Resetting Refugees through Community Sponsorship: A Revolutionary Operational Approach Built on Traditional Legal Infrastructure

Jennifer Bond and Ania Kwadrans

Article abstract
More than a dozen states are exploring the potential of introducing community sponsorship programs as a way of contributing to the global refugee protection regime. This article provides a comparative analysis of the legal and administrative frameworks that have underpinned the introduction of community sponsorship in four diverse countries: Canada, the United Kingdom, New Zealand, and Argentina. We also briefly examine the introduction of co-sponsorship in the United States, a country without any formal national program. We conclude that while community sponsorship programs have the potential to revolutionize refugee resettlement, their operationalization is not contingent on revolutionary legal infrastructure.
Resettling Refugees through Community Sponsorship: A Revolutionary Operational Approach Built on Traditional Legal Infrastructure

JENNIFER BOND and ANIA KWADRANS

Abstract
More than a dozen states are exploring the potential of introducing community sponsorship programs as a way of contributing to the global refugee protection regime. This article provides a comparative analysis of the legal and administrative frameworks that have underpinned the introduction of community sponsorship in four diverse countries: Canada, the United Kingdom, New Zealand, and Argentina. We also briefly examine the introduction of co-sponsorship in the United States, a country without any formal national program. We conclude that while community sponsorship programs have the potential to revolutionize refugee resettlement, their operationalization is not contingent on revolutionary legal infrastructure.

Résumé
Plus d’une douzaine de pays à travers le monde envisagent activement la possibilité d’introduire des programmes de parrainage communautaires comme manière de contribuer au régime global de protection des réfugiés. Cet article offre une analyse comparative des cadres légaux et administratifs sur lesquels s’est appuyée l’introduction du parrainage communautaire dans quatre pays: le Canada, le Royaume-Uni, la Nouvelle-Zélande et l’Argentine. Nous examinons aussi brièvement l’introduction du co-parrainage aux États-Unis, un pays qui ne possède pas formellement de programme national. Nous concluons que bien que les programmes de parrainage communautaires aient le potentiel de révolutionner la réinstallation des réfugiés, leur mise en œuvre ne dépend pas d’une infrastructure juridique révolutionnaire.
**Introduction**

Community sponsorship programs empower ordinary citizens to welcome and integrate refugee newcomers into their communities. More than a dozen countries are exploring the introduction of these programs as part of their global commitments to refugee protection, and each exploration includes an assessment of feasibility—including considering what statutory, regulatory, and policy structures are required to operationalize the unique model. This article fills a gap in academic literature and policy documents by providing a comparative analysis of the legal and administrative frameworks that have underpinned the introduction of community sponsorship programs in four diverse countries: Canada, the United Kingdom, New Zealand, and Argentina. We also briefly examine the United States, a country that has recently seen the localized introduction of sponsorship-style programs, despite the absence of a dedicated national scheme or any formal framework. As discussed below, we term the US model “co-sponsorship.”

Since the inception of Canada’s Private Sponsorship of Refugees (PSR) Program in 1979, ordinary individuals have resettled over 300,000 refugees to large and small communities across the country. Comparative data emanating from this program over the past forty years demonstrate that sponsored refugees have better and quicker integration outcomes than refugees resettled through more traditional government programs. Community sponsorship also engages a broad range of Canadian citizens and enjoys consistent bipartisan political support. Refugee sponsorship received increased attention in late 2015, when a brewing political crisis over refugees spilled into the mainstream media and mobilized millions of people around the world looking to directly assist the vulnerable individuals flashing across their screens each day. In Canada, sponsorship provided an ideal vehicle to organize and leverage this mobilization and—following a time-bound political commitment by a new national government—tens of thousands of Syrians were sponsored to the country in just a few months. Canada’s PSR Program also provided a unique channel to sustain and broaden this engagement: since 2015, over two million Canadians from over 400 communities have sponsored refugees—extraordinary figures that hint at the potential power and scope of the community sponsorship model.

In September 2016 the government of Canada, the UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR), and the Open Society Foundations announced the formation of the Global Refugee Sponsorship Initiative (GRSI), a partnership aimed at sharing the community sponsorship model, and supporting its adoption around the world. The Giustra Foundation and the University of Ottawa joined the GRSI before it formally launched in December 2016, and the new partnership articulated three goals: increasing and improving refugee resettlement; strengthening and supporting local host communities; and improving the narrative surrounding refugees and newcomers. In its first two years of operation, the GRSI worked with over twenty countries around the world, supporting community and government stakeholders as they assessed feasibility, designed, piloted, and/or implemented sponsorship programs. Jennifer Bond co-founded the GRSI and serves as its chair, while Ania Kwadrans has played a critical role on the team since the initiative launched. While this article does not directly draw on that work, our understanding of community sponsorship is deeply informed by it.

The GRSI’s formation, and its subsequent high level of activity, is only one indication of growing global interest in community sponsorship programs. Increasing engagement is also formally reflected in statements and initiatives by the European Union and in the final draft of the Global Compact on Refugees (GCR), a multilateral agreement that explicitly encourages states to “establish private or community sponsorship programmes … including community-based programmes promoted through the Global Refugee Sponsorship Initiative.” Momentum is also visible in individual countries, as is clearly reflected in a strong joint statement issued by immigration ministers from Canada, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Argentina, Spain, and New Zealand. The statement notes the benefits of community sponsorship and encourages other countries to adopt these programs.

Collective experience with the process for introducing new community sponsorship programs is growing, but nascent. The case studies presented in this article aim to advance the field by providing examples of varying technical structures that have facilitated introduction of sponsorship across a range of countries. Each of our case studies explores legislation, executive announcements and orders, and any operational infrastructure that may have been established through regulation and policy documents, and subsequently implemented by government organizations or entities with delegated authority. On the basis of our five country examples, we conclude that while the legislative and policy nuances of each community sponsorship program have emerged in ways tailored to each state’s particular context, the frameworks that underpin these programs contain key similarities, including reliance on the same basic infrastructure as traditional refugee resettlement schemes.

**Definitions and Methodology**

The terms community sponsorship, private sponsorship, and refugee sponsorship have not been universally defined, resulting in conceptual confusion amongst stakeholders—a topic Jennifer Bond is exploring in a dedicated piece of
For the purposes of this contribution, we define *community sponsorship programs* as programs that empower groups of ordinary individuals—as opposed to governments or professionalized agencies—to lead in welcoming, supporting, and integrating refugees. While policy design features vary between countries, the basic model is a “public-private partnership between governments who, at minimum, facilitate legal admission of refugees, and private actors who provide financial, social and/or emotional support to receive and settle refugees into their community.”

Under our conceptualization of community sponsorship, the model responds to the observation that “by redefining basic human needs as ‘problems’ that only professionals can resolve … over-professionalization alienates people from the helping relationships they could establish with neighbours and kin.” The deep engagement and high degree of responsibility undertaken by individual refugee sponsors repositions newcomers from vulnerable outsiders whom private individuals watch fail or succeed, to partners in a project of collective interests: the newcomers’ success is inherently also the sponsors’ success. This profound partnership divides sponsorship programs from other forms of refugee support, including those that rely heavily on volunteers but are fundamentally led by paid professionals.

This article presents the legal and policy architecture that states have used to enable citizen sponsors to lead in resettling refugees. In addition to exploring four countries with government-created, national sponsorship programs, we also briefly examine the United States, a country with a large refugee resettlement program but no formal community sponsorship scheme at the legislative or policy level. Despite this absence, several local resettlement organizations in the United States have developed de facto sponsorship-style initiatives by sub-delegating authority in a way that manifests the type of citizen-led process at the core of our understanding of sponsorship. Since professionalized agencies retain official responsibility for newcomers’ integration, these programs do not fall within the scope of our definition of *community sponsorship*, and we thus present them using a different but related term: *co-sponsorship*.

We also deliberately restrict our analysis to countries that have introduced sponsorship programs in the context of resettlement—the relocation of a refugee from her country of asylum to a third country, usually with the support of the UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR). Resettlement programs are voluntary: while the Refugee Convention codifies obligations for states to protect certain non-nationals who claim asylum from within their territory, they are not legally obliged to offer protection to refugees who remain in the jurisdiction of other states. Despite this lack of formal requirement, the international community has repeatedly recognized the need for more “equitable sharing” of responsibility for refugees, and over forty states have established resettlement programs as one way of contributing to this objective. Each resettlement country has established its own distinct national procedures for operationalizing its program, but Canada’s PSR Program was, for many decades, unique because of the way that it empowered ordinary individuals to take primary responsibility for all aspects of welcoming and integrating newcomers.

Our focus on community sponsorship in the context of resettlement means that our analysis does not consider community-driven models that support asylum seekers or other populations of newcomers. We also consciously omit programs where the “welcomers” are exclusively family members, as well as programs where costs are shared between private and public actors, but integration is led primarily by government or professionalized refugee support organizations as opposed to community groups or individuals. Finally, because we are interested in exploring the infrastructure that has enabled the creation of sustainable, national sponsorship programs, we have not considered ad hoc, community-driven initiatives negotiated with single civil society groups via time-limited agreements.

This article provides a technical analysis of the statutory, regulatory, and policy structures that were required to initially operationalize a selection of community sponsorship programs. As a result, we take a historical view of our first case study—Canada—and examine the legislative changes that created the foundations for the world’s largest and longest-running community sponsorship program.

**Canada**

**Enabling Legislation and Orders**

Canada acceded to the 1951 Refugee Convention in 1969. A detailed review of Canada’s immigration policy followed in 1973, culminating in the 1976 *Immigration Act*, which introduced Canada’s first official resettlement program. Prior to 1976, refugee resettlement was based on ad hoc decisions and Cabinet orders-in-council. The new legal framework explicitly recognized refugees as a distinct class of migrants and included a more transparent approach for overseas selection and resettlement on humanitarian grounds. Refugees who met the requirements of the Act were to be granted permanent resident status upon arrival to the country. Since 1959, Canada has resettled over 700,000 refugees from all over the world.

The 1976 resettlement framework also included a provision that explicitly enabled refugee resettlement through community sponsorship. Specifically, the new *Immigration Act* gave power to the Governor-in-Council to make regulations “prescribing classes of persons whose applications for landing may be sponsored by Canadian citizens [or]
... permanent residents,” and “establishing the require-
ments to be met by any [sponsoring] person or organiza-
tion including the provision of an undertaking to assist any
such Convention refugee, person or immigrant in becoming
successfully established in Canada.” These brief statutory
references provided the foundation for the world’s first com-
munity sponsorship program.

Canada’s new approach to resettlement was quickly oper-
ationalized: in December 1978 the country pledged to accept
5,000 refugees from Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos as part of
an international response to the forced displacement of mil-
lions of Indochinese refugees. The scale and visibility of the
crisis continued to increase, however, prompting public calls
for the government to further expand its commitment. In
June 1979 the Canadian government announced that it would
admit 12,000 Indochinese refugees—8,000 of whom would
be government-assisted and 4,000 of whom would be pri-
vately sponsored by individual groups and organizations.
That same month, the commitment was increased further to
50,000 resettled refugees by the end of 1980.

To manage the rapidly increasing numbers, the government established a Special Refugee Task Force to specifically manage Cana-
da’s resettlement of Indochinese refugees. It also pledged
its ambitious new targets by offering a “matching”
model to the Canadian public, whereby it would admit one
Indochinese refugee to the government-supported stream
for everyone who was privately sponsored. With this com-
mmitment, the country’s new PSR Program rapidly took hold
as one of Canada’s principal resettlement mechanisms.

Regulations and Program Administration

Canada’s Immigration Regulations, 1978, contained pro-
visions that contoured the country’s new PSR Program, including defining the eligibility parameters for a sponsored
refugee and specifying that sponsor groups must be com-
posed of at least five Canadian citizens or permanent
residents (or be a Canadian corporation) residing or located
in the expected community of settlement. Eligible groups
were permitted to resettle refugees after signing a written
undertaking that they would provide one year of financial
and settlement support and demonstrating sufficient finan-
cial resources and a plan for “adequate arrangements … for
the reception of the Convention refugee and his accompany-
ing dependants.” The new regulations were in place before
the Governor-in-Council designated the first three classes of
refugees eligible for the program on 29 January 1979.

Faith communities and ethno-cultural groups in Canada
had a long history of supporting resettled refugees before
the psr program was introduced and were well positioned
to support the influx of Indochinese newcomers through the
new sponsorship stream. These national organizations sought
ways to leverage their own infrastructure, and beginning in
March 1979, developed master agreements with the Canadian
government that allowed them to authorize individual con-
gregations across Canada to sponsor Indochinese refugees.

These agreements also allowed the government of Canada to delegate sponsor-screening responsibilities to agreement-
holding organizations, while government officials retained
responsibility for vetting refugees and thousands of “Groups of
Five” who were unaffiliated with a larger sponsorship organiza-
tion. Within weeks, the government had signed agreements
with almost all the national church bodies in Canada.

Today Canada’s refugee law is governed by the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, 2001 (IRPA) and its associ-
ated Immigration and Refugee Protection Regulations, 2002 (IRPR). The IRPA retains the central provision that enables
sponsorship, and the IRPR sets out, inter alia, the eligibility
criteria for sponsors and sponsored refugees. The dual
track set in 1979 between master agreement holders (today, “sponsorship agreement holders”) and “Groups of Five” con-
tinues to underpin the program’s modern form. However, Canada’s sponsorship program has diversified and today
includes dedicated and specialized programs for sponsor-
identified refugees; UNHCR-referred refugees; individuals persecuted for sexual orientation or gender identity;
refugees with complex medical needs; urgent cases; and
post-secondary students. Despite this evolution, the core
of all of Canada’s community sponsorship programs remains
robust citizen responsibility and empowerment.

As described above, the world’s first community sponsor-
ship program was formed simultaneously with, and inte-
grated into, Canada’s new national resettlement program. Its
unique referral mechanism permitting sponsors to identify
refugees they wished to resettle was enabled by an explicit
provision in the 1976 Immigration Act, which also delineated
very generally the parameters through which persons could
seek protection, and gave scope for regulations to fill in my-
riad details. This model underscores the minimal legislative
framework that was necessary to facilitate the introduction
of this radically different approach to refugee resettlement.

Unlike Canada, our next two case studies—the United
Kingdom and New Zealand—each introduced community
sponsorship into pre-existing and well-established refugee
resettlement infrastructure. In the following sections, we
examine the distinct approach each country took to doing so.

United Kingdom

Enabling Legislation and Orders

The United Kingdom ratified the Refugee Convention on
11 March 1954. It has been resettling refugees since the
early 1970s via a combination of two informal programs and
ad hoc initiatives to respond to specific humanitarian
crises. Since 1971 the legal basis for refugees to be admitted to, and stay in, the United Kingdom—including through resettlement—has been the Immigration Act, 1971. The Act requires any individuals who are neither UK citizens nor members of the European Economic Area to obtain leave from UK authorities before entering the country.

Building on its three decades of experience with informal and ad hoc resettlement programs, the United Kingdom formalized its approach to resettlement in 2004 by introducing the Gateway Protection Program (GPP). The GPP was operationalized and continues to function by virtue of section 59 of the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act, 2002 (NIA), which enables the secretary of state to “participate in [projects] designed to facilitate cooperation between States in matters relating to migration” and to “arrange or assist the settlement of migrants.” The NIA further specifies that the secretary of state may provide financial support to international organizations in the United Kingdom for their migration-related projects, and may partner with other governments that advance similar programs.

The same broad provision in the NIA that underpinned the GPP also facilitated the more recent introduction of two newer resettlement programs: the Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme (VPRS), and the Vulnerable Children’s Resettlement Scheme (VCRS). The VPRS was announced on 29 January 2014 in a statement to Parliament by the home secretary, in which she committed to creating a new resettlement program for Syrian refugees. The home secretary did not initially quantify the scope of the initiative, but on 2 September 2015 it was announced that the VPRS would resettle 20,000 Syrians by 2020. In July 2017 the scope of the program was expanded to include refugees not only of Syrian nationality but also others affected by the Syrian conflict. The VPRS relies on the UNHCR to refer eligible refugees residing in Egypt, Iraq, Turkey, Jordan, and Lebanon. A cross-government Syrian Resettlement Team that includes the UK Home Office, the Department for Communities and Local Government, the Department for International Development, and several other ministries was created to implement the program. The United Kingdom also pledged to resettle 3,000 at-risk children and their families from the Middle East and North Africa by 2020, a commitment that resulted in the creation of the VCRS. Refugees resettled through the VPRS and VCRS programs are granted refugee status, which enables them to work and to access benefits in the United Kingdom.

After five years of residency in the United Kingdom, resettled refugees may apply for indefinite leave to remain in the country. The United Kingdom resettled over 25,000 refugees from all over the world between 2003 and 2018.

The UK community sponsorship program was introduced as a component of the VPRS and the VCGRS in a separate and very brief political statement by the home secretary at the Conservative Party conference on 6 October 2015. There, it was announced that the United Kingdom would “develop a community sponsorship scheme … to allow individuals, charities, faith groups, churches and businesses to support refugees directly.” This statement launched work to create a robust national sponsorship program. Further, by putting no limits on the number of refugees who could be sponsored from within the broader resettlement scheme, the United Kingdom established the most ambitious sponsorship initiative since the one Canada introduced forty years ago.

The UK sponsorship program relies entirely on the same legislative architecture that underpins its broader resettlement program: the only statutory reference to the community sponsorship scheme is a ministerial arrangement under the Equality Act, 2010, a technical inclusion that addresses the fact that the program focuses only on Syrian nationals and individuals affected by the Syrian conflict. Otherwise, the formal legal framework enabling resettlement is silent on the introduction of community sponsorship.

Regulations and Program Administration

Details of the UK community sponsorship scheme are delineated through policy instructions, guidelines, and forms produced by the UK Home Office. Collectively, these documents establish that citizens and community groups chosen as sponsors have primary responsibility for welcoming and integrating UNHCR-referred refugees to their local neighbourhoods. Prospective sponsors must partner with registered charities or community interest companies, but these organizations are not required to have expertise in working with refugees and do not lead the process—thus preserving the core of the sponsorship model. Sponsors must also obtain written approval of the local authority in the sponsored family’s future place of residence; demonstrate financial capacity to sponsor; and provide a detailed settlement plan that illustrates how they will deliver on their responsibilities, including securing housing for two years. After the UK Home Office provisionally approves a sponsor’s application, a formal agreement is signed, and the sponsors must attend a training workshop before being authorized to resettle a family. Once authorized to sponsor, the UK Home Office works with the sponsors and local authority to allocate a suitable refugee family to each specific group.

The UK community sponsorship scheme has inspired hundreds of local neighbourhoods to welcome refugees, and millions of pounds of public and private sector funding have been invested to develop capacity to recruit, vet, and support sponsorship groups and to evolve the policy model. This has resulted in significant sponsorship-specific infrastructure at the government and community level, and
the program has become an entrenched part of the United Kingdom's resettlement landscape, with its own unique and sustainable ecosystem.

As a result of recent success in the United Kingdom, many countries considering their own sponsorship programs are interested in learning from the UK experience. This makes the absence of any dedicated legal architecture to support the UK sponsorship scheme noteworthy: unlike the Canadian program, which was introduced by a specific statutory reference, the robust UK program was enabled exclusively through a high-level political statement and detailed administrative processes. However, the program is part of a well-established overall resettlement program, and some of the state-level operations associated with that broader program—including the overseas refugee referral mechanism—have been largely retained. This means that the focus of the new sponsorship scheme has been exclusively on transitioning the modality for delivering post-arrival reception and support.

Our next case study, New Zealand, also introduced sponsorship within a well-established resettlement program. However, New Zealand relied on the combination of existing legal architecture and a robust Cabinet document to pilot both a new community-based reception program and new refugee referral criteria.

New Zealand

Enabling Legislation and Orders

New Zealand acceded to the Refugee Convention on 30 June 1960 and has a long history of welcoming newcomers fleeing persecution. It has been resettling UNHCR-referred refugees since the early 1980s and operating its formal Refugee Quota Programme since 1987.

New Zealand’s 1987 Immigration Act introduced an extensive framework for refugee protection. The Immigration Act, 2009 built on this framework and explicitly authorized resettlement. The 2009 Act also gave the minister a broad mandate to certify immigration instructions relating to, inter alia, residence class visas, and “any general or specific objective of immigration policy.” These Immigration Instructions set out the criteria for granting visas and permitting entry into the country, and provided the legal basis for a resettlement program. Between 2003 and 2018, New Zealand resettled over 10,200 refugees through its state-led Refugee Quota Programme.

In June 2016 the New Zealand Cabinet agreed to increase its annual resettlement quota from 750 to 1,000 UNHCR-referred refugees and to pilot “a community organisation refugee sponsorship category … as a new form of admission.” A Cabinet background paper on the community organization refugee sponsorship category (published on 30 August 2017) informed this decision; proposing that the sponsorship program would be distinct from the Refugee Quota Programme and would form a new "part of New Zealand’s broader refugee and humanitarian programme.”

In September 2018, New Zealand announced that it would also increase its core annual quota by an additional 500 refugees per year, beginning in July 2019.

Many specifics of New Zealand’s pilot sponsorship program were laid out in the NZ Cabinet Minute of Decision (9 August 2017). In particular, individuals selected for the Community Organization Refugee Sponsorship Category needed to be recognized as refugees by the UNHCR; to possess a basic facility with English and a minimum of three years’ work experience (or a qualification requiring a minimum of two years’ tertiary study); and be between eighteen and forty-five years of age. Sponsors under the program needed to be registered legal entities; to have demonstrated experience working with refugees or other vulnerable people (although they did not need not be professional resettlement agencies); to possess financial and settlement capacity to support the sponsored refugees; and be willing to enter into an outcomes agreement with Immigration New Zealand for the provision of their settlement and integration responsibilities. Refugees resettled through the pilot community sponsorship program were to be granted permanent resident visas.

The New Zealand Cabinet also agreed that sponsoring community organizations could either nominate refugees eligible for the sponsorship program or be matched to refugees referred to New Zealand by the UNHCR. The addition of new eligibility criteria and the option of sponsor-naming represented major Cabinet-directed variations to New Zealand’s traditional resettlement program, and it is noteworthy that introducing these changes did not require legislative amendment. Instead, the very general nature of the existing statutory framework—focusing on visa criteria rather than the specifics of a particular resettlement stream—was deemed to provide the requisite legal authority for the pilot to be introduced and operationalized.

Regulation and Program Administration

New Zealand’s 2009 Act is complemented by a series of regulations and by the Department of Immigration’s “Operational Manual.” Amongst other things, the “Operational Manual” sets out specific details for the Refugee Quota Programme, including its objectives and eligibility requirements. It also establishes the requirement that resettled refugees receive an orientation at the Mangere Refugee Resettlement Centre—a component that was retained in the community sponsorship scheme. The Cabinet decision that gave rise to New Zealand’s community sponsorship program was also implemented through the “Operational
allowing sponsorship groups to support either a UNHCR-referred refugee or a sponsor-referred refugee (with some specific restrictions in each case), only Canada has introduced legislation that has formally recognized distinct referral mechanisms. In the other examples, the formal legislative instruments are silent on referral methodology.

Our next case study examines a newer resettlement country, Argentina, and explains how administrative processes created a resettlement program delivered exclusively through a sponsorship model.

**Argentina**

**Enabling Legislation and Orders**

Argentina ratified the Refugee Convention on 15 November 1961 and has a long history of welcoming newcomers through its asylum system. However, the country’s approach to resettlement has been noticeably iterative: in 1979 and 1980 its first formalized resettlement program focused on 300 refugees from Southeast Asia, and in 2005 it participated in the regional Solidarity Resettlement Program to resettle Colombian refugees. The creation of this second resettlement initiative corresponded with a broader overall restructuring of the country’s formal legal architecture relating to refugees and immigrants, resulting first in introduction of the *Migration Law* in 2004, and then in the enactment of the *General Law of Recognition and Protection of Refugees* in 2006. Neither of these instruments specifically references either resettlement or sponsorship, but the *Migration Law* provides the legal basis for an individual’s admission to, permission to stay in, or removal from Argentina and also enables humanitarian admissions using temporary status visas. Individuals resettled to Argentina with humanitarian visas may petition for refugee status once they arrive in the country.

Argentina’s most recent resettlement commitment has focused on Syrian refugees, and operates under the combined authority of the humanitarian visa regime set out in the *Migration Law* and two presidential decrees. The first presidential decree was issued in 2010 and sets out more detailed parameters for implementing the *Migration Law*, including its humanitarian provisions. The 2010 presidential decree also established the National Directorate for Migration as the agency responsible for implementing and enforcing the *Migration Law* and for creating associated regulations. Importantly, the 2010 presidential decree also delegated authority to Argentine consulates abroad to issue entry permits and visas, including humanitarian visas.

A second presidential decree was issued in September 2016, shortly after Argentina’s president announced at a UN summit that the country would resettle 3,000 Syrian refugees. The 2016 decree established a National Cabinet for the Syria
Program to coordinate efforts of the ministries involved in the integration of refugees. It also stipulated that the National Directorate for Migration would coordinate an inter-institutional working group to implement the national Cabinet’s instructions and provide recommendations to the national Cabinet. The result was that two key coordinating bodies for the Syrian Resettlement Program were established through the 2010 and 2016 presidential decrees.

Further contours of Argentina’s current resettlement commitment—the Special Humanitarian Visa Program for Foreigners Affected by the Syrian Conflict (Syria Program)—are delineated in a regulatory scheme established by the National Directorate for Migration pursuant to its authority under the Migration Act and the 2010 presidential decree. As we explain below, Argentina’s entire commitment to resettle Syrian refugees was designed to function as a national community sponsorship program.

*Regulations and Program Administration*

In response to international appeals for more states to resettle Syrian refugees, Argentina’s National Directorate for Migration created an administrative provision on 14 October 2014 (First Syria Program Provision), which established the country’s Syria Program. The First Syria Program Provision introduced the initial iteration of the country’s community sponsorship program by relying on the humanitarian admissions section of the Migration Law to enable Argentinian relatives of Syrian and Palestinian refugees to sponsor their family members’ resettlement. Under this original program, Argentinian relatives (termed “callers” [llamantes]) needed to provide a letter of invitation attesting to their kinship bonds with the sponsored refugee; proof of identity; and proof of domicile. In 2014 and 2015 over 200 sponsorship applications were submitted under this original Syria Program, and the basic operational framework for Argentina’s first community sponsorship program was formally established.

Momentum for Argentina’s Syria Program was renewed in September 2016 when the country pledged to resettle 3,000 Syrian refugees. Responding to this commitment, the National Directorate for Migration issued a second provision (Second Syria Program Provision), which updates the 2014 Syria Program by broadening the eligibility criteria for sponsors to include not only groups of individuals (“callers”) but also sponsoring organizations referred to as “requesters” (requerentes). The revised program allows both callers and requesters to initiate the humanitarian admission of individuals affected by the Syrian conflict by presenting a letter of invitation explicitly assuming a one-year commitment to provide accommodation and other integration support. Callers are also given the option of submitting a letter of endorsement from an organization, guaranteeing that callers will fulfil their commitments, and meaning that requestors may sponsor refugees directly or act as guarantors for callers. Significantly, the Second Syria Program Provision removes the requirement of familial ties between the sponsors and the sponsored refugees, enabling the introduction of a UNHCR referral mechanism.

Argentina’s Second Syria Program Provision also enables the National Directorate for Migration to implement mechanisms to collaborate with, and support, callers and requesters with the integration process. This function is implemented by the inter-institutional Working Group coordinated by the National Directorate for Migration, which—by virtue of the 2016 presidential decree—also receives instructions from the national Cabinet for the Syria Program. Successful implementation of Argentina’s Syria Program and growth of its overall resettlement infrastructure is also supported by the UNHCR’s Emerging Countries Joint Support Mechanism and by a 2018 investment by the European Union. As of July 2018, Argentinian callers and requesters had sponsored more than 400 refugees.

As we have seen, Argentina relied on broad statutory provisions and two presidential decrees to authorize the issuance of humanitarian visas and create important infrastructure for resettlement, including the establishment of two key coordinating bodies. Critically, Argentina is the only country under examination that plans to deliver its entire resettlement program via community sponsorship. As with other examples, the details of this model were established and operationalized at the administrative level, but Argentina is unique, both in relation to its degree of reliance on sponsorship and the fact that the model is neither mentioned in statutory instruments nor referenced explicitly by orders from the executive branch. The cumulative effect is that Argentina used entirely administrative processes to translate its broad humanitarian visa regime and a political commitment to support Syrian refugees into a well-delineated community sponsorship-based resettlement scheme.

Our final case study examines the United States—a large resettlement country that does not have a national community sponsorship program. Nevertheless, a number of American civil society organizations have recognized the potential of sponsorship and built their own mini infrastructure within the country’s broader overall resettlement scheme.

*United States*

*Resettlement Framework*

The United States is not a party to the Refugee Convention but did accede to its additional protocol on 1 November 1968 and is thus bound by articles 2–34 of the convention and to the core principle of *non-refoulement*. The country has a long history of accepting refugees from all over the world.
and in 1980 created the US Refugee Admission Program (USRAP) through the enactment of the Refugee Act of 1980.\textsuperscript{180} Introduction of the USRAP created a "standardized system for identifying, vetting, and resettling" refugees\textsuperscript{181} and, since then, the United States has resettled more refugees than any other country: annual admissions peaked between 1990 and 1995 with an average of 112,000 refugees resettled annually, and remained high into the 2010s, with 78,761 refugees resettled in 2016.\textsuperscript{182} These numbers dropped precipitously to 24,559 in 2017\textsuperscript{183} and to 15,784 in 2018\textsuperscript{184} under a new US administration. Between 2003 and 2018 the United States resettled over 640,000 refugees from all over the world.\textsuperscript{185}

The backbone of US immigration and refugee policy is the 	extit{Immigration and Nationality Act} (INA), a wide-ranging statutory regime introduced in 1985.\textsuperscript{186} The INA continues the US resettlement program and gives the president absolute discretion to set the country's annual refugee resettlement quota, taking into consideration both humanitarian concerns and the national interest.\textsuperscript{187} The scheme specifies that, once the president establishes the annual quota, the United States must work with the UNHCR, other specially trained NGOs, and its embassies abroad to receive referrals of individuals eligible for its refugee admissions program.\textsuperscript{188} Resettled refugees are admitted to the United States with refugee status. After one year of residency, they may request permanent resident status, and after five years they are eligible to apply for US citizenship.\textsuperscript{189}

The INA also established the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) within the Department of Health and Human Services. The ORR is tasked with funding and administering the domestic implementation of the US resettlement program.\textsuperscript{190} Specifically, the INA gives the ORR authority to work with stakeholders to develop policies on resettlement\textsuperscript{191} and to provide grants and contracts to "public or private non-profit agencies for initial resettlement . . . of refugees in the United States."\textsuperscript{192} To deliver on its resettlement mandate, the ORR partners with nine professional resettlement agencies,\textsuperscript{193} each of which is responsible for ensuring that a refugee's settlement needs are met,\textsuperscript{194} including housing, furnishings, food, clothing, and facilitated access to community and state-provided services.\textsuperscript{195}

The ORR's nine resettlement partners in turn subcontract these responsibilities to hundreds of local service providers all across the United States. These organizations welcome and integrate refugees under authority delegated by the ORR.\textsuperscript{196} There is wide variance in how these local partners operate, but the majority use a combination of professional case workers and volunteers to provide support.

Certain US organizations have, however, been inspired by the community sponsorship model and have chosen to further delegate core integration and decision-making responsibilities to highly empowered groups of sponsors.\textsuperscript{197} This has the effect of creating de facto community sponsorship models within certain communities. Since the US government did not create or formally acknowledge these programs,\textsuperscript{198} and since the refugee agencies retain ultimate oversight and responsibility for the groups, we term this model "co-sponsorship."

### Community-Level Co-sponsorship

One example of a robust and successful community co-sponsorship program was introduced by Integrated Refugee & Immigrant Services (IRIS) in Connecticut—a local affiliate of two of the nine US resettlement agencies.\textsuperscript{199} Under the IRIS co-sponsorship model, community groups of at least ten people are empowered to take primary responsibility for welcoming and integrating resettled refugees into their communities.\textsuperscript{200} Once these groups demonstrate to IRIS that they are prepared to welcome a refugee family, they must sign a formal agreement pledging to fulfill their responsibilities towards the resettled refugees.\textsuperscript{201} Responsibilities include fundraising to provide housing and basic necessities; welcoming the family on arrival; providing orientation and transportation assistance; assisting in connecting the family with health, education, and other services and benefits; helping the family manage its resources and secure employment;\textsuperscript{202} and offering overall logistical and emotional support.

IRIS provides guidance and training to co-sponsorship groups as they prepare to meet their responsibilities, and subsequently provides light-touch support to sponsors as needed. It also delivers federally required case management for the refugee family through a number of check-ins during the initial resettlement period.\textsuperscript{203} However, the agency does not direct the activities of the co-sponsors, who become the key decision-makers and implementers of all aspects of the settlement process. This represents a radical shift from the more traditional, highly professionalized US resettlement model. In 2016 one-third of the 530 refugees referred to IRIS were settled by community co-sponsorship groups.\textsuperscript{204} Allowing the agency to increase its overall capacity, welcome more newcomers to its area, and significantly grow the number of individual citizens engaging in significant ways with newly arrived refugees.\textsuperscript{205} While the United States does not have a formal sponsorship program, the IRIS program demonstrates that key components of sponsorship can be implemented not only within existing legal frameworks, but also within traditional operational models.

### Conclusion

Community sponsorship programs have the potential to be truly transformative. Countries seeking new ways to
contribute to global refugee protection, while simultaneously improving integration outcomes and benefiting their own local communities, are examining Canada's long history with sponsorship and considering how similar models might be introduced in their own domestic contexts. Our work with the GRSI has shown us that one of the first steps for any country considering a community sponsorship program is an examination of what laws, regulations, and policies are necessary to make it operational. The case studies presented in this article illustrate some of the varying approaches that have been taken in this regard.

Canada is the only country to have embedded sponsorship into its principal immigration and refugee statute simultaneously with the introduction of a nascent resettlement program. The United Kingdom and Argentina provide interesting contrasts to this approach. Both countries developed and operationalized sponsorship programs subsequent to high-level political announcements. In Argentina the commitment was a general one to resettle Syrian refugees, while in the United Kingdom it was a specific reference to the introduction of a community-led sponsorship program. After these announcements, both countries introduced their programs without any new supporting legislation: Argentina by creating a new regulatory framework under the broad authority of its general immigration law; and the United Kingdom by leveraging the administrative frameworks associated with two pre-existing resettlement programs. It is also noteworthy that, while both of these newer sponsorship programs are limited to refugees affected by the Syrian conflict, the specific regulatory infrastructure enabling the UK program does not reflect this restriction, while Argentina's does. This is consistent with Argentina's iterative approach to resettlement and may mean that additional political directives or legal authority would be needed for the country to retain its sponsorship program as a longer-term feature of its overall refugee policy.

Like the United Kingdom, New Zealand introduced its community sponsorship program into a well-established resettlement framework. However, while both programs rely on existing resettlement infrastructure and were introduced without legislative amendment, a significant amount of programmatic detail for the New Zealand program was included in the authorizing Cabinet documents. As a result, any subsequent policy changes to New Zealand's program will presumably require renewed parliamentary approval. It is of course noteworthy that, at the time of writing, New Zealand's sponsorship program was limited to a small-scale pilot initiative; it is possible that a future, longer-term commitment will be embedded into the country's legal infrastructure in a different way.

Finally, the development of co-sponsorship programs in the United States illustrates how the core elements of sponsorship can be implemented by motivated and creative civil society actors willing to deliberately de-professionalize their approach to refugee resettlement. The successful program at IRIS is a particularly strong example of what can be achieved in the absence of any formal adjustments to the national infrastructure. Of course, these initiatives rely on an existing resettlement pathway that is legally and administratively embedded, and in this way the United States most closely resembles the UK example.

While each of these situations is unique, our overall conclusion is that community sponsorship programs do not require significant, dedicated legislative infrastructure. In fact, Canada is the only country to have introduced a statutory provision explicitly authorizing community engagement in resettling refugees, and that provision is extremely broad. More frequently, sponsorship programs have been introduced through a combination of political will and administrative creativity.

For the many countries considering new sponsorship programs, this is good news: while they may need to carefully consider the political, policy, and operational realities of these systems, they likely do not need to undertake widespread legislative reform. As true believers in the power of sponsorship to transform the lives of both newcomers and the communities that welcome them, we hope this means that more programs will be introduced in the near term. Indeed, with global capacity shrinking at an alarming rate and the world desperately in need of creative solutions, the future of refugee resettlement may depend on it.
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Immigration and Nationality Act, (US), 8 USC 1158, s 207(a) (2) [INA]. The provision further enables the president to permit the resettlement of certain refugees in specific emergencies in addition to the annual quotas (207(b)). The INA incorporates the Refugee Act of 1980, which for the first time incorporated the Convention definition of refugee into U.S. law: Refugee Council USA, “History of the U.S. Refugee Resettlement Program,” http://www.rcusa.org/history/.

U.S. Department of State, “U.S. Refugee Admission Program,” https://www.state.gov/j/prm/ra/admissions/index.htm. Potential cases are referred to one of nine resettlement support centres around the world operated by international and non-governmental organizations and funded and managed by the U.S. Department of State’s Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration. Refugees are interviewed and vetted by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and undergo a health screening before being approved for travel to the United States.


INA, s. 411. The INA further mandates the ORR to ensure sufficient funding for employment training and placement, language training, and cash assistance to resettled refugees: INA, s. 412(1)(A). It also provides that employable refugees should be placed in jobs as soon as possible after arrival in the United States, that available social services should be focused on employment acquisition, language training, and case management, and that “local voluntary agency activities should be conducted in close cooperation and advance consultation with State and local governments”: INA, s. 412(1)(B).

INA, s. 412(a)(C).

INA, s. 412(10)(A)(ii).


The duration of this responsibility was a minimum of thirty days and up to ninety days after the refugees’ arrival. UNHCR Resettlement Handbook USA, 10.

UNHCR Resettlement Handbook USA, 10.


The closest the US government has come to a formal program was a 2016 announcement indicating interest in a program: “Top State Department officials voiced their support for private sector programs that can enhance resettlement capacity in the country. It was announced that the State Department was working in conjunction with Refugee Council USA—the umbrella organization that represents the nine charities that resettle refugees across the country—in crafting details for a private refugee sponsorship pilot program [that was] to launch in 2017.” However, the new administration elected in November 2016 did not continue this work: Matthew La Corte, “Let the U.S. Resettle Refugees Privately,” Refugees Deeply, 17 November 2016, https://www.newsdeeply.com/refugees/community/2016/11/17/let-the-u-s-resettle-refugees-privately.


Integrated Refugee & Immigrant Services, Community Co-Sponsorship Program, 8.


Integrated Refugee & Immigrant Services, Community Co-Sponsorship Program, 5, 7.

The United Kingdom would be free to change its policy and apply its Community Sponsorship Program to other resettlement programs like the GPP.
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