Executive Summary

Over the last five to ten years, an increasing number of countries worldwide have been investing in pathways for refugee protection that engage volunteers to support the welcome, settlement, and integration of refugees, albeit to varying degrees depending on the programme. Many aspects of these programmes are carefully crafted—from how volunteers are recruited and trained, to how refugees are prepared for arrival in a new country and matched with volunteers. But too often, insufficient attention is paid to how refugees will transition out of these programmes and how volunteers and programme organisers can best support them during this phase.

Too often, insufficient attention is paid to how refugees will transition out of these programmes and how volunteers and programme organisers can best support them during this phase.

The extent to which refugees can independently navigate life in the host community upon the conclusion of volunteer-supported pathways—which include different sponsorship programmes as well as labour and education complementary pathways programmes—significantly influences their path to integration. The attained level of self-sufficiency and the establishment of personal networks also play a pivotal role in shaping social cohesion in the receiving community.

A smooth transition to autonomous living and phase-out of volunteer and programme support is thus key to the long-term success of refugees and their new communities, and to programme sustainability. However, a number of obstacles often threaten to complicate the transition, including:

- limited understanding and mismatched expectations—from both refugees and volunteers—about what to expect during and after the sponsorship period;
- difficulties handling the volunteer–refugee relationship, including finding a balance between enhancing refugees’ self-sufficiency, phasing out support, and setting boundaries to avoid over-reliance on or paternalistic attitudes from volunteers;
- refugees’ limited ability or willingness to work towards self-sufficiency while they are still grappling with family separation and post-traumatic stress; and
- limited local infrastructure in terms of housing, space in schools, and job opportunities, complicated by the potential...
for discrimination or reluctance to integrate migrants and refugees into these sectors.

A few programmes have paid particular attention to facilitating refugees’ transition out of support, yet significant gaps in understanding and limited cross-country peer-learning persist. Analysis of programme practices and challenges across national contexts suggests that programme organisers could help support refugees’ successful transition to self-sufficiency by doing the following:

► Improving refugees’ and volunteers’ understanding of the programme and the post-programme transition process. Topics should include the programme’s goals and limits, the roles of different participants, refugees’ backgrounds, and the integration process. This can be done by developing pre- and post-arrival trainings to shape expectations and address misunderstandings (e.g., related to power dynamics and the transition process), introducing a code of conduct to clarify roles, and facilitating peer-to-peer communication with previously arrived refugees and experienced volunteers.

► Encouraging volunteers to work with refugees in setting up a transition plan. This should be done early on in volunteers’ time working with refugees and involve reaching a common understanding and agreement on programme objectives and what a ‘successful’ transition means. Engaging refugees in this planning process can help empower them to make decisions about their future, indicate to volunteers what activities to prioritise, and facilitate the programme assessment process.

► Closely monitoring refugees’ and volunteers’ relationships. This can be done through regular meetings, surveys, or working with intercultural mediators.

A proactive approach allows programme organisers to identify challenges in a timely manner and provide further guidance, training, and support to both refugees and volunteers as needed.

► Ensuring a smooth transition to non-programme-based services. This requires raising refugees’ awareness of those services and reaching out to local service providers to ensure they are ready to provide them. It also necessitates improving the mechanisms that match refugees with host communities to ensure that needed services and other resources (including affordable housing and job opportunities) will be available in the community after a programme’s support for refugees ends.

As countries continue to invest in developing and scaling protection pathways that engage volunteers, facilitating refugees’ seamless transition out of these initiatives and into mainstream support structures is crucial. Ensuring that refugees are well supported and guided in their path to self-sufficiency throughout the programme is necessary to ensure both their longer-term integration in their new communities and the sustainability of the programme itself.

1 Introduction

Since 2015, an increasing number of countries have experimented with ways to increase their capacity to welcome and support the integration of refugees by involving volunteers from receiving communities. These pathways—which include different refugee sponsorship programmes (including those that act as additional entry pathways and those that are part of traditional resettlement channels) as well as labour and education complementary pathways programmes—vary in terms of design and modes of public engagement. But by involving volunteer groups and other members of the receiving soci-
ety, including universities, employers, faith-based groups, and civil-society organisations, in refugee settlement, all of these programmes seek to both improve refugees’ integration and promote social cohesion. This is done by facilitating intercultural interactions that help increase awareness and, often, foster meaningful relationships that endure beyond the duration of the programmes.

While different support arrangements exist under different pathways, volunteers participating in these programmes typically commit to all or some of the following tasks:

- welcoming refugees and facilitating their social integration into the community;
- helping refugees settle and navigate life in their new community and country (this may include providing support with administrative tasks, enrolling children in schools and adults in language lessons, navigating health-care services and the job market, and/or providing financial support);
- helping refugees find and, sometimes, pay for housing; and
- supporting refugees’ transition out of volunteer and programme support.

These commitments typically last from a few months up to two years, depending on the programme. Refugees also typically receive assistance from the civil-society organisation that facilitates the programme (sometimes referred to as the ‘lead organisation’), in addition to volunteer support, and the balance between the two shapes the type and extent of volunteers’ responsibilities. Once the support period comes to an end, however, volunteers’ commitments—including (where applicable) paying for rent and other basic necessities, managing the household budget, and making appointments—are over. This does not necessarily signify an end to the relationship volunteers and refugees develop, but those that continue evolve from formal to informal relationships. After this point, refugees are expected to independently navigate their lives in the receiving community and, if necessary, be able to access community and national resources.

The way in which the phasing out of support is managed by volunteers and the nongovernmental organisations or government entities involved in these programmes deeply influences the success of the transition and refugees’ path to autonomy. A timely, well-structured, and clear transition strategy can facilitate a smooth and effective programme conclusion, advance refugees’ self-sufficiency and integration, ensure a positive experience for both refugees and volunteers, and safeguard a programme’s reputation and long-term sustainability (see Figure 1). Conversely, a poorly managed transition can adversely affect refugees’ autonomy and leave them overly dependent on volunteers, overwhelm volunteers who have invested time and effort in the programme, and potentially reduce their willingness to remain involved, thus harming programme sustainability.

Despite the pivotal role it plays, the transition out of support is often an overlooked aspect of these programmes’ design, compared to others such as refugee beneficiary and volunteer identification, matching, and onboarding. This can make the transition a formidable challenge for both refugees and volunteers. A few programmes have made progress in establishing guidelines, trainings, and other tools to facilitate this phase, but systematic approaches are rare and a substantial knowledge gap remains concerning challenges and best practices for facilitating and executing a successful transition. As more countries channel resources into refugee sponsor-
ship and complementary pathways programmes, addressing this gap and enhancing the transition process is of utmost importance.

This issue brief identifies lessons learnt to date and considerations for further improvements. The brief draws insights from different sponsorship programmes as well as education and labour complementary pathways programmes that involve sponsorship or volunteer engagement. This brief represents an initial effort to document and analyse existing practices and spark further thinking and action on effective management of the post-programme transition period.

2 Current Practices in Phasing Out Programme and Volunteer Support

The transition out of programme and volunteer support is a gradual process rather than a single end-point. Activities and planning to support this phase often begin well ahead of refugees’ arrival, such as through orientations that help set expectations, and continue until volunteers’ formal commitments conclude. In some cases, volunteers’ or lead organisations’ support continues for a bit longer if refugees need it, generally in an informal way, but the goal

---

**FIGURE 1**

Benefits of an effective strategy for refugees’ transition out of sponsorship and complementary pathways programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR REFUGEES</th>
<th>FOR VOLUNTEERS</th>
<th>FOR LOCAL STAKEHOLDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better prepared to independently navigate life in the new community</td>
<td>Better understanding of how to guide refugees’ transition out of the programme</td>
<td>Greater awareness of refugee newcomers, their rights, and the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive experience with the programme</td>
<td>Positive experience with the programme</td>
<td>Improved ability to prepare education, health, and other systems to support refugees during and after the programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR THE PROGRAMME

- Promote programme’s positive reputation and sustainability
- Ensure programme objectives related to refugee self-sufficiency, integration, and social cohesion within receiving communities are met
- Refugees and volunteers more likely to recommend the programme to others

Source: Compilation by the author.
is to ensure refugees have the knowledge, skills, and resources to thrive in their new community. Individual volunteers usually provide direct guidance and support to refugees as they settle and progress toward self-sufficiency, and the civil-society organisations that set up and manage these programmes typically help set refugees’ expectations before arrival, communicate with volunteers regarding their tasks, and oversee the transition.

While there is no universal approach to handling the transition, lead organisations in these programmes usually try to promote the following:

► Both refugees and volunteers should understand the limits and duration of support and how to plan for the transition.

► Refugees should have access to the tools and resources they need to navigate life in the host community, including housing, employment, public transport, and medical care.

► Refugees should be informed about and registered for services and benefits available outside the programme and have access to a broad support network.

As the period during which refugees receive support from volunteers and the programme is relatively short, refugees are not expected to achieve full socioeconomic integration before it concludes. Success is instead typically assessed based on refugees’ progress towards self-sufficiency and integration into their new communities. The exact indicators used vary by programme, but they commonly include refugees’ feelings of safety in their new community, engagement in social activities beyond those they undertake with volunteers, registration for non-programme-related services and support, and proficiency in managing daily tasks such as paying rent, managing a budget, making appointments, using public transportation, and navigating the health-care and education systems and the job market.

### 3 Challenges for a Smooth Transition

Despite some programmes’ efforts to effectively manage the transition out of sponsorship, the process is complex and often fraught with challenges. These can include mismatches in expectations around this phase and how to navigate it, difficulties managing volunteer–refugee communications and relationships, and structural issues that hinder or slow the process (see Figure 2). The nature and extent of these challenges vary depending on the type of programme and volunteer support.

**FIGURE 2**

*Obstacles to refugees’ effective transition out of support in sponsorship and complementary pathways programmes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MISUNDERSTANDINGS about a programme’s expected outcomes, how refugees will transition out of the programme, and how volunteers will support that transition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RELATIONSHIP CHALLENGES between volunteers and refugees, including difficulties related to communication, boundaries, and avoiding paternalism and dependency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUCTURAL BARRIERS such as limited infrastructure, housing, and job opportunities, as well as legal status and service access challenges rooted in a programme’s design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees’ successful transition to self-sufficiency and integration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compilation by the author.
A. Misunderstandings about the transition period and the end of programme support

Lack of understanding or unrealistic expectations can occur among both refugees and volunteers—about both the programme and its expected outcomes, and about what will happen when support ends. This can lead to frustration and disappointment. Additionally, lack of awareness among local stakeholders about the programme and refugee issues more broadly has often caused delays for refugees’ local integration and added to the burden placed on volunteers.

The transition process

Insufficient guidance provided by lead organisations to volunteers on when and how to assist refugees during the transition, and about the support available to both, has often created problems. In some cases, volunteers have said they felt unprepared to support refugees’ transition to self-sufficiency. In others, refugees have mistakenly believed that volunteer and programme support will be available indefinitely; for example, while refugees are generally told of the time limits during predeparture orientation, trauma and the scale of life changes can make such information difficult to retain and fully digest. Some sponsorship and complementary pathway programmes have also suffered from a lack of awareness among local service providers and other actors (such as landlords, banks, employers, and local authorities) that could play a crucial role in supporting refugees after the programmes’ support concludes. This includes a lack of awareness about what sponsorship programmes and complementary pathways exist in a particular context and how they work, local stakeholders’ potential roles in them and how to support refugee beneficiaries, and the rights of refugees during and following the programmes. Because of this, volunteers have often had to step in to fill informational gaps (e.g., by acting as mediators between refugees and local stakeholders, and providing these types of information) and refugees have faced delays or limited access to local services and support.

Programme outcomes

Refugees and volunteers sometimes harbour unrealistic expectations regarding the time frame for refugees’ integration and the level of self-sufficiency that is achievable during the support period. This can occur when a volunteer does not understand or take into consideration a refugee’s background. For example, some volunteer groups participating in the United Kingdom’s community sponsorship scheme initially expected refugees to be fully autonomous by the end of the 12-month support period, but came to realise this expectation was unrealistic. Similarly, sponsors in Belgium have grappled with frustration when the integration process has lasted longer than expected. Unrealistic or differing expectations for refugees’ integration and indicators of programme success can lead to frustration for both volunteers and refugees when the expected level of self-sufficiency is not achieved during the support period. This can also negatively affect volunteers’ planning for refugees’ transition if it means they insufficiently prioritise providing certain types of support, and it can limit volunteer retention if volunteers perceive their engagement or the programme to have failed or fallen short of what was expected.

B. Difficulties managing the refugee–volunteer relationship

Even when refugees and volunteers have a good understanding of what to expect and how to manage the transition out of a programme, challenges may arise in how they relate to each other.
Establishing boundaries

Difficulties in setting limits and a paternalistic ‘do for’ rather than ‘do with’ approach have, in some instances, created problematic power dynamics in relationships between volunteers and refugees. In some cases, refugees have directly expressed a need for further assistance and volunteers have struggled to decline, fostering a lingering sense of dependency. In other cases, volunteers have developed an excessive sense of responsibility for and commitment to ‘their’ refugees, wanting to feel useful or feeling obliged to provide support beyond the time frame and/or extent of the support agreement. The extension of volunteers’ responsibilities and, especially, a paternalistic (‘do for’) approach not only negatively affect the level of autonomy refugees can achieve by the end of volunteer support, they can also contribute to volunteer fatigue and may discourage some from repeating or recommending the experience.

Communicating

In a related issue, broaching the topic of transition out of support has posed a challenge for some volunteers. In the United Kingdom, for example, some sponsors reported struggling so much to discuss this that refugees were not at all informed that programme support would eventually end. In Canada, where some sponsorship schemes allow volunteers to sponsor members of their own (extended) families, having the conversation about the phasing out of support proved easier in these family-based schemes due to participants’ pre-existing relationships and trust than in the country’s Blended Visa Office-Referred programme, where refugees and volunteers do not know each other prior to being matched. In general, delaying or avoiding this conversation only reinforces unrealistic programme expectations and further complicates the timely and effective planning and execution of the transition.

C. Structural and programme-specific challenges

Even when refugees and sponsors have sufficient information, communicate well, and share expectations for the post-programme transition, structural issues within the broader society (e.g., job and housing availability) and the long-term nature of refugee integration can still make the transition difficult. Programme-specific challenges linked to the design of different pathways have also posed challenges.

Integration dynamics, supportive infrastructure, and opportunities in host communities

Integration is a long-term, nonlinear process that normally extends beyond a programme’s support period. Relocating to a new country involves adapting to a new culture and social norms, making new friends, often learning a new language, validating skills and qualifications, finding a job (preferably a well-paid one), and other milestones necessary for achieving self-sufficiency and integration in the receiving community. For people fleeing war or persecution, mental health profoundly influences this transition, as the integration process unfolds while they are seeking to reconstruct their identity and grappling with family separation and traumatic experiences. Progressing towards self-sufficiency is even harder for the most vulnerable refugees, including single mothers, the elderly, and those with disabilities, raising questions about the feasibility of and expectations around totally ending programme support for them.

External barriers within receiving communities, such as lack of housing, jobs and job training, and education (school placements for children as well as language programmes for adults), can also delay refugees’ integration and hinder the effectiveness of their transition out of sponsorship. Securing affordable housing during and after programme
Challenges that vary by programme type

The prevalence of integration and transition challenges varies across programmes, depending on programme design (including selected refugees’ backgrounds and needs, volunteers’ roles and level of engagement, beneficiaries’ legal status, and the services and resources available during and after the programme). For example, sponsorship programmes in Europe often assist more vulnerable refugees than labour or education pathway schemes, which follow different selection criteria mainly based on skills and qualifications. Programmes working with more vulnerable refugees generally have volunteers provide more extensive support and, therefore, have a greater likelihood of fostering a ‘saviour’ dynamic between volunteers and refugees, raising the risk of over-reliance if refugees are not effectively empowered throughout the programme and transition process to do things independently.

In labour and education complementary pathways programmes, refugees are often younger, somewhat less vulnerable, and may exhibit greater autonomy earlier on in the programme. In addition, the clearer societal roles these pathways offer to beneficiaries (as workers or students) can somewhat reduce the obstacles to establishing oneself and moving towards self-sufficiency. Refugees participating in these pathways often also have some knowledge of the local language or English, which may speed up their integration and mean they require less extensive volunteer support. Still, difficulties related to setting boundaries sometimes emerge due to paternalistic attitudes from educational institutions, for example, or power dynamics in the workplace that can limit refugees’ perceived autonomy. Additionally, beneficiaries of these pathways may still struggle with trauma and family separation.

The different pathways to protection also offer different legal statuses and access to different networks, services, and resources, facilitated by the civil-society organisations, universities, and employers that manage these pathways. These differences can affect the ease or difficulty and timeline of refugees’ path to self-sufficiency. For instance, refugees entering Belgium’s education pathway were able to access language courses within three weeks of arrival, compared to up to six months for those participating in the national sponsorship programme. Similarly, refugees in Italy’s humanitarian corridor sponsorship pathway are typically not eligible for support under the public reception system for resettled refugees and asylum seekers, which has mean the pathway’s lead organisations have often found it necessary to extend their support for participating refugees. Finally, the fact that some education pathways facilitate refugees’ entry into a country...
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using regular (and therefore, time-limited) study visas raises distinct transition challenges, since those who wish to remain in the country and/or are unable to return to their origin country because it is unsafe need to successfully transition to a different legal status (such as through employment).37

4 Seven Good Practices for Managing the Transition

As sponsorship and complementary pathways programmes continue to grow in relevance and scale, improving the transition out of these programmes and better paving the path to self-sufficiency remain key challenges. Policymakers and the civil-society organisations involved in these pathways should consider taking the following steps towards meeting these challenges.

1. Promote realistic expectations among both refugees and volunteers about programme support, expected outcomes, and the transition process. A well-managed transition starts with setting realistic expectations. A clear understanding among volunteers and refugees about how the programme works, their roles, the available assistance, and the transition process can help avoid frustration.38 It can also ensure that refugees feel more at ease during the phasing out of support, that volunteers feel less overwhelmed, and that relationships are easier to sustain through the end of a programme.39 Moreover, an in-depth understanding of the integration process can help shape both parties’ expectations about what is achievable within the time frame of a programme. Stressing that full integration is an ongoing process and one that varies from one individual to the next can improve planning and reduce disappointment. A few strategies can help in this regard:

► Provide pre-programme guidance for volunteers and refugees. Ideally, expectation management should start before refugees arrive. Predeparture orientations for refugees, led by civil-society or government staff, can help ensure that refugees make informed decisions and know what to expect before joining a programme. For example, Talent Beyond Boundaries, an organisation that supports the operation of employment-based complementary pathways in several countries, holds an informed-decision-making session with refugees to help them understand job details (e.g., the role, contract length, benefits) and the place where the job is located.40 Other strategies include predeparture video calls (such as those conducted by intercultural mediators working for Caritas International in Belgium to help refugees set realistic expectations41) and providing additional materials in refugees’ native languages (such as a podcast developed by Mosaico and Association Frantz Fanon to provide information about Italy’s humanitarian corridor42). Pre-programme trainings can also improve volunteers’ awareness of refugees’ backgrounds and needs. For example, Ireland’s community sponsorship programme has a standardised mandatory training for volunteers that covers topics such as intergroup communication, bias, and power dynamics,43 and the UK-based nongovernmental organisation Reset is introducing a trauma-informed training to help volunteers understand behaviours linked to trauma and how to effectively support refugees.44

► Strengthen understanding with post-arrival trainings and support. Repetition is key for reinforcing knowledge, addressing mismatches in expectations, and avoiding frustration. Setting up additional trainings for refugees and volunteers after refugees have arrived in the host country can help
achieve this goal. For example, in Germany, refugees are required to attend a two-week orientation in a reception centre upon arrival to better prepare for life in the country and understand the culture before formally starting the programme. Volunteers are also offered additional trainings to address any questions or challenges that may emerge, including to prevent paternalistic attitudes by reinforcing their understanding that refugees are individuals with their own aspirations. Similarly, Intersos, the humanitarian aid organisation leading a sponsorship programme for unaccompanied minors in Italy, runs post-arrival trainings to help manage participants’ expectations and to emphasise the importance of attending vocational trainings and finding a job in preparation for the end of programme support.

2. Guide volunteers in planning refugees’ transition to self-sufficiency. Although volunteers provide critical support to refugees in sponsorship and complementary pathways programmes, they are not social workers and typically do not have professional experience working with refugees. Careful planning is, therefore, imperative for a successful phasing out of programme and volunteer support, particularly when volunteers have been providing financial or housing assistance (as is the case in many sponsorship programmes). Lead organisations in these programmes play a key role in ensuring that volunteers engage in thorough transition planning and are prepared for related tasks. The following steps can be helpful:

- Introduce a written agreement between refugees, volunteers, and other relevant stakeholders. A code of ethics/conduct or similar agreement signed by all parties outlining what will and will not be done by each party can help formalise expectations, clearly delineate responsibilities, and ensure a common understanding of roles. This type of document can also serve as a reference point for refugees and volunteers, facilitating the definition of and respectful adherence to boundaries and ensuring the fulfilment of tasks. Such agreements are used, for example, in Canada’s sponsorship and education pathways.

- Develop templates and guidelines for volunteers. Organisations involved in many sponsorship and complementary pathways programmes have introduced guidelines or even detailed planning templates to aid volunteers in understanding and organising their tasks. These resources enable volunteers to identify milestones, set a timeline for each area in which they need to work with refugees (e.g., health care, social welfare,
the labour market, and education), and specify what needs to be done, when, and by whom. Most lead organisations recommend that an individual plan be set shortly after refugees arrive, although in a few cases, some pre-planning is done before their arrival.

- **Guide a gradual progression from more intensive to more hands-off forms of support.** A clear transition from ‘doing things for the family’ as they settle in to ‘teaching the family how to do things for themselves’—increasing autonomy and decreasing dependency—is essential. Examples of coaching volunteers in this approach include instructing them to guide refugees in independently booking medical appointments, providing opportunities to manage small sums of money before they have to fully handle their household budget, and simply accompanying them to some of their first appointments to ensure they familiarise themselves with the route, the places, and the tasks and people they will be dealing with. For example, Reset encourages volunteers in the United Kingdom to critically reflect on the types of support they offer as refugees’ time with the sponsorship programme passes and to ask themselves whether they still need to do those tasks.

- **Introduce the use of checklists and reminders.** By creating checklists and sending reminders to volunteers, lead organisations can help ensure volunteers have a clear understanding of what activities to focus on for each month. For instance, the World University Service of Canada sends such reminders monthly to volunteers supporting refugee-background students.

3. **Ensure volunteers to engage refugees in planning, both before and during the transition, by working with them to set priorities, determine what success looks like, assess progress, and decide on next steps.** In order to enhance refugees’ agency in and ownership of their integration process, and to more effectively prioritise and target volunteer support, it is essential to involve refugees in the process. Transition planning should incorporate refugees’ goals and expectations, including what they want to focus on (e.g., housing, employment, finances) during the volunteer support period, and ensure that refugees are regularly informed about and involved in coordinating the transition out of support. This can include the following steps:

- **Set priorities for the transition plan.** Ideally, the support plan should be created jointly by refugees and volunteers, taking into account refugees’ hopes and ambitions, backgrounds, and needs and reflecting on how volunteers can best provide support. Co-created plans can help ensure that refugees and volunteers agree on what activities should be prioritised at different points of time, fostering refugees’ ownership of their pathway to autonomy and integration and maximising the timeliness of volunteers’ support. Such plans can, for instance, enable refugees to voice whether they feel ready to engage in certain integration activities (such as language classes or training courses) upon arrival or if they need to use the first months to focus on rebuilding their personal identity and family unit, informing volunteers’ decisions around how they provide support.

- **Define success.** Refugees’ perspectives should also be considered in defining the parameters of success in programme and volunteer support. Traditionally, volunteers and lead organisations have focused their support on what they perceived as essential for a successful transition. However, volunteers’ definition of success may differ from that...
of refugees, and definitions may vary among refugees themselves. For example, in Canada, a representative of one of the organisations overseeing the Blended Visa Office-Referred sponsorship programme said that participants typically associate success with dignity, defined by their ability to choose for themselves and have agency, while volunteers seemed to link success to independence, measured in terms of refugees’ language proficiency and ability to pursue employment and education opportunities. In recognition of such gaps, the World University Service of Canada, an educational outreach organisation that facilitates the biggest education pathway in Canada, plans to start asking refugee students to identify what success looks like for them one year, five years, and ten years from the start of the programme.

Communication early about the end of support. Making sure that volunteers remind refugees about the upcoming end of support and what this entails, some months in advance, is crucial for facilitating a smooth transition and preventing a negative or even traumatic experience for refugees. The Canadian Refugee Sponsorship Training Program advises volunteer groups to start preparing for the phase-out of support at least three months before support ends (in their case, month nine). In some cases, volunteers are encouraged to initiate discussions as early as month six, to remind refugees of the support currently available and when it will end.

Assess refugees’ progress. Volunteers’ collaboration with refugees is also pivotal for assessing their progress. Discussion of topics such as refugees’ capacity to access affordable housing, manage a budget, apply for educational programmes and subsidies, and understand emergency services and social assistance can help pinpoint unmet needs and knowledge gaps and enable the development of more tailored support in the final months. If minimum self-sufficiency is not likely to be achieved before the programme ends, such an assessment can enable volunteers and refugees to jointly develop alternative next steps, with the support of the lead organisation.

4. Regularly monitor volunteers’ and refugees’ relationship and provide support as needed. A well-managed transition should entail proactive follow-up by lead organisations with both refugees and volunteers. This includes monitoring the relationship between the two and refugees’ progress towards self-sufficiency, and identifying and addressing potential challenges before the programme concludes. Timely recognition and resolution of problems, for instance paternalistic attitudes from volunteers, is key to preventing refugees from becoming overly dependent on volunteers as well as to prevent volunteer burnout. Such diligence is essential to ensure refugees and volunteers have a good experience and to safeguard the programme’s reputation. Monitoring and support should include the following elements:

Monitor volunteers’ experiences. Regular check-in and monitoring meetings conducted by lead organisations are vital to assess volunteers’ ongoing experience and to identify areas that require improvement or support before the programme ends. For example, in the United Kingdom, meetings take place shortly after refugees arrive and at months six and nine to monitor progress and encourage volunteers to continuously re-evaluate their work. Nasc, one of the nongovernmental organisation involved in Ireland’s sponsorship programme, monitors progress every six months over
a year and a half of support, while in Italy, Refugees Welcome does so every three months during the humanitarian corridor’s one year of support. And in Canada, the Mennonite Central Committee organises monthly video calls for volunteers in the country’s sponsorship programmes to share concerns. In some cases, lead organisations opt for systemised surveys instead of, or in addition to, meetings to collect information about progress and challenges faced by volunteers.

► Monitor refugees’ experiences. Check-in meetings between lead organisations and refugees are crucial for taking refugees’ concerns and feedback into account. Engaging intercultural mediators whom refugees can trust can further encourage them to speak up. This space can empower and incentivise refugees to voice their concerns, rather than feeling obligated to express gratitude to volunteers and lead organisations, and it thus can mitigate some of the potentially adverse effects of these systems’ power dynamics. For example, under the sponsorship programme in Belgium, Caritas engages intercultural mediators in informal meetings with refugees and volunteers on an as-needed basis during the support period and in the programme’s regular monitoring visits. The mediators’ familiarity with the situation in refugees’ country of departure and knowledge of their language have helped bring proximity and trust to the relationship and facilitated the collection of feedback. In a similar effort, the German sponsorship programme has an ombudsman that works with translators and is available to address any inquiries refugees may have during the programme.

► Provide targeted and on-demand support. Areas of concern identified by refugees and volunteers during monitoring often require lead organisations to develop further trainings, guidelines, or other forms of support. For instance, following concerns about power dynamics in sponsorship relationships in the Canadian education complementary pathway, the World University Service of Canada has started to organise a training for volunteers that emphasises refugees’ right to decide for themselves (e.g., how to manage their budget and what integration goals to prioritise) and the importance of preventing paternalistic attitudes. Similarly, Caritas Belgium has created fact sheets based on concerns raised by volunteers and refugees, covering topics such as obtaining a driver’s license and accessing mental health support.

5. When designing programmes, take into consideration local availability of housing and other resources and how those match up to refugees’ needs and volunteers’ roles. Considering local resources when making programme decisions can facilitate a smoother transition. Placing refugees in areas that have limited opportunities (such as affordable housing, jobs, and schools) or that are far from other family members in the country can jeopardise their autonomy and integration and may prompt some to relocate after programme completion, requiring them to start anew, again. The more lead organisations invest in pre-arrival and programme-design planning, the better programme results will be for refugees and volunteers. Two important areas of focus are:

► Improve matching mechanisms. More sophisticated mechanisms that take housing availability and affordability, refugees’ needs, and family links into account can improve the quality of decisions about
which host communities or volunteers to match refugees with. This can help improve integration outcomes, prevent refugees from having to or wanting to relocate after the end of a programme, and amplify refugees’ voices in decisions that affect their future. For example, La Federazione delle Chiese Evangeliche in Italia (the Federation of Protestant Churches in Italy) works with civil-society stakeholders in Lebanon and local stakeholders Italy to collect information on refugees’ needs and Italian communities’ reception capacity for consideration in the Italian humanitarian sponsorship programme’s matching process. Some other programmes have in recent years developed and tested innovative, algorithm-based matching tools that consider refugees’ preferences and needs and host communities’ capacities, with the aim of optimising integration outcomes.

Facilitate access to long-term housing. Finding longer-term housing is an important, and often challenging, part of refugees’ transition out of volunteer and programme support. Programmes have tried to address this in different ways. For instance, sponsorship programmes in Sweden and Finland require that governments (rather than volunteers) take on responsibility for refugee housing, reducing the volunteer workload and helping to ensure the safety of refugees after the end of the programme. In some programmes where volunteers are initially responsible for housing, lead organisations require volunteers to take into account future housing-related challenges by identifying initial housing that aligns with the minimum welfare allowance, eliminating the need for refugees to relocate following the programme end (and the end of volunteers’ financial assistance). This is the case in the German sponsorship programme, for example, and the humanitarian (sponsorship) corridor led by the Fédération de l’Entraide Protestante in France. Overall, however, advanced planning for housing challenges is rare in sponsorship and complementary pathways programmes.

Inform refugees of support resources. For community services to be effective, refugees must know about them and be able to access them. Volunteers play a key role in ensuring that refugees are aware of support services beyond the programme and know where to go to access them. Lead organisations can also play a role. For example, in Ireland, the Open Community has developed an app for refugee families with information in five languages about the Irish welfare, education, and housing systems and other aspects of life in the country. And in Belgium, Caritas
provides training sessions for beneficiaries of the education pathway programme, as part of the EU-Passworld project, that familiarise refugees with available services (e.g., psychological wellbeing, housing, and labour market support services).\textsuperscript{84}

► Advocate for refugees with local and national service providers. Lead organisations and government agencies engaged in sponsorship programmes play a crucial role in ensuring that local and national service providers responsible for post-programme support are informed about sponsored refugees’ right to access these services. For example, the Belgian federal agency for the reception of asylum seekers, Fedasil, has sought to ensure local stakeholders know about the national sponsorship programme and the rights of refugee participants, in order to ensure that refugees have access to available local services and support.\textsuperscript{85}

7. Implement a whole-of-society approach to supporting refugees. A well-managed transition is contingent on refugees having access to resources and support from a network of local stakeholders, beyond service providers, after a programme concludes. It therefore heavily relies on the extent to which relevant stakeholders (such as local schools, companies, and others) are informed about the existence of sponsorship programmes and complementary pathways and engaged in supporting refugees during and after a programme. Several strategies have proved useful in establishing a broad ecosystem of support:

► Seek diversity among volunteers. Having volunteers of varying ages, professional backgrounds, and migratory experiences can enrich the programme and unlock additional opportunities and resources for refugees after programme support comes to an end.\textsuperscript{86}

► Engage a wider spectrum of stakeholders within host communities. Involving a more extensive array of actors from receiving communities, beyond volunteers and lead organisations, provides refugees with a broader network of support that can help them access needed assistance beyond the programme. In the Basque Country’s sponsorship programme in Spain, lead organisations systematically build wider networks of support by informing and involving local authorities, schools, churches, health centres, diaspora communities, social workers, and other local stakeholders in welcoming and supporting refugees.\textsuperscript{87} Similarly, Refugees Welcome Italy works to establish a broad ecosystem of support, often including faith-based organisations and universities, which can offer refugees assistance with housing and other resources.\textsuperscript{88}

► Enhance programme visibility in strategic sectors. Boosting programme visibility among potential service providers and other allies and advocates can facilitate refugees’ integration both during and after they transition out of a programme. Some outreach efforts, for example, target discrimination against refugees in the housing market. Refugees Welcome Italy works to addressing prejudices and reluctance to rent to refugees by raising private owners’ awareness of what it is like to provide housing to refugees. The organisation also works closely with building administrations to identify empty flats that could be rented to refugees at an affordable price.\textsuperscript{89} Other outreach efforts seek to encourage companies to hire refugees and to help refugees find jobs. For example, La Federazione delle Chiese Evangeliche in Italia has been working with the private foundation Adecco to secure internship opportunities
for sponsored refugees in Italy, with the aim of facilitating a smoother transition to employment.\textsuperscript{90} And in Canada, volunteers in the education complementary pathway often work with universities to support refugees in getting part-time jobs where they can gain in-country professional experience, which can support their future transition to work.\textsuperscript{91} In many contexts, however, more work is needed to help facilitate the recognition of skills, qualifications, and credentials that refugees bring with them from other countries, to ensure that they can apply those assets in the receiving country’s labour market.

5 Conclusion

For refugees in sponsorship and complementary pathways programmes, a successful transition to autonomy demands meticulous planning (including carefully defining success and setting priorities), realistic expectations, clear relationship boundaries, close follow-up, and a broad network of support. It also requires a focus on refugee empowerment, striking a delicate balance between volunteers helping refugees settle in, fostering their independence, and encouraging them to pursue their own aspirations.\textsuperscript{92} These efforts can enhance refugee autonomy as well as programme sustainability and effectiveness.

It is clear that civil-society organisations, government entities, and others involved in these programmes play a pivotal role in raising awareness and equipping volunteers to support refugees through the development of tools, guidance, and trainings as well as the provision of oversight. However, questions remain about how promising approaches can be replicated and scaled up in different contexts and programmes. Robust reflection mechanisms—such as end-of-sponsorship evaluations that invite volunteers and refugees to reflect on experiences, successes, challenges, and suggestions for improvement—can help build an evidence base and secure continuous learning.\textsuperscript{93} Better understanding of transition best practices and opportunities for peer-learning are essential to refine existing strategies, realign programme goals, and enhance the overall effectiveness of these pathways to protection.

Better understanding of transition best practices and opportunities for peer-learning are essential to refine existing strategies, realign programme goals, and enhance the overall effectiveness of these pathways to protection.
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