

Introduction



This study comparatively analyzed the **origin** and **evolution** of **regularization programs** for **Venezuelan migrants** in Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru.

Since 2015, more than **6.8 million Venezuelans** have fled their nation's economic, social, and political debacle. The three studied countries are home to **two thirds** of this diaspora.

The Venezuelan exodus turned into an **unprecedented migration crisis** in receiving countries. Colombian, Ecuadorian, and Peruvian authorities, with little experience with immigration, found themselves **reacting rather than responding** to the Venezuelan crisis.

Objective



To **identify, compare, and analyze** the major **strengths** and **weaknesses** of the **ad-hoc regularization schemes** implemented in the three countries of study. Draw **recommendations for policymakers** based on the results of this comparative analysis.

Methodology



Conducted a **qualitative-heavy document review** to identify **150 government decrees and resolutions, CSO reports, academic papers, and migration agency studies** describing **regularization programs** in the three studied countries. **Shortlisted 50 documents** based on **relevance, depth, credibility, and date of publication.**

Results



- Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru have historically been **origin countries**. They were **caught off guard** when the Venezuelan migration crisis exploded.
- Authorities have had to **rely on ad-hoc measures** to cope with the **unprecedented arrival—in scale and timing—of Venezuelans**.
- **Colombia** has implemented **four regularization programs (PIP, PTP, PEP, and PPT)**. Ecuador has implemented **two regularization programs (VERHU & VIRTE)**. Peru has also implemented **two regularization programs (PTP & CPP)**.
- Colombia was the **first country** to roll out a **regularization scheme in 2016**, followed by **Peru in 2017**, and lastly by **Ecuador in 2019**.
- **Ecuador and Peru**, as opposed to Colombia, have imposed the **most stringent entry and regularization requirements** for Venezuelan immigrants. This partly explains why both countries have significantly higher irregularity rates.
- Ecuador's **VIRTE** and Peru's **CPP** are the least accessible and affordable regularization pathways for their associated costs and bureaucratic requirements.

Conclusions



1

Authorities **underestimated** Venezuelans' intention to **settle** in their countries, which resulted in **patchy, tardy, and inadequate** regularization pathways that **failed to guarantee permanent residency.**

2

Authorities **repeatedly amended** the **eligibility criteria**, **modified** the **application requirements**, and **altered** the **application window** of regularization programs, all of which led to **excessive fragmentation** and the **misallocation** of **human** and **fiscal resources**.

3

Barriers to accessing regularization schemes persist across the studied countries. The most concerning are the requirement to **have entered the national territory before an arbitrary date** and/or to **have entered the national territory regularly**.

4

Access to **public goods and services** across the three countries was only **legally guaranteed** five years after the crisis' onset. Actual access remains **extremely limited**.

References



UNHCR; IOM; Migration Policy Institute; R4V Platform; Cancillería Colombia; El Peruano; Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores y Movilidad Humana de Ecuador.

Acknowledgments



- Special thanks to Dr. Claudia Díaz Ríos for her constant guidance and advice, and to Shraddha Prasad and Flo Zheng for their support and words of encouragement.
- My gratitude to the **Laidlaw Foundation** for this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to research one of Latin America's most pressing issues.