

Waiting for Resettlement: Insights from Rwandan Refugee Camps

Caroline Leclercq

Abstract Resettlement serves as a protection mechanism and a durable solution for refugees. While research has explored various dimensions of resettlement, the lived experiences of navigating identification and selection processes remain insufficiently examined. Rwanda, a key first-asylum country and strategic partner in UNHCR's resettlement efforts, provides a fruitful case to explore these processes. Fieldwork conducted in February 2025 employed a qualitative mixed-methods approach, generating insights from refugees and the UNHCR office in Kigali. The research focused on the psychosocial impact of prolonged uncertainty throughout the resettlement process and the dynamics of communication between UNHCR, resettlement states, and refugees. Refugees view resettlement as a rare opportunity to secure rights, dignity, and prospects, yet the extended uncertainty and limited access to information generate feelings of dependency and mistrust. The findings reveal a persistent gap between the formal procedures formulated by the UNHCR and the refugees' lived realities.

INTRODUCTION

This article presents the findings of a field study conducted in Rwanda in February 2025, focusing on the selection process for refugee resettlement in four camps across the country. Refugees fleeing armed conflict—such as those displaced from Goma in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)—rarely reach distant destinations like the United States or the European Union directly, given the perilous and often costly journey this would entail. Instead, they seek protection in neighbouring countries, such as Rwanda, which has long functioned as a first-asylum state and strategic partner in international resettlement efforts. Resettlement, alongside voluntary repatriation and local integration, constitutes one of UNHCR's three 'durable solutions'. It serves both as a mechanism of international burden-sharing among host states and as a protection tool for the most vulnerable.¹ Resettlement includes the selection and transfer of refugees from a first country of asylum² (here, Rwanda) with no long-term integration prospects,

another country that has agreed to accept them as refugees with permanent residence status.³

The resettlement process is characterized by a sequence of steps over which refugees have little agency. Potential resettlement cases are first identified by UNHCR staff on the basis of specific vulnerability criteria, after which individuals are contacted by phone and invited to a preliminary interview (the resettlement needs assessment and initial review). This initial stage aims to verify basic protection needs, family composition, and potential links to resettlement countries. A second, more detailed interview follows (the resettlement interview), during which UNHCR assesses the degree of vulnerability and compiles a comprehensive Refugee Resettlement Form (RRF). The file is then transmitted to a resettlement state deemed appropriate, given its quota and selection criteria.

National authorities of resettlement states subsequently conduct their own interview, which may include additional considerations, for example, integration potential. In some cases, however, states rely exclusively on the files submitted by UNHCR. For those accepted, additional pre-departure procedures are required in Rwanda, including a medical screening to mitigate public health risks (such as tuberculosis, hepatitis, or other contagious diseases), a security check and a cultural orientation session intended to prepare refugees for life in the destination country. The resettlement countries' final selection decisions are not motivated nor subject to appeal.⁴

Despite this structured sequence, this paper shows that refugees often perceive the

resettlement process as opaque and fragmented, with long waiting periods and limited communication on the evolution of their case. These challenges are rooted in the structure of the resettlement system itself, which, in the end, depends entirely on the sovereign decisions of resettlement states.⁵ As this article shows, this institutional dependency often translates into procedural uncertainties for refugees, shaping how they experience and perceive the resettlement process. While research on refugee resettlement has grown in the past two decades, notably through the works of Marjoleine Zieck, Nathalie Welfens, Janine Prantl, or Meltem Ineli-Ciger,⁶ the lived experience of navigating the selection procedure remains understudied.

This paper aims to address this gap. Fieldwork conducted in February 2025 combined qualitative interviews with refugees and a written questionnaire submitted to the UNHCR office in Kigali. Data collection focused on perceptions of selection mechanisms, the psychosocial impact of prolonged uncertainty regarding subsequent steps and outcomes of the process, and the dynamics of communication between UNHCR, states, and refugees. While resettlement is seen by refugees as a rare opportunity to secure rights, dignity, and prospects, opaque procedures, scarce information, and long delays foster dependency and mistrust among refugees. The article proceeds by presenting the case of Rwanda as a resettlement actor, the research methodology and camp-specific dynamics. It then turns to refugees' perspectives on communication with UNHCR and resettlement states and on the uncertainty generated by long procedures, while also reflecting on how these experiences are understood and justified by institutional actors. It concludes with reflections on the findings' broader implications for the international resettlement framework and the impact of U.S. policy shifts under the Trump administration.

RWANDA AS RESETTLEMENT ACTOR

Rwanda, a first-asylum country and strategic partner in UNHCR's resettlement efforts, provides a relevant case to explore how refugees themselves perceive the navigation of identification and selection procedures within resettlement. It has hosted a significant refugee population for many years, mainly from the neighbouring DRC and Burundi. Many of these individuals live in camps under conditions of prolonged exile—sometimes for over twenty years—with no realistic prospects of return or local integration. In this context, resettlement often represents the only durable solution for the most vulnerable among them,⁷ making Rwanda a particularly relevant field for analysing identification and selection processes.

Rwanda is also distinctive in terms of its alignment with U.S. resettlement mechanisms. U.S. resettlement support is primarily implemented through two distinct pathways: Priority 1 (P1) which targets individual cases identified as particularly vulnerable, such as survivors of violence, women at risk, and individuals with urgent medical needs, and Priority 2 (P2) which focuses on groups of special humanitarian concern designated by the U.S. Department of State. In Rwanda, P2 applies to Congolese refugees who meet specific eligibility criteria related to their area of origin and date of arrival, criteria that can be adjusted over time. Unlike P1, P2 processing does not require justification based on individual vulnerability.⁸ Overall, it provides a structured framework that enables the U.S. to set resettlement priorities and guides UNHCR's case identification in Rwanda, resulting in a more targeted approach compared to many other first-asylum countries.

The U.S. are also a key financial contributor to UNHCR operations there. In 2022, U.S. earmarked approximately USD 17.7 millions of funding to the Rwanda UNHCR operation, making the U.S. by far the largest donor among countries contributing specifically to the refugee response in Rwanda.⁹ This financial support helps sustain assistance in food security, camp-based services, documentation, and protection, which in turn

enables UNHCR to identify and refer cases under the U.S. priority frameworks. The dual role of the U.S.—both determining priorities through P1/P2 and providing substantial funding—gives it considerable influence over who gets referred and how smoothly resettlements are processed in Rwanda.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND FIELDWORK

Conducted as part of my doctoral thesis, the study aimed to understand the lived experiences of refugees navigating the resettlement process. Rather than focusing solely on institutional mechanisms, the interviews aimed to capture the lived experiences of individuals navigating a complex procedure. The conversations explored how refugees are identified by UNHCR, how they interact with resettlement states, and what challenges they face throughout the journey—from initial contact to potential departure. Particular attention was paid to their perceptions, expectations, and emotional responses, revealing the human dimension behind administrative procedures. In addition, a written survey was conducted with UNHCR staff in Kigali which sheds light on the practical constraints and justifications articulated by field actors.

A total of 51 refugees were interviewed (26 men and 25 women), all part of the resettlement process. The adopted methodology was qualitative, implemented through semi-structured interviews. Most interviewees were from the DRC, and two were from Burundi. Regarding resettlement countries, most were undergoing procedures to be resettled to the United States, while three were in the process with Canada, three with Australia, one with Denmark, one with France, and one with Norway (the latter being the only case of rejection). Interviewees were situated at different stages of the identification and selection process: some had only been identified by UNHCR and completed the first interview, others had already undergone the selection interview with the resettlement state but not yet the medical and security screening, while a third group had passed all steps and were waiting

for departure. This heterogeneity shaped the observations made, as participants' perceptions and experiences reflected both the procedural stage they were in and the uncertainty surrounding future steps. While these variations enriched the insights generated, the fact that all participants had already been identified by UNHCR represents a methodological limitation: the study could not capture the perspectives of those who aspire to be resettled, but were never selected, as their perceptions of fairness in the resettlement procedures may differ significantly.

The interviews were conducted in four refugee camps located in different regions of Rwanda—Nyabiheke in the East (17 refugees), Mahama in the Southeast (16 refugees), Kigeme in the South (2 refugees), and Kiziba in the West (16 refugees). The four refugee camps illustrate distinct conditions and experiences of the process leading to actual resettlement. Nyabiheke, the smallest of the camps with almost 12,000 residents, stands out for the relatively smooth flow of communication between refugees and UNHCR staff, and resettlement was often perceived as the primary pathway available.¹⁰ By contrast, Mahama, the largest camp with over 63,000 residents, combines its very large population with more institutionalized protection mechanisms, including two UNHCR offices and a hotline system that processed hundreds of resettlement cases in early 2024, alongside more than 650 departures in the first quarter alone.¹¹ Kigeme (circa 15,000 residents) presents a narrower picture. With only two interviews conducted there, my findings are limited. However, the camp is important to note because resettlement is restricted to medical or specific protection cases. As the fieldwork showed, this selective scope makes the process highly constrained and less visible to most residents.¹² Kiziba (almost 16,000 residents) offers yet another configuration: although smaller than Mahama, it recorded the highest number of resettlement cases relative to its population. In 2023 alone, more than 1,200 slots were allocated to residents of this camp (including 1,000 to the United States). The centrality of resettlement as an option for durable protection

is reflected in the fact that most formal complaints submitted by refugees of the Kiziba camp to UNHCR staff concern this process. The presence of a university also makes Kiziba distinct, offering young refugees a rare combination of both educational opportunity and resettlement prospects.¹³

While UNHCR operates actively in all four camps through staff responsible for identifying resettlement cases, direct interviews with these officers were not possible. The Kigali office instead opted for a consolidated written questionnaire format, both to ensure coherence across responses and to articulate the institutional constraints shaping resettlement implementation.

REFUGEES' EXPERIENCES OF THE IDENTIFICATION AND SELECTION PROCESS

Based on the interviews with the refugees, the fieldwork highlights systemic prolonged uncertainty, limited access to information, and the psychological toll of suspended departures. These experiences are then contextualized through the written responses provided by the UNHCR office in Kigali, which shed light on the operational constraints put forward by institutional actors.

Communication and Interviews with UNHCR and Resettlement States

As refugees cannot, in practice, apply for resettlement themselves, cases are solely initiated by the UNHCR. The way refugees are informed of their entry into the resettlement process varies from camp to camp. Generally, the respondents perceive resettlement as a rare and valuable opportunity, synonymous with a better future and safety. However, very few understand the specific criteria (i.e., vulnerability) that led to their initial identification by the UNHCR.¹⁴

Following the first identification interview with the UNHCR, no written decision is provided regarding the refugee's (non-)eligibility for resettlement. Refugees must wait to be approached again to know whether they are selected for the resettlement interview. While some get contacted within a relatively short time (one month), the

majority¹⁵ reports prolonged waiting periods of several months or even years, during which they are uncertain whether they are considered for resettlement.

While opportunities to obtain information about the progress of their case are limited, they vary by camp. In Nyabiheke, communication with UNHCR is generally effective, facilitated by WhatsApp groups, village representatives, emails, phone calls, and notice boards. In Mahama, refugees are informed about the resettlement process primarily through a designated focal person, typically a fellow refugee acting as a liaison between the community and UNHCR. While they also communicate via phone calls, village representatives, occasional emails, and the camp office, communication is more challenging due to the camp's large size. In Kigeme, volunteers and a central office handle cases. Contact is made through a help desk, central office, volunteers who locate individuals, and notice boards. In Kiziba, communication is more challenging, largely due to the camp's high number of people in the resettlement process. Emails often go unanswered; complaint boxes are frequently ignored and contact usually relies on in-person meetings. The UNHCR also holds open office hours twice a week for those who wish to raise concerns. Overall, while significant efforts are made to keep refugees informed, the combination of large camp populations, sometimes a high number of people in the resettlement process, and financial constraints inevitably complicates communication. According to the UNHCR office in Kigali, refugees do have access to counselling services from both protection and resettlement staff, and each location has systems in place to handle phone calls and emails. However, limited human resources restrict the responsiveness of these mechanisms. In practice, urgent issues are generally brought to UNHCR's attention through camp leadership structures and community-based protection mechanisms.

For refugees, the selection interviews with representatives of resettlement countries introduce new layers of complexity and emotional strain. While the content of the interview with

representatives of a resettlement country differs slightly from the first one carried out by the UNHCR as it also includes questions on future integration prospects, refugees are typically required to recount their migration journey once again. For some, this repetition of past experiences triggered painful memories, making the process emotionally taxing.¹⁶

After the interview with the resettlement state representatives, the next phone call—which may come months or even years later—is not to communicate a decision of acceptance or refusal, but simply to summon them to the next interview or procedural step, often in Kigali. This means that the refugees never receive a clear notification of acceptance; instead, they only discover that their case is still under consideration. This fragmented mode of communication fosters confusion and anxiety, as refugees remain uncertain about both their progress and their chances of success in the resettlement process.

Nevertheless, the acceptance rate for UNHCR submissions to resettlement states remained very high in 2024, reaching 96 percent. This reflects states' continued trust in UNHCR processing mechanisms and the fact that UNHCR carefully considers resettlement states' criteria when deciding which cases to submit.¹⁷ In some instances, this trust translates into a form of near-full reliance on UNHCR assessments since certain states choose to base their decisions solely on dossiers constituted by the UNHCR—particularly the detailed RRF, which draws on the two in-depth interviews already carried out by UNHCR—without conducting an additional interview themselves. However, this is not the prevailing practice, and states still retain full discretion to accept or reject individual cases. In the context of this fieldwork, only one explicit rejection case was reported, based on a lack of credibility regarding refugee status. The individual was never contacted again. The UNHCR informed the person that they had not been selected for resettlement by the Norwegian authorities due to 'inconsistencies in their

narrative'. The person's request for further clarification never received a response.

According to the UNHCR office in Kigali, most resettlement states provide little information about the reasons for rejections. In some cases, such as when rejection is based on medical reasons or disability-related support needs, refugees receive more explicit explanations. More commonly, however, resettlement States simply invoke 'general credibility concerns,' without offering further clarification. Decisions may sometimes be communicated in writing to refugees, but in other instances, only UNHCR is informed, typically through emails or verbal explanations. This information clarifies whether or not the case can be resubmitted to a different resettlement country¹⁸. It is often difficult to obtain information about rejections based on discretionary considerations, such as national security or other public interest criteria. This includes adverse information gathered through background checks by national authorities (for example, social media activity, biometric data shared between resettlement states, undisclosed family ties, or political affiliations).

Length of the Procedure and Prolonged Uncertainty

A recurring concern among refugees is the excessive duration of the resettlement process, coupled with constant uncertainty. Regardless of the destination country, waiting is described as an omnipresent reality. Some refugees refer to their cases as 'sleeping files', reflecting the absence of updates on progress or reasons for suspension. This lack of transparency regarding timelines and outcome generates significant psychological stress.

The way resettlement is organised significantly limits UNHCR's operational flexibility, and as explained in the previous section, communication about the different stages of the resettlement process is also affected. This context explains why many refugees describe a sense of enforced passivity, constantly waiting for a potential call from UNHCR announcing an interview with a resettlement country. Many refugees refrain from contacting UNHCR to inquire about their case

status, fearing it might negatively influence the decision or be perceived as impatience. This perceived risk of jeopardising their chances reinforces a sense of silence and passivity throughout the waiting period. Yet this 'waiting' is not always spent entirely passive: some refugees report approaching their focal point or the responsible office to seek updates, but such efforts often remain unanswered. This is partly because the final decision, and thus the pace of the process, ultimately rests with resettlement states rather than the UNHCR. Long gaps between interviews are therefore less a reflection of inaction by the UNHCR than of the timelines and procedural requirements imposed by the receiving countries, which remain outside UNHCR's control. The resulting uncertainty leaves refugees suspended in a long, indeterminate present, unable to plan for the future.

The UNHCR office in Kigali states that the reasons for lengthy resettlement procedures are explained to refugees on a case-by-case basis. Family dynamics are among the most common: changes such as marriage, divorce, remarriage, or the birth of a child require updated registration and additional assessments by both the UNHCR and the resettlement country. In particular, the birth of a child may trigger additional procedures if both biological parents are not registered under the same case file, a frequent occurrence in the regional context, where years of protracted displacement, mobility between camps, and unstable protection frameworks often lead to families being formed outside formal procedures and registered under separate files. Despite UNHCR's efforts to support families, each modification to the family composition congests an already slow and rigid system.

Beyond family-related factors, other delays stem from complex eligibility reviews (for example, when documentation is incomplete or inconsistent), allegations or suspicions of fraud, unresolved nationality or statelessness issues, temporary absence or loss of contact with family members, or medical referrals requiring specialist treatment before departure. Structural constraints add further

layers: resettlement may be postponed if quotas are not available for a refugee's profile in a given year. Limited staff capacity and the prioritisation of urgent cases over pending updates reinforce these delays.

Finally, more factors can slow down the process. At times, resettlement states temporarily suspend their programmes due to reception challenges. In such cases, applications that have already been submitted are effectively put on hold. Also, practical obstacles contribute to delays: social housing for large families or single individuals can be difficult to arrange in most resettlement states, and additional obstacles to housing arise when a refugee has a significant mobility impairment or other disability.

During the interviews, several refugees shared how uncertainty sometimes culminates in last-minute cancellations, particularly for those selected for resettlement to the United States.¹⁹ For instance, a woman aged 32, who was supposed to depart with her children, recounted that she had already received a departure date and had begun concrete preparations: buying items for her future life (including going into debt with neighbours in the camp, whom she had promised to repay once she arrived in the United States and found work), organizing farewells and withdrawing her children from school. However, upon arrival at the airport, she was informed that her departure had been cancelled. She described this sudden disruption at the very last minute as deeply destabilizing, both psychologically and economically. Several other interviewees²⁰ also reported depression, often without receiving appropriate psychological support.

Almost half of the refugees interviewed²¹ waited for over a year without any explanation for the suspension of their cases. This silence, they explained, profoundly affected their morale and disrupted their daily lives. For example, Mrs. Y., aged 20, stated that her 12-year-old brother had dropped out of school, convinced that their departure was imminent. She explained that, for him, continuing his studies felt pointless: not only was he expecting to leave at any moment, but he

also felt that any effort invested in school would be wasted as he would have to start over once resettled in the United States. When the departure was indefinitely delayed, he found himself outside the education system, with no clear prospects for the future.

These psychological effects are further compounded by the broader living conditions in the camps, which intensify the burden of waiting and deepen the sense of uncertainty. All interviewees mentioned the difficult living conditions in the camps: restricted access to adequate food and very limited professional opportunities. Living in camps constrains access to formal employment outside, and even when opportunities arise, several refugees reported discrimination from employers reluctant to hire them because of their refugee status. As a result, local integration is widely perceived as unattainable—except in rare cases of marriage with Rwandan citizens—leaving resettlement as the only realistic pathway to a more stable future. Among the youngest interviewees (aged 20–28, whose parents fled the conflict in Goma in 1996), born and raised in camps, issues of identity also emerged. Several expressed that they felt that they belonged neither to their parents' country of origin nor to Rwanda, and for them, resettlement represented not only durable protection but also a project of (re)constructing identity and belonging.

CONCLUSION

Taken together, the fieldwork in Rwandan refugee camps has revealed both the complexity and the fragility entailed in the current resettlement system. For most refugees, resettlement remains the only viable, durable solution, as local integration is largely unattainable and return is not an option. Yet, as seen, the process is experienced as opaque and fragmented, unpredictable and marked by long periods of silence. Refugees' perspectives underscore the psychological toll of prolonged waiting or uncertainty, the destabilizing effects of last-minute cancellations, and the challenges of navigating a process over which they have little

control. Beyond UNHCR's communication constraints, this opacity also stems from the fact that resettlement states are not bound by any procedural obligations—such as clear timelines, transparency regarding the various stages and reasons underlying decisions, or the issuance of written, reasoned outcomes and access to an appeal mechanism. The absence of such procedural safeguards leaves refugees in a state of uncertainty and fuels the perception of arbitrariness. Their testimonies, therefore, call for greater transparency, clearer procedures, and improved communication throughout the resettlement process.

These individual experiences are shaped by broader structural challenges faced by UNHCR in implementing durable solutions. Since January 2025, the indefinite suspension of all resettlement submissions to the United States has disrupted the U.S. resettlement mission, leaving thousands of already accepted cases in limbo. This has been compounded by the freezing of U.S. financial contributions to UNHCR, which traditionally constituted a significant share of its resettlement budget. Together, these measures have significantly reduced resettlement departures from Rwanda and weakened the overall operational capacity. The loss of U.S. funding has not only slowed the processing and follow-up of cases but also affected essential protection-related activities, such as community engagement, child protection, and communication with refugee populations.

These developments expose the fragility of a system largely reliant on the leadership of a few major resettlement countries — primarily the United States — revealing a structural imbalance between global protection needs and the political will to address them. They also underscore the discretionary nature of resettlement policies, where domestic political changes in key states can directly destabilize international protection frameworks. It remains to be seen how recent shifts connected to the Trump administration will further affect the resettlement programme, both in terms of operational capacity and the future of durable

solutions for refugees in protracted situations. In this context, the need for a more resilient, diversified, and transparent resettlement system becomes all the more urgent.

Author bio Caroline Leclercq holds a Master's degree in Law from UCLouvain and a specialized Master's in European Law from ULB's Institute for European Studies. She has worked with the Odysseus academic network, served as an assistant for ULB's Equality Law Clinic and Refugee Law Clinic, and worked as a legal expert at the Association for the Rights of Foreigners (ADDE). Currently, Caroline is pursuing a PhD in EU law on refugee resettlement at Université Libre de Bruxelles and Université Catholique de Louvain-la-Neuve. She is also a board member of ADDE. Her research focuses on the selection of refugees for resettlement in Europe, and more specifically in Belgium. Email: caroline.leclercq@ulb.be

¹ UNHCR (2011). *UNHCR Resettlement Handbook, Revised Edition*. Geneva: UNHCR. p 3.

² 'State of first asylum' and 'host state' will be used consistently to refer to this State.

³ UNHCR (2011). p 3.

⁴ See UNHCR Resettlement Handbook, Country Chapters.

⁵ See UNHCR (2023). Resettlement Handbook, Ch. 4.8 'Resettlement country selection'.

<https://www.unhcr.org/resettlement-handbook/4-managing-resettlement-activities/4-8-resettlement-country-selection/>; De Boer T., & Zieck M. (2020). The Legal Abyss of Discretion in the Resettlement of Refugees Cherry-Picking and the Lack of Due Process in the EU. *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 32(48), 54-85.

⁶ Zieck, M. (2024). *Resettlement as protection: Integrating resettlement of refugees in international law*. Elgar Publishing; Welfens N. (2024). The EU's normative justifications of refugee resettlement. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 37(2), 552–569; Prantl, J. (2023). *The Legal Framework for Refugee Resettlement to the European Union*. Nomos; Ineli-Ciger, M. (2022). Is Resettlement Still a Durable Solution? An Analysis in Light of the Proposal for a Regulation Establishing a Union Resettlement Framework. *European Journal of Migration and Law*, 24(1), 27-55.

⁷ UNHCR (2022). Rwanda. <https://www.unhcr.org/rw/about-us>.

⁸ Unlike general resettlement pathways, P2 submissions do not require the inclusion of the refugee claim (Section 4 of the Resettlement Registration Form – RRF) or the individual justification for resettlement (Section 5)

to access the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program (USRAP).

⁹ UNHCR (2022). Rwanda Fact Sheet. <https://www.unhcr.org/media/rwanda-fact-sheet>.

¹⁰ UNHCR (2023). Nyabiheke Refugee Camp – Factsheet. <https://data.unhcr.org/en/documents/details/108469>.

¹¹ UNHCR (2024). Mahama Refugee Camp – Factsheet. <https://data.unhcr.org/en/documents/details/108899>.

¹² UNHCR (2024). Kigeme Refugee Camp – Factsheet. <https://reliefweb.int/report/rwanda/rwanda-kigeme-refugee-camp-factsheet-february-2023>.

¹³ UNHCR (2023). Kiziba Refugee Camp – Factsheet. <https://reliefweb.int/report/rwanda/unhcr-rwanda-kiziba-camp-fact-sheet-february-2023>.

¹⁴ According to their own understanding, 8 refugees reported serious medical issues (either affecting themselves or their family members) that could justify resettlement; 3 mentioned family ties with individuals residing in the resettlement country; 1 refugee identified as a political refugee and is aware of the risks posed by proximity to Burundi; 1 highlighted her status as an albino, which exposes her to discrimination and persecution within the camp.

¹⁵ 47 refugees

¹⁶ 13 refugees mentioned difficulties in speaking about their past.

¹⁷ UNHCR (2025). Projected Global Resettlement Needs 2026. <https://www.unhcr.org/media/projected-global-resettlement-needs-2026>.

¹⁸ A denial is considered non-prejudicial when no justification is provided or when it results from national immigration or asylum policies unrelated to UNHCR's protection criteria. This includes refusals based on factors such as "integration potential," practical

constraints like family size or medical needs, or differences in national eligibility standards. Such cases may be resubmitted to another resettlement State. By contrast, a prejudicial denial arises when the rejection calls into question UNHCR's assessment of the need for resettlement or eligibility for international protection, for example due to credibility doubts, refugee status determination issues, or security concerns, and therefore cannot be resubmitted to another resettlement State. In such cases, UNHCR reviews the concerns raised by the resettlement country and ensures that they have been properly balanced against the protection needs of the case'

¹⁹ 42 out of 51 refugees.

²⁰ 3 refugees used this term.

²¹ 17 refugees.