LERRN
WORKING PAPER SERIES

LOCAL ENGAGEMENT REFUGEE RESEARCH NETWORK

PAPER NO. 2 - DEC 2019

DURABLE SOLUTIONS AND THE HUMANITARIANDEVELOPMENT NEXUS

A Literature Review

MERVE ERDILMEN

PhD Student, Department of Political Science, McGill University

PUBLICATION INFORMATION

Title: Durable Solutions and the Humanitarian-Development Nexus: A Literature Review

Authors: Merve Erdilmen

Year: 2019

Working Paper No. 2

DOI: https://doi.org/10.22215/glrnw/1931662

Recommended Citation: Erdilmen, M. (2019). Durable Solutions and the Humanitarian-Development Nexus: A Literature Review. Local Engagement Refugee Research Network (LERRN). https://doi.org/10.22215/glrnw/1931662.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary 4

Introduction 5

1. Definitions and Conceptual Debates 8

2. Linking Humanitarian and Development Perspectives in Relation to the Traditional Durable Solutions and "Alternate Pathways" 11

2.1 Repatriation 11
2.2 Local integration 14
2.3 Resttlement 15
2.4 Alternative "solutions": Mobility, "alternate pathways" and self-reliance

3. Policies and Practices of Major International Organizations and Donors Relating to the Links between Development, Humanitarianism and Durable Solutions for Refugees 18

4. Gender-Sensitive and Intersectional Perspectives on Durable Solutions as they Relate to the Humanitarian-Development Nexus 18

5. Contributions of Refugees and Diasporic Communities to Durable Solutions and Bridging Humanitarian and Development Approaches 18

6. Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus: Relationship to Durable Solutions 18

Conclusion 23

Works Cited 26

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper provides a brief review of the literature on the link between humanitarian and development approaches to durable solutions for refugees. By shedding light on the meaning, scope, and timing of durable solutions; strengths and shortcomings of traditional durable solutions; the emergence of alternative solutions; intersectional approaches to durable solutions; and the roles of international organizations, non-governmental organizations, as well as refugees themselves in the pursuit of durable solutions as they relate to the humanitarian-development nexus, the paper aims at examining the gaps in the literature and avenues for future studies and policies. The paper has three main findings. First, while the literature on the humanitarian-development nexus as it relates to durable solutions has received remarkable interest from scholars and policymakers, the links between the humanitarian approach to emergencies, durable solutions for refugees, and development lenses on the solutions are not always clearly examined in the literature. Second, the extensive literature on the durable solutions to displacement appears to focus mostly on experiences of flight and displacement and remains limited in exploring the struggle for solutions. Finally, most of the work on durable solutions studies solutions in the Global North, which is the destination only for a small proportion of refugee populations, rendering the focus on the pursuit of solutions within the Global South limited.

There is a need for a deeper understanding of which "solutions" work in which contexts, recognizing the difficulty of reaching general conclusions about processes that are shaped by context-specific histories, cultures, socioeconomic conditions and experiences.

It is also important to articulate the gap between refugees' everyday practices and the policies of international organizations that contribute to solutions, the meaning of achieving a solution, and the perspectives that guide the conversation on the humanitarian-development nexus as it relates to durable solutions for refugees.

The fundamental questions like solutions for who, by whom, how, and when deserve more attention, especially within the context of the Global South.

INTRODUCTION

Finding solutions to protracted refugee situations and related conflicts has been one of the most pronounced challenges for the international humanitarian and peacebuilding communities since the end of WWII.

This challenge is particularly pressing as the number of displaced people worldwide is now higher than at any point since the World War II (UNHCR 2018).

Many have been displaced from their homes due to conflicts or persecution, yet natural disasters have also contributed to rising number of forced migrants. In 2016 alone, for instance, natural catastrophes affected 377 million people (Development Initiatives 2017: 19). The rising numbers of displaced populations and the intertwining of natural-and-human-made-conflicts prompt a reconsideration of the traditional durable solutions to refugee situations: voluntary repatriation, local integration, and resettlement.

In particular there is a need for increased scholarly attention to how efforts to bridge humanitarian responses to refugees and longer-term development efforts – the "humanitarian-development nexus" – relate to the resolution of displacement.

Recurrent crises have resulted in rising calls for multi-stakeholder, localized, empowermentoriented, international cooperation-based solutions to protracted displacement patterns. Relatedly, major international organizations (IOs) have started to promote new frameworks and initiatives for humanitarian as well as development-oriented approaches to durable solutions. These include, perhaps most prominently, the Global Compact on Refugees following the 2016 New York Declaration (UNHCR 2016c; WHO 2016). For some actors, these approaches are more successful or at least more promising than earlier, compartmentalized approaches to addressing the humanitarian-development nexus and durable solutions for refugees (Hanatani et al. 2019). Yet, multiplicity and ubiquity of humanitarian-development actors brought their own challenges to understanding and achieving durable solutions.

Three main trends can be identified within the literature on the humanitarian-development nexus as it relates to durable solutions for refugees.

1. **There is an extensive literature on the humanitarian-development nexus, and the issue is pertinent to the pursuit of durable solutions to displacement, but the link between these issues is not always clearly made in the literature.**

2. **While there is a considerable body of literature on durable solutions to displacement, there continues to be strong "exilic bias" in the literature on refugees, with experiences of flight and displacement studied in more detail than struggles for solutions (including as related to the humanitarian-development nexus).**

3. **In the literature on durable solutions, there is more work focused on durable solutions as they relate to the minority of refugees who reach countries in the Global North, rather than the pursuit of solutions within the Global South.**

1. DEFINITIONS AND CONCEPTUAL DEBATES

Much of the literature on durable solutions skips fundamental conceptual questions and focuses instead on the implementation of solutions in different contexts (Gottwald 2012; Chimni 2004; Bradley et al. 2019). Questions of what "durable solutions" mean, when solutions start and end, when displacement ends, what the term "durable" refers to, and solutions for whom and by whom, often seem to fall through the cracks in the literature and in interventions intended to support the resolution of displacement.

The term "durable solutions" does not appear in major legal documents on refugees. Neither the 1951 Refugee Convention nor the Statute of the Office of the UNHCR explicitly reference durable solutions, although the Statute does mandate UNHCR to seek 'permanent solutions for the problem of refugees by assisting Governments...to facilitate the voluntary repatriation of such refugees, or their assimilation within new national communities' (UNHCR 1950: chapter 1 para. 1).

The lack of an official definition of the term "durable solutions" as it relates to refugees has led to ambiguities of implementation and scope-related practical concerns.

A trio of solutions have come to be known as the "durable solutions" for refugees:

repatriation, with an emphasis on voluntariness

local integration

resettlement

For humanitarian agencies, the traditional trio constitute durable solutions as they are imagined to end the threat of persecution and forced migrants' precarious and vulnerable living conditions. However, from a rights-based perspective, durable solutions must also address the structural conditions that led to conflicts in the first place, such as discrimination, wars, poverty, marginalization, and environmental degradation (YacobHaliso 2016). Simply returning to one's country of origin, or obtaining citizenship elsewhere, does not mean that these structural concerns have been addressed.

Relating human rights-based approaches to the conceptualization of durable solutions, some call for attention to the relationship between transnational justice and durable solutions to protracted displacement and conflicts. Bradley (2012, 2015), Bradley, Milner and Peruniak (2019), Souter (2014), and Duthie (2013) point out the need to understand and address questions of justice and accountability linked to durable solutions for refugees. From this perspective, enabling durable solutions for refugees can be a form of redress or reparation for some of the wrongs refugees have experienced. Given the intertwined nature of humanitarian crises, development, and peacebuilding the pursuit of durable solutions must be understood as a long-term process (Gottwald 2012: 108; Souter 2014; Bradley et al. 2019).

It is important to consider who the target of durable solutions is, and from whose perspective they have been historically conceptualized and implemented on the ground – that is, solutions for whom, and by whom.

From the perspective of states, durable solutions are usually seen as humanitarian responses to refugees, rather than being a moral or legal duty. (Return may be an exception here, as exiled citizens generally have a legal right to return to their country of origin.) Depicting durable solutions as an act of charity, states aim at justifying their responses to different categories of displaced populations and prioritizing repatriation as the most preferable solution (Chimni 1999; Long and Crisp 2010; Hammond 2014).

In supporting durable solutions, states focus attention on select groups of refugees, and typically disregard or devote much less attention and resources to internally displaced persons (IDPs).

Asylum seekers who are able to reach countries in the Global North and achieve recognition as refugees have historically been able to access citizenship and thus pursue local integration as a durable solution, but increasingly asylum seekers are labelled as "bad" forced migrants, and derided as illegal migrants (Hyndmand and Giles 2017). This hierarchy between forced migrants who face similar challenges further distorts already complex debates on the nature of durable solutions. The literature tends to focus on durable solutions for refugees and to a lesser extent IDPs; migrants without documents remain out of scope of the conversation on durable solutions (Zeender and McCallin 2013). There is, however, extensive literature on how undocumented migrants in countries such as the United States have achieved citizenship.

Scholars have also contended that one of the fundamental features of the contemporary Westphalian state regime is the idea of citizenship as a privilege: sovereign states define and control the criteria for membership in a state. Displaced populations, as falling out of the state's borders and national-cultural conditions of membership, are rarely granted citizenship. This is a sobering reality, as achieving citizenship for stateless refugees is seen in much of the literature as "the" solution to the refugee problem.

People who sought safe haven in different countries try to produce their own solutions to displacement and protracted humanitarian crises which differ from state-centric and humanitarianagency-based
conceptualizations of durable solutions. Wide varieties of everyday practices from transnational ties (Harild et al. 2015; Horst 2006; Van Hear 2002; Gottwald 2012), and mobility (Long and Crisp 2010; Crisp 2004; Milner and Loescher 2011) to political mobilization (Jacobsen 2019), have been used by refugees and IDPs as a remedy to the shortcomings of traditional durable solutions. Displaced communities' efforts to achieve durable solutions tend to be studied in camp contexts. For instance, Van Hear (2003: 3) argues that 'refugee camps are often rightly represented as sites of immobility or restricted mobility'. There is a need for conceptual/definitional work engaging the perspectives and experiences of refugees outside camps.

Thinking about solutions from the perspectives of humanitarian agencies, states, and forced migrants themselves calls attention to important tensions between durable solutions for refugees, versus for refugee flows as a challenge for states and international politics (Hathaway 2007).

Tracing the sources of how durable solutions shifted far from the fundamental focus on the refugees' autonomy and dignity and turned into a bundle of fixed, top-down solutions, Hathaway vocalizes how durable solutions became a tool for state interests, instead of remedying displaced populations' problems.

Hathaway's arguments about the top-down implementation of durable solutions also reflects the still compartmentalized nature of the international humanitarian and development regimes. Over the last 20 years, there have been extensive debates on the need to more closely link humanitarian and development-related responses to conflicts and particular populations such as refugees. Various initiatives have attempted to address this gap at the organizational level (Hanatani et al. 2019). Recently, with the adoption of the 2016 New York Declaration, scholars have pointed out the need for to more clearly conceptualize what the humanitarian-development nexus means.

Much of the scholarly literature on the humanitarian-development nexus focuses on the economic aspects of humanitarian operations. For example, 'the suggestion that development is an indispensable component for solving the refugee dilemma implies that the grounding for displacement is economic', says Bill Frelick (quoted in Hathaway 1997: 151). Nelson and Dorsey (2003) attempt to clarify the meaning of the humanitarian-development nexus by tracing its roots and trends within it. A rights-based approach to development, collaborative campaigning by human rights and development NGOs, and the adoption of economic rights orientations by human rights groups are three main phases that led to current definitions of the humanitarian-development nexus (Nelson and Dorsey 2003: 2014). Dunbar and Milner (2016: 2), for example, argue that the humanitarian-development nexus focuses on 'reducing the gap in humanitarian funding, reducing refugees' reliance on international assistance, and mitigating the impact of large refugee movements on host communities',

and show how the humanitarian-development nexus has been practiced broadly in Africa for six decades now. In general, the humanitarian-development nexus refers to attempts towards bridging humanitarian efforts and development efforts/policies. The divide between humanitarianism and development is argued to be 'shaped by different principles, philosophies, cultures, attitudes and mind sets, and involving complex politics' (King 2018).

Clarifying terms like "durable solution" and the "humanitarian-development nexus" is important to contribute to our understanding of the relationship between these concepts.

2. LINKING HUMANITARIAN AND DEVELOPMENT PERSPECTIVES

IN RELATION TO THE TRADITIONAL DURABLE SOLUTIONS AND "ALTERNATE PATHWAYS"

This section provides a general overview of literature on the traditional trio of durable solutions and the emerging inquiry on alternative solutions. Shortcomings of each of the three traditional durable solutions – namely, repatriation, local integration, and resettlement – gave rise to interest in "alternate pathways" or "complementary pathways" to traditional solutions.

2.1 REPATRIATION

Generally speaking, in the Cold War period, repatriation was not pursued by many refugees or states. With the dissolution of the Soviet Union, repatriation became "preferred solution" for both states and IOs. This was tied to Western states' reduced interest in resettling refugees from conflicts in Communist countries, and the fact that repatriation is generally the only one of the three traditional solutions to which refugees have a formal legal right. In 1992, UNHCR declared the 1990s as the decade of repatriation (Toft 2007: 147). Starting from the 1980s, repatriation, either voluntary or involuntary, and organized or spontaneous, was implemented in many different contexts for diverse groups of refugees. Provisions specifying that repatriation should take place in safety and in dignity began to appear in international agreements in 1980s (Bradley 2019). While return is still the preferred solution for states today, there are many refugees whose countries remain violent, and whose governments may see them as enemies, making return difficult if not impossible (Toft 2007). There are also refugees whose countries did not exist before they sought for refuge, such as many refugees from states that emerged in the post-Soviet Union period. These barriers create major challenges in implementing return as the "preferred solution."

There are also challenges in enabling voluntary, sustainable repatriation in the context of the trend towards returns occurring unassisted or "spontaneously," and often in the context of ongoing conflict. (Harild et al. 2015: 6-7).

> **While repatriation is ideally expected to be voluntary and with institutional support from organizations such as UNHCR or IOM, in practice the overwhelming majority of returnees do so spontaneously with no help.**

Scholars have looked at the drivers of spontaneous voluntary or forced return (Toft 2007), yet there is a need for better understanding of how spontaneous return is actually practised, and which ties and strategies help returnees and facilitate returns.

Research on repatriation has also examined the politics and ethics of repatriation (Hammond 2014; Bradley 2015; Sauter 2014; Zieck 2004), the empirical and ethical sources of the distinction between voluntary and involuntary return (Hammond 2004; Harild et al. 2015), the conditions for successful social and economic reintegration (Fransen and Bilgili 2018), country of origin and asylum states' approaches to repatriation (Chimni 1999; Toft 2007), 'home-making and emplacement' (Hammond 2014), drivers of forced return, and the reasons for which refugees may reject return even if their countries of origin have become relatively peaceful (Crisp 2004; Harild et al. 2015). However, there is still a need for deeper understanding of the conditions for effective and just integration upon return. It is important to understand the link between integration, peace, and development, as the inequality between returnees and local populations may spark conflicts among groups (Sctwartz 2018).

In recent years there have been some important steps in terms of addressing development challenges associated with repatriation, mainly property restitution, reconstruction, and transnational livelihoods.

These could helpfully be further studied within the framework of durable solutions and the humanitarian-development nexus.

UNHCR, for example, recognizes its own insufficiency regarding the provision of better reintegration conditions upon the return. The agency mainly provides basic, short-term assistance to returnees, and struggles to engage with structural reintegration, development, and peacebuilding initiatives, due to the limits of its mandate as well as the restrictions on the budget. Attempts to solve this gap between assistance in the local contexts and failure to provide durable and reparative integration procedures gave rise to UNHCR's 4Rs approach (UNHCR 2004).

The 4Rs stand for:

1. **Repatriation**
2. **Reintegration**
3. **Rehabilitation**
4. **Reconstruction**

which, in conjunction, aim 'to ensure linkages between all four processes so as to promote durable solutions for refugees, ensure poverty reduction and help create good local governance' (Zieck 2004: 46).

The 4R concept was defined as an 'overarching framework for institutional collaboration in the implementation of reintegration operations allowing flexibility for country specific situations [aiming to] address effectively the mainstreaming of reintegration into national development plans and programmes' (Muggah 2007). Although the 4R approach is an important step toward bridging the link between durable solutions and larger humanitarian and development concerns, it does not provide detailed guidance for thinking about return in terms of peacebuilding concerns, and related transnational justice concerns.

2.2 LOCAL INTEGRATION

Local integration refers to the process of refugees becoming part of the economic, social, and cultural life in countries of asylum. It is important to recognize the distinction between formal integration, i.e. granting of citizenship to refugees in the countries of refuge, and unofficial or de facto integration, through which refugees may be integrated into local economies and society (often with little external IO or state support), but still lack a full set of formal rights, particularly citizenship rights. The literature on local integration is generally divided, with most studies focusing only on one type of local integration: formal or informal. Hovil's (2014) holistic focus on official and unofficial integration as well as the interplay between them, is an exception. Hovil (2014: 489) refers to official and unofficial local integration as de jure and de facto integration, respectively:

> *De jure local integration is primarily about national belonging (despite the misleading notion of 'local') and is represented by the formal process of obtaining a new citizenship and is an overtly political process', while de facto integration 'is an informal process that takes place primarily at a local level whereby refugee individuals or groups negotiate belonging in the locality in which they are living.*
>
> ***– Dr. Lucy Hovil (2014: 489)***

There has been interest in state-led assistance to support local integration, such as through microfinance and vocational training especially for refugee women (Yacob-Haliso 2016). Differential and overlapping development challenges associated with de facto vs de jure local integration come up often in the literature.

Yet, there is a shortage of studies that interrogate under which conditions states are more willing to grant citizenship to refugees and the political dimensions of de jure integration. Experiences in Tanzania are an important source of insight into this issue, but deeper understanding may be gained by looking at the Tanzanian experience in comparative perspective (Milner 2009, 2014; Kuch 2016).

Formal local integration in the global South has received somewhat less attention in comparison to repatriation and resettlement.

85% **While the drivers of successful local integration in the Global North have been studied extensively in the context of the migration integration literature, local integration initiatives in the Global South which host 85% of world's refugees have remained under-studied.**

The limited available literature focuses mainly on African contexts, where local integration has been promoted by the European states as the realistic solution (UNHCR 2018). Local integration challenges facing urban refugees have received scant attention, even though the majority of displaced populations live in the urban dwellings, rather than camps (Crisp 2004; Hovil 2014: 490).

Recently, scholars have started to engage with the local integration conditions of urban refugees, which is an important step toward filling the gaps in our understanding of the dynamics within the practice of local integration.

Most of this work focuses on the strategies of self-settled refugees. Work focused on the economic, social, cultural, and diaspora-based aspects of self-settled refugees' local integration is highly valuable as it stands against the stereotypical portrayal of refugees as 'vulnerable and in need' (Carpenter 2007). Dryden-Peterson and Hovil (2004: 33) similarly point out the how self-settled refugees' local integration contributes to 'commercial activities and sustainability'. Drawing on the success of self-settlement in certain contexts, such as Africa and Asia, local integration's link to self-reliance has been also inquired (Crisp 2004). However, the legally unrecognized and generally invisible nature of refugees' self-integration in local contexts renders them both vulnerable to exclusion from official rights and empowered as informal integration provides them tools to cope with the costs or downsides of being "included". There is an assumption in much of the literature that being included in efforts to secure formal durable solutions is in refugees' interests, but this assumption has been helpfully critiqued by scholars such as Landau (2019), who underscores the limited benefits provided by formal citizenship in some contexts, particularly in the Global South, and the advantages for some refugees of being able to move under the radar.

Scholars need to focus more on the interplay between official and unofficial local integration and humanitarian mechanisms to encourage 'local and national forms of belonging'

Landau 2019; Hovil 2014: 497

as a further step to reach more effective solutions for refugees. Engaging host communities in development efforts associated with local integration could be of special importance for further discussions on the link between humanitarian-development nexus and durable solutions

2.3 RESETTLEMENT

Resettlement is defined as 'the selection and transfer of refugees from a state in which they have sought protection to a third state which has agreed to admit them – as refugees – with permanent residence status' (UNHCR 2011: 416). It has been pursued as part of the UNHCR's mandate since the end of WWII. As resettlement offers permanent legal status to resettled refugees, this enables them to have a smother path of integration (Van Selm 2014). While resettlement was a promoted and preferred solution for many refugees from post-WWII throughout the Cold War years, it lost its "charm" with the end of Cold War and changes in the profile of many refugee populations. In the Cold War period, the US accepted the resettlement of refugees mainly because of the discursive and economic power gained by the resettlement of refugees from the Soviet-bloc countries (Chimni 2004; Thomson 2017). However, rising numbers of displaced people and their mixed profiles decreased the Global North's tendency to support resettlement. Today, resettlement is usually only implemented in the absence of other options (Jubilut and Carneiro 2011: 69).

Today some 28 countries offer resettlement, with the US, Canada and Australia making up 90% of offered resettlement places (Van Selm 2014). In addition to the limited number of resettlement countries, the context of resettlement is also marked by highly limited access to resettlement

<1% **of the total refugee population worldwide is offered resettlement each year**

Likewise, 'the number of available resettlement places has not grown significantly' (UNHCR 2015: 43). The limited number of resettlement spots depends on the construction of resettlement as a solution for the most marginalized refugees. UNHCR's criteria prioritizes survivors of violence and torture, refugees with medical needs, women at risk, family reunification, children and adolescents with special needs, and refugees without integration prospects (Troeller 2002: 87).

There is an extensive literature on the integration of refugees resettled in the global North (Van Selm 2014; Hyndman and Giles 2017). This literature looks at issues relevant to the humanitariandevelopment nexus, such as how resettled refugees secure independent livelihoods, but studies in this vein tend are not usually framed in terms of the humanitarian-development nexus but rather the literature on integration in the Global North. Examinations of resettlement from the perspective of refugees remain limited. Questions about which refugee populations are more likely to get resettled and why, for instance, are important to fill the gaps in the literature. Many studies interrogate the implementation of resettlement in the Global North, but only a handful of ones focused on the resettlement in the Global South, despite efforts in recent years to encourage Southern states to resettle refugees. Potential implications of lessons from the extensive literature on integration of resettled refugees in the Global North for processes in the Global South is needed could be further explored, drawing out connections to the humanitarian-development nexus.

Resettlement has been also studied in relation to the role of transnational interactions among various displaced communities. The influence of transnational networks on the process of resettlement has been emphasized by many (Van Hear 2002; Horst 2006; Chimni 2004; Milner and Loescher 2011). For example, transnational ties among refugees, particularly in the form of remittances, can help those who remain in the Global South to have better livelihoods. Horst (2006: 17) argues that remittances contribute to the households of resettled refugees more than state and UNHCR assistance in some cases. In this sense, the literature recognizes the significance of remittances from resettled refugees in addressing development challenges. The idea of promoting the "strategic use of resettlement" (SUR) has recently become prominent.

Strategic Use of Resettlement (SUR)

UNHCR defines SUR as 'the planned use of resettlement in a manner that maximizes the benefits, directly or indirectly, other than those received by the refugee being resettled.

Those benefits may accrue to other refugees, the hosting State, other States or the international protection regime in general' (UNHCR 2010: 2). UNHCR (2010: 1)

has actively encouraged the strategic use of resettlement since the early 2000s, however the agency itself acknowledges that SUR has remained 'misunderstood and undervalued'. Very limited success with institutionalized efforts to promote the 'strategic use of resettlement' (Van Selm 2014) so far suggests the limits of efforts to have resettlement open up significant opportunities for refugees who remain in the Global South. However, further explorations of the "strategic use of resettlement" could be helpful, drawing out the ways in which resettlement may relate to efforts to overcome the divide between humanitarian and developmentbased approaches to supporting durable solutions.

2.4. ALTERNATIVE "SOLUTIONS": MOBILITY, "ALTERNATE PATHWAYS" AND SELFRELIANCE

Since the mid-1990s, limited progress in resolving displacement through the traditional durable solutions has contributed to rising scholarly and policy interest in the possibility of alternative "solutions" for refugees. A flexible solution providing mobility for displaced communities across and within the borders of countries of asylum, origin countries, as well as third countries is one of the most commonly suggested alternative solutions (see e.g. Long and Crisp 2010). IOM's Framework for the Progressive Resolution (2016) explicitly refers to mobility as an alternate pathway to traditional solutions. Through mobility, forced migrants may have the chance to split their families in different locations to reduce the risks associated with forced migration and increase the family income, to access different opportunities for education and health, and even to see and check if intended areas of return are indeed appropriate (Gottwald 2012).

A special ECOWAS agreement between Liberia, Nigeria, and Sierra Leone that allows refugees to hold three-year-work and residency permits across these countries is one of the first examples of a successfully implemented mobility framework benefitting refugees.

Similarly, the Mexico Plan of Action in Latin America (2004) created regional cooperation for the free movement of refugees through the launch of 'borders of solidarity', a 'solidarity resettlement program' and 'cities of solidarity' initiatives that provided opportunities for higher mobility and self-reliance to refugees, while local host communities also economically benefit from refugees' mobility (Jubilut and Carneiro 2011). A further example is UNHCR's 'Go-and-See-Visits' (GSV) and 'Come-and-TellVisits' (CTV) operations that enable representatives of refugee communities to visit prospective areas of return and in turn, to inform refugees about living conditions in their places of origin (Gottwald 2012: 129). All three examples helpfully promoted refugee mobility as an alternative solution to protracted crises.

Transnationalism and transnational displaced communities' networks are also suggested as an alternative solution (Horst 2006).

Displaced persons often develop transnational economic and political networks that can empower them to have better living conditions, advocate for their rights, and make more informed decisions about their choices of solutions. Strategies deployed by forced migrants themselves have positioned them to benefit from transnational networks, whether they are living in camps or in urban areas.

It is important to better understand the dynamics, strengths and limitations of such refugee initiatives and their links to more formal durable solutions. This may be a particularly promising line of investigation in relation to the relationship between durable solutions and the humanitarian-development-durable solutions nexus.

A wide range of alternative or complementary approaches to advancing durable solutions, beyond the traditional trinity, have been suggested. In addition to the possibilities discussed above, these include family reunification programs, self-reliance initiatives, migration on education visas, labour migration through the acquisition of work visas for refugees with needed skills, the creation of political federations in ethnic-conflict ridden areas and new political communities for refugees (Rutinwa 1996, Cohen and Van Hear 2017), the encouragement of North-South coalitions to provide alternative pathways to durable solutions (Loescher and Milner 2011), and the more systematic inclusion of refugees in policy planning and implementation. It is important to note the class dimensions of many of these "alternatives": many are only accessible to those refugees who are already comparatively well-resourced, formally educated, or have family ties in other countries, particularly in the Global North. The extent to which these options would benefit refugees who are amongst the most socio-economically disadvantaged needs more careful consideration. That said, the novelty of some of these alternatives is their link with the humanitarian-development-peace nexus, in the sense that they generally recognize the intertwined relationship between humanitarian responses to refugees, development, and peacebuilding. It is a known fact now that durable and dignified solutions for forced migrants cannot be achieved without consideration of the local contexts' development and peace conditions. The impacts of climate change on development also needs to be considered (Bradley and McAdam 2012).

Given increased interest in alternatives to the traditional durable solutions (an issue discussed in detail in the context of the Global Compact on Refugees), it can be argued that better understanding is needed of the conditions for the successful implementation these suggested alternative solutions, and exploration of their connections to broader efforts to address development, peacebuilding, climate change and other challenges. It would also be helpful to explore the extent to which these alternative approaches open up access to alternative formal citizenships for refugees – recognizing that despite skepticism from scholars such as Landau on the practical value of formal citizenship for some forced migrants, many refugees are eager to access effective formal citizenship.

3. POLICIES AND PRACTICES OF MAJOR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND DONORS

RELATING TO THE LINKS BETWEEN DEVELOPMENT, HUMANITARIANISM AND DURABLE SOLUTIONS FOR REFUGEES

UNHCR, the International Organization for Migration (IOM), UNDP, the World Bank, and the World Health Organization (WHO) are amongst the major International Organizations (IOs) in the field of humanitarianism and development. While UNHCR was established in 1951 and has been actively implementing durable solutions for refugees, other agencies' involvement with durable solutions for refugees is of relatively limited scope and is more recent.

UNHCR' policies pertaining to the link between durable solutions and the humanitariandevelopment nexus started to emerge in the early 1990s with the agency's adoption of 'proactive, home-land oriented and holistic' approaches in countries of origin (Gottwald 2012: 102). In the following years, UNHCR attempted to shift its focus from mere legal protection of and formal solutions for refugees to more holistic development-related approaches. The agency has emphasized the importance of self-reliance of refugees and advised that 'self-reliant refugees are more likely to achieve durable solutions' (UNHCR 2005: IV).

Self-reliance is referred to as displaced populations' socio-economic sustainable self-sufficiency in ensuring access to food, water, shelter, health, and education without further assistance from UNHCR

These early developments inform agencies' approaches to the intertwined humanitarian and development needs. The 2009 ExCom Conclusion suggested that cooperation between a range of actors are needed for the humanitarian-development-oriented solutions to refugees (UNHCR ExCom 2009; Milner 2014). UNHCR has also launched efforts such as the 'Transitional Solutions Initiative' (TSI).

> **The core of the TSI plans is development assistance to refugee-hosting areas that will move refugee camps from dependence to self-reliance while at the same time providing support for the hosting regions.**

Finally, in 2016, with the adoption of the New York Declaration on Refugees and Migrants, the link between humanitarian operations, durable solutions and development initiatives was further emphasized, with the declaration and

the subsequent Global Compact on Refugees addressing 'global solutions', 'local solutions', 'third-country solutions' and 'long-term and sustainable solutions'.

UNHCR 2016c: paras. 10 and 18

(The meaning of "solution" in the Declaration and Compact, and the relationship between references to global, local and third country solutions and the traditional three durable solutions for refugees is unclear.)

While UNHCR traditionally leads efforts to promote durable solutions for refugees, IOM has also been engaged with repatriation activities. Recently, in parallel with the rising visibility of the humanitarian-development nexus in the international arena, IOM has developed a 'Framework for the Progressive Resolution of Displacement Situations'. The framework emphasizes the importance of mobility, better protection mechanisms for forced migrants, and self-reliance as an alternative to repatriation, local integration, and resettlement (IOM 2016). This framework reflects continued international interest in the link between durable solution and the humanitariandevelopment nexus, and is of particular interest because it addresses durable solutions not only for refugees, but also for IDPs. The overarching normative framework on durable solutions for IDPs is in some senses more clearly articulated than it is for refugees. The main standards for IDPs are the 1998 Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement and the 2010 IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for IDPs. The relationship between durable solutions for refugees and IDPs is an underexamined issue, particularly in relation to the humanitarian-development nexus.

UNDP, the World Bank, and WHO, which are fundamentally development-oriented IOs, started to collaborate with major agencies in the humanitarian field, especially with the rise of interest in the humanitarian-development nexus in the context of responses to the Syrian refugee crisis. The World Bank is working with OCHA, UNDP, UNHCR, UNICEF, and other partners, including donors, to advance the policy, operational and financial shifts required to enable the broader understanding of humanitarian operations and development needs, particularly across recurrent and protracted crises. The collaboration between the World Bank and other agencies has resulted in new policies as well as the institutional recognition of the benefits of the humanitariandevelopment approach through the 2016 Declaration.

Similarly, WHO has started to focus on the humanitarian, development, and peace nexus. The Sustaining Peace Resolutions of 2016 is a significant contribution regarding the inclusion of peace in discussion of the humanitarian-development nexus. WHO highlights that protracted crises "are the new normal" and often driven by conflict, which are generally produced by governments. The addition of peace to the humanitarian-development nexus also reflects the growing literature on the relationship between displacement, humanitarian development and peacebuilding.

4. GENDER-SENSITIVE AND INTERSECTIONAL PERSPECTIVES ON DURABLE SOLUTIONS

AS THEY RELATE TO THE HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT NEXUS

Intersectional approaches to studying the pursuit of durable solutions and the humanitariandevelopment nexus can be identified as newly emerging or gaining momentum. The literature has long overlooked the gendered dimensions of access to durable solutions. Existing literature on gendered and intersectional approaches to durable solutions focuses on inequality between women and men in access to durable solutions (Yacob-Haliso 2016; Martin 2004, 2017; Freedman 2008); many of these studies focus on specific country case studies. The literature on gender, race, ethnicity, and disability as pertaining to the relationship between durable solutions and the humanitarian-development nexus is scant, and there is a clear need for studies that shed light on the broad dynamics as well as fine-grained experiences of inequalities in the struggle for durable solutions to displacement, as shaped by factors such as gender, race, (dis)ability, age and class.

Yacob-Haliso (2016: 17) questions women's engagement with durable solutions by showing how experiences of refugee women reflect the 'intersectionality of disadvantage'. Refugee women do not form a social group as recognized by refugee law and often remain dependent on men's preferences or access to certain solutions over others. Historically, for example, the majority of resettled refugees were men, while most of the world's refugees has been women (UNHCR 2018).

1/2 **Today, at least half of the total number of refugees, internally displaced or stateless populations in the world are women and girls (UNHCR 2018).**

The discrepancy between the number of refugee women and their level of access to resettlement and local integration, refugee women empowerment projects, self-reliance assistance, and related development-oriented programs, such as vocational training, is one the most important observations emerging from the limited literature on gender, durable solutions and the humanitarian-development nexus, and points to the need for further work in this area (Ritchie 2018).

Many contend that the violence that refugee women experience in displacement is 'inextricably linked with the violence they experience in peacetime and in wartime and upon accessing durable solutions' (Cockburn 2004; Meintjes et al. 2001). In considering the fact that the literature on gendered and intersectional approaches to durable solutions and the humanitarian-development nexus is very limited, it is important to recognize that 'any durable solutions, to be sustainable, must adopt a continuum approach which seeks to address root causes of gender-based violence' (Yacob-Haliso 2016: 62).

5. CONTRIBUTIONS OF REFUGEES AND DIASPORIC COMMUNITIES

TO DURABLE SOLUTIONS AND BRIDGING HUMANITARIAN AND DEVELOPMENT APPROACHES

Important bodies of literature suggest that refugees are not only recipients of aid or benefits through efforts to address the humanitarian-development nexus, but actors who actively contribute to solutions and efforts to bridge aid and development gaps. Earlier discussions on alternative solutions, local integration, and gendered approaches to forced migration all refer to and recognize refugees' agency (in different ways and to varying degrees), and call for better understanding of refugee-led practices related to durable solutions.

The significance of refugee and diaspora-led efforts to develop livelihoods and businesses, educational opportunities, etc. as foundations for durable solutions comes up frequently in recent studies.

In recent years, there have been several studies on militarized refugees and the conceptualization of refugee agency as it relates to militarization; this issue is related to peace conditions in local contexts, which has also been studied in detail in recent years (Song 2012; Janmyr 2016; Rüegger 2018; Steputat 2004). Transnational refugee mobilization and implications for durable solutions and addressing development challenges is also repeatedly considered while thinking about the contributions of refugees and diasporas (Van Hear 2006; Horst 2006; Long and Crisp 2010; Thomson 2017; Hanatani et al. 2019; Fiddian-Qasmiyeh et al. 2014).

6. HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT-PEACE NEXUS: RELATIONSHIP TO DURABLE SOLUTIONS

The 2016 World Humanitarian Summit and the 2016 New York Declaration on Refugees and Migrants (and the subsequent Global Compacts on Refugees and Migrants) lay the groundwork for contemporary international political efforts to address the humanitarian-development nexus, with recognizing the need to understanding the link between humanitarian and development but also peacebuilding, and durable solutions (UN General Assembly 2016). Both the Summit and the New York Declaration referenced the relationship between displacement, peacebuilding, and broader development processes. By highlighting how humanitarian and development initiatives may fail to provide a sustainable solution for displaced populations, unless peacebuilding processes are considered, the Summit and Declaration show the interconnections between each realm. Many humanitarian crises today are rooted in the interplay of displacement, conflict, and developmental problems. The literature on the durable solutions' reparative and justice-related aspects, as mentioned already, can also be studied in conjunction with the humanitariandevelopment-peace nexus.

Bradley's (2015) and Duthie's (2013) emphasis on the relationship between durable solutions and refugees' participation in transitional justice and reconciliation processes can speak with the emerging literature of the humanitarian-development-peace nexus.

Yet, scholars should refine understanding of the dynamics among durable solutions, refugees as agents of (transnational) justice, and development-peace initiatives in different parts of the world and in various time periods.

CONCLUSION

The strength of approaching durable solutions through its link with humanitarian-development efforts is that it helps us consider durable solutions, development and peace-related concerns in a holistic sense. There is a need for deeper understanding of which "solutions" work in which contexts, recognizing the difficulty of reaching general conclusions about processes that are shaped by context-specific histories, cultures, socio-economic conditions and experiences.

Drawing on gaps in the literature identified above, key questions for future research can be identified as follows:

1. Considering the interplay between refugees' everyday lives and the tendency in much of the literature to position IOs at the centre of efforts to address the humanitarian-development nexus, what are the challenges for producing policies that account more for refugees' everyday lives and contributions to solutions?

2. In the context of continued discussions of "alternatives" to the traditional three durable solutions, what does it really mean to achieve a solution? Whose terms and perspectives should guide the conversation?

3. Whose responsibility is it to advance solutions?

4. How is the struggle for solutions, and the effort to overcome fractures between humanitarian and development-oriented responses to refugees, shaped by local politics, conditions and histories, and to what extent can lessons be shared across contexts?

WORKS CITED

BRADLEY, M. (2015). *Forced Migration, Reconciliation and Justice.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

BRADLEY, M. (2019). 'Resolving Refugee Situations: Seeking Solutions Worthy of the Name'. Research paper for the World Refugee Council/Centre on International Governance Innovation.

BRADLEY, M. (2019) 'Introduction: Shaping the Struggles of Their Times: Refugees, Peacebuilding, and Resolving Displacement'. In, Bradley, M., Milner, J., Peruniak, B. (ed) *Refugees, Peacebuilding and Resolving Displacement: Shaping the Struggles of their Times*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. pp.1-20.

BRADLEY, M., and MCADAM J. (2012). 'Rethinking Durable Solutions to Displacement in the Context of Climate Change'. *Brookings-LSE Project on Internal Displacement*. Available at <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/rethinking-durable-solutions-to-displacement-in-the-context-of-climate-change/>.

BRADLEY, M., MILNER, J., and PERUNIAK, B. (ed). (2019). *Refugees, Peacebuilding and Resolving Displacement: Shaping the Struggles of Their Times.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

CARPRENTER, R. (2007). *Innocent Women and Children' : Gender, Norms and the Protection of Civilians* (Gender in a global/local world). Farnham: Ashgate Pub.

COCKBURN, C. (2004). 'The Continuum of Violence: A Gender Perspective on War and Peace'. In Giles, W., and Hyndman, J. (ed.) *Sites of Violence: Gender and Conflict Zones.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, pp. 24–44.

COHEN, R., and VAN HEAR, N. (2017). 'Visions of Refugia: Territorial and Transnational Solutions to Mass Displacement'. *Planning Theory & Practice* 18(3):494-504.

CHIMNI, B. S. (2004). 'From Resettlement to Involuntary Repatriation: Towards a Critical History of Durable Solutions to Refugee Problems'. *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 23(3): 55-73.

CRISP, J. (2004). 'The Local Integration and Local Settlement of Refugees: A Conceptual and Historical Analysis, New Issues in Refugee Research'. Research Paper No. 102, Geneva, UNHCR.

DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES. (2017). 'Progress Report 2017'. Available at <https://devinit.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Development-Initiatives-Progress-Report-2017.pdf>.

DUNBAR, K., and MILNER, J. (2016). 'The Humanitarian-Development Nexus: Opportunities for Canadian Leadership'. RRN/CRS Policy Brief, Available at <https://refugeeresearch.net/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/dunbar_feb%E2%80%9917.pdf>.

DUTHIE, R. (ed.). (2012). *Transitional Justice and Displacement.* New York: Social Sciences Research Council.

DRYDEN-PETERSON, S., and HOVIL, L. (2004). 'A Remaining Hope for Durable Solutions: Local Integration of Refugees and Their Hosts in the Case of Uganda'. *Refuge* 22(1): 26-38.

FIDDIAN-QASMIYEH, E., LOESCHER, G., LONG, K., and SIGONA, N. (ed.). (2014). *The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies* (First ed., Oxford handbooks) [First edition.]. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

FRANSEN, S., and BILGILI, O. (2018). 'Who Reintegrates? The Constituents of Reintegration of Displaced Populations'. *Population, Space and Place*, 24(6): 1-13.

FREEDMAN, J. (2008). 'Women Seeking Asylum'. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 10(2):154-172.

GILES, W., and HYNDMAN, J. (ed.). (2004). *Sites of Violence : Gender and Conflict Zones.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

GOTTWALD, M. (2012). 'Back to the Future: The Concept of "Comprehensive Solutions'. *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 31(3), 101-136.

HAMMOND, L. (2014). 'Voluntary' Repatriation and Reintegration'. In Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, E., Loescher, G., Long, K., & Sigona, N. (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies* (First ed., Oxford handbooks) [First edition.]. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

HANATANI, A., GOMEZ, O., & KAWAGUCHI, C. (ed). (2019). *Crisis Management beyond the Humanitarian-Development Nexus* (Routledge humanitarian studies series). Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

HARILD N., CHRISTENSEN, A., and ZETTER, R. (2015). *Sustainable Refugee Return: Triggers, Constraints, and Lessons on Addressing the Development Challenges of Forced Displacement.* Washington D.C.: World Bank.

HATHAWAY, J. (1997). 'Reconceiving International Refugee Law'.Nijhoff Law Specials. The Hague: M. Nijhoff.

HATHAWAY, J. (2007). 'Refugee Solutions, or Solutions to Refugeehood'. *Refuge* 24(2) : 3-10. Available at <https://refuge.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/refuge/article/view/21378/20048>.

HORST, C. (2006). 'Refugee Livelihoods: Continuity and Transformations'. *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 25(2): 6-22.

HORST, C. (2006). *Transnational Nomads: How Somalis Cope with Refugee Life in the Dadaab Camps of Kenya.* Oxford: Berghahn Books.

HOVIL, L. (2014). 'Local Integration'. In Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, E., Loescher, G., Long, K., and Sigona, N. (ed.) *Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, pp. 1-17.

HYNDMAN, J., and GILES, W. (2017). 'It's So Cold Here; We Feel This Coldness": Refugee Resettlement After Long-Term Exile'. In Hyndman, J., and Giles, W. (ed.) *Refugees In Extended Exile : Living on the Edge* (Interventions). London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

HYNDMAN, J., and GILES, W. (2017). *Refugees In Extended Exile : Living on the Edge* (Interventions). London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

IOM. (2016). 'The Progressive Resolution of Displacement Situations'. Available at <https://www.iom.int/sites/g/files/tmzbdl486/files/our_work/DOE/humanitarian_emergencies/Progressive-Resolution-of-Displacement-Situations.pdf>.

JACOBSEN, K. (2019). 'Durable Solutions and the Political Action of Refugees'. In, Bradley, M., Milner, J., and Peruniak, B. (ed). *Refugees, Peacebuilding and Resolving Displacement: Shaping the Struggles of their Times*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. pp.23- 38.

JANMYR, M. (2016). "Refugees as Contributors to Peace'. *Global Policy*, Available at <https://www.globalpolicyjournal.com/blog/06/06/2016/refugees-contributors-peace>.

JUBILUT, L., and CARNEIRO, W. (2011). 'Resettlement in Solidarity: A New Regional Approach towards a More Humane Durable Solution'. *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 30(3):63- 86.

KING, S. (2018). 'The Humanitarian-Development Nexus'. Available at <https://www.ids.ac.uk/news/the-humanitarian-development-nexus/>.

KUCH, A. (2016). 'Naturalization of Burundian Refugees in Tanzania: The Debates on Local Integration and the Meaning of Citizenship Revisited'. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 30(3): 468-487.

LANDAU, L. (2019). 'Shunning Solidarity: Durable Solutions in a Fluid Era'. In, Bradley, M., Milner, J., and Peruniak, B. (ed.) *Refugees, Peacebuilding and Resolving Displacement: Shaping the Struggles of their Times.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

LONG, K., and CRISP, J. (2010). 'Migration, Mobility and Solutions: An Evolving Perspective'. *Forced Migration Review* 35: 56-57. Available at <https://www.fmreview.org/sites/fmr/files/FMRdownloads/en/disability/FMR35/56-57.pdf>.

LONG, K. (2010). *Home Alone? A Review of the Relationship between Repatriation, Mobility and Durable Solutions.* UNHCR PDES. Available at <https://www.unhcr.org/africa/4b97afc49>.

MARTIN, S. (2004). *Refugee Women* (2nd ed., Program in migration and refugee studies). Lanham, Md.: Lexington Books.

MARTIN S. (2017). 'UNHCR Policy on Refugee Women: A 25-Year Retrospective'. In BuckleyZistel, S., and Krause, U. (ed.) *Gender, Violence, Refugees*. New York: Berghahn Books. pp. 1-25.

MEINTJES, S., PILLAY, A. and TURSHEN, M. (2001). 'There Is No Aftermath for Women'. In Meintjes, S., Pillay, A., and Turshen, M. (ed.). *The Aftermath: Women in Post-Conflict Transformation.* London: Zed Books. pp.3–18.

MILNER, J. (2009). *Refugees, the State and the Politics of Asylum in Africa.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

MILNER, J. (2009). 'Refugees and the Regional Dynamics of Peacebuilding'. *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 28(1):13—30.

MILNER, J. (2014). 'Can Global Refugee Policy Leverage Durable Solutions? Lessons from Tanzania's Naturalization of Burundian Refugees'. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 27(4): 553- 573.

MILNER, J., and LOESCHER, G. (2011). 'Responding to Protracted Refugee Situations Lessons from a Decade of Discussion'. *Forced Migration Policy Briefing 6, Refugee Studies Centre*, Oxford, Available at <https://www.rsc.ox.ac.uk/files/files-1/pb6-responding-protracted-refugee-situations-2011.pdf>.

MUGGAH, R. (2007). 'The Death-Knell of 4R: Rethinking Durable Solutions for Displaced People'. *Humanitarian Practice Network*, Available at <https://odihpn.org/magazine/the-death-knell-of-%C2%914r%C2%92-rethinking-durable-solutions-for-displaced-people/>.

NELSON, P. J., and DORSEY, E. (2003). 'At the Nexus of Human Rights and Development: New Methods and Strategies of Global NGOs'. *World Development* 31(12): 2013-2026.

NYBERG-SORENSEN, N. (2012). 'Revisiting the Migration–Development Nexus: From Social Networks and Remittances to Markets for Migration Control'. *International Migration* 50(3): 61-76.

OCHA, UNDOP, UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP, and the World Bank. (2015). 'Addressing Protracted Displacement: A Framework for Development- Humanitarian Cooperation'. Available at <https://cic.nyu.edu/wp-content/uploads/1662/65/addressing_protracted_displacement_a_think_piece_dec_2015.pdf>.

PRESSE, D., and THOMSON, J. (2008). 'The Resettlement Challenge: Integration of Refugees from Protracted Refugee Situations'. *Refuge* 25(1): 94-99.

RITCHIE, H. (2018). 'Gender and Enterprise in Fragile Refugee Settings: Female Empowerment amidst Male Emasculation—A Challenge to Local Integration?'. *Disasters* 42(51): 40-60.

RUTINWA, B. (1996). 'Beyond Durable Solutions: An Appraisal of the New Proposals for Prevention and Solution of the Refugee Crises in the Great Lakes Region'. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 9(3): 312-325.

RUEGGER, S. (2018). 'Refugees, Ethnic Power Relations, and Civil Conflict in the Country of Asylum'. *Journal of Peace Research* 56(1): 42-57.

SCHWARTZ, S. (2018). 'Homeward Bound: Return Migration and Local Conflict After Civil War'. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Available at <https://academiccommons.columbia.edu/doi/10.7916/D8ZK706X>.

SONG, Y. H. (2012). 'International Humanitarian Response and Militarization of Refugee and IDP Camps in Kenya and Sudan'. *Journal of International and Area Studies* 19(1): 115-136.

SOUTER, J. (2014). 'Durable Solutions as Reparation for the Unjust Harms of Displacement: Who Owe What to Refugees?'. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 27(2): 171-190.

STEPUTAT, F. (2004). 'Refugees, Security and Development: Current Experience and Strategies of Protection and Assistance in the 'Region of Origin''. *Danish Institute for International Studies*, working paper no. 11, Available at <https://www.diis.dk/files/media/publications/import/extra/fst_refugees.pdf>.

THOMSON, J. (2017). 'Role of Resettlement in Refugee Responsibility Sharing' (Global leadership and cooperation for refugees, paper 3). Place of publication not identified: Centre for International Governance Innovation.

TOFT, M. (2007). 'The Myth of the Borderless World: Refugees and Repatriation Policy'. *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 24(2): 139-157.

TROELLER, G. (2002). 'UNHCR Resettlement: Evolution and Future Direction'. *International Journal of Refugee Law* 14(1):85-95.

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE FOR THE COORDINATION OF HUMANITARIAN AFFAIRS (OCHA). n.d. *World Humanitarian Summit 2016*. OCHA. Available at <https://www.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/WHS%20Concept%20Note.pdf>.

UNDP, UNHCR, and World Bank. (2010). *Transitional Solutions Initiative: UNDP and UNHCR in Collaboration with the World Bank.* UNDP, UNHCR, World Bank. Available at <https://www.unhcr.org/media/concept-note-transitional-solutions-initiative-tsi-undp-and-unhcr-collaboration-world-bank>.

UN General Assembly. (2016). 'Outcome of the World Humanitarian Summit – Report of the Secretary General'. Available at <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/outcome-world-humanitarian-summit-report-secretary-general-a71353>.

UNHCR. (1950). 'Statute'. Available at <https://www.unhcr.org/media/statute-office-united-nations-high-commissioner-refugees>.

UNHCR. (2003). *Agenda for Protection.* UNHCR. Available at <unhcr.org/protection/globalconsult/3e637b194/agenda-protection-third-edition.html>.

UNHCR. (2004). 'Handbook for Repatriation and Reintegration Activities'. Available at <https://www.unhcr.org/media/handbook-repatriation-and-reintegration-activities-complete-handbook>.

UNHCR. (2005). *Handbook for Self-Reliance.* Geneva: UNHCR.

UNHCR. (2006). 'UNHCR's Expanded Role in Support of the Inter-Agency Response to Situations of Internal Displacement: Report of a Lessons Learned and Effective Practice Workshop'. Geneva.

UNHCR. (2007). 'Concept Paper on the High Commissioner's Dialogue on Protection Challenges'. Geneva, UNHCR, 30.

UNHCR. (2008). 'Protracted Refugee Situations: High Commissioner's Initiative'. Geneva.

UNHCR. (2008). 'UNHCR's Role in Support of the Return and Reintegration of Displaced Populations: Policy Framework and Implementation Strategy'. Available at <https://www.refworld.org/reference/annualreport/unhcr/2008/en/56738>.

UNHCR. (2009). EXCOM. 'Conclusion on Protracted Refugee Situations'. No. 109 (LXI).

UNHCR. (2009). 'Refugee Protection and Mixed Migration: The 10-Point Plan in Action'. Geneva: UNHCR.

UNHCR. (2010). 'UNHCR Position Paper on the Strategic Use of Resettlement'. Available at <https://www.unhcr.org/media/unhcr-position-paper-strategic-use-resettlement>.

UNHCR. (2016a). 'Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework: From the New York Declaration to a Global Compact on Refugees'. UNHCR. Available at <https://www.unhcr.org/media/comprehensive-refugee-response-framework-new-york-declaration-global-compact-refugees>.

UNHCR. (2016b). 'UNHCR Commitments at the World Humanitarian Summit'. UNHCR. Available at <https://www.unhcr.org/rw/news/press-releases/unhcr-commitments-world-humanitarian-summit>.

UNHCR. (2016c). 'New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants'. Available at <https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A_RES_71_1.pdf>.

UNHCR. (2016d). 'Solutions for Refugees'. In *The 10-Point Plan in Action, 2016 Update*, pp. 175-198. Available at <https://www.refworld.org/policy/strategy/unhcr/2016/en/114089>.

UNHCR. (2018). 'Figures at a Glance'. Available at <https://www.unhcr.org/ph/figures-at-a-glance>.

VAN HEAR, N. (2002). 'From "Durable Solutions" to "Transnational Relations": Home and Exile Among Refugee Diasporas'. In Frederiksen, F. B., and Nyberg-Sorensen, N. (ed.). *Beyond Home and Exile: Making Sense of Lives on the Move* Copenhagen: Roskilde University. pp.232-251.

VAN HEAR, N. (2003). 'From Durable Solutions to Transnational Relations: Home and Exile among Refugee Diasporas'. *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Working paper No. 83. Centre for Development Research, Copenhagen. Available at <https://www.unhcr.org/media/durable-solutions-transnational-relations-home-and-exile-among-refugee-diasporas-nicholas-van>.

VAN SELM, J. (2014). 'Refugee Resettlement'. In Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, E., Loescher, G., Long, K., and Sigona, N. (ed.) *Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, pp. 511-526

YACOB-HALISO, O. (2016). 'Intersectionality and Durable Solutions for Refugee Women in Africa'. *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development* 11(3): 53-67.

WHO. (2016). 'The New Way of Working: Strengthening the Humanitarian, Development, Peace Nexus' WHO. Available at <https://www.who.int/health-cluster/about/structure/new-way-working.pdf>.

ZEENDER, G., and MCCALLIN, B. (2013). 'Durable Solutions for Internally Displaced Persons in Burundi within Reach;. *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 32(1): 74–100.

ZETTER, R., and LONG, K. (2012). 'Unlocking Protracted Displacement'. *Forced Migration Review* 40: 34–37.

LERRN

LOCAL ENGAGEMENT REFUGEE RESEARCH NETWORK

TWITTER

OUR WEBSITE

CONTACT US

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada

Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines du Canada

Canada

This research was supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.