ADVOCATING ON REFUGEE PROTECTION WITH UNHCR

In June 2014, the Refugee Council of Australia (RCOA) joined Australian representatives of refugee communities and non-government organisations (NGOs) in a series of meetings in Geneva involving senior officials of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), NGO representatives from 82 nations and government representatives from 25 states involved in refugee resettlement. The main gathering was the 2014 UNHCR Annual Consultations with NGOs (held on 17-19 June), with additional discussions between Australian delegates and senior officials of UNHCR being held on 16 and 20 June.

RCOA, represented by chief executive officer Paul Power, worked closely during the Annual Consultations with NGOs and participated in meetings with UNHCR officials with five refugee community representatives – Nuha Markus, Tenneh Kpaka, Najeeba Wazefadost, Joseph Youhana and Parsuram Sharma-Luital – and representatives of Australian NGOs including Australian National Committee on Refugee Women, Centre for Refugee Research (University of NSW), AMES (Victoria), Settlement Services International, Amnesty International Australia, Refugee and Immigration Legal Centre (Melbourne), Refugee and Immigration Legal Service (Brisbane), Act for Peace and Access Community Services.

In participating in these meetings, RCOA sought to:

• work with other Australian delegates to bring concerns of refugee communities in Australia to the attention of UNHCR, particularly concerns related to the protection of refugees and asylum seekers in various parts of Asia, the Middle East and Africa;
• participate actively in discussions on refugee protection and resettlement, bringing perspectives from Australian NGO and communities;
• update interested NGO and UNHCR representatives about recent developments in Australia; and
• learn more about current international responses to global refugee needs, to help inform RCOA’s domestic work in policy development and community education.

UNHCR Annual Consultations with NGOs

The largest and most diverse annual gathering of NGOs involved in working with refugees, the 2014 UNHCR Annual Consultations drew more participants than ever before – 485 delegates from 82 countries. The theme of the gathering was “Women’s Leadership and Participation”, with this theme explored through sessions which discussed achieving self-reliance, monitoring immigration detention, protection at sea, the engagement and participation of young people in humanitarian situations, resettlement, faith and protection, programmatic responses to sexual and gender based violence, UNHCR’s partnerships with NGOs, internal displacement and mental health and psychosocial support. The geographic sessions – focusing on Africa, Asia-Pacific, Middle East and North Africa, the Americas and Europe – looked (to varying degrees) at current refugee needs from a gender perspective.

In his address to the opening plenary of the consultation, UN High Commissioner for Refugees, Antonio Guterres, said that the challenges of forced displacement continued to grow in an unprecedented way, long-running crises caused by conflicts in countries such as Somalia and Afghanistan remaining unresolved as new crises grew in countries such as Syria. "This is a world in crisis and we as humanitarians are in trouble,” he said. Mr Guterres spoke of the empowerment of women as being vital to resolving a multitude of problems facing the world. "One of the problems of today's world, one of the reasons why we see this multiplication of conflicts, we see these dramatic violations of human rights..."
everywhere is indeed that we still live, especially from the political perspective, in a clearly male-dominated world. And it’s still a clearly male-dominated culture that prevails in the way governments act, in the way that many international organisations … act, and in which even, in some societies, civil society is organised.”

Current crises discussed included:
- the Syrian crisis, which has resulted in the movement of more than 2.8 million people as refugees into neighbouring countries;
- the growth in the number of people fleeing Iraq as the civil war escalates;
- the shocking death toll of asylum seekers and forced migrants on boats on the Mediterranean Sea;
- the largely unnoticed refugee crises in Central African Republic (350,000 refugees have fled to neighbouring countries) and South Sudan; and
- the large-scale movement of unaccompanied and separated children from Central America to the United States.

Delegates examined issues for refugee women such as statelessness, early marriage, trafficking, child labour, lack of access to education, the absence of the right to work, detention, restricted access to refugee status determination, and sexual and gender-based violence. Effective programs to address these issues were highlighted, with much discussion about responses as varied as strategic litigation, community education, engaging with faith leaders, education, livelihood training and advocacy.

**Discussion of the situation in Australia**

In his address to the opening plenary, Mr Guterres named Australia as one of a number of countries closing its borders to people seeking protection. Later, in response to a question from Amnesty International Australia, he reiterated concerns about Australia shifting its responsibilities to asylum seekers to countries like Nauru and Papua New Guinea where adequate refugee protections were not in place, reaffirming UNHCR’s commitment to continue monitoring conditions in Australia’s offshore detention centres.

Answering a question from Najeeba Wazefadost of the Australian National Committee on Refugee Women, Mr Guterres said Australia was in a “very strange situation” with its refugee policy. “(Australia) is a very generous country hosting refugees. It has the most successful resettlement program I can imagine and the community integration is excellent. The combination of civil society, local authorities and central government in that is excellent. The problem is when we discuss boats and there, of course, we enter into a very, very, very dramatic thing. I think it is a kind of collective sociological and psychological question. They receive, I think, 180,000 migrants in a year. If you come to Australia in a different way, it’s fine but if they come in a boat it is like something strange happens to their minds.” Excerpts from Mr Guterres’ address and his response to questions can be found at Appendix A.

The international interest in Australian policy was demonstrated when more than 40 delegates gave up their lunch break to hear a discussion facilitated by RCOA, featuring Mr Power, Ms Wazefadost and Angus Francis of the Refugee and Immigration Legal Service, Brisbane. RCOA distributed a summary of policy changes which had happened over the previous 12 months and answered questions about Australian policy. Many international delegates struggled to understand the rationale of the Australian Government’s position or the justification for such hard-line policies given the small number of asylum seekers seeking to enter Australia, particularly in comparison to the massive displacement occurring in so many other regions of the world. The brief distributed to international delegates by RCOA is at Appendix B.

**Issues raised directly with senior UNHCR officials**

On 16 and 20 June, RCOA arranged meetings for Australian refugee community and NGO representatives with the directors and senior staff of UNHCR’s Asia, Africa and Middle East and North Africa Bureaux, its Resettlement Service and Division of International Protection. In the months prior to the meetings, RCOA had worked with the refugee community representatives and the Centre for Refugee Research to gather issues of concern to raise with UNHCR from communities in Australia. A wide variety of issues were raised in the five meetings.
Asia Bureau

- Concerns of refugee communities about food supplies and conditions within Thai-Burma border camps, fears about the possibility of refugees being pressured into repatriation, the statelessness of refugees born in the camps and the situation of family members unable to join resettled relatives in Australia because they are not registered as refugees.
- Resettlement and repatriation plans for remaining Bhutanese refugees in Nepal and the situation of Bhutanese refugees who have been charged with offences in Nepal.
- Security and protection issues for returned asylum seekers to Sri Lanka.
- Ongoing security concerns for Afghan refugees in Pakistan and the limited access to UNHCR and IOM offices in Quetta.
- Conditions in detention centres in Indonesia.
- Concerns in Malaysia about detention, extortion and refoulement of refugees from Burma.

Africa Bureau

- Security and inadequate food for Eritrean refugees at Shagarab Refugee Camp, Sudan.
- Insecurity and extortion by Kenyan police of refugees living in urban areas.
- Trafficking of Eritrean refugees through Sudan and Egypt.
- Treatment of Oromo people seeking refuge in a number of countries in the Horn of Africa region and continuing persecution within Ethiopia.
- Mental health concerns for Burundian refugees in camps in Kenya.
- Delays in renewing ID cards for UNHCR-registered refugees in Kenya and Sudan.
- Arrest, deportation and refoulement of Eritreans by Sudanese police.
- Lack of progress in refugee status determination for Burundians in camps in Tanzania and concerns about forced repatriation of Burundian refugees from Tanzania.
- Concern about uncertain status of Rwandan refugees in Democratic Republic of Congo.
- Concerns for Congolese refugees in Zambia who fear being forced to return.

Middle East and North Africa Bureau

- The rapidly changing situation in Iraq.
- Concerns for refugee women in Syria, Jordan and Lebanon, including lack of employment, inadequate access to general and maternal health care, forced and early marriage, restricted access to UNHCR offices.
- Problems facing IDPs in Syria, including lack of basic services and insecurity in areas of Syria, the additional vulnerability of members of ethnic and religious minorities, child marriage and sexual and gender based violence.
- The situation of youth and adolescents living in refugee camps, specifically disadvantaged females who are facing issues such as domestic violence, poverty, forced and arranged marriages, survival sex, loss of their children, lack of legal support for their rights, as well as lack of health and protective services.
- Reports of female genital mutilation being practised in camps in Iraqi Kurdistan and Egypt.
- Lack of access to housing and services for refugees in Lebanon and concerns about child labour.
- Trafficking of Eritreans in the Sinai Peninsula and refoulement of Eritreans from Egypt.
- The differences in treatment of Palestinian refugees who have fled from Syria (who fall under the mandate of UN Relief and Works Agency) compared to Palestinian refugees who have fled Iraq (who fall under the mandate of UNHCR), including more restricted access to resettlement.

Resettlement Service

- Bhutanese community concerns about the final phase of resettlement from Nepal and the unfulfilled wish of some refugees to return to Bhutan.
- The impact of the Australian Government’s policy of restricting family reunion for refugees who entered Australia by boat.
- The situation of people in Thai-Burma border refugee camps who are unable to join resettled relatives in Australia because they are not registered as refugees.
• Similar problems with family reunion facing Afghan refugees in Iran who missed the refugee registration deadline.
• The exorbitant exit fees being charged by Nepal for non-Bhutanese refugees who are being resettled and similar fees (though much lower) charged by Lebanon and Jordan.
• Australia’s very narrow definition of women at risk, which excludes any woman (no matter how vulnerable) who has a male partner.
• Sharing of relevant information gathered by UNHCR prior to resettlement with Australian services involved in arranging specialist assistance after arrival.
• What happens to a family’s resettlement application when the primary applicant is killed in the country of asylum (raised in relation to Afghan refugees in Pakistan).
• The low priority being given by many resettlement states to resettling Rohingya refugees.

Division of International Protection
• Concerns raised by refugee women in Thailand and Nepal, through consultations conducted by Centre for Refugee Research.
• Australia’s new restrictions on family reunion of refugees who arrived by boat.
• Concerns about changes in Australian policy towards asylum seekers, including the situation of children born in detention in Australia, the July 2013 changes to offshore processing of asylum claims, the introduction of the code of behaviour for asylum seekers, the removal of funded legal advice and the reintroduction of temporary protection.
• Australia’s plans to resettle refugees from Nauru to Cambodia.

Thanks
RCOA would like to thank the Australian Council for International Development, Amnesty International Australia, Settlement Services International and Caritas Australia for contributing towards the cost of sending refugee representatives to participate in these meetings. With this support, RCOA chose Nuha Markus as the recipient of the John Gibson Community Leadership Grant to be RCOA’s nominated refugee representative at the UNHCR NGO Consultations. Partial support was also given to two other delegates. The Australian National Committee on Refugee Women chose and supported two delegates from Australia and the Centre for Refugee Research arranged support for refugee women delegates from Thailand, Burma and Nepal. This approach of supporting refugee community representatives greatly enhanced the Australian delegation’s advocacy in Geneva, ensuring that people who understood the issues from personal experience were able to raise the concerns of refugee communities in Australia and Asia.

Paul Power
CEO, Refugee Council of Australia
August 2014
EXCERPTS FROM THE ADDRESS TO UNHCR ANNUAL CONSULTATIONS WITH NGOS BY UN HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES, ANTONIO GUTERRES, 17 JUNE 2014

From Mr Guterres’ speech to the opening plenary
I think it is also important to underline that, especially from the perspective now of refugee protection, we are facing also the development in several parts of the world of manifestations of xenophobia and similar other problems – Islamophobia, racism – that are particularly worrying. If you analyse the result of the last European elections, you have seen that xenophobic parties made remarkable increases in the number of votes. And even from the point of view of, for instance, borders, we see, in several situations in the world, borders being closed. We see it in Egypt. We see it in Bulgaria. We see it in Australia. We see it in many other parts of the world – and manifestations of xenophobia at the same time targeting refugees in communities in very dramatic circumstances. The plight of Somalis for instance in many countries, including in African countries, is a very dramatic demonstration of this dimension.

Mr Guterres’ response to a question from Dr Graham Thom of Amnesty International Australia (about whether UNHCR will continue to visit Nauru detention centre and seeking his view of Australia’s plan to settle refugees in Cambodia):
We will not fail to provide our colleagues the financial and other aspects of the capacity to go on monitoring, when allowed, the situation in Nauru but also in Papua New Guinea and eventually, if that will be the case, in Cambodia. This is something that we have been very worried about. The findings that were presented about Nauru clearly underline that Nauru is not a place where adequate protection can be granted. This is quite obvious. We insist that this is the responsibility of the country that receives the people and that this should be an Australian responsibility. The fact that Cambodia has signed the Convention doesn’t mean that Cambodia is an adequate space for meaningful protection for people in need. Our position has always been, as you know, very reluctant in relation to those agreements, very reserved in relation to them. Of course, we can do our best to support people in the circumstances where we might be able to operate. But that doesn’t mean that we are in agreement with this kind of extra processing of refugees without giving the guarantees that those found to be in need of protection will be accepted in countries, or be resettled to countries, where that protection can be effectively granted, which, of course, is not the case with Nauru and eventually will not be the case with Cambodia.

In response to a question from Najeeba Wazefadost of Australian National Committee for Refugee Women (about the need for greater support for community-based organisations formed by refugees in many countries – which Mr Guterres misunderstood as being about community organisations in Australia):
To the colleagues from Australia, I fully agree that the entities of civil society should be supported. I had the idea that in Australia they are strongly supported and I could see the civil society working very actively and very engaged. We have problems with Australia but they are of a different nature. It is related to boats and things of the sort, not with the civil society. We will of course do our best to support any movement of the civil society in relation to the need to increase their capacity in relation to refugee protection. Australia is a very strange situation. It is a very generous country hosting refugees. It has the most successful resettlement program I can imagine and the community integration is excellent. The combination of civil society, local authorities and central government in that is excellent. The problem is when we discuss boats and there, of course, we enter into a very, very, very dramatic thing. I think it is a kind of collective sociological and psychological question. They receive, I think, 180,000 migrants in a year. If you come to Australia in a different way, it’s fine but if they come in a boat it is like something strange happens to their minds. That problem I know that we have and it is a serious one but the one that you mention I was not aware. In any case but if there is anything that we can help, we will do it.
WHAT IS GOING ON IN AUSTRALIA?

An overview of recent refugee policy changes

Background

Recent years have seen numerous changes to Australia’s refugee and asylum seeker policies, largely as a political response to a significant increase in the number of asylum seekers arriving in Australia by boat (51,637 arrivals in the five years to December 2013) and a consequent increase in deaths at sea between Indonesia and Australia (at least 862 deaths recorded over the same period). Both of Australia’s major political parties have attempted to address this issue through deterrence-based policies which block access to protection in Australia and impose penalties on people who arrive by boat. These policies have compromised the safety, health and wellbeing of refugees and asylum seekers and brought Australia into breach of both the Refugee Convention and core international human rights treaties. The election of a new government in September 2013 on a platform of “stopping the boats” has resulted in further policy changes which continue to undermine protection for people fleeing persecution.

Refugee and Humanitarian Program

- **Increase in 2012:** During the 2012-13 financial year, the size of Australia’s Refugee and Humanitarian program was increased from 13,750 to 20,000 places, divided between offshore resettlement and onshore protection. This was the largest increase to the program in 30 years and resulted in an 87% rise in the number of offshore resettlement visas granted.

- **Reversal of increase:** With the change of government in September 2013, the size of the Refugee and Humanitarian Program was reduced back to 13,750 places, with the majority of these dedicated to offshore resettlement. The Government has also introduced a cap on onshore protection visas, meaning that no more than 2,750 permanent visas can be granted each year to people who apply for protection within Australia, regardless of how many people are found to be in need of protection.

Detention and community alternatives

- **Indefinite mandatory detention:** Australia maintains a policy of indefinite mandatory detention for all non-citizens who enter or are present in Australia without a valid visa. The vast majority of people in detention are asylum seekers who arrived by boat. As at 30 April 2014, 4258 people were in locked immigration detention, at least 3700 of them being asylum seekers who arrived by boat.

- **Use of Bridging Visas:** In October 2011, the previous Government began to release large numbers of asylum seekers from closed immigration detention into alternative community-based arrangements.

---


2 Analysis of political claims about numbers of deaths at sea can be found at [http://theconversation.com/factcheck-have-more-than-1000-asylum-seekers-died-at-sea-under-labor-16221](http://theconversation.com/factcheck-have-more-than-1000-asylum-seekers-died-at-sea-under-labor-16221)

3 The year to 30 June 2013.

Most have been released on to short-term Bridging Visas (24,273 people as at 30 April 2014). These visas allow them to live freely in the community pending resolution of their claims. They have access to Australia’s universal healthcare scheme and receive a basic living allowance paid at 89% of comparable income support rates for Australian citizens and permanent residents.

- **Denial of work rights:** Asylum seekers released on Bridging Visas who arrived by boat before 13 August 2012 are eligible to work but those who arrived by boat after this date (who make up the majority of the 30,000 asylum seekers currently living in the community) are not. Many of these asylum seekers face destitution and marginalisation: they often struggle to afford basics such as adequate food, housing and medication and have few opportunities to engage with the broader community due to their limited incomes, lack of English skills and inability to work.

- **Access to case support:** Some Bridging Visa holders who are vulnerable or have complex needs are eligible for more intensive casework support but most receive little assistance beyond income support. Those who are particularly vulnerable (such as unaccompanied minors, families and people with significant mental health issues) may be released into community detention, a form of community release which is more restrictive but also provides more intensive support than release on to a Bridging Visa.

- **Refugees with adverse security assessments:** There are currently around 50 refugees (including children) who remain in indefinite closed detention due to having received adverse security assessments from the Australian Security and Intelligence Organisation (ASIO). Nearly all have now been detained for over four years and appear to have no prospect of release in the foreseeable future. In July 2013, the UN Human Rights Committee found that the indefinite detention of these refugees breached the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.  

**Refugee Status Determination (RSD) and legal advice**

- **Excision policy:** Under Australian law, a person who arrives by boat without authorisation is barred from applying from any sort of visa, including a Protection Visa, unless the Minister for Immigration and Citizenship personally intervenes to "lift the bar". Known as excision, this policy previously applied only to specific outlying territories of Australia (such as Christmas Island) but has recently been extended to the whole of Australia. As a result, asylum seekers who arrive anywhere in Australia by boat cannot apply for a visa except at the discretion of the Minister.

- **Delays in RSD:** Since the Federal election in September 2013, refugee status determination (RSD) has effectively been suspended for asylum seekers who arrived in Australia by boat. Many asylum seekers living in the community on Bridging Visas have been waiting for well over a year for the opportunity to lodge a claim.

- **Plans for a ‘fast track’ process:** The Government has announced its intention to introduce a new RSD process for asylum seekers who arrived by boat, modelled on the UK’s fast-track process. Claims will be “triaged” with a view to making assessments within 14 days and access to independent merits review will be withdrawn, with reviews of primary decisions instead being conducted by officials within the Department of Immigration. For asylum seekers deemed to have deliberately discarded identity documentation, there will be a presumption against awarding refugee status.

- **Removal of funded legal advice:** Asylum seekers who arrive without valid visas are no longer eligible for free government-funded legal advice. Asylum seekers who do arrive with valid visas are eligible for free legal advice at the primary stage of decision-making but no longer at the merits review stage.

- **‘Enhanced screening’ of Sri Lankan applicants:** Since October 2012, asylum seekers arriving by boat from Sri Lanka have been subject to “enhanced screening”. Under this process, an asylum seeker is interviewed by two officers from the Department of Immigration about their reasons for travelling to Australia. If the asylum seeker raises concerns which suggest that they may have a valid protection claim, they are “screened in” so that their claim can be formally processed. If they do not raise any protection concerns, they are “screened out” and returned to Sri Lanka without having the opportunity to formally lodge a protection claim. The system lacks transparency and denies asylum seekers the opportunity to have their claims fairly assessed. More than 1,000 people have been “screened out” and returned to Sri Lanka since the system was introduced.

---

Offshore processing

- **Transfers to Nauru and Papua New Guinea**: All asylum seekers who arrived in Australia by boat after 13 July 2013 are subject to offshore processing. Under this policy, asylum seekers are transferred to detention centres in Nauru and Papua New Guinea's Manus Island where their claims are processed under the laws of those countries. If they are found to be refugees, the Government intends for them to be resettled in a country other than Australia. Resettlement arrangements are currently being developed with the governments of Papua New Guinea (PNG) and Cambodia.

- **Delays in RSD**: Processing of claims has been incredibly slow, with the first decisions handed down in May 2014 despite the detention centres having been open since late 2012. There is concern that neither Nauru nor PNG has sufficient capacity or expertise to conduct credible RSD or provide adequate protection and support to people seeking protection. UNHCR has expressed particular concern about the shortcomings of PNG’s legal framework for RSD.\(^6\)

- **Detention centre standards**: Accommodation standards, facilities and services in the detention centres remain well below international standards. UNHCR and Amnesty International\(^7\) have documented the harsh nature of the conditions and noted the physical and mental health impacts of indefinite detention on the asylum seekers, who include children and unaccompanied minors.

- **Response to 2014 protest**: In February 2014, peaceful protests by asylum seekers detained in the Manus Island facility degenerated into a riot. PNG security guards and police stormed the facility and violently attacked asylum seekers, including people who had not been involved in the protests and were attempting to take shelter in their rooms. One asylum seeker was beaten to death and over 60 others were injured, some of them seriously. Several inquiries into the incident are underway\(^8\) but no one had been charged or arrested at the time of writing.

Border protection

- **Operation Sovereign Borders**: Soon after being sworn in, the newly-elected Australian Government established “Operation Sovereign Borders”, a military-style response to the movement of asylum seekers by boat to Australia, led by a three-star commander reporting directly to the Minister for Immigration. Australian naval and customs officers were issued with orders were to turn back boats carrying asylum seekers “when it is safe to do so”. The Government reveals little information about turnback operations, claiming that doing so would jeopardise their success through providing intelligence to people smugglers.

- **Use of lifeboats**: As part of turnback operations, asylum seekers have been transferred from their boats to Australian vessels and forced to board fully-enclosed and “unsinkable” lifeboats which are then cast adrift outside Indonesian territorial waters.

- **Regional deterrence strategies**: The Australian Government is working with other governments in the region to strengthen border protection and deterrence measures so as to combat people smuggling and reduce “irregular movement”. Measures have included donating patrol vessels to Malaysia and Sri Lanka, stationing Australian Customs and Border Protection officials in Indonesia, Malaysia and Sri Lanka and capacity-building initiatives.

Temporary Protection Visas (TPVs)

- **Previous policy**: TPVs were previously in place in Australia between 1999 and 2007. Granted to refugees who arrived in Australia by boat, TPVs allowed their holders to remain in Australia for three years, after which time they had to re-apply for protection. TPV holders could not sponsor family members for resettlement or travel outside Australia and had only limited access to services and support. The negative impacts of these conditions on the health, wellbeing and settlement outcomes of TPV holders have been well documented.\(^9\)

---


\(^8\) Including an Australian Senate inquiry; see [http://bit.ly/1o2mK9](http://bit.ly/1o2mK9)

\(^9\) See the Refugee Council of Australia’s policy brief on TPVs, [http://bit.ly/1oYZAb7](http://bit.ly/1oYZAb7)
• **Reintroduction**: The incoming Government has pledged to reintroduce TPVs but the requisite regulations have been blocked in the Senate (the upper house of Australia’s Parliament). It is suspected that the Government will attempt to reintroduce these regulations once the composition of the Senate changes in July 2014.

• **Denial of access to permanent residency**: If reintroduced, the conditions on TPVs will be similar to those in place previously, with the exception that TPV holders no longer have the option of applying for permanent residency once their visa expires. Instead, the Minister for Immigration may grant permanent residency by discretion once someone has held a TPV for at least five years.

**Other measures**

• **Use of term 'illegal maritime arrivals'**: The Australian Government has instructed government staff and contractors to refer to asylum seekers arriving by boat as “illegal maritime arrivals” (previously “irregular maritime arrivals”), despite the fact that it is not illegal under Australian law to arrive without authorisation for the purpose of seeking asylum.

• **Denial of family reunion**: Refugees who arrived in Australia by boat have virtually no opportunities for family reunion. They are not eligible to sponsor family members for resettlement under Australia’s Refugee and Humanitarian Program and are considered the “lowest processing priority” under the family stream of Australia’s general migration program, meaning that their applications have very little chance of success (although the changes to processing priorities will not apply to those who have become Australian citizens). In addition, TPV holders will not be permitted to sponsor family members under any program and will not have the opportunity to become citizens unless the Minister for Immigration chooses to grant them permanent residency.

*This summary was produced by the Refugee Council of Australia for distribution to delegates at UNHCR’s 2014 Annual Consultations with NGOs (Geneva, 17-19 June 2014).*