – including a decline from over 9.5 per cent in 2016 to 8.4 per cent in 2019 – global poverty is projected to rise in 2020 and 2021, with the pandemic-related economic downturn pushing 100 million or more people into extreme poverty, exacerbating existing inequalities and inflicting lasting damage on human capital.15 More than 40 per cent of the global poor – including many refugees – live in economies affected by fragility, conflict, and violence. That number is expected to rise to 67 per cent in the next decade.

Limited data show that around two-thirds of refugees live in poverty.

While the lack of comprehensive data precludes regional or global estimates at this time, existing country-level studies do provide an early indication of the poverty levels of refugees and host communities (see note on data sources and methodology). Surveys measuring consumption in Ethiopia, Kenya, and Uganda and efforts to model poverty in Chad and Jordan show that, on average, two-thirds of refugees live in poverty, meaning that they do not have enough resources to satisfy minimum daily caloric intake or basic non-food needs (Figure 26).16 On average, the poverty rate for refugees in these settings is 25 to 40 percentage points higher than that of the national population. The conditions of host communities, meanwhile, vary widely. In Ethiopia and Uganda, for example, refugee-hosting communities fare slightly better than the national average, while in Kenya, host communities surrounding Kakuma Camp and Kalobeyei Settlement are among the poorest in the country.

Even among refugees, the incidence of poverty may vary widely by country of origin, household size, education level, arrival date, gender, and other factors. In 2019, in Kenya (Kakuma Camp), female-headed households were more likely to be poor (72%) than those led by males (64%), whereas there was little difference in Uganda (47% and 47%).17

Refugees fell deeper into poverty during the COVID-19 pandemic and may be slower to recover employment than nationals.

The economic shock associated with the COVID-19 pandemic has dealt a profound negative economic blow to refugees’ ability to meet their basic needs. Surveys in eight countries show worsening socio-economic well-being of both forcibly displaced and host communities over the course of the pandemic. Both populations have lost assets, savings, income, and access to basic services, and many are severely food insecure.18

In Uganda, poverty among refugees is estimated to have increased by 52 per cent in October-November 2020 from 44 per cent before the outbreak in March 2020. During this time, 89 per cent of households experienced declines in total income, while the number of households that reported running out of food due to lack of money or other resources...
In 2020, UNHCR delivered USD 695 million in cash assistance to some 8.5 million people in over 100 countries, 95 per cent of whom reported improvements in living conditions. In Turkey, beneficiaries of the Emergency Social Safety Net, which provided cash assistance to 1.2 million refugees – an estimated one-third of the total refugee population of the time – were shown to be better off after the transfer and more food secure, had lower debt levels, and were less likely to resort to negative coping strategies. In comparison, the welfare of non-beneficiaries declined during the period according to most common measures of welfare. This is consistent with findings from Lebanon and Jordan, which show that cash assistance and food vouchers provided by UNHCR and the World Food Programme reduced poverty rates among Syrian refugees from an estimated 69 per cent to 17 per cent in 2016, leaving “little doubt that the UNHCR cash assistance and the WFP food voucher programmes have a strong poverty-reduction capacity in their current form.” Similarly, cash transfers were associated with significant reductions in the use of negative coping strategies and increased access to basic needs in Rwanda and Greece.

Africa is the top receiving region with 154 (22%), followed by the Middle East and North Africa with 70 (10%), the Americas with 66 (9%), Europe with 64 (9%), the ‘global pledges’ category (commitments and contributions to more than one region) with 22 (3%) and Asia and the Pacific with 14 (2%). Pledge updates have been reported on 56 per cent (239) of the pledges characterized as advancing GCR objective 2. Some 43 per cent (93) of these pledges are in progress, while 5.5 per cent (27) reported being in the planning phase. Close to 30 pledges have been reported as fulfilled (27%).

Regarding sectors (Figure 28), the greatest proportion of the pledges focuses on strengthening or enhancing the self-reliance of refugees by way of education (46% or 174) and jobs and livelihoods (27% or 115). Support in local integration (solutions) together with the Health and Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) sector and Energy and Infrastructure, also received a substantial commitment from donors and other stakeholders with 18 per cent (76) and 8 per cent (33), respectively. UNHCR has nevertheless classified some contributions in the database as “other” or “multiple-focus” with 4 per cent (17) and 3 per cent (14) respectively.

More than ever, the coordination of education actions in support of host-country governments is crucial to increase sustainable funding for education and strengthen inclusion of all displaced children. The pandemic has also provided opportunities to put innovative approaches into practice and demonstrate how to ensure refugees are included in national and global education responses. Despite school closures, promising progress has been made on more than half of the pledges, highlighting the impressive level of commitment to support refugee education. Among the gaps in the pledges, greater support is required to increase access to secondary education for each globally. Thirty-three pledges were made in support of secondary education for refugees.

In relation to social protection and local integration, despite some key delays in advancing pledges, partners at different levels, including Governments, donors, civil society, and communities stepped up the inclusion of refugees and other persons of concern in the response to the COVID-19 pandemic, including access to testing, treatment and vaccinations. The inclusion of refugees in national health systems requires development of medium-term inclusion plans developed at country level, which are supported by multiple stakeholders. In parallel, support to livelihood opportunities will be key to enhance refugees’ self-reliance, enabling refugees to integrate locally and make financial contributions to, for example, health insurance schemes.

Concerning jobs and livelihoods, mentioning commitments towards refugee jobs and training, given the need to both the pandemic affected industries that employ large number of refugees, remains a challenge. It is important to recognize the good will of Governments that have pledged to open their labour markets. Amongst the newly fulfilled pledges, Morocco has listed 10,070 refugees and asylum-seekers with formal employment opportunities through the programme of the Secretariat of Labour and Social Prevention (STPS) and the CDMEAR (Comisión Mexicana de Ayuda a Refugiados). Nonetheless, host countries will need to be supported financially.
4.3 Global Compact on Refugees

Objective 3: Expand access to third country solutions

States, harnessing the contributions of a wide range of actors, demonstrate solidarity with refugees and their host communities by delegating access to third country admission avenues for refugees. The Three-Year Strategy (2019-2021) on Displacement and Complementary Pathways (‘The Strategy’), translates the Global Compact for Refugees’ vision for the first time into a global plan of action to build the structures needed to increase the number of resettlement and complementary pathways spaces, expand the number of engaged countries and actors, and improve the availability and predictability of third country solutions for refugees. While the Strategy constitutes a roadmap from 2019 to 2021, a period which will come to an end this year, it will continue to provide a blueprint for all stakeholders to advance third country solutions beyond 2021. The goal is that five million refugees are able to access effective protection and third country solutions by the end of 2028, by increasing resettlement, advancing complementary pathways, and building the foundation through promoting welcoming and inclusive societies.

Between 2016 and 2020, close to 1.4 million refugees accessed third country solutions – more than during the previous five years. Between 2016 and 2020, some six per cent or 286,900 more refugees accessed third country solutions, compared to the previous five years (Figure 29). They totaled 1.37 million at the end of 2020. After a peak in 2016, a downward trend in admissions can be observed, with a record low in 2020, representing almost 30 per cent less
OUTCOME 1: Refugees in need have access to resettlement opportunities in an increasing number of countries

Contributions will be sought from States, with the assistance of relevant stakeholders, to establish, or enlarge the scope, size, and quality of, resettlement programmes. In support of these efforts, UNHCR – in cooperation with States and relevant stakeholders – will devise a three-year strategy to increase the pool of resettlement places, including countries not already participating in global resettlement efforts, GCR, para. 91

Following a landmark year for departures in 2016, declining resettlement opportunities reduced admissions in the following years

Resettlement remains a life-saving mechanism and a tool to provide protection and solutions for the refugees who are the most at risk. The year 2016 was ground-breaking, with over 126,500 refugees departing with UNHCR’s assistance to rebuild their lives in safety. Table 1. Against a change in the global resettlement landscape, characterized by inflations in Sub-Saharan 2017 and achieved the third largest (44%) resettlement admissions after the consecutive years of increasing departures. This was followed by a further annual decrease in resettlement departures in 2018 (14%). The slight increase recorded in 2019 (14%) was short-lived. The decline deepened in 2020 (64%) and 2021 (31%).

During the first year of the Strategy, departures exceeded the agreed target

With steady increases of 10,000, the global targets for resettlement admissions of refugees referred by UNHCR were set at 60,000 for 2019, 70,000 for 2020, and 80,000 for 2021, reaching 150,000 refugees to be admitted in 2028. The target was surpassed in 2019 by almost 4,000 additional departures.

Resettlement fell with the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic

In 2020, arrivals to resettlement States were severely affected by border closures and travel restrictions. This was also the result of lower quotas allocated by States for new resettlement admissions around the world. The negative impact of the COVID-19 pandemic was substantial on case-processing activities for resettlement by UNHCR and partners, with many embassies also suspending visa services, in-person interviews, and the collection of biometrics. Thus, by the end of 2020, fewer than 23,000 refugees had departed on resettlement, meaning that only one-third of the 70,000 target was achieved. In 2021, refugees continue to be adversely affected by the social and economic effects of the pandemic. This has heightened the importance of resettlement and complementary pathways as a demonstration of burden- and responsibility-sharing. As of the time of this report (which includes statistics through the end of July 2021), 15,830 refugees had departed on resettlement in 2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Strategy target</th>
<th>UNHCR-assisted resettlement departures</th>
<th>Percentage of target</th>
<th>Number of targeted countries</th>
<th>Actual number of countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>126,291</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69,038</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55,680</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>63,728</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>22,809</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>15,774</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistics until 31 July 2021.
The already huge gap between resettlement needs and resettlement departures is widening further

As shown in Figure 30, there continues to be a huge gap between resettlement needs and resettlement departures. In 2016, some 11 per cent of refugees in need of resettlement were resettled. This decreased in 2019 (4%) and 2020 (2%). Based on July 2021 data, just over one per cent of those in need have been resettled in 2021. This means that over 14 million refugees need to be resettled in 2021, an increase of 25 per cent compared to 2019.

During the pandemic, several actors took steps to ensure resettlement continues to provide durable solutions for refugees

Despite the impediments imposed by COVID-19, several States, UNHCR, and other partners worked to maintain resettlement processing and admissions for those who are the most at risk. They adjusted their adjudication processes by implementing dossier consideration or remote interviews, to enable continued resettlement case processing, demonstrating solidarity with countries that host large numbers of refugees and have been severely affected by the pandemic.

To meet the Strategy’s targets, multi-year planning and funding are critical

Multi-year planning and funding, including for the reception and integration of resettled refugees, will be essential to achieve a sustainable and coordinated global resettlement response. Multi-year planning will lay the groundwork to meet the 10-year goal set by the Strategy to resettle one million refugees globally by 2028.

The number of countries receiving UNHCR resettlement submissions declined

The year 2019 saw an increase and diversification of resettlement States, with 35 States engaged in resettlement programming, which remained the same in 2017.13 Thereafter, the number of States with regular resettlement programmes already decreased. The Strategy aims to increase incrementally the number of resettlement countries globally, starting with a target of 29 met in 2018. This number, however, decreased to 25 countries in 2020, and in 2021, so far, only 22 countries have received submissions from UNHCR. Continued advocacy with and support from actors, such as the European Commission, in sustaining and expanding existing resettlement programmes and establishing new ones, will be critical to achieving the goals of the Strategy.

Ten countries accounted for more than 90 per cent of all resettlement departures

From 2019 until mid-2021, the top 10 resettlement countries accounted for 91 per cent of the 102,300 recorded departures (Figure 31).

Figure 31: Top 10 resettlement states by departures, 2019-2021 (July)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome 2: Refugees have access to complementary pathways for admission to third countries

As a complement to resettlement, other pathways for the admission of persons with international protection needs can facilitate access to protection and/or solutions. There is a need to ensure that such pathways are made available on a more systematic, organized, sustainable and gender-responsive basis, that they contain appropriate protection safeguards, and that the number of countries offering these opportunities is expanded overall.

GCR, para. 94

Along with resettlement, the Strategy includes complementary pathways for admission, with a view to increasing their availability and predictability significantly. Complementary pathways are a responsibility-sharing mechanism and constitute a progressive approach to solutions. For this report and as established in the GCR indicator framework, complementary pathways entail refugees accessing existing legal admission pathways, as well as refugee-specific admission programmes, providing for entry and lawful stay in a third country that are additional and separate from UNHCR-assisted resettlement programmes.14

Four refugees are admitted through complementary pathways for every one refugee admitted through resettlement with UNHCR assistance

Available data show a peak in 2017 in terms of indicative admissions15 through complementary
pathways and a progressive decline ever since. While the round targeted for the first year of the Strategy was met with 169,000 admissions, due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020, the overall number of admissions through complementary pathways plummeted (over 108,000) by at least 40 per cent compared to the previous year (Figure 32).

Some 763,000 nationals of Afghanistan, Eritrea, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Somalia, the Syrian Arab Republic, and Venezuela arrived in OECD countries and Brazil through safe legal pathways between 2017 and 2020. Between 2017 and 2020, over 173,000 first time residence permits were granted by OECD countries and Brazil to nationals of Afghanistan, Eritrea, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Somalia, the Syrian Arab Republic, and Venezuela by permit/admission type, between 2017 and 2020 (cumulative)
GLOBAL COMPACT ON REFUGEES COUNTRY PROFILE: NIGER

Niger is a major transit and host country for refugees in mixed movements because of ongoing crises in Mali, Nigeria, Chad, Libya, and Burkina Faso. According to the World Bank, Niger has the lowest swath per capita compared to its peers in the region. As of 30 June 2021, Niger was hosting a total population of 693,200 refugees (48, IDPs (31%), and other displaced populations. Seventy-three per cent of refugees are from Nigeria, 21 per cent from Mali, and 5 per cent from other countries; Sanctuary of the Mediterranean account for 25 per cent of the asylum-seekers. Women account for 53 per cent of the population. The returnee security context has caused numerous additional refugees and IDP movements within the country, including secondary movements in search of safety. The COVID-19 pandemic has required the redesign of humanitarian interventions. The data ecosystem (especially regarding socio-economic data) remains fragile due to the security situation, lack of access to displaced populations, and weak capacities. Niger is a low-income country with an extreme poverty rate estimated at 42.0 per cent in 2020. The country has also been experiencing chronic food insecurity for decades.

Despite increasing needs due to the deteriorating situation in the Sahel and Nigeria, the volume of bilateral ODA for the refugee situation in Niger decreased by 27 per cent between 2018 and 2019. The Refugee Law allows refugees originating from Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) countries to enjoy the same rights as nationals regarding access to the labor market and land for agricultural and livestock development services. However, the COVID-19 pandemic and health-related barriers to access education work. The situation has deteriorated with the pandemic. Freedom of movement is guaranteed in the Refugee Law. It is in practice limited, however, owing to the deteriorating security situation. Several refugee-hosting areas were closed, and a state of emergency was declared in several regions of the country. The Refugee Law enables refugee children and youth to access education on the same basis as nationals. The Government has been integrating refugee children into national education programmes since March 2012. However, enrolment of refugee children is lower than that of nationals, due to the volatile security situation; high mobility and language, social, and cultural barriers. The enrolment rates for refugee children range from 71 to 26 per cent in rural areas, while in Niamey, 56 per cent of refugee children are enrolled. Between November 2019 and 30 June 2021, 4,300 refugees found third-country solutions, mainly through the resettlement programme. Resettled refugees were admitted to Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America. Complementary pathways aimed at benefiting vulnerable refugees within the region were implemented. The COVID-19 pandemic has negatively affected the implementation of resettlement activities in March 2020; resettlement departures were temporary suspended, but resumed gradually in August 2020. The number of new arrivals in complementary pathways reached 14,500 and, along the Mali border, in 2021. The movement of asylum-seekers and IDPs, as well as access to refugee camps. The introduction of remote processing therefore helped the operation to continue resettlement and complementary pathways case-processing.

PLEDGE TOWARDS GCR

OBJECTIVE 3

A total of 152 pledges were made at the GCR towards resettlement and complementary pathways, contributing to expanded access to third country solutions (Figure 35). Three pledges set approximately 10 per cent of all those made at the GCR. More than half of the respective pledges are from developed countries and willing to address a number of key challenges and constraints.

Figure 35. Proportion of GCR Pledges towards Objective 3, August 2021

60% 15% 7% 17% 2% 2%

Sixty (40%) pledges categorized as advancing GCR objective 3 were expected to be “progress” and 50% “significant.” The latter included pledges made by Portugal, Canada, Colombia, Norway, Peru, the Middle East Council of Churches, and several others. Updates were not received for 73 pledges (48%). Overall, some 55 per cent of these pledges were made by entities in Europe, followed by the Americas, Africa, and the Middle East and North Africa. Approximately 75 per cent of all pledges linked to GCR objective 3 were individual contributions.

Since the GCR, a high level of engagement by Member States and other actors was witnessed towards the Three-Year Strategy on Resettlement and Complementary Pathways. Notably, several States reported having advanced their pledges to increase their resettlement quotas, including Finland, Belgium, Japan, and Uruguay, despite travel restrictions, border closures, and other COVID-19-related constraints affecting the numbers of resettlement departures.

Concerning complementary pathways, while promising initiatives to improve access, including for land regularization, were implemented as part of the GCR pledge process, a need remains to amend current legislation and policies posing barriers. Additional initiatives to reduce travel costs and provide pro bono legal representation for refugees and their families would support progress in this area. Notable progress was made by Japan’s International Christian University Foundation on scholarships and by Italy on the establishment of a humanitarian corridor; however, implementation more broadly was hindered by the pandemic. In terms of access to work, Talent Beyond Borders made progress on its pledge to secure work opportunities for refugees. Argentina’s implementation of its pledge to expand its humanitarian visa programme and other complementary pathways was delayed by the pandemic.

The Joint UNHCR/IOM Sustainable Resettlement and Complementary Pathways Initiative (CRISP) played a key role during the period, including for the funding of complementary pathways capacity-building initiatives. Argentina fulfilled its pledge to provide financial support and other support, enabling activities. Further funding is, however, required to expand implementation over the coming years.
4.4 Global Compact on Refugees Objective 4: Support conditions in countries of origin for return in safety and dignity

The international community as a whole will contribute resources and expertise to support countries of origin, upon their request, to address root causes, to remove obstacles to return, and to enable conditions favourable to voluntary repatriation.

**GCR, para. 88**

**OUTCOME 1:** Resources are made available to support the sustainable reintegration of returning refugees by an increasing number of donors

ODA provided in support of refugee returnees in countries of origin decreased

The GCR underlined that voluntary repatriation in conditions of safety and dignity remains the preferred solution in most refugee situations. It calls upon the international community as a whole to stand ready to provide support, including to facilitate sustainability of return, while recognizing that enabling voluntary repatriation is first and foremost the responsibility of the country of origin towards its own people. According to the Financing for Refugee Situations Survey 2020, donors contributed a total of USD 1.37 billion in ODA to support refugee returnees in the country of origin between 2018 and 2019. From USD 784 million in 2018 to USD 584 million in 2019, the total amount of ODA decreased by 26 per cent (Figure 36). This decrease in available funding coincides with the global decrease in the number of refugee returnees recorded during the same period. From nearly 519,500 in 2018 to slightly over 317,000 in 2019, the number of voluntary repatriations decreased by 39 per cent. The amount of bilateral ODA for refugee returnees in their countries accounted for some six per cent of all bilateral ODA to refugee situations over the two years. The interpretation of this downward trend in bilateral ODA to countries of origin, however, should be treated with caution, especially as data are only available for two years. Moreover, the distinction between ODA for countries of origin versus asylum poses challenges in reporting for some donors.

**Figure 36:** Bilateral ODA provided to, or for the benefit of refugee returnees in the country of origin, humanitarian and development assistance, 2018-2019 (OECD Financing for Refugee Situations Survey 2020, gross disbursement, 2019 constant prices, US dollars)

Top countries of return are among top recipients of bilateral ODA to countries of origin

Half of the top 10 countries of return between 2018 and 2020 were among the top 10 recipients of bilateral ODA (Figure 37). For countries of origin, as reported by donors in the OECD survey for 2018 and 2019, these were Afghanistan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mali, and the Syrian Arab Republic. The countries in the top 10 countries of return, but not in the top 10 recipients were Burundi, Côte d’Ivoire, Somalia, South Sudan, and Sudan. Except Côte d’Ivoire, these countries were, however, in the list of the top 20 recipients. Conversely, Chad, Cuba, Iraq, Myanmar, and the State of Palestine were among the top recipients of bilateral ODA to countries of origin, but not among the top countries of return.

When taking into account all bilateral ODA to refugee situations received by the top 10 countries of return i.e., regardless of whether they are classified as countries of origin or asylum by donors, seven are among the top 20 recipients of ODA (see chapter on GCR objective 1; Afghanistan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mali, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, and the Syrian Arab Republic). The top countries of return not included in the top 20 recipients are Burundi, the Central African Republic, and Côte d’Ivoire.17

**Figure 37:** Top 10 recipients of bilateral ODA to countries of origin, as reported by donors, 2018-2019 (cumulative)
Countries of origin received proportionally more development assistance than countries of asylum

Compared to countries of asylum, bilateral ODA received by countries of origin has a larger development assistance component. In cumulative terms, it amounted to 57 per cent between 2018 and 2019 for countries of origin, while for countries of asylum it was 36 per cent. This preponderance of development assistance over humanitarian aid for countries of origin seems consistent with the GCR’s emphasis on addressing root causes and enabling conditions favourable to voluntary repatriation.

Figure 38: Numbers of donors of bilateral ODA by country of origin, 2019

The number of donors supporting countries of origin is lower than for countries of asylum. The number of donors reported by the OECD survey was 20 for countries of origin and 31 for countries of asylum in 2019 (Figure 38). While this is consistent with the lower volume of bilateral ODA received, it may also mean greater scope for broadening the base of support to countries of origin. It is worth noting, however, that the number of donors per country in the top 10 countries of return increases when accounting for bilateral ODA to refugee situations in general (i.e., regardless of whether they are classified as countries of origin or asylum by donors). For Afghanistan and the Syrian Arab Republic, for instance, the number of donors increased from nine to 13 and eight to 21, respectively.

Countries of origin have fewer donors than countries of asylum

The number of donors supporting countries of origin is lower than for countries of asylum. The number of donors reported by the OECD survey was 20 for countries of origin and 31 for countries of asylum in 2019 (Figure 38). While this is consistent with the lower volume of bilateral ODA received, it may also mean greater scope for broadening the base of support to countries of origin. It is worth noting, however, that the number of donors per country in the top 10 countries of return increases when accounting for bilateral ODA to refugee situations in general (i.e., regardless of whether they are classified as countries of origin or asylum by donors). For Afghanistan and the Syrian Arab Republic, for instance, the number of donors increased from nine to 13 and eight to 21, respectively.

OUTCOME 2: Refugees are able to return and reintegrate socially and economically

Voluntary repatriation in conditions of safety and dignity remains the preferred solution in the majority of refugee situations. The overriding priorities are to promote the enabling conditions for voluntary repatriation in full respect for the principle of non-refoulement, to ensure the exercise of a free and informed choice and to mobilise support to underpin safe and dignified repatriation.

GCR, para. 87

Although more refugees have returned, there is a downward trend after 2016

There were 14 per cent more returns of refugees between 2016 and 2020, than during the previous five years. More than 2 million refugees have returned to their country of origin since 2016 compared to 1.8 million between 2011 and 2015. Three-quarters of the solutions accessed by refugees were returns, during the last five years. Voluntary return was at its highest in 2016, with 552,000 returns. Since then and until 2020, there was an overall downward trend in the number of returns. The second increase, observed in 2018, was overshadowed by the decline recorded during the rest of the period. In 2020, only one per cent of refugees was able to return to their country of origin compared to three per cent in 2016 (Figure 39).

With more people becoming displaced and fewer able to return, an increasing number find themselves in protected displacement situations. The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated the trend. Borders were closed and voluntary repatriations suspended. While the situation regarding the pandemic remains uncertain, obstacles in many countries of origin, including ongoing conflict, persistently insecure conditions, impunity for crimes and human rights violations and the absence of essential services continue to be significant factors influencing the decisions of refugees about whether to return.

Figure 39: Number and proportion of refugee returns, 2015-2020
Afghanistan was the first country of refuge returns between 2016 and 2020. The first country of return between 2016 and 2020 was Afghanistan (Figure 40). It was followed by the Syrian Arab Republic and South Sudan. Before the recent events in Afghanistan, which saw the Taliban region control the country, close to 8% of the population (38.9 million)⁶⁷ was composed of former refugees (8.2 million) who had returned to their country of origin during the last two decades. The 2.3 million Afghans who returned in 2020 accounted for the lowest level recorded since the 2000s. The number has steadily declined since 2016, when 384,000 Afghans returned. Some 421,700 Syrians returned to their country between 2016 and 2020. In 2020, 38,000 Syrian refugees returned, 60 per cent fewer than in 2019. Returns have been spontaneous or organized by host countries or other actors. Spontaneous returns were also observed to South Sudan. Close to one-half (222,000) of the returns in 2020 were to South Sudan, mostly from Uganda (74,000), Sudan (22,500), and Ethiopia (14,500). Since 2017, returns of Burundian refugees have been facilitated, with the majority returning from the United Republic of Tanzania, and smaller numbers from the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Kenya, following the conclusion of elections in Burundi in May 2020, increased interest in voluntary repatriation has been expressed by refugees living in several countries.

Data available only for a few countries show big differences regarding access to civil documentation for refugee returns. Progress was made in Burundi. Data collected in 2021 revealed that nearly 72 per cent of returner heads of household had relevant documents compared with only 33 per cent in 2020. Data available for refugee returners to other countries provides only benchmarks that nonetheless reveal categorical and subnational differences in the area. For example, data from household level assessments conducted in South Sudan amongst refugees who had returned spontaneously to different parts of the country show that the percentage possessing individual documentation is very low. Over 16,000 households were interviewed between January 2019 and June 2021. Most of those interviewed reported returning from neighbouring countries to South Sudan during 2019 or thereafter. Findings also show that approximately 25 per cent of those returning from Sudan were in possession of an identity document. The proportion was even lower for returnees from Uganda (4.2%), Ethiopia (2.1%), and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (0.6%). Concerning refugee returnees to Côte d’Ivoire, only 13 per cent were in possession of civil documentation, according to data collected between 2018 and 2020.

In relation to the Syria situation, data on the possession of civil documentation have been gathered through Regional Perception and Intention Surveys conducted by UNHCR with refugees hosted in neighbouring countries, except for Turkey, since 2017. In 2021, the survey oversampled some 3,250 Syrian refugees, out of a total of 10 million of these refugees. Ninety per cent of the respondents stated that they possess an e-card civil document issued by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic.

**GLOBAL COMPACT ON REFUGEES COUNTRY PROFILE: ECUADOR**

Due to severe internal conflicts with neighbouring countries, Ecuador has been hosting Colombian refugees since 1987. In 2021, more than 53,000 Colombian refugees are residing in Ecuador, which account for 97 per cent of the total refugee population in the country. Since 2017, the Americas region has been witnessing the largest refugee and migrant humanitarian crisis in its recent history. It is estimated that more than 450,000 Venezuelan refugees and migrants are residing in Ecuador, making it the fourth largest host country in the region, behind Colombia, Peru, and Chile. After years of economic decline due to plummeting oil prices, the COVID-19 pandemic has worsened poverty at the national level, negatively affecting the situation of refugees and migrants and the Syrian refugees in Ecuador. In 2020, the national poverty rate increased to 32.4 per cent. According to UNHCR’s presence in the country, the rate is likely to be higher for refugees and migrants.

According to OECD data, the volume of bilateral ODA to the refugee situation in Ecuador more than tripled between 2018 and 2019. No bilateral ODA channeled directly to national actors was reported in the survey. According to UNHCR’s country presence, this may not capture all the funding provided by the international community to local governments and NGOs active in the refugee response. The low grants refugees access to work and social security on the same basis as nationals. The right to freedom of movement is absolute for all persons present in the territory, irrespective of migratory status. A total of 52,982 Venezuelan and 11,912 Colombian students were enrolled in the national education system for the period 2020-2021. This is an increase compared to the 2019-2020 period. However, data do not allow the calculation of the proportion of refugee or migrant children enrolled. Four countries received UNHCR resettlement submissions from Ecuador in 2021—a decrease compared to preceding years.
PLEDGES TOWARDS GLOBAL COMPACT ON REFUGEES

OBJECTIVE 4

Some 60 pledges were made at the GCF towards supporting conditions in countries of origin for return in safety and dignity. This represents only four per cent of all GCF pledges, the smallest proportion across all four objectives (Figure 41).

Among the 60 pledges submitted, 26 updates were received, of which some 85 per cent were reported to be in progress. Four pledges were fulfilled, and two were reported to be in the planning phase. Cumulatively, more than 50 per cent of pledges linked to GCR objective 4 concern Africa and Asia and the Pacific. Nineteen pledges (32%) were global pledges. Some 60 per cent of pledges were submitted by States, while 20 per cent were made by international organizations and NGOs. A little over 20 per cent were bilateral or multilateral donor pledges, and more than 50 per cent were made by hosting countries.

While travel restrictions and complex political climates hindered large-scale voluntary repatriation, pledges for returns to Burundi, Afghanistan, the Central African Republic, Cameroon, and Mali were implemented or remained in progress. Related progress was made through GCR Support Platforms. The Federal Government of Somalia adopted a National Durable Solutions Strategy 2020-2024 to address the root causes of displacement and its consequences habitually. As part of Honduras’ pledge to build the capacity of municipalities to deal with returnees, refugees, and migrants, 14 municipalities were trained in displacement-related matters, despite some delays due to the pandemic.
Reliable, comparable, and timely data is critical for evidence-based measures to improve socio-economic conditions for refugees and host communities; assess and address the impact of large refugee populations on host countries in emergency and protracted situations; and identify and plan appropriate solutions.

The GCR undermines the role of data and evidence for effective planning and accountability. If it is not to support for the inclusion of refugees and host populations in national data collection and strengthening national systems to enable the production of statistics on refugee situations. In addition to national ownership of data collection, over-researching recommendations on GCR and other indicators on refugees and host populations relate to disaggregation by gender, age, and diversity; the promotion of harmonized and interoperable statistical methods; and alignment with international standards and statistical practices. While more reliable and comparable data to measure GCR objective 2 on refugee self-reliance, such as poverty levels among refugees, is urgently needed, shortcomings in basic demographic characteristics should not be forgotten; sex; and age-disaggregated stock figures are currently lacking for 25 per cent of the global refugee population, a data gap that stands at 80 per cent for refugees in countries in the Americas and 35 per cent in Asia and the Pacific.

The table at the end of this report lists the GCR indicators, and the corresponding data sources and collection methods.

INTERNATIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON REFUGEE STATISTICS

Until recently, there were no globally endorsed standards for the collection, compilation, and dissemination of data on refugees internationally. With the objective of improving the collection of data on refugees, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) established the Expert Group on Refugee and Internally Displaced Persons Statistics (EGRIS) to develop International Recommendations on Refugee Statistics (IRRS) that were endorsed at the 45th session of the UNHCR in 2018. The recommendations were developed through a collaborative process in which national authorities and regional and international agencies with relevant expertise in research and statistics on refugees, asylum-seekers, and related populations. EGRIS is currently investing in building capacities for implementation of the IRRS and the International Recommendations on IDP Statistics (IRDs). Some countries have already taken steps to implement the recommendations, providing good practices and lessons learned. This is the case of Kenya, which has included refugees in its 2018 national census. Morocco has also made progress, by including question modules to identify refugees in the national survey, such as the labor force survey. Going forward, EGRIS is advocating for integration of forced displacement into National Statistics for the Development of Statistics (NDS), investment in national statistical capacities, and increased funding for the forced displacement data area. Increased multi-stakeholder partnerships and coordination with international organizations and UNHCR will be critical in improving the quality and understanding of the importance of statistics on refugees for effective policymaking and programme development.

Data for Global Compact on Refugees Objective 1

The OECD Financing for Refugee Situations Survey 2020, which is a follow-up to the Survey on Policies for Refugees and Humanitarian Settings (SPR) 2018-2020, collected data on the OECD’s FRR indicators, covering the period 2018-2020. UNHCR expressed deep gratitude to the 28 members of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC), one DAC participant, four multilateral development banks, and three other donor countries, for participating in the OECD refugee financing survey in 2020, notably Austria, Australia, Belgium, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, the European Union, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Estonia, Kuwait, Lithuanie, Taiwan Province of China, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the European Investment Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the World Bank.

Due to data availability issues, the data provided by several countries for the fiscal year of 2020 could not be included in this report. A detailed description of the methodology and limitations of the survey is provided in annex. 2020 OECD survey need to be integrated into the standard OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS). There is also a need to develop the use of the IRRS indicators to support standardised Development Cooperation Interchangeable metadata, an international standard framework, on the definition of refugee and related terms and populations by bilateral interventions, including funding relevant to refugee situations. Instead of the original indicator GCR indicator 12.2 on the number of partners supporting national arrangements in the refugee-hosting country, UNHCR had to develop a proxy (or indirect) indicator on the number of partners listed per country in Refugee Response Framework (RRF). Conceptual, methodological, and practical issues prevented the completion of the original indicator. Among them was the lack of a common and operational definition of “national arrangements” for reporting against the global indicator. The GCR does not prescribe the exact nature and design of such arrangements. It is presented as a concept to be contextualized in each refugee-hosting country, leading to arrangements which vary greatly in terms of their formation, design, and elements. Further, the definition of partners supporting such arrangements, and the extent to which these partners are listed in publicly available national plans, varies, posing additional administrative and practical challenges. Another key consideration relates to the data collection burden. In-depth research into the arrangements in each refugee-hosting context, and the partners engaged in these could have provided significant resources and generated a large amount of qualitative data, whereas the intent of the GCR indicators is to provide a succinct account of progress using simple and comparable data over time.

Despite its advantages in terms of definitional clarity, and data availability, this proxy indicator also has some limitations: Multi-stakeholder inter-agency/Refugee Response Plans only cover a portion of refugee-hosting countries. Bilateral countries today a significant number of refugees are covered by one or more RRPs, many large refugee-hosting countries are not covered. Additionally, RRPs for only partners who are funding or providing technical assistance for the service delivery activities. For example, Government entities that are in a leadership role but are not accounting for funds are not typically listed in the UNHCR’s global catalogue of refugee-led organizations that may partner with larger organizations listed in the plans. Finally, without extensive research, it is not possible to disaggregate partners listed in RRPs beyond the categories of UN and non-UN (b) in the latter category being almost entirely made up of civil society organizations. Partners in the collaboration of such stakeholders such as: refugee-led organizations, women-led organizations, academia, or others are therefore not covered by this indicator.
Data for Global Compact on Refugees Objective 2

The proportion of refugees with access to decent work (2.1.5) and the proportion of refugees who can move freely within the host country (2.2.2) are both conceptualized as legal indicators.

The data were collected by UNHCR through a survey containing questions on the legal framework providing access to wage-earning employment, self-employment, workplace protection, the right to freedom of movement, and the right to choose one’s place of residence. Given a number of data limitations mentioned in the report and its importance to the topics under refugee self-reliance, there is a need to strengthen the measurement of decent work, including by continuing the collaboration with the International Labour Organization and developing the measurement of de facto access to work (e.g., using household surveys).

At the end of 2019, data on primary and secondary education enrollment of refugee children (indicator 2.2.3) was only available for 12 host countries representing 51 percent of the global refugee population (UNHCR 2020, Counting Together the Education). This had improved to over 40 countries reporting for the 2020 report (Staying the Course: Data from national education management information systems (MIS) is often not disaggregated by displacement status of school students.

To gain a better understanding of the inclusion of refugees in national education systems, UNHCR Regional Bureaus and country operations were contacted to seek information on national education policies, to understand whether refugee students were included in national education systems. The aim of this exercise was to obtain information from all countries, but emphasis was placed on major hosting countries, in order to cover at least 90 percent of all refugees and Venezuelans displaced abroad. In total, data were collected for 97 countries. Country operations were provided with several options and had to indicate whether national education policy or other relevant policies at the pre-primary, primary, and secondary levels indicate:

1. Refugees can access under the same conditions as nationals;
2. Refugees can access but face limitations;
3. Refugees cannot access education;
4. No official policy for refugees;
5. Don’t know.

Of all country operations contacted, 97 countries reported data on this proxy GCR question. Indicator 2.2.2 measures the proportion of refugee and host community populations living below the national poverty line. Few household surveys on refugee populations collect the complex and costly consumption data required to calculate the proportion of refugees living below the national poverty line. Even fewer surveys are representative of all refugees in a host country, which could be used to derive national estimates of poverty levels among refugees (see the UNHCR report Data Disaggregation of SSIC: Indicator by Forced Displacement).

For the estimated 50 million people globally, poverty data is either unavailable or outdated, limiting efforts to identify and address its causes (UNHCR 2020). Furthermore, where national household surveys do exist, forcibly displaced persons are often excluded, resulting in (until recently) a near complete absence of information on their levels of poverty. This lack of representative and comparable poverty data is recognized by the GCR and was a principal factor leading to the foundation of the UNHCR World Bank World Data Center on Forced Displacement.

To improve data on refugees’ education and poverty levels in the long-term, inclusion of refugees in national statistical systems, as outlined in the International Recommendations on Refugee Statistics (IRRS), is needed. This also goes for the continuing coordination and integration of data collection activities and databases by non-national actors, such as UNHCR’s case management system, proGres, and a representative flagship Refugee Survey Series currently under development with national systems. While they do not substitute improved primary data collection, statistical methods like survey imputation and simulation as well as rapid consumption modules are important techniques to estimate poverty levels in fragile contexts that do not allow for full expenditure and consumption modules.

Data for Global Compact on Refugees Objective 3

UNHCR systematically records and publishes reliable resettlement data from administrative records. However, resettlement submission and Better Systems (reported by UNHCR) do not always match resettlement statistics published by States. As Government figures may include submissions received outside of UNHCR resettlement processes. A systematic review of the number of refugees admitted through private or community sponsorship programmes could help to resolve these inconsistencies.

The joint report Safe Pathways for Refugees II (UNHCR-OECD 2021) summarizes recommendations to States to produce better data on complementary pathways for admission to third countries. These include collection of data on both citizenship and country of birth and on previous country of residence of migrants and refugees, to distinguish between people who were displaced directly from their country of origin and those who had previously sought an asylum in a first country of asylum. Disaggregation of admission data by gender, age, and other relevant indicators and status changes, for instance from education to work permits, will furthermore help improve evidence on complementary pathways.

Data for Global Compact on Refugees Objective 4

Data for resources to support the sustainable reintegration of returning refugees and measure ODA disbursed for refugee returnees in their countries of origin, as well as the number of donors who provide such funds, are compiled through the OECD survey on Financing for Refugee Situations (2020).

Data for GCR indicator 4.2.2 on the proportion of returnees with legally recognized documentation and credentials are sparse. Out of the top 10 return countries, some data were available only for Afghanistan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Burundi, Côte d’Ivoire, and South Sudan. The methodologies used as well as the data collected on documentation vary across countries, making the compilation of a global indicator currently unreliable. Data collected through household surveys, such as the Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) and Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS), or those conducted for the World Bank Global Finders database do not typically include dedicated sub-samples of returnees and questions to measure this indicator. More work remains to be done to increase and systematize the availability of data on possession of documentation. Doing so will also require building the capacity of civil registries to facilitate timely access by refugees, returnees, and stateless persons, as appropriate, to civil and birth registration and documentation, including through digital technology and the provision of mobile services, subject to full respect for data protection and privacy principles. Another way forward to collect improved data for this indicator is to include questions in national household surveys targeted at identifying returned refugees in line with those questions outlined in the IRRS and asking for documents and credentials.
Classification of Global Refugee Forum pledges

**Objective 1:** Included financial and technical, as well as policy pledges made towards refugee-hosting countries by bilateral and multilateral actors such as donor States, multilateral development institutions, and other stakeholders, such as NGOs and the private sector. Although having an ‘escaping the pressures’ dimensions, the pledges with a focus on resettlement and complementary pathways, as well as in support of conditions in countries of origin, by bilateral/ multilateral actors and other stakeholders were separated and excluded from reporting under **Objective 1**.

Under **Objective 2**, pledges were classified by applying two main criteria: (1) policy and financial pledges made directly by refugee-hosting countries, with the following areas of focus: jobs and livelihoods, solutions (local integration), and education; and (2) policy and financial pledges made by private actors (NGOs, private sector, faith-based organisations, and other stakeholders, among others) and a submitting entity that is a bilateral/multilateral donor with the following areas of focus: jobs and livelihoods, energy and infrastructure (focused on health and WASH also when related to sustainability), education, and solutions (local integration). The analysis of pledges under **Objective 3**, focused on solutions pledges related to resettlement and complementary pathways, including labour mobility, community sponsorship, and family reunification. **Objective 4** focused on policy and financial pledges relating to return, including voluntary repatriation and reintegration.

---

### Data sources of Global Compact on Refugees indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ease of movement</td>
<td>1.1 Resources supporting additional instruments and programmes are made available for refugees and host communities in the refugee-hosting country</td>
<td>Administrative Records (OECD Financing for Refugee Situations Survey 2020)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 National arrangements and coordinated refugee responses are supported</td>
<td>Administrative Records (OECD Financing for Refugee Situations Survey 2020)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Proportion of ODA provided to, or on behalf of, refugees and host communities by national actors in the refugee-hosting country</td>
<td>Administrative Records (UNHCR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Number of partners supporting national arrangements in the refugee-hosting country</td>
<td>Administrative Records (UNHCR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Enhance refugee self-reliance</td>
<td>2.1 Refugees see the social and economic life of the host country</td>
<td>Administrative/Legal Records (Survey conducted by UNHCR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Refuge and host community self-reliance is strengthened</td>
<td>2.2.1 Proportion of refugee children enrolled in the national education system (primary and secondary)</td>
<td>Administrative Records (processed by UNHCR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2 Proportion of refugee and host community populations living below the national poverty line of the host country</td>
<td>Household surveys (National household surveys; World Bank, UNCR and activities supported by the WB; UNHCR Joint Data Center)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>OUTCOME</td>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>DATA SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Expand access to third country solutions.</td>
<td>3.1: Number of refugees who departed on resettlement from the host country</td>
<td>Administrative Records (processed by UNHCR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2: Number of countries receiving UNHCR resettlement submissions from the host country</td>
<td>Administrative Records (processed by UNHCR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Support conditions in countries of origin for return in safety and dignity.</td>
<td>4.1: Volume of ODA provided to, or for the benefit of, refugees in the country of origin</td>
<td>Administrative Records (OSS Financing for Refugee Situations Survey 2020)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2: Number of refugees returning to their country of origin</td>
<td>Administrative Records (UNHCR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.1. Number of refugees returning to their country of origin</td>
<td>Administrative Records (UNHCR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.2. Proportion of returnees with legally recognized documentation and essential</td>
<td>Household surveys / administrative records (UNHCR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Endnotes**
6.2.2.2 The 2018 UNHCR report on the Protection Indicators for Refugees (PIRs) shows that the proportion of refugees in the global refugee population is approximately 60% for each of the regions. The PIRs are based on a statistical modeling to estimate missing data, using a 95% per cent posterior prediction interval, the lower and upper bounds are estimated to be 42 and 54 per cent.

6.3.3.3 According to the World Health Organization (WHO), in 15 per cent of the world’s population is estimated to live with some form of disability. It is likely that there are several million refugees with disabilities and that their numbers have increased since 2016. A survey conducted in Lebanon found that 21% of Syrian refugees have a disability, and one-third of all Syrian refugees household had at least one member with a disability. UNHCR’s 2020 Vulnerability Assessment for Syrian Refugees in Lebanon conducted by the UNHCR and WHO found that 19% of refugees were identified as having a disability, with a high percentage of these individuals reporting mental health issues.

6.4.4.4 Statistical modeling is used to estimate the prevalence of disabilities. Thirty-three per cent of refugees who are diagnosed as having a disability are reported to have a mental health condition.

6.5.5.5 People with disabilities are at risk of exclusion and marginalization. They are more likely to face discrimination, are less likely to access social services, and have limited access to economic opportunities. People with disabilities are more likely to experience violence and sexual and gender-based violence. They are also more likely to be stigmatized and discriminated against.

6.6.6.6 According to the UNHCR report on the Protection Indicators for Refugees (PIRs), in 2018, 67% of refugees in the global refugee population are women, and 33% are men. The gender imbalance is particularly pronounced in conflict situations and in countries with high rates of conflict.

6.7.7.7 Refugees with disabilities are more likely to face discrimination and stigmatization. They are less likely to access social services, and have limited access to economic opportunities. They are also more likely to experience violence and sexual and gender-based violence. They are also more likely to be stigmatized and discriminated against. People with disabilities are at risk of exclusion and marginalization. They are more likely to face discrimination, are less likely to access social services, and have limited access to economic opportunities. People with disabilities are more likely to experience violence and sexual and gender-based violence. They are also more likely to be stigmatized and discriminated against.
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SUDAN. Berhane Tilahun, 48, escaped with very little
when he fled the conflict in Ethiopia’s Tigray region. He
arrived in Sudan’s Tumaytah camp nearly two months
ago and looked for a way to make a living. Without the
means to start a business, he found a job at a small mill
where he makes enough to support his family. Sudan
has welcomed refugees and asylum-seekers for
decades and many host communities often share what
little they have with newly arrived families like
Berhane’s.
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BRAZIL. World Refugee Day activities with Venezuelan
refugees and migrants in Boa Vista, Roraima.
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