



BRIEFING

Next three-year Refugee Resettlement Programme - options

Date:	30 November 2015	Priority:	Medium
Security classification:	In Confidence	Tracking number:	1132 15-16

Action sought		
	Action sought	Deadline
Hon Michael Woodhouse Minister of Immigration	Provide feedback on the attached paper	14 December 2015
Hon Craig Foss Associate Minister of Immigration	Copy attached for your information	N/A

Contact for telephone discussion (if required)				
Name	Position	Telephone		1st contact
Christine Hyndman	Manager, Immigration Policy, MBIE	04 901 8575	S 9(2)(a)	✓
Floss Caughey	Senior Advisor, Immigration Policy	04 901 8583		

The following departments/agencies have been consulted					
<input type="checkbox"/> Treasury	<input type="checkbox"/> MoJ	<input type="checkbox"/> NZTE	<input type="checkbox"/> MSD	<input type="checkbox"/> TEC	<input type="checkbox"/> MoE
<input type="checkbox"/> MFAT	<input type="checkbox"/> MPI	<input type="checkbox"/> MfE	<input type="checkbox"/> DIA	<input type="checkbox"/> TPK	<input type="checkbox"/> MoH

Minister's office to complete:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Approved | <input type="checkbox"/> Declined |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noted | <input type="checkbox"/> Needs change |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Seen | <input type="checkbox"/> Overtaken by Events |
| <input type="checkbox"/> See Minister's Notes | <input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn |



BRIEFING

Next three-year Refugee Resettlement Programme - options

Date:	30 November 2015	Priority:	Medium
Security classification:	In Confidence	Tracking number:	1132 15-16

Purpose

To advise on options for the next three-year Refugee Resettlement Programme (2016/17 – 2018/19) for your feedback.

Executive Summary

You have requested a full review of the Refugee Quota Programme and advice on options for the next three years (2016/17 – 2018/19), including its size and composition. This review provides an opportunity to consider, alongside the traditional priority protection places, other forms of admission for refugees which allow consideration of new broader selection criteria. We propose both the traditional priority protection cases and the other forms of admission together be called a Refugee Resettlement Programme.

The new selection criteria for those refugees accepted under other forms of admission are proposed to enhance their employment opportunities and enable them to settle well in New Zealand, participate in the community, and be independent. They would go further in that regard, however, than any of our peer countries.

Selecting refugees on the basis of religion or ethnicity would be counter to the fundamental principles of the Refugee Convention and are not included in the selection criteria.

We also propose two approaches to the settlement of refugees under other forms of admission, which are complementary to one another. These are:

- government-supported, whereby the usual 12-month community refugee settlement support would be reduced to six months, and
- community group-supported, ^{S 9(2)(f)(iv)}
S 9(2)(f)(iv)

You are asked to provide feedback on six options. As your office has requested, all of the options apply to the 250 places Cabinet has agreed be used to resettle Syrian refugees for each of the years 2016/17 and 2017/18 [CAB-15-MIN-0057]. ^{S 9(2)(g)(i)}
S 9(2)(g)(i)

The options for the next three-year Refugee Resettlement Programme:

- range in size from no ongoing increase to an ongoing maximum of 1,100 places each year (that is, an increase of 350 places from 2018/19) and none recommend reducing the number of priority protection places below 750, and
- include traditional priority protection places and other forms of admission using the new selection criteria (both community group-supported and government-supported).

The refugee-specific fiscal costs of each option have been estimated, noting that Cabinet has already approved funding for 2016/17 and 2017/18, so any new funding would be required from 2018/19 only.

Summary table of the six options

	2016/17 Total	2017/18 Total	2018/19 Total	2018/19 Priority protection	2018/19 Government- supported	2018/19 Community group- supported	Notes for 2018/19
1 (a)	1,000	1,000	750	750	-	-	Reverts to 750 § 9(2)(f)(iv) § 9(2)(f)(iv)
1 (b)	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	-	-	250 places § 9(2)(f)(iv)
2 (a)	1,000	1,000	1,000	750	150	100	250 places § 9(2)(f)(iv)
2 (b)	1,000	1,000	1,100	750	150	200	250 places § 9(2)(f)(iv) plus from 2018/19, 100 places not specified
3 (a)	1,000	1,000	1,000	850	75	75	250 places § 9(2)(f)(iv)
3 (b)	1,000	1,000	1,100	850	150	100	250 places § 9(2)(f)(iv) plus 100 places not specified

This paper also makes recommendations concerning the traditional priority protection places. We make recommendations on regional allocations. allocation of the 150 transferee places when not required by Australia ~~§ 6(b)(i)~~
~~§ 6(b)(i)~~

Recommended action

The Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (the Ministry) recommends that you:

- a. ~~§ 9(2)(f)(iv)~~

Agree/disagree

- b. **Agree** to indicate which of the options below you want included in the Cabinet paper and which is your preferred option:

Options	Include in Cabinet paper	Preferred option
<u>Option 1(a): Priority protection only</u> 250 places in 2016/17 and 2017/18 for Syrian refugees are priority protection cases and revert to 750 priority protection cases each year from 2018/19.		
<u>Option 1(b): Priority protection only</u> The same as Option 1 (a) except continue at 1,000 priority protection cases from 2018/19.		
<u>Option 2(a): Other forms of admission and new selection criteria:</u> 250 places in 2016/17 and 2017/18 for Syrian refugees under other forms of admission using new selection criteria continued for 2018/19 (i) for 2016/17, 250 government-supported and, from 2017/18, 150 government-supported, and (ii) from 2017/18, 100 each year community group-supported.		
<u>Option 2(b): Other forms of admission and new selection criteria</u> The same as Option 2(a) except from 2018/19 increase to 200 community group-supported each year, and not limited to Syrians.		
<u>Option 3(a): Mixed priority protection and other forms of admission:</u> 250 places in 2016/17 and 2017/18 for Syrian refugees and continued for 2018/19 (i) 100 places each year priority protection (ii) for 2016/17, 150 government-supported and from 2017/18, 75 government-supported, and (iii) from 2017/18, 75 community group-supported.		
<u>Option 3(b): Mixed priority protection and other forms of admission</u> The same as Option 3(a) except from 2018/19, 150 government-supported and 100 community-group supported, and not limited to Syrians.		

Agree/disagree

- c. **Agree that, as the Syrian refugee crisis is likely to persist for some time,** § 9(2)(f)(iv) unless Option 1(a) is chosen, in which case, 100 of the 750 priority protection places each year be allocated to large-scale refugee crisis situations, to be used for the resettlement of Syrian refugees in 2018/19

Agree/disagree

- d. § 9(2)(f)(iv)

S 9(2)(f)(iv)

Noted

e. **Agree** that the paper to Cabinet due in March 2016 recommend that:

(i) 55 per cent of the priority protection places be allocated to refugees resettled from the Asia-Pacific region and 45 per cent to refugees resettled from the rest of the world (17 per cent from the Americas, 14 per cent from the Middle East and 14 per cent from the African region)

Agree/disagree

(ii) the annual 150 transferee places be reallocated according to the regional allocation, if not needed by Australia, and

Agree/disagree

§ 6(a)

Agree/disagree

f. **Agree** to discuss the proposals in this paper with officials.

Agree/disagree

Christine Hyndman
Manager, Immigration Policy
Labour, Science and Enterprise
Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment

Hon Michael Woodhouse
Minister of Immigration

30.11.2015

..... / /

The global refugee situation

1. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) estimates that over 1,150,000¹ refugees globally are in need of resettlement, which is a 22 per cent increase on its 2014 estimate². The estimated number by region is shown in Table One below. The UNHCR is expected to make a submission to you in early 2016 regarding New Zealand's response to the global refugee situation.

¹This number includes 215,000 in Europe.

² UNHCR Projected Global Resettlement Needs, 2016.

Table One: UNHCR projected refugee resettlement needs by region

Region	Number	Percentage increase on 2014	Comments
Middle East/North Africa	369,500	13 %	The increase is due to the Syrian conflict.
Africa	396,000	41%	South Sudan, Mali, Nigeria, Central African Republic and Democratic Republic of Congo are the main source of refugees.
Asia	169,500	-3%	A small decrease has resulted from a gradual phase-out of large-scale resettlement operations in Thailand and the fact that Nepalese and Myanmar nationals are not being registered as refugees in Malaysia.
Americas	7,500	-52%	A large decrease following expanded durable resettlement opportunities for Colombian refugees becoming available in Ecuador.

New Zealand's current Refugee Quota Programme

From 2018/19, the annual number will revert to 750 if the status quo is maintained

- The current Refugee Quota Programme has been set at 750 (plus or minus 10 per cent) refugees per annum for decades. On 7 September 2015, Cabinet agreed that New Zealand would resettle 750 Syrian refugees over two and a half years, 600 of them in addition to the annual Refugee Quota [CAB-15-MIN-0057]. The impact on the next three-year Refugee Resettlement Programme is shown in Table Two below. If the status quo is maintained, the size of the Refugee Quota Programme will revert to 750 from 2018/19.

Table Two: Current Refugee Quota Programme (including emergency response to Syrian refugee crisis)

2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
1,000 (includes 250)	1,000 (includes 250)	750

- According to a recent UNHCR report,³ New Zealand is eighth among resettlement countries in terms of numbers of refugees resettled and seventh in terms of per capita resettlement⁴ (see Annex One). Global refugee resettlement needs, however, vastly outnumber the 80,000 places made available each year by around 30 resettlement countries. Countries neighbouring refugee-producing countries (for example, Lebanon, Turkey and Jordan) bear the greatest burden of providing protection to refugees.

All refugees accepted for the Refugee Quota Programme are priority protection cases

- The refugees resettled in New Zealand under the Refugee Quota are all priority protection cases submitted by the UNHCR to INZ for consideration for resettlement. Table Three shows the annual Refugee Quota by category, as agreed in 2013 [CAB Min (13) 20/15].

³ UNHCR Projected Global Resettlement Needs, 2016.

⁴ These numbers exclude successful asylum claimants.

Table Three: Refugee Quota Programme by category

General protection	Transferees**	Women at risk	Medical/disabled	Total
450*	150**	At least 75	Up to 75	750

*Includes family reunification places and large-scale refugee crisis situations.

**To date, the places offered to Australia for refugees subject to Australian offshore processing legislation have been reallocated to UNHCR-referred refugees.

5. The UNHCR submits priority protection cases to resettlement countries using internationally-recognised UNHCR Resettlement Submission categories. To protect the integrity of resettlement to provide protection and a durable solution for the most vulnerable refugees, and to maintain streamlined and efficient processes, the UNHCR does not accept country requests for additional selection criteria which consider "integration potential" for these places.

Most refugee places have been allocated to the Asia-Pacific region

6. In 2013, Cabinet decided that, from 2014/15, New Zealand would allocate 150 places within the Refugee Quota to refugees who were subject to Australia's offshore processing legislation (transferees) [CAB Min (13) 20/15]. The remaining 80 per cent of the Refugee Quota would be allocated in the following way: 40 per cent to the UNHCR-referred refugees resettled from the Asia-Pacific region and 40 per cent from the rest of the world (11 per cent from the Middle East, 11 per cent from Africa and 18 per cent from the American region). In practice, the regional allocation has varied from this as a result of subsequent decisions – the reallocation of the unused 150 places for transferees to the Asia-Pacific region and the allocation of the places for large-scale refugee crisis situations to Syrian refugees.
7. As Table Four shows, the actual percentage of places allocated to the Asia-Pacific region was 63 per cent in 2013/14 and 65 per cent in 2014/15. ^{s 6(b)(i)}

Table Four: Actual regional allocation for the Refugee Quotas in 2013/14 and 2014/15

Region	2013/14		2014/15	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Asia-Pacific	467	62	501	65
Middle East	120	16	163*	22
Africa	17	2	4	1
Americas	146	20	88	12
Total	750	100	756	100

*Includes 83 Syrians resettled under places for large-scale refugee crisis situations.

8. Myanmarese, Colombian, Bhutanese, Afghan, Sri Lankan and Syrian people have been among the top five nationalities resettled under the Refugee Quota in 2013/14 and 2014/15.

Table Five: Top five nationalities of refugees resettled in New Zealand


Nationalities	2013/14	Nationalities	2014/15
Myanmarese	222	Myanmarese	159
Colombian	124	Afghan	157
Bhutanese	91	Bhutanese	96
Sri Lankan	75	Syrian	83
Afghan	40	Colombian	76

Next three-year Refugee Resettlement Programme options


Other forms of admission would allow broader selection criteria to be used

9. This review of the next three-year Refugee Quota Programme (2016/17 – 2018/19) is an opportunity to consider other forms of admission for refugees to sit alongside the traditional resettlement of priority protection cases in the Refugee Quota Programme. Canada has long standing private sponsorship and government/community group shared arrangements. Other forms of admission also include humanitarian visas/labour mobility schemes, academic visas and family reunification.
10. The UNHCR is supportive of other forms of admission that offer refugees other legal avenues of safety and protection, alongside the traditional resettlement of priority protection cases and within a country's overall Refugee Resettlement Programme. Other forms of admission allow broader selection criteria which can aid the successful settlement of refugees. They also allow for other actors besides Government, such as community groups, to support refugees for resettlement.
11. Setting new selection criteria for other forms of admission and allowing community-group support might enable:
- higher levels of employment of refugees, which in turn would contribute to improved settlement outcomes, participation in the community, independence and self-sufficiency
 - increased numbers of refugees resettled in New Zealand in a way that is cost-effective, and
 - greater community participation in supporting refugee settlement.
12. We propose both the traditional priority protection cases and the other forms of admission together be called a Refugee Resettlement Programme.

S 9(2)(f)(iv)



S 6(b)(ii)



The new selection criteria would support achievement of the New Zealand Refugee Resettlement Strategy

16. In 2012, Cabinet agreed that the New Zealand Refugee Resettlement Strategy (the Strategy) would have a focus on quota refugees achieving more self-sufficiency, better integration and less dependence on State support [CAB Min (12) 8/12]. It was reported in a 2012 study that, after 10 years in New Zealand, only 42 per cent of working-age former refugees were employed at the time of the survey⁵. Refugee settlement services have been refocused to better achieve the aims of the Strategy, including enhancing employment opportunities and settlement outcomes. S 9(2)(f)(iv)

S 9(2)(f)(iv)

17. Additional numbers of refugees could be resettled in New Zealand using other forms of admission as this is anticipated to have a lower fiscal cost, over the long term.

The new selection criteria, however, might be subject to criticism for undermining New Zealand's humanitarian response to the Syrian refugee crisis

S 9(2)(g)(i)

19. Furthermore, the media statement issued on 7 September announcing New Zealand's decision to take more Syrian refugees stated that "the process for the 600 additional places will be the same as any intake under the current quota". However, introducing new selection criteria and resettling them under other forms of admission means the process is not the same as for the priority protection cases resettled to date under the Refugee Quota Programme.

20. The risk of such criticism could be mitigated by:

- resettling at least some Syrian refugees as priority protection cases (refer Option 3(a) and (b) below), and/or
- continuing to resettle 250 Syrian refugees in 2018/19 (Options 2 and 3).

S 9(2)(f)(iv)

⁵ *Quota Refugees Ten Years On: Perspectives on Integration, Community and Identity* (2012).

S 9(2)(f)(iv)

S 9(2)(f)(iv)

There are two settlement approaches proposed

22. We put forward two settlement approaches for refugees accepted under other forms of admission. They are not mutually exclusive:

a) Government-supported – under this approach, the Government would fund the same services as for priority protection refugees, except that the 12-month refugee settlement support in the community that priority protection refugees usually receive would be reduced to six months, as these refugees would be expected to need support for a shorter period.

b) Community group-supported – S 9(2)(f)(iv)

S 9(2)(f)(iv)

The two new settlement approaches together allow for the testing of this overall approach

27. The benefits of involving community groups are:

- enhancing and creating bonds between refugees, community-based organisations and local communities, and

- providing a shared model to expand the Refugee Resettlement Programme, with communities undertaking responsibility for some aspects of settlement while the refugees remain eligible for publicly-funded services.

28. The main risk is that the response from community groups and their capacity to supply the resources to undertake refugee settlement is unknown at this point. Some groups might regard this approach as central government seeking to shift costs to the community. For that reason, under the other forms of admission the proposed number of refugees to be supported by community groups in the options below is quite modest – no more than 100 each year in most cases – and the two new settlement approaches are complementary.

29. The government-supported approach allows certainty that the refugees selected under other forms of admission using the new selection criteria will be well supported in New Zealand, but comes at a higher cost than the community group-supported approach. We propose that, after two years, the overall approach of resettling refugees under other forms of admission using new selection criteria and both settlement approaches be evaluated, as noted in paragraph 25 above, and the results included in the three-year Refugee Resettlement Programme review.

Six options for numbers above the current priority protection quota are put forward for your consideration

30. Six options for the next three-year Refugee Resettlement Programme have been put forward for your feedback. They are summarised in Table Six below. As you have requested, all of the options apply to the 250 places Cabinet has agreed be used to resettle Syrian refugees for each of the years 2016/17 and 2017/18. They range in size from no ongoing increase to an ongoing increase of 350 places from 2018/19 (giving a maximum of 1,100 places each year). None of the options recommend reducing the number of priority protection places below 750. The options include priority protection places and other forms of admission using new selection criteria and the new settlement approaches (government-supported and community group-supported).

31. The six options are:

Option 1(a): Priority protection only

250 places in 2016/17 and 2017/18 for Syrian refugees are priority protection cases and revert to 750 priority protection cases each year from 2018/19.

Option 1(b): Priority protection only

The same as Option 1(a) but continue at 1,000 priority protection cases from 2018/19.

Option 2(a): Other forms of admission and new selection criteria:

250 places in 2016/17 and 2017/18 for Syrian refugees under other forms of admission using new selection criteria and continued for 2018/19

- (i) for 2016/17, 250 government-supported and from 2017/18 150 government-supported
- (ii) from 2017/18, 100 community group-supported each year.

Option 2(b): Other forms of admission and new selection criteria:

The same as Option 2(a) but from 2018/19 increase to 200 community supported each year, and not limited to Syrians.

Option 3(a): Mixed priority protection and other forms of admission:

250 places in 2016/17 and 2017/18 for Syrian refugees, continued for 2018/19

- (i) 100 places each year priority protection
- (ii) for 2016/17, 150 government-supported and from 2017/18, 75 government-supported
- (iii) from 2017/18, and 75 community group-supported.

Option 3(b): Mixed priority protection and other forms of admission:

The same as Option 3(a) except from 2018/19, 150 government-supported and 100 community group-supported and not limited to Syrians.

32. The six options are summarised in Table Six.

Table Six: Summary of the six options

	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2018/19 Priority protection	2018/19 Government- supported	2018/19 Community group- supported	Notes for 2018/19
	Total	Total	Total				
1 (a)	1,000	1,000	750	750	-	-	Reverts to 750, S 9(2)(f)(iv)
1 (b)	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	-	-	250 places S 9(2)(f)(iv)
2 (a)	1,000	1,000	1,000	750	150	100	250 places S 9(2)(f)(iv)
2 (b)	1,000	1,000	1,100	750	150	200	250 places S 9(2)(f)(iv) plus from 2018/19, 100 not specified
3 (a)	1,000	1,000	1,000	850	75	75	250 places S 9(2)(f)(iv)
3 (b)	1,000	1,000	1,100	850	150	100	250 places S 9(2)(f)(iv) plus from 2018/19, 100 not specified

33. The key benefits and risks of each option are summarised in Table Seven.

Table Seven: Key benefits and risks of each option

Options for the annual intake	Key benefits	Key Risks
<u>Option 1(a): Priority protection</u> 250 places 2016/17 and 2017/18 for Syrian refugees are priority protection cases and revert to 750 priority protection cases each year from 2018/19.	Maintains the priority protection focus of the refugee quota programme.	S 9(2)(g)(i)
<u>Option 1(b): Priority protection</u> The same as Option 1(a) but continue at 1,000 priority protection cases from 2018/19.	In addition to the benefit in Option 1(a): Maintains and extends New Zealand's humanitarian response to the Syrian refugee crisis in 2018/19.	May impact on New Zealand's capacity to further increase refugee resettlement.
<u>Option 2(a): Other forms of admission and new selection criteria:</u> 250 places 2016/17 and 2017/18 for Syrian refugees under other forms of admission using new selection criteria and continued for 2018/19. (i) for 2016/17, 250 government-supported and from 2017/18 150 government-supported. (ii) from 2017/18, 100 each	Maintains the number of Syrian refugees resettled in 2018/19 S 9(2)(f)(iv) Community groups have more opportunity to participate in refugee resettlement. Lower costs per refugee could enable	S 9(2)(g)(i) S 6(b)(ii) Community groups may lack capacity to support refugees effectively.

Options for the annual intake	Key benefits	Key Risks
year community group-supported.	more refugees to be resettled in the future.	
<p><u>Option 2(b): Other forms of admission and new selection criteria:</u></p> <p>The same as Option 2(a) but from 2018/19 increase to 200 community supported each year, and not limited to Syrians.</p>	<p>In addition to the benefits of Option 2 (a):</p> <p>Responds to calls for an increase in the number of refugees New Zealand resettles from 2018/19.</p> <p>Enables other forms of admission using new selection criteria and community support to be extended beyond Syrian refugees.</p>	<p>In addition to the risks for Option 2(a)</p> <p>s 9(2)(g)(i)</p>
<p><u>Option 3(a): Mixed priority protection and other forms of admission:</u></p> <p>250 places 2016/17 and 2017/18 for Syrian refugees and continued for 2018/19</p> <p>(i) 100 places each year priority protection.</p> <p>(ii) for 2016/17, 150 government-supported and from 2017/18, 75 government- funded</p> <p>(iii) from 2017/18, and 75 community group-supported.</p>	<p>Maintains the priority protection focus of the refugee quota programme for 100 Syrian refugees</p> <p>Responds to calls for an increase in the number of refugees New Zealand resettles from 2018/19.</p> <p>New selection criteria should result in quicker and improved settlement outcomes of refugees - higher employment levels, lower benefit uptake, more quickly able to actively participate</p> <p>Community groups have more opportunity to participate in refugee resettlement.</p> <p>Lower costs per refugee could enable more refugees to be resettled in the future.</p>	<p>May be criticism that New Zealand's refugee quota programme and humanitarian response are being undermined by new selection criteria – however, 100 priority protection cases are retained.</p> <p>s 6(b)(ii)</p> <p>Community groups may lack capacity to support refugees effectively.</p>
<p><u>Option 3(b): Mixed priority protection and other forms of admission:</u></p> <p>The same as Option 3 (a) except from 2018/19, 150 government-supported and 100 community group-supported</p> <p>s 9(2)(f)(iv)</p>	<p>In addition to the benefits of Option 3(a)</p> <p>Responds to calls for an increase in the number of refugees New Zealand resettles from 2018/19.</p> <p>Enables other forms of admission using new selection criteria and community support to be extended beyond Syrian refugees.</p>	<p>In addition to the risks of Option 3 (a)</p> <p>s 9(2)(g)(i)</p>

34. Funding for 2016/17 and 2017/18 has already been approved [CAB-15-MIN-0237]. The refugee-specific costs have been estimated separately from the mainstream costs because new funding from 2018/19 would be sought to cover the refugee-specific costs only. Refugee specific costs are incurred by Immigration New Zealand, and the Ministries of Education, Health and Social Development.

Table Eight: Estimated refugee-specific costs for each option

	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21 & out years
	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m
Option 1 (a)	-	-	-	-	-
Option 1 (b)	-	-	§ 9(2)(f)(iv)		
Option 2 (a)	-	-			
Option 2 (b)	-	-			
Option 3 (a)					
Option 3 (b)					

35. The estimated unit price per year for both refugee-specific costs for priority protection places and for those resettled under other forms of admission (community group-supported and government-supported) is shown in Table Nine.

Table Nine: Unit price per year for refugee specific costs

	Priority protection	Community supported	Government-supported
	\$	\$	\$
Refugee-specific	38,400	§ 9(2)(f)(iv)	33,133

36. Funding for the mainstream costs would be provided via future population-based funding adjustments or, in the case of Vote Social Development, six-monthly forecasts. § 9(2)(f)(iv)

It is likely that the Syrian refugee crisis will persist for some time so we propose continuing to target places to Syrian refugees

37. In 2013, Cabinet agreed that 50 places each year would be used for refugees from large-scale refugee crisis situations. These places were allocated to refugees from the Syrian refugee crisis over 2013/14 and 2014/15. Cabinet subsequently agreed to resettle 250 refugees each year from 2015/16 – 2017/18 from the Syrian refugee crisis [CAB-15-MIN-0057]. For 2016/17 and 2017/18, these places were in addition to the usual 750 Refugee Quota places.

38. We propose that, if Option 1(a) is chosen (maintaining the status quo of 750 priority protection cases from 2018/19), that 100 places each year be allocated to large-scale refugee crisis situations, up from the 50 annual places agreed in 2013. If any of the other options are chosen, § 9(2)(f)(iv)

39. We propose that in 2018/2019, as part of the review for the next three-year refugee resettlement programme, that the continued need for maintaining the number of places for large-scale refugee crisis situations (such as the Syrian refugee crisis), or whether some of the places should instead be used for refugees from elsewhere, be reviewed.

We propose that 55 per cent of the priority protection places be allocated to the Asia-Pacific region

40. We propose that 55 per cent of priority protection places (excluding those allocated to large-scale refugee crisis situations) be allocated to refugees resettled from the Asia-Pacific and 45 per cent from the rest of the world, to more closely reflect the focus on the Asia-Pacific region in recent years. We further propose that the rest of the world places be allocated as 14 per cent of refugees resettled from the Middle East, 14 per cent from Africa and 17 per cent from the Americas. The percentage of places allocated for resettlement from the Americas would reduce from 22 per cent to 17 per cent as the number of refugees from this region (Colombians in Ecuador) requiring resettlement has declined. The percentage allocated to refugees from the Middle East and Africa would remain the same as Cabinet agreed in 2013, and the percentage for the Asia Pacific region would increase from 50 per cent to 55 per cent.
41. The number of places allocated to each region according to the percentages proposed in paragraph 40 is shown in Table Ten below, as per 1(a) (maintain the status quo of 750 places from 2018/19). We have excluded the large-scale refugee crisis situation places from the regional allocations, as the locations of future large-scale refugee crisis situations are not known. We have included reference to transferees as explained below.

We propose that transferee places are reallocated according to the regional allocation if not needed by Australia

42. New Zealand has offered up to 150 places each year to Australia for it to use for its refugees subject to Australian offshore processing legislation. s 6(b)(i)
 s 6(b)(i)
 and they have been reallocated by Cabinet to UNHCR-referred refugees. It is recommended that, if they are not needed by Australia, they be reallocated as per the regional allocation in Table Ten below (see columns headed "150 reallocated"), rather than Cabinet approval being sought each year.

Table Ten: Proposed approximate regional allocations 2016/17 – 2018/19

Region	%	2016/17		2017/18		2018/19	
		150 for transferees	150 realloc'd	150 for transferees	150 realloc'd	150 for transferees	150 realloc'd
Asia-Pacific	55	330	413	330	413	275	358
Americas	17	102	127	102	127	85	110
Middle East	14	84	105	84	105	70	91
Africa	14	84	105	84	105	70	91
Total regional allocation	100	600	750	600	750	500	650
Large-scale refugee crisis situations*	NA	250	250	250	250	100	100

*Cabinet has agreed that these places be used for refugees from the Syrian refugee crisis in 2016/17 and 2017/18 – the 100 for 2018/19 is proposed in this paper if Option 1(a) is chosen.

The family-link requirement is proving overly restrictive

s 6(a)

Next steps

44. We propose drafting a paper for you to take to the Cabinet External Relations and Defence Committee in March 2016. We will include consideration of the UNHCR submission that you are expected to receive early next year in the draft Cabinet paper and its accompanying briefing. If Cabinet agrees an other forms of admission stream, the first people admitted under it will arrive during the 2017 calendar year (once contracts have been let and selection according to the new selection criteria undertaken).
45. We seek your feedback on the six options put forward in this paper, on which is your preferred option, whether there are any options you do not wish to be included in the Cabinet paper and whether there are any amendments required to options you will include.
46. We also seek your feedback on the proposed selection criteria for the refugees admitted under other forms of admission and the other recommendations in this paper.
47. Once we have received your feedback, we will consult relevant agencies, in particular the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, who have not been consulted on these proposals to date.
48. If you, and then Cabinet, agree that the community group-supported option should be pursued for the settlement of refugees accepted under other forms of admission, the Ministry will consult relevant community groups on the detail of the proposals and report back to you on the outcome.

Annex One: Per Capita Resettlement by Country of Resettlement in 2014 (UNHCR)

<i>Country of resettlement</i>	<i>Persons resettled in 2014</i>	<i>Population per refugees resettled</i>
Australia	6,162	3,636
Norway	1,188	4,117
Canada	7,233	4,718
Finland	1,011	5,310
Sweden	1,407	6,267
United States of America	48,911	6,384
New Zealand	632	6,911
Liechtenstein	5	7,200
Denmark	332	16,720
Luxembourg	28	18,143
Netherlands	743	22,362
Germany	3,467	23,945
Austria	269	31,234
Ireland	98	45,592
Switzerland	139	56,338
Uruguay	52	64,846
Iceland	4	79,500
United Kingdom	628	98,831
France	378	167,278
Belgium	32	341,906
Romania	44	496,841
Portugal	14	756,429
Spain	30	1,539,400
Argentina	21	1,922,571
Hungary	4	2,503,750
Czech Republic	4	2,638,500
Republic of Korea	14	3,461,000
Brazil	44	4,436,591
Japan	23	5,537,087
Mexico	1	117,886,000

Source: UNHCR Projected Global Resettlement Needs, 2016