

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LEGAL SCIENCE AND INNOVATION

[ISSN 2581-9453]

Volume 7 | Issue 3

2025

© 2025 International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.ijlsi.com/>

Under the aegis of VidhiAagaz – Inking Your Brain (<https://www.vidhiaagaz.com>)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation at VidhiAagaz. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation after due review.

In case of **any suggestion or complaint**, please contact support@vidhiaagaz.com.

To submit your Manuscript for Publication at International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation, kindly email your Manuscript at editor.ijlsi@gmail.com.

The Future of Asylum Seekers: Reforming International Refugee Law in Response to Global Displacement Crisis

BUSHRA ANSARI¹ AND HIRA KHAN²

ABSTRACT

The worldwide displacement crisis, with more than 120 million forcibly displaced individuals as of May 2024, has revealed the inadequacies of the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol in meeting modern challenges like climate-related displacement, mixed migration, and protracted refugee situations. This paper discusses the pressing need to reform international refugee law to protect asylum seekers more effectively while maintaining state sovereignty and global responsibility-sharing. It examines the trends of today, such as policies of externalization, securitarian asylum measures, and rising climate-linked displacement, and advocates a revamped legal framework encompassing broadened definitions of refugees, regional arrangements, and novel protection mechanisms. It prioritizes equitable burden-sharing and the embedding of human rights considerations to yield sustainable solutions to asylum seekers.

Keywords: Asylum, Protocol, Displacement, Policies, Climate.

I. INTRODUCTION

The globe is experiencing an unprecedented escalation of forced displacement caused by conflict, persecution, climate change, and socio-economic instability. More than 120 million people have been forcibly displaced as of mid-2024, comprising 43.4 million refugees, 68.3 million internally displaced persons (IDPs), and 8 million asylum seekers. But the current international law framework, grounded in the 1951 Refugee Convention, provides a limited definition of "refugee" as only those who are fleeing persecution on grounds of race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or membership in a specific social group. The definition does not capture modern drivers of displacement like environmental degradation, climate-related disasters, and generalized violence, leaving major protection gaps. Asylum seekers are increasingly subjected to restrictive state practices, such as externalization policies, border closures, and non-entrée measures, all of which undermine the underlying right to seek asylum. This paper critically assesses the limitations of existing international refugee law, analyzes

¹ Author is an LL.M. student at Khwaja Moinuddin Chishti Language University, Lucknow, India.

² Author is an LL.M. student at Khwaja Moinuddin Chishti Language University, Lucknow, India.

suggested reforms, and offers a forward-looking framework to guarantee more inclusive and equitable protection for displaced persons in an increasingly dynamic global environment.

II. CHALLENGES IN THE CURRENT INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE LAW FRAMEWORK

A. Narrow Definition of Refugees

The 1951 Refugee Convention, although the cornerstone of international refugee protection, has a narrow definition of a refugee, limiting qualification to those who flee persecution on grounds of race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or membership of a specific social group. The narrow definition leaves out enormous numbers of forcibly displaced individuals who leave due to causes not specifically mentioned in the Convention, including environmental degradation, climate-related disasters, economic breakdown, or widespread violence. For example, in 2022, about 84% of asylum seekers and refugees had come from countries listed as most vulnerable to the effects of climate change. However, with no accepted legal status for "climate refugees," these people are frequently excluded from formal protection channels. As a result, they are forced to traverse irregular and frequently perilous routes of migration or rely on transient, ad hoc humanitarian responses with no durability or legal predictability. This protection gap highlights the imperative to go back and extend the legal frameworks in international refugee law to respond to the intricacies and shifting drivers of displacement in the 21st century.

B. Externalization and Non-Entrée Policies

One new trend among the states, and especially in the Global North, is the introduction of externalization and non-entrée policies that seek to outsource the processing of asylum to third states. The intent behind these steps is to dissuade asylum seekers from making it to the territory of a state, hence evading the legal responsibility arising upon arrival. These practices explicitly contradict the principle of non-refoulement—a bedrock of international refugee law that forbids the return of persons to a state where they are at risk of serious harm to life or liberty. Prominent instances include Italy's contentious deal to process asylum claims in Albania, the United Kingdom's abandoned Rwanda plan, and the United States' migration management deals with Mexico and Guatemala. These arrangements often lead to serious human rights abuses, such as arbitrary and extended detention, denial of access to counsel, and exposure to inhumane conditions. Furthermore, they erode the international legal order set out in the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol, weakening global commitment to just and humane asylum processes. The expansion of such policies is part of a larger trend of declining asylum space and greater securitization of borders, with serious consequences for the rights and dignity

of displaced people.

C. Protracted Displacement and Lack of Durable Solutions

Forced displacement nowadays is not just prevalent but also more protracted. Refugees currently experience an average displacement duration of about 20 years, and internally displaced persons (IDPs) stay displaced for more than a decade on average. This is an indication of an alarming fact: the classic "durable solutions" of voluntary repatriation, resettlement, and local integration are no longer accessible to the majority of displaced people. Voluntary return is typically obstructed by ongoing conflict, political unrest, or insecurity within origin countries. Only 1.1 million refugees, for example, managed to return home in 2023, showcasing the low degree of feasibility with this choice.

Resettlement, the other important solution, is badly underpinned by a lack of international commitment. Despite the increasing number of displaced persons globally, resettlement quotas provided by industrialized countries have continued to be disproportionately small. Local integration, as perhaps more durable, is often thwarted by legal, social, and political obstacles in host states, which may not have the infrastructure, public acceptance, or political will to absorb large numbers of refugees.

This responsibility disproportionately rests on low- and middle-income countries, hosting almost 75% of all the world's refugees. These nations, already struggling with limited resources and development constraints, frequently don't have the resources to offer proper services and opportunities for the displaced. The existing global framework provides few channels for fair responsibility-sharing, resulting in profound global imbalances and inadequate assistance to the host communities. Without greater international collaboration and a reconceptualization of long-term solutions, extended displacement will persist to characterize the refugee experience, robbing millions of the possibility of a secure and dignified future.

D. Mixed Migration and Asylum System Overload

Contemporary displacement is also more and more marked by mixed migration flows, with refugees, economic migrants, trafficked persons, and other vulnerable groups following the same channels of movement via the same means. This convergence poses difficult challenges for national asylum systems, which are usually not able to distinguish between disparate protection needs at scale. During 2023, the United States experienced record-high border crossings, highlighting the strain imposed on already overwhelmed asylum infrastructures. The same dynamics are observed in Europe and elsewhere, where bureaucratic backlogs, capacity constraints, and polarization have stretched the capacity to provide timely and equitable asylum

decisions.

The territorial model of asylum—whereby individuals must be physically present within the borders of a country to benefit from its protection—is increasingly impracticable in the context of such blended and mass flows. Consequently, numerous states have brought forth restrictive policies that criminalize or punish unauthorized entry, for example, detention, fast-track removals, or denial of access to the process. These steps go directly against Article 31 of the 1951 Refugee Convention, which outlaws punishing refugees for unlawful entry or residence in case they present themselves without delay and have good cause. The absence of safe and legal means to seek asylum also forces vulnerable people to make dangerous trips, typically undertaken with the assistance of smugglers and traffickers.

This systemic overload not only undermines the rights of asylum seekers but also undermines public confidence in the asylum system itself, driving xenophobia and politicization. This requires a concerted international response involving differentiated processing mechanisms, increased legal migration channels, and increased investment in asylum system capacity and integrity. Temporary displacement involves mixed migration, where refugees, economic migrants, and others travel together, overwhelming asylum systems. In 2023, the U.S. faced record-high border crossings, exacerbating backlogs and political tensions. The territorial asylum system, requiring asylum seekers to reach a country's borders, is ill-equipped to manage these flows, leading to policies that penalize irregular entry despite Article 31 of the Refugee Convention prohibiting such penalties.

E. Climate Change and Emerging Displacement Drivers

Climate change is increasingly becoming one of the most powerful drivers of human displacement. Through its effects—such as extended droughts, sea-level rise, desertification, floods, and extreme weather events—it upsets livelihoods, worsens scarcity of resources, and accelerates instability. In 2022 alone, climate-related disasters accounted for an estimated 32.6 million internal displacements globally, making environmental causes a top reason for forced migration. Although most of this displacement is still internal, there is an increasing trend of cross-border movements caused by climate-related insecurity, especially in vulnerable areas like the Pacific Islands, sub-Saharan Africa, and parts of South Asia.

Despite the increasing magnitude and urgency of climate-related displacement, international refugee law is still not well suited to deal with this phenomenon. The 1951 Refugee Convention does not accept environmental concerns as sound bases for refugee protection unless accompanied by a well-founded fear of persecution on one or more of the Convention's five

grounds—race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or membership in a specific social group. Consequently, people fleeing from climate-related harms tend to remain outside formal protection regimes, even when their lives are at stake.

This legal loophole puts millions in limbo, dependent on short-term, ad hoc humanitarian relief without the security of legal status, long-term stability, or resettlement. Certain regional and national initiatives—like the Kampala Convention in Africa or the use of humanitarian visas—have already started to respond to these challenges, but there is no consistent global system yet for the protection of "climate-displaced persons." The rising frequency and intensity of environmental disturbances necessitate broadening existing legal tools or establishing new normative frameworks that take into account climate change as a valid cause of forced displacement. These frameworks need to include climate justice principles, common but differentiated responsibilities, and anticipatory adaptation strategies to ensure that the most vulnerable are not left behind.

III. CURRENT REFORM EFFORTS AND PROPOSALS

A. Global Compact on Refugees (GCR)

Taken over by the United Nations General Assembly in 2018, the Global Compact on Refugees (GCR) is a major step towards the global reinforcement of the international response to forced displacement. It is aimed at facilitating more predictable and equitable responsibility-sharing among states and improving international cooperation. The GCR enumerates four major goals: reducing pressure on host countries, promoting refugee self-sufficiency, increasing access to third-country solutions (i.e., resettlement), and facilitating conditions for safe and dignified returns to countries of origin.

The Compact also set up the Global Refugee Forum, held every four years, as a venue where states and stakeholders voluntarily pledge support in funding, technical cooperation, and policy adjustments. While these systems build consensus and galvanize action, the GCR is a non-binding instrument, which circumscribes its enforceability and influence. Numerous states fail to implement their commitments or pursue limiting policies that undermine the Compact's intent.

In addition, persistent underfunding continues to weaken the achievement of the GCR's objectives. As of 2024, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) estimated a budget requirement of \$10.622 billion to respond to global displacement issues, but a large funding gap remains. This financial gap not only impacts humanitarian action but also long-term development activities to strengthen resilience and inclusion. Lacking binding

agreements and continued funding, the transformative power of the GCR is largely theoretical.

B. Regional Cooperation Initiatives

Regional frameworks have become key instruments for responding to displacement in context-specific and cooperative terms. Initiatives like the Comprehensive Regional Protection and Solutions Framework (MIRPS) in Central America and the Rabat Process in Africa seek to enable collective approaches to migration and refugee flows, especially where regions are disproportionately impacted by forced displacement. These frameworks facilitate burden- and responsibility-sharing between neighboring states, promote harmonized asylum procedures, and facilitate efforts towards voluntary repatriation, local integration, and resettlement.

For instance, MIRPS convenes Central American and Mexican countries to coordinate action on gang violence-driven displacement, political instability, and economic need. Likewise, the Rabat Process entails dialogue among African and European nations on development and migration, with emphasis on enhancing border management, fighting human trafficking, and promoting legal channels of migration.

Notwithstanding the promise of regional initiatives, considerable challenges lie before them. Institutional capacity and chronic resource deficits of weak institutions usually undermine the implementation of agreed policy options. In numerous instances, frontline states are subject to disproportionate responsibilities due to the undermining effects on regional solidarity, national interests, lack of mutual trust, as well as inequitable burden-sharing. Again, the reliability of funding, technical support by the international community is a given, curbing scalability and sustaining such programs in the long term.

Nevertheless, regional cooperation is still a necessary part of a more adaptive and flexible global asylum system, especially when based on common principles and backed by strong multilateral action.

C. Proposed Overhauls of the 1951 Refugee Convention

Against the background of the changing dynamics of global displacement, there is increasingly heated debate among policymakers, scholars, and humanitarian actors about the relevance of the 1951 Refugee Convention. There are some who argue that the Convention should be updated to expand its coverage by consciously incorporating new drivers of displacement, including climate change, violence on a large scale, and extreme economic deprivation. These supporters contend that a broadened definition of "refugee" would better correspond to modern-day realities and grant legal protection to millions now denied the international asylum system.

Others propose substituting the Convention with a new, more adaptable treaty that more accurately responds to regional contexts and collective responsibilities. Such a treaty could prioritize cooperative burden-sharing, differentiated obligations according to states' capacities, and new protection channels beyond classic resettlement and asylum.

Parallel to these permissive policy tendencies are also restrictive ones. The European Union, for example, has entertained reforms which would make it possible to deport rejected asylum applicants to so-called "safe third countries" or transit states—a sign of increased frustration on the part of some states with what they see as the Convention's legal and procedural limitations. Such proposals threaten to erode the right of seeking asylum and the principle of non-refoulement, a mainstay of international refugee law.

More importantly, attempts to abolish or fundamentally re-engineer the Convention without a strong and effective alternative might tear down protection norms built up over decades and further isolate displaced persons. Due to the political sensitivities at stake, the majority of experts warn against scrapping the Convention entirely. Rather, they call for interpretive adaptation, supporting legal frameworks, and regional agreements that can find ways to apply the Convention's principles to novel circumstances without compromising its fundamental protections.

D. Climate-Specific Protection Mechanisms

As climate change increasingly becomes a major driver of displacement, the need for protection mechanisms specific to environmental and climate-induced mobility is increasingly recognized. While international refugee law does not yet recognize climate migrants under the 1951 Refugee Convention except in cases where persecution is also present, new efforts seek to close this protection gap.

A particular highlight is the Kaldor Centre's Practical Toolkit (2025), which offers pragmatic advice to judges and legal practitioners on how to include climate considerations in refugee and asylum decisions. The toolkit reinforces the point that, in specific instances, climate change and disaster can increase the vulnerability to human rights abuses or compound existing persecution, thus qualifying an individual as a refugee based on an expansive interpretive methodology. It also aids in determining whether return to a home country would subject people to inhumane or degrading treatment as a result of climate effects, thus triggering the principle of non-refoulement.

Moreover, the 1998 UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement identify environmental catastrophes, such as those caused by climate change, as valid reasons for internal

displacement. The principles confirm the rights of internally displaced persons (IDPs) to protection, assistance, and durable solutions. Nevertheless, their non-binding status and absence of enforcement mechanisms reduce their practical utility, especially in weak states with low capacity or political will.

Although these instruments are steps towards the recognition of climate displacement, they do not go far enough towards providing full legal protection, particularly for those who move across borders as a consequence of climate drivers. The growing consensus points to the need for creating binding global rules—or at least regional ones—to specifically address displacement caused by climate and provide predictable, rights-based responses.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REFORMING INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE LAW

Expand the Refugee Definition: The greatest reform of the international refugee law is broadening the definition of a refugee to encompass people affected by climate displacement, generalized violence, and acute socio-economic degradation. The 1951 Refugee Convention definition, as it stands, is too limited and leaves out millions who are forced to flee situations that do not necessarily meet its five protected grounds of persecution based on (race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or membership of a specific social group). As displacement globally increasingly results from cross-cutting, multi-dimensional drivers—environmental disasters, armed conflict, and mass poverty—such a framework does not protect those in dire need.

Reforming the Refugee Convention to encompass climate-driven displacement would offer a framework of law under which protection would be granted and where displaced individuals can claim access to rights, including asylum, non-refoulement, and aid. A separate protocol could further be adopted in conjunction to account for socio-economic displacement, and such a protocol would acknowledge severe poverty or endangerment of life and livelihood stemming from extreme poverty or unsustainable socio-economic instability as valid reasons to claim refuge.

This expansion would align the refugee protection regime with changing human rights norms, acknowledging that displacement causes are no longer exclusively associated with political persecution or direct violence. It would also fill large protection gaps, so that the international community would not turn a blind eye to the suffering of those displaced by non-conventional threats. But such reform needs to be crafted with caution to avoid exploitation of the system, such as setting criteria that will ensure those who are truly at risk of serious harm are given priority for protection.

Strengthen Regional Responsibility-Sharing: To tackle the increasing complexities of forced displacement, it is imperative to have binding regional compacts that allocate the responsibilities of hosting refugees and resettling them equitably and sustainably. These compacts could take inspiration from the guidelines outlined in the Global Compact on Refugees (GCR), but with legally binding obligations that ensure accountability of states for what they can do according to their economic resources, population, and level of development. According to this system, high-income nations—most of which are top contributors to international displacement through climate change and conflict—need to up their resettlement targets. For instance, South Korea's move to boost its resettlement contributions to the UNHCR in 2024 substantially (fourfold compared to what it had before) is a notable precedent. High-income nations may establish clear resettlement targets according to a percentage calculation about GDP, population, and infrastructure. This would guarantee that refugee hosting is not disproportionately left to low- and middle-income countries, which frequently bear the cost of displacement but do not have the resources to offer proper protection and services.

Regional compacts might also include mutual assistance arrangements for emergency situations, whereby states experiencing sudden surges of refugees would be able to draw on financial, technical, or logistical support from neighboring states. By including a regional dimension, this system would promote burden-sharing and produce a more equitable and sustainable response to displacement. Such compacts might also assist in the management of mixed migration flows and offer protection to those not necessarily included in the classical definition of refugees.

These regional frameworks must be accompanied by open monitoring and accountability processes to ensure compliance and avoid circumvention of states' obligations. Lacking binding commitments and enforcement, however, the success of regional agreements remains doubtful, as reflected in the uneven application of the GCR.

Regulate Externalization Policies: To ensure that externalization policies and third-country asylum processing are by international human rights standards, there is a need to set up an independent international monitoring body. This body would be responsible for monitoring, assessing, and ensuring that the rights of asylum seekers are protected in states where asylum processing occurs, especially in third countries under externalization arrangements.

It would concentrate on a few critical elements of asylum processing: legal aid access, the justice and openness of procedures, safeguarding vulnerable groups, and compliance with the non-refoulement principle—the ban on the return of persons to conditions in which they could

be persecuted, tortured, or subjected to inhuman treatment. By establishing clear standards for asylum processing and regular audits and reviews, the oversight body would ensure that third-country arrangements do not breach international protections or compromise the integrity of the asylum system.

This institution would be patterned after current international human rights organizations like the UN Human Rights Council or the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). It would require the authority to make binding recommendations, provide independent investigations, and collaborate with national governments and regional bodies to ensure compliance with human rights standards.

Externalization has to be always a measure of last resort applied only in truly exceptional circumstances, where there is no reasonable alternative. It never has to become the standard procedure for dealing with asylum seekers because it has serious potential for infringing on major human rights violations, such as extended detention, absence of counsel, unsatisfactory conditions for living, and infringement on the right to claim asylum. Rather, efforts should focus on constructing solid and humane asylum systems in countries of first arrival, reinforcing regional cooperation, and guaranteeing that protection needs are addressed without applying externalization as a politically expedient or cost-saving solution.

Practically, such an oversight entity would ensure that states comply with their obligations under the 1951 Refugee Convention and other international human rights regimes and rebuild trust in international protection systems.

Enhance Durable Solutions: In order to respond to forced displacement challenges, there's a need to augment funding to local integration initiatives, increase resettlement quotas, and fund post-conflict reconstruction to facilitate safe returns.

a. Enhancing Local Integration Programs

Host countries, particularly low- and middle-income countries, require financial and technical assistance for refugee integration. Programs must offer access to education, healthcare, employment, and legal means to citizenship, both for refugees and host communities, by promoting social cohesion and economic development.

b. Increasing Resettlement Quotas

The wealthier nations should pledge to resettle more refugees, targeting 10% of the world's refugee population. Resettlement must be determined by vulnerability rather than by political considerations to make protection more even.

c. Assisting Post-Conflict Reconstruction

The international community needs to place high priority on reconstructing infrastructure and livelihoods in areas affected by conflict so that they can support returns in safety and on a voluntary basis. Short-term reconstruction attempts must deal with the causes of displacement and foster sustainable development.

d. Bringing Development Actors into Humanitarian Responses

Humanitarian aid needs to be accompanied by development actors to achieve long-term solutions that increase economic independence and social inclusion among displaced people and integrate them into national development planning.

An integration of a multi-dimensional approach based on integration, resettlement, safe returns, and development cooperation will bring about more sustainable answers to global displacement crises.

Adopt Climate-Specific Protections: Establish a legally binding climate-displacement framework for persons under the UNFCCC to fill gaps in existing refugee law. The framework must:

Establish a Climate-Displacement Category: Establish climate-induced displacement as a separate category, providing temporary protection status, including healthcare, education, and employment.

Offer Relocation Assistance: Internationally cooperate to offer financial assistance, shelter, and social services, with special emphasis on vulnerable groups such as women, children, and indigenous people.

Assure Pathways to Permanent Residency: Provide displaced individuals with the option of seeking permanent residency and integration into host nations based on duration of displacement and positive contributions to the host community.

Foster International Cooperation: Encourage fair burden sharing, with high-income nations taking the lead in supporting displaced communities, supported by funding instruments

Align with Preceding Systems: Integrate with preceding frameworks such as the 1951 Refugee Convention and the Global Compact on Refugees to promote balanced protection.

Strengthen Asylum Systems: Investment in national asylum systems is important to clear backlogs, provide legal representation, and respect Article 31 of the 1951 Refugee Convention by decriminalizing irregular entry. Prior actions are:

Cutting Backlogs and Simplifying Processing: Invest in asylum systems, introduce effective case management, and give priority to vulnerable groups such as unaccompanied children and victims of violence.

Broadening Legal Services: Boost funding for nonprofit legal services (e.g., HIAS) and upskill legal professionals to assist asylum seekers in maneuvering through intricate systems.

Decriminalizing Irregular Entry: Support Article 31 by decriminalizing irregular entry and not penalizing asylum seekers for seeking asylum, rather prioritizing equitable asylum procedures.

Strengthening System Capacity: Invest in personnel, training, and infrastructure to enhance case management and decision-making processes, with a guarantee of on-time and equitable processing.

Encouraging Global Cooperation: Work together with global agencies such as UNHCR to get technical and financial assistance, promoting responsibility-sharing between states to assist host countries through resettlement and support.

Such investments will lead to more equitable, effective, and compassionate asylum systems worldwide.

Leverage Technology and Data: To counter increasing displacement due to climate change, conflict, and socio-political reasons, technology and data-based solutions are key to improving humanitarian responses. Predictive analytics based on AI and machine learning can be used to predict displacement trends by examining data from climate, conflict, and socio-economic factors. This facilitates anticipatory interventions, including resource distribution and early relocation initiatives, minimizing the effects on affected areas.

Real-time data collection through satellite imaging, mobile applications, and digital platforms can enhance crisis decision-making, coordination, and resource allocation. For instance, Switzerland's Rabat initiative monitors missing migrants, highlighting how data can strengthen response mechanisms and guarantee protection.

Electronic identification systems, for example, biometric information, can protect refugee identities, facilitate easier access to services, and prevent fraud, as well as contribute to expediting asylum procedures. Ethical use of information, respecting privacy and human rights, is necessary, however, to ensure that sensitive data is safeguarded.

In addition, encouraging cooperation through international data-sharing platforms can promote coordination and transparency among stakeholders to respond more effectively and in a timely

manner. Enhancing technological capacity in host countries is essential to enhance local responses, supplemented by international support and resources.

V. CONCLUSION

The destiny of asylum seekers is inextricably tied to far-reaching reforms in international refugee law that can adequately respond to the changing nature of global displacement. Although the 1951 Refugee Convention continues to be a cornerstone of refugee protection, its limited scope, intended for a world very different from the one we have today, does not account for the intricacies brought about by modern-day factors like climate change, mixed migration, and long-standing conflicts. Today's legal system deprives millions of uprooted people of protection, frequently placing them in desperate situations where they are forced to resort to unsafe migration channels or risk legal limbo.

An overhauled refugee protection regime needs to balance the need to respect state sovereignty and protect the core right to seek asylum on a tightrope. At its essence, such a system must ensure fair responsibility-sharing on an equitable basis, making both high-income and low- and middle-income countries contribute in terms of hosting refugees with their resources and capacities. Extended protections must fill the vacancies that make individuals displaced because of climate change-related disasters, generalized violence, and extreme socio-economic distress not covered by law as it stands today. Additionally, creative solutions like the incorporation of climate-targeted safeguards and building sustainable mechanisms for mixed flows of migration have to be integral to the transformed process.

Strengthening regional cooperation, in the form of binding treaties and collective quotas for resettlement, will enable more even distribution of the asylum seeker burden and offer concrete avenues for refugees to rebuild their lives. This can be supported by protecting asylum seekers from being exposed to externalization measures or deterrence programs that deny their right to seek protection, like the increasing phenomenon of offshore processing and third-country arrangements.

In addition, strict compliance with human rights norms is imperative in ensuring not only that asylum seekers are permitted to seek refuge but also treated with dignity and fairness during the process. The global community needs to uphold the principle of non-refoulement, avoid human rights violations in detention centers, and provide access to legal representation for asylum seekers.

The current processes at the UN, such as the Global Refugee Forum, offer useful fora for debate and progress on these much-needed reforms. But true change will only happen if there is real

political will on the part of states combined with international solidarity. The international community should understand that the responsibility to protect asylum seekers is shared and that the safety, dignity, and rights of the displaced need to be protected irrespective of the difficulties brought about by modern displacement dynamics.

Through the incorporation of climate-sensitive measures, enhancing regional cooperation, ensuring compliance with human rights, and promoting global solidarity, the global community can establish a more resilient asylum system. The system should be responsive to the realities of contemporary displacement while maintaining the dignity and security of asylum seekers, ensuring that they are no longer left behind during crises that cross borders.

VI. REFERENCES

1. European Commission, *Humanitarian Aid: Forced Displacement*, EUROPEAN COMMISSION, https://civil-protection-humanitarian-aid.ec.europa.eu/what/humanitarian-aid/forced-displacement_en.
2. Al Jazeera, *Forcibly Displaced Population Doubles to 120 Million Over the Past 10 Years*, AL JAZEERA, June 13, 2024, <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2024/6/13/forcibly-displaced-population-doubles-to-120-million-over-the-past-10-years>.
3. United Nations Economic and Social Council, *ECOSOC Resolutions and Decisions: Economic and Social Council 7173*, UNITED NATIONS, <https://press.un.org/en/2024/ecosoc7173.doc.htm>.
4. *JHUMANITARIAN ACTION, Forced Displacement and its Impact on Humanitarian Action*, 7 J. HUMANITARIAN ACTION 1 (2022), <https://jhumanitarianaction.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s41018-022-00130-1>.
5. Rachelle Goldstein, *Embracing the Global Compact on Refugees*, CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL LAW & JUSTICE, May 24, 2019, <https://cilj.co.uk/2019/05/24/embracing-the-global-compact-on-refugees/>.
6. Shivangi Shukla, *Global Compact on Refugees and the Crisis in India*, QRIUS, <https://qrius.com/global-compact-refugees-crisis-india/>.
7. McGill University, *The Global Compact on Refugees: Celebration or Missed Opportunity?*, MCGILL UNIVERSITY, <https://www.mcgill.ca/humanrights/article/70th-anniversary-universal-declaration-human-rights/global-compact-refugees-celebration-or-missed-opportunity>.
8. Parliamentary Information and Research Service, *Canada's Participation in the Global Compact on Refugees*, LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, Research Paper No. 2019-21-E, https://lop.parl.ca/sites/PublicWebsite/default/en_CA/ResearchPublications/201921E.
9. Jonathan Simon, *The Global Compact on Refugees and International Law: A Missed Opportunity*, REFUGEE LAW INITIATIVE, University of London, Feb. 5, 2019, <https://rli.blogs.sas.ac.uk/2019/02/05/the-gcr-and-international-law-a-missed-opportunity/>.

10. United Nations, *UN General Assembly Declares Global Compact on Refugees a Historic Achievement*, UNITED NATIONS, Dec. 17, 2018, <https://news.un.org/en/story/2018/12/1028641>.
