

Global Compact on Refugees – Second Formal Consultations
20 – 21 March, Geneva

Agenda 2: Programme of action: Mechanisms for burden - and responsibility - sharing
(Part III.A)

Uganda (On behalf of the Africa Group)

- Welcome the new text, which takes into account inputs of all Member States.
- Technical support to national capacities, reference to new and protracted emergencies, additional mechanisms for responsibility and burden sharing, material aspects of burden sharing, and measuring the impact of hosting refugees as a tool are all positive elements. We also welcome the coordinating role of UNHCR and take note of the proposed mapping of impact although note the absence of a clear mechanism to do this. We request the introduction of such a clear mechanism in the text.
- Document is still prescriptive on what host countries are supposed to do and not clear on international cooperation. It should not create new responsibilities for host countries, and this stance should be reflected across the document.
- The Africa region remains the most underfunded, as a result we continue to advocate for flexible, predictable, un-earmarked, multiyear funding.
- Africa is grappling with chronic underfunding of programmes. Funding should take into account humanitarian and development needs as well as priorities of host states.
- Para 13 – where the role of cities and municipalities is mentioned, must should include towns, and should not exclude local authorities in rural areas.
- Involving local authorities should not undermine the centrality of national government systems and must engage the subnational through national.
- Language in para 19 does not reflect exclusive right of national prerogative to set up coordination systems.
- Seek further clarity on how all responsibility sharing mechanisms will work together to avoid duplication and overlap. At the same time, already existing mechanisms must be strengthened.
- Seek further clarity in the text on preconditions for the activation of the Global Platform. This will enable hosts to predict the availability of international support.
- On aid effectiveness principle: important that international protection regime is based on the principle of international solidarity. The principle of aid effectiveness mentioned in para 28 brings a non-humanitarian dimension and conditionality which is not in line with humanitarian action and national priorities.

European Union

- Welcome efforts to counter discrimination and strengthen diversity and gender sensitivity as well as best interest of the child.
- Important to give some consideration for lessons learnt from existing mechanisms to avoid duplication and overlaps.
- We need further details and consideration of cost of proposed responsibility sharing structures and implication for UNHCR in addition to its protection mandate.
- Refugee summits might be useful to mobilize political will and engage non-traditional actors, would encourage complementarity and linkages with proposed solidarity conferences. These

could be convened by the UN Secretary General, every five years, to take stock to promote accountability. These should include stocktaking and measurement on the entirety of the compact, not just pledges.

- We would welcome clarification on dates for refugee summits and what is expected from them.
- Composition of national arrangements should be determined by host states.
- Humanitarian assistance must be delivered in line with humanitarian principals.
- Welcome a reference to mutually reinforcing contributions as well as national and regional references to implement durable solutions. Clarifications on role of regional organizations would be useful.
- Seek clarification on comprehensive plans and the role of hosting states in that respect, and comprehensive plans should be pre-condition for activation of the platform. These should be activated when additional support is required. We welcome the Global Platform. This will need to be tailored to conditions and better clarify the role of the Platform, which should have well defined objectives and avoid duplication. It should be activated in close consultation with host country.
- We welcome the solidarity conference as a tool at the disposal of the High Commissioner, but need further clarification regarding complementarity with pledging conferences and this could be led by states.
- And propose clarification regarding the education alliance with regard to its scope and funding.
- In accessing need and vulnerability, interoperability to share data is important.
- On measuring impact, we would suggest language stick to paragraph 20 of the omnibus resolution. We should also avoid language of cost which does not do justice to contributions and resources mobilized e.g. for infrastructure.

Turkey (On behalf of MIKTA – Mexico, Indonesia, the Republic of Korea, Turkey and Australia)

- Support regional instruments in their capacity to reach global solutions and welcome the inclusion of regional approaches and mechanisms, which have the possibility to encourage coordination and whole of society approach.
- International cooperation could benefit from regional cooperation with regional mechanisms and will help avoid duplicative structures.
- Regional approaches have potential for creativity. This is why we feel great value in regional mechanisms, working and sharing information with each other.
- Principles of protection must remain paramount: *non-refoulement* and consideration of those with high risk of vulnerability.
- Implementation of GCR may include operationalizing the humanitarian and development action with the goal of leaving no one behind and the result of the WHS, GB and NWoW could be taken into consideration.

Brazil (On behalf of GRULAC)

- Responsibility sharing is the cornerstone of the compact and will reflect fundamental change when we have framework for predictable responsibility sharing.
- Full realization of Global refugee summits will depend on follow-up measures, which means the need for a concrete responsibility sharing mechanism, highlighting differentiated approach.
- We stress the importance of regional and sub-regional approaches. Regional cooperation to foster exchange of information is important.

- Funding gap in refugee responses means we adequate, flexible financing is critical. With regard to development funds, it must be provided over and above existing financing, in line with national priorities and should not be subject to conditionalities.
- Acknowledge regional protection framework (MIRPS), which fertilized the development of national plans and exchange of good practices and increased cooperation in support of international cooperation.
- In light of the multi-stakeholder approach, references to regional practices could be made, particularly the Brasilia 100 points of action.
- Many municipalities are implementing responses to assist refugees and promote their inclusion including networks of universities to promote education (Alliance of Cities).

Iran

- Host countries hope that the GCR will make fair and equitable responsibility sharing a reality. This cannot happen without a robust mechanism.
- References to mechanisms for responsibility sharing have no presence in this draft. 'Mechanism' is define as a logical assembly of components, information flows that intend to get results. Current components include same existing humanitarian traditional approaches, which have proven not useful. These cannot create new additionalities for host countries.
- Interested stakeholder support is far from satisfactory. Key question is: What makes this process different from previous ones? How can this lead to predictable and equitable responsibility and burden sharing? It is impossible to change behavior when this has not been done it in the past.
- National arrangements without global arrangements cannot achieve much and would bring additional burden, everlasting pressure on host countries. At most, the GRS will be a forum to express views, not guaranteeing adequacy and fair burden sharing. We can read some loopholes in the proposed mechanism which may allow to evade responsibility sharing, thus questioning the efficiency.
- Expanding access to third country solutions and supporting returns to countries of origin should have the same importance as supporting refugee self-reliance. This would address the unequal distribution of refugees across the globe.
- Such mechanisms must be rule based and has to promote real burden sharing and equal distribution of refugees. Refugee protection should be depoliticized.
- We should work to depoliticize refugee protection and prevent the avoidance of norms.

Germany

- Welcome the detailed text including stronger references to UN reforms, to end discrimination, sexual exploitation. We also call for more coherent references to AGD, against racism. We want strong commitment to needs of vulnerable groups and commitment to data protection, privacy and due diligence.
- Support global mechanisms and call for mutually reinforcing pledges. In this perspective, we would welcome pledges from host countries on e.g. refugee legislation and out-of-camp policies. GRS should call for participation to the Platform and it could draw on pledges made at the summit.
- More concrete text is needed on all the Platform, particularly calling for further discussions on how the Platform can support UNHCR's work. How members will be selected, how it will be activated and what added value it could bring could be addressed through a desk-based exercise simulating the Platform engagement in situations.

- National arrangement should be established by national governments, but humanitarian action should be principled, delivered on the basis of humanitarian principles.
- Role of national development bodies and civil society is important.
- Important to highlight the humanitarian, development and peace nexus.
- Clear references children could be strengthened.
- Welcome introduced language on mapping. Appreciate World Bank exercise to map data. Need to map contribution of refugees and not just cost of refugees. Quality of hosting should be considered as well.

Kenya

- Acknowledge significant amendments have been made.
- Matter of concern that 67 years after the adoption of the Convention, we are still trying to actualize responsibility and burden sharing and trying to translate it into reality.
- GCR gives us an opportunity to change the course of history and in that regard, we call on states with inward looking policies to show empathy.
- Mechanism for burden and responsibility sharing in para 15 needs to be linked with related mapping of cost of hosting refugees and consideration of how this could be operationalized.
- Reliable and timely data is critical to improve solutions for refugees (para 35), also linkages with para 42.
- To inform responsibility sharing mechanisms, it is also proposed that information be brought into global mechanisms like the Global Support Platform and global refugee summits.
- Global Platform should be activated by the UN High Commissioner, given that the platform will require support and we will need some further clarification on the Global Platform funding implications and how this will be serviced.

Mexico

- Ministerial conference could lead to promises for international cooperation and it is essential this be monitored and followed up to take stock of advances.
- Cannot ignore that these events bring cost. So, consider taking advantage of the annual High Commissioner's protection dialogue also with regard to targets for protection.
- Welcome the connection between the platform and ExCom.
- Responsibility sharing mechanisms should be coherent with governing bodies of UNHCR and promote complementarity of approach while avoiding overlaps.
- Welcome focus on regional approaches.

United Kingdom

- Burden and responsibility sharing is ambitious and welcome.
- Global refugee summit is welcome and will be able to galvanize political commitment that will drive the delivery of comprehensive responses and get commitment on wide range of issues.
- However, suggested frequency may present challenges in avoiding fatigue. One way to avoid this would be for the UN SG to call these summits.
- Global Support Platform is welcome, but more detail needed, for example, how these platforms de disbanded (lifespan; avoiding proliferation). Also, not yet clear what the unique value-add would be.

- Global refugee summits should be about galvanizing resources, not delivering. There is a clear role for UNHCR to service the summit, but states could lead it.
- In relation to mapping of burden on host countries, no need to include cost as impact already encapsulates it.
- Need clarity on how all this fits together: initial table-top exercise could be useful to see what outcomes it will deliver. Stand ready to help on this.

New Zealand

- Global refugee summit should not be a repetition of solidarity and pledging conferences. Challenging to get ministerial attendance, and the frequency should be determined by states in the first summit.
- Need clarity on what preparatory processes need to be put in place before the summit.
- Global Support Platform is a work in progress and can enable stronger coordination across UNHCR work and this would contribute to strategic and holistic view. Need clarity on what level of attendance is expected, and whether it will include other UN agencies.
- Stronger coordination in UNHCR work is needed.
- Need to indicate legal and policy processes that will be matched by donor contributions.
- National and regional arrangements and country compacts seem to have varying objectives, we wonder if we can bring all of them together.
- Concerns about overlap and duplication, different strands need to be complementary and predictable.
- All this takes effort and time, and we do not want the servicing of these to detract UNHCR from its core work, and would also like to know the cost implications.
- Data evidence is crucial to understand what is happening with refugees, but data should be disaggregated.

Ethiopia

- Para 11 should link to UN reforms and refer to xenophobia.
- Share concerns about overlap and duplication which may affect effectiveness. Call for complementarity.
- With regard to mechanisms for responsibility and burden sharing appreciate the three-tiered approach and call for inclusion of sub-regional entities like IGAD. Can contribute to situational analysis, early warning, etc.
- Global Platform has a role in situation awareness.
- Call for ratification of the Convention as a tool.
- Policy demands in host country and country of origin looks like conditionality for international support and this could play against the interests of refugees.
- Want the private sector to be involved. Innovative technologies should be mentioned.

Japan

- Welcome the flow chart distributed today.
- Global refugee summit: we need to clarify difference, focus and similarities between existing high-level events/pledging conferences as well as ExCom high-level segment and other country specific events that take place all year.

- Solidarity conferences and Platform: still struggling to understand how this will work in practice and to visualize its role.
- To avoid unnecessary duplication, want a lean, meaningful mechanism and need to clarify structure and how all this will complement current structures.
- On key tools, welcome funding from development and private sector, and appreciate that need for data is well articulated.

Montenegro

- Welcome the elaborations of the PoA
- Contribution of host countries is better reflected.
- Would like to see stronger language to fight discrimination.
- Would like to see older people instead of older adults.
- Better recognition of countries of transit, and additional focus on capacities of sustainable and durable solutions.
- Need a sustainable model of financing activities related to national needs.
- Stronger emphasis on development projects that will contribute to sustainable returns.

South Africa

- Welcome mapping the cost of hosting refugees. Important as it will provide a comprehensive picture of on the ground challenges of hosting refugees.
- Welcome the section on regional approaches.
- Need to recognize the regional and sub-regional mechanisms, especially to avoid duplications. Would like to see references to the multilateral African Development Bank in relation to the Platform and footnote 12.
- Subheading 3.1 remains unchanged, recommend deleting *efficient* or add *effective*.
- Stress that the GCR should avoid language that does not enjoy consensus among UN Member States.
- Local actors should be included, our preference will be to include local authorities through national government.
- Would welcome further details on the objective of the joint data center that UNHCR has set up with World Bank.

Indonesia

- Underscore that equity and not equality is needed for responsibility sharing, taking into account the context, needs and different starting point for states.
- Add the term *applicable* to country regional and national mechanisms as well on data, add *respective* to resource and capacity on funding allocation by states.

USA

- Appreciate this new part and clarity on how UNHCR will report on progress.
- There are a number of questions about cost and duplication of the proposed responsibility sharing mechanisms.

- Global refugee summits: should this have a five-year time frame or a three-year time frame? It takes time to implement pledges. Should states co-host with the UN SG? UNHCR could co-host but will need support.
- Can we make existing pledges and conferences more effective by including solidarity elements? London conference is an example. We could also add private sector?
- Establishing such summit should not run counter to commitments to un-earmarked and loosely earmarked funding.
- Good practice exchanges between regional organizations: Could this be done across regional groups such as GRULAC?
- Fully support UNHCR effort to measure the impact of hosting refugees and the role of the WB, but wonder about the phrase “Cost and impact”. Is this not duplicative, since impact includes costs already, as well as benefits?
- Flowchart responds to some questions, but we still have to clarify how the Global Platform will be triggered, when, its composition, and would welcome specific mechanisms. In this regard, a desk-top exercise scenario is a good proposal and could help answer some questions.
- Support multi-stakeholder approach: refugee and host community involvement to priorities monitoring work.
- Additional national and regional involvement could improve outcome. More language on partnership is needed in the GCR.

Norway

- We recognize the need for Global Refugee Summits as high-level pledging conferences, which should be accompanied with a template. Pledges should not only be financial but include commitments for resettlement, etc.
- Prerequisite for broad political support is a credible system mapping of responsibility sharing and systematic analysis/reporting on how states deliver on pledges.
- Global Platform: would welcome further specification on roles, criteria, composition and outputs. UNHCR should hold table-top exercise and compare it with existing mechanisms.
- Solidarity conferences: UNHCR should develop templates for pledging and to report on follow-up of pledges.

Honduras

- Mechanism for responsibility sharing should have fair and clear outlook.
- Para 21 should be strengthened for regional cooperation to truly being able to help multi-lateral proposals for existing national plans, prevention and solutions.
- Degree of involvement of private sector (para 28) is a powerful element, especially for return policies.
- Support to economic growth along with reference to agenda 2030 would be useful.

Canada

- This part is essential to the success of the GCR. Particularly, we need to find ways to broaden support base.
- Proposed mechanisms do have the potential to achieve this although more work needed.
- Global refugee summits involve wide range of pledges and are not just limited to states. The part on mobilizing private sector should be developed.

- We believe further engagement in CRRF should be strengthened in this section by valuing country level private platforms.
- Accountability and transparency of commitments should be built into the summits objectives.
- Welcome additional details on Global Support Platform: its composition will vary and will be activated in relation to new and protracted situation. It should address lack of political will and trust among states so as to catalyze refugee responses. Still not clear how this Platform will promote this as well as wider engagement. We therefore welcome the idea of a desktop exercise in the coming weeks.
- Pleased to see measuring the impact of hosting refugees, however must align with omnibus resolution language.

Switzerland

- Mapping the cost of hosting refugees is welcome.
- Global refugee summit: UNHCR has identified certain domains that will improve operationalizing.
- Three-year cycle is too close and UNHCR should not bear sole responsibility of holding the summit. Commitments by states should not encourage earmarking and co-exist with core funding of humanitarian organizations.
- Clearly summit is aiming to mobilize political will to better share responsibility. This may yield value.
- Finally, with the Global Support Platform, interesting idea and this could provide outcome for different responsibility sharing.

Republic of Korea

- Flowchart illustrated relation between these different responsibility-sharing mechanisms.
- However, we need to avoid duplication between new mechanism and existing mechanisms.
- Relation between refugee summit and Global Support Platform still not clear, would encourage to share details about this.

Sweden

- Express support for para 6, strong reference to human rights in para 4, and welcome Para 12, age gender and diversity considerations and pleased to see links to end discrimination.
- Reference to Convention of Child could be added.
- Does UNHCR see additions to yearly resettlement places? This is important to clarify.
- On the global refugee summits, would like to know how will these will be organized?
- Global Support Platform: need further discussions and details should clarify outstanding questions and look forward to the table-top exercise.
- Solidarity conferences: should be convened when they add value based on needs assessment.
- Echo concerns expressed by others about cost of these mechanisms and how all this fit together; avoid duplications.
- Para 28 – pleased to see multiannual, multiyear, flexible funding and underlining that donor base has to be broadened.
- Welcome the role of local authorities and inclusion of persons of concerns.

- On data, welcome strong language on this: data should be disaggregated and stress importance of data protection.
- Thankful that UNHCR has engaged in mapping the impact of hosting refugees and recognize the complex nature of this task.

Netherlands

- Appreciate of the text, now it refers to all UN Member States. Most specifically calls for broadening the support base and supporting the countries of origin and allowing host countries to make policy changes.
- But still more work needed on how all mechanisms will interact and on the role of UNHCR.
- Supportive of para 28 regarding un-earmarked funding, but lacks a notion to broaden the support base and should reflect to private contributions. Could be inserted there.
- Appreciate inclusion of refugees themselves, it should be a genuine effort, not a box-checking exercise. Refugee engagement should be both at national and global level.
- Netherlands has brought to these consultations a refugee youth delegate who was at the HC Dialogue.
- Still not convinced about the alliance for education: UNHCR has its hands full already, and will appreciate more clarity and consequences for UNHCR budget.
- Para 42 must reflect the agreed text of the Omnibus resolution. Would like to know more about the data center.

Malaysia

- Global refugee summit: regular summits are welcome, but seek more clarity. Three-year period may be too short to plan a conference and this must be done in conjunction with other UNHCR high-level meetings to ensure full participation and lower burden of reporting.
- National arrangements are welcome along with regional approaches. We highlight the efforts under the Bali process to tackle trafficking etc. the ASEAN humanitarian center and the AHA centre are good example of how regional organizations can be instrumental in coordinating humanitarian response.
- Global Support Platform: we hope this does not overlap with other mechanisms and seek more clarity especially considering the ad hoc nature.
- How will solidarity conferences be different from solidarity summits?
- Recognize continued humanitarian financing but also encourage private sector contribution to be further highlighted. Appreciate references to the Grand Bargain.
- GCR is premised on multi-stakeholder approach and welcome the inclusion of sport and cultural activities.
- Data evidence is welcome and acknowledge the constraint on national capacities, and hope compilation and analysis of data does not become a burden.

France

- Meeting the challenges on a non-binding basis could contribute to solidarity.
- Global refugee summits: grateful to the High Commissioner for explaining why the three-year cycles were chosen; a longer cycle (5 years) could be envisaged, especially since there may be solidarity conference at intervals.

- Grateful to UNHCR for further explanation on the possibility of relying on current meetings of UNHCR.
- With respect to tools, commends the timely, predictable funding and keeping with commitments of Grand Bargain although we need to ensure the budgetary rules and processes of each states, particularly the principle of budgetary annuality.
- Commends reference to reliable data to identify appropriate solutions, but must emphasize data protection.
- On measuring the cost and impact of hosting refugees, prefer retaining the initial language of the Omnibus resolution and not mentioning only the impact. Would appreciate clarification on how this will be implemented.

Brazil

- Striking balance between voluntariness and stronger responsibility sharing arrangements. Proposals may contribute to achieve that balance, but need stronger follow-up measures.
- Financial support and resettlement are not the only means to achieve solutions.
- One driver of the GCR was the importance of physical barriers to access to territory. In ensuring access to territory and first determination procedure, all states can avoid shifting burden to others.
- Asylum and improved reception conditions are also good ways to share responsibility.
- Global support platform: should be flexible and avoid the divide between donor and host country, and also define accountability to affected countries.

Russian Federation

- Global refugee summits: portends new reporting on pledges, while we already have enough reporting commitments. The GCR being non-binding, it is clear that reporting should be done on a voluntary basis.
- Sustained interference by some countries in the internal affairs of others is the main root cause of refugee situations, and countries who have contributed should be held responsible for managing the refugee situation.
- Solidarity conferences: we ask to delete footnote 13 referring to the London Conference since it was supported only by the Syrian opposition only, not the Syrian people.
- Reference to Grand Bargain and World Humanitarian Summit should also be deleted as not all countries supported this.
- Sports and cultural activities, could include footnote regarding the UNESCO Sport Charter and Kazakh national plan.

Turkey

- Responsibility sharing should be the backbone of the GCR.
- Welcome the global refugee summit: will ensure stronger commitment and greater attention; important to keep the high-level attention, and this should be held at margins of UN General Assembly. The title of the conference could be Global Ministerial Conference on Refugees. GCR should give a clear picture who will contribute to refugee response.
- And thank UNHCR for the flowchart. Would like to see the inclusion of a template in the flow chart as to what to do in crisis situations. This could be included as an annex.

- Would like to support the idea of national arrangements and the multi-stakeholder approach, but additional language concerning the sovereignty of host states is needed. National platforms should only be activated following consensus by host states and coordination should be done by national institutions.
- Solidarity conference could channel assistance, but engagement of development actors, local communities and private sectors should be upon the request of the High Commissioner of the UNHCR, who should convene the solidarity conference.
- National laws and regulations should not be disregarded and storage of personal data should be done according to national laws.
- Determination in gaps in international cooperation is necessary. UNHCR should consult governments in measuring cost and impact.
- Strongly suggest resettlement and complementary pathways be also included as subtitle in key tools for responsibility sharing because this is not just about financing.

Morocco

- Call upon UNHCR to provide clearer role on summits and the cost of hosting refugees.
- Regional approaches important to ensure consistency and facilitating good practices at the regional level.
- Global Support Platform: some information provided but need more on its financing and activation criteria.
- Inclusive and holistic approach: all references to local authorities should be linked to central and national authorities since only national governments are subjects of international law.

Holy See

- When responding to refugee needs, important to note that this solidarity does not happen without sacrifice and in some situations refugees out-number host populations.
- Host countries contribute collective good from their own resources.
- Important to distribute financial resources in refugee hosting countries, after all these are investment in humanity.
- This should not serve as subcontracting responsibility to some countries. Nor should this be a justification of containing refugees but responsibility sharing to achieve durable solutions.
- Welcome links to UN resolution against discrimination.
- GCR must be centered on the human person and in this regard, we propose fundamental rights should underpin all action.

Belgium

- Thank UNHCR for the distribution of flow chart. For reasons of effectiveness, possible new mechanisms should take into account existing mechanisms and avoid overlaps and duplication.
- Therefore, would welcome more details on administrative burden and cost and balance between un-earmarked funding and earmarked contributions that are normally the objectives of solidarity conferences.

Australia

- Agree that ministerial level conference should go beyond financial measures. Must identify new partners and new way of working. Summits should not duplicate other mechanisms especially at regional level.
- Value Global Support Platform, but need to see greater clarity and how it will gain mandate.
- Solidarity conferences would draw attention to some contexts, but it will be important not to create pledging fatigue.
- Pleased to see reference to multi-stakeholder approach and remark generosity of host states and encourage others who can do more to do so.
- Pleased to note emphasis on data, disaggregated by sex, age and urge the use of Washington group criteria.
- Impact mechanisms are a useful exercise and can contribute to the pool of information but these should not create disincentives for other states to engage.

Spain

- Welcome the flowchart which explains how the mechanisms should be structured.
- Structures should avoid overlaps, and promote collaboration among UN agencies.
- Appreciate idea of GRS and suggest more flexibility needed. UN GA and HCD should be used for follow-up.
- Regional approach is essential.
- Funding should be flexible and un-earmarked in line with Grand Bargain, NWoW.
- Welcome private sector engagement.
- Fundamental responsibility of state should be reiterated, although acknowledge multi-stakeholder approach.

Colombia

- Effective utilization of resources in order to relieve the burden of host countries and take advantage of resources.
- Global Platform: requires more profound discussion, unique opportunity to three key problems: reinforce and mobilize resources and early warning to ensure preparatory measures; build dialogue between donor, host countries and others; and reduce the gap on responsibility sharing.

Italy

- In our view, new mechanisms will mobilize concrete international cooperation including mutually reinforcing pledges. They should help broaden the base of support and support the Global Support Platform that is tailored to context with clear objectives and aims to mobilize political commitment providing advice on response strategies.
- We would welcome more clarity on activation and linkages between different tools notably between solidarity and pledging conferences.
- We should avoid duplications e.g. between pledging and solidarity conferences.
- Other support measures should be considered, and not only financial contribution such as hosting refugee and technical assistance.
- Welcome the multi-stakeholder approach in order to operationalize the burden and responsibility sharing and vital to include local authorities.
- Coordination mechanism should be further clarified.

- Welcome more explicit reference to mixed movement, and also a means to make links with GCM.

Poland

- Further clarification on proposed mechanism, particularly on the Global Refugee Summit and Solidarity Conferences and the interlinkages with current mechanisms to collect pledges.
- Must build on existing structures and possible duplication must be avoided and require clarification on cost, value added of the implementation.
- Evidence-based approach is important. Support data collection for evidence, as it can help direct action and welcome information on terminology of diversity, gender-age disaggregated data would require further clarification.

Estonia

- How are national, regional, and global mechanisms complementary? They should not add to existing mechanisms.
- What will be the management and cost implications of these mechanisms for UNHCR?
- Welcome the global refugee summit to support the achievement the goals: how it is linked to solidarity conferences and this could be led by the UN Secretary General.
- It should be activated only when national and regional mechanisms fail to mobilize resources. And these should not engage operationally.
- On solidarity conferences, we need further information on added value and complementarities with pledging conferences, and stresses coherence of language on impact mapping which includes both costs and benefits.
- On the Platform: would like UNHCR to clarify what is a significant refugee situation that may trigger the platform activation.
- Reliable data and evidence is vital, especially for forecasting. Suggest reference to interoperability of data with full respect to data protection.

Denmark

- Welcome the three-tiered approach on burden and responsibility sharing. Still seek clarity on the overall architecture and the various initiatives like the global refugee summit, Global Support Platform and solidarity conferences, and how they co-exist and how we can avoid duplication. Welcome the flowchart in this perspective but need further clarifications.
- Global refugee summits are welcome and will help galvanize political will and ensure further responsibility sharing. Organizing them every three years may be unrealistic with regard to proper preparation and follow-up. A five-year timeframe would be more realistic.
- Would need clarity on how solidarity conferences and pledging conferences fit with humanitarian appeals cycle.
- Collaboration between UNHCR and OCHA should continue.
- We must not lose focus on importance of un-earmarked funding in the context of country pledging events. Still need to determine how to highlight this.
- Global Support Platform is important to galvanize and widen support, but still need to better understand who will convene it, activation, how will it be applied in protracted vs. emergency situations, etc.?

- We underline UNHCR's core protection functions. We are thinking to rearrange responsibilities about care and maintenance, while maintaining the UNHCR mandate. We encourage participation by development actors and of refugees themselves.
- On data and evidence, applaud UNHCR call to work with World Bank, and this should be disaggregated by gender, age and diversity.
- Concrete reference to impact mapping is welcomed but encourage to use language from the omnibus resolution to avoid confusion. Positive to have WB work on this.
- Follow-up: welcome refugee and civil society engagement and strong accountability. Highlight that responsibility for follow-up is joint for all of us and we must allow space for development actors that promote self-reliance and inclusion.

Lebanon

- Welcome the new version that took on board concerns of host countries.
- Overall structure has improved substantially, and introduction is consistent and links to refugee instruments as well as human rights and international humanitarian law.
- Para 2 and 3 emphasize the undue burden on some countries and state principles of international cooperation and global solidarity. Gives strength and direction to the GCR.
- Welcome inclusion of goals in para 5, which mention an improved system of responsibility sharing. Underpins that relevance and success of the GCR is premised on capacity to act as an enabler for the system.
- Para 6 goes in the right direction: tackling of refugee issues is a common problem and should be done through more equitable distribution of contributions.
- Political will is paramount, language could mention huge refugee flows are common concern for all humankind, using similar language from other instruments. General political will could be triggered when danger is universal.
- Warn against bringing big concepts such as root causes, gender equality and prevention without proper contextualizing. We are not opposed to those concepts but we might lose ourselves if we lose sight of our objectives. Need to keep our efforts focused.
- Main concern is to reduce burden on host countries while working on durable solutions. These concepts could be misused to create new burden on host countries, e.g. for more integration.
- Commend for providing Part 3 adds new elements, see good progress, such as global refugee summit, or broader detail about Global Support Platform.
- Also think mapping the cost of hosting refugees is a good addition and should be further explored.
- First draft takes into account national and regional level. These should interact smoothly. Seen on paper, these mechanisms look promising, but multiplying layers risk failures at one level means failure at all levels.

Czech Republic

- Appreciate that the first draft of the GCR focuses on efforts to define responsibility sharing mechanism. GCR should also help adoption of the Convention.
- Welcome that it enables states to participate according to their national capacity.
- We have been active in many areas through humanitarian and migration programmes. Will come with more elaborate proposals in April.

Jordan

- Scope and definition of refugees goes beyond the legal international scope and must be reformulated.
- We need to clearly express commitment to equitable and predicate responsibility sharing. Also refer to para 68 of NYD in para 2.
- Framework for equitable and predictable responsibility sharing among all Member States must be a Member State driven exercise and not divert responsibility to local actors. Sharing with local actors is a further burden.
- Also ask to add *as appropriate* in stakeholders (para 16).
- Current references to human rights goes beyond the scope of refugee response (para 4).
- Para 5 must reflect para 18 of NYD CRRF; success will hinge on equitable and predictable burden and responsibility sharing.
- Para 6 and 7 will have to be balanced: international cooperation cannot be voluntary and we need to remove the ambiguity.
- Conditionality must be dropped.
- Durable solutions from the outset requires to work on returns.
- Para 8 and 9 extend the definition of refugee, so need to be reformulated.
- GCR should focus on refugees as separate from the Compact on Migration and delete references to mixed movements.
- In para 14, we do not see linkages with host country as part of burden sharing and dealt with separately in repatriation.
- On separate regional and national mechanism, qualify regional as *when appropriate*.
- Resettlement must also be moved to a separate section.
- Follow-up: all sections have to reviewed. Too early to present an opinion on this.
- Overall, still need to ensure not too prescriptive on host countries. The underlying assumption remains that refugee situations are permanent while those should be seen as temporary.

Ecuador

- GCR is a unique opportunity to integrate holistic understanding to reduce pressure on host countries. Agree that both financial and material support are important. Refugee cost must be shared equitably among states.
- Resettlement of refugees is also important for responsibility sharing. We need a quota system on resettlement.
- We welcome role of new actors such as IFIs and the private sector. Public-private alliances can be useful.
- Voice concern for minimum and predictable commitments as well as the types of contributions to monitor burden sharing and not create new responsibilities for host countries.
- Believe mechanisms must operate on the principle of equity, diversity and transparency (humanitarian principles).
- Global refugee summit, the Global Support Platform are more detailed, but not clear how these are interrelated and how to avoid overlap. Connections must be set out in the next document.

Algeria

- GCR should be non-political and consultations must be guided by the UN charter and international law.

- Welcome references to root causes although those should be made beyond the introduction, within other sections.
- Welcome elaborations on system but sees certain that ideas proposed can contribute to global solidarity and give GCR an equitable and predictable responsibility sharing mechanism. These needs to be looked at more in depth. And what should be a fair share.
- We also need to ensure we avoid fatigue from donors and hosts.
- Para 11 would gain from feedback from CRRF in pilot countries including successes and failures.
- Global refugee summit would make possible momentum, but we have two questions: duplication with other high-level events, and the outcome of similar events that have not been convincing, even after the launch of the CRRF.
- Mapping of impact goes in the right direction, but we need concrete proposals on how to have equitable sharing.
- In para 17, observe lack of clarity and worries about conditionality. Conditional granting is a diversion from the doctrine.
- Recognize the role of host states in para 19 in relation to the Global Support Platform: not convinced about the added value and its role and capacity. Looks like a new bureaucracy. Which role would it play vis-à-vis durable solutions? How would it mobilize resources?
- Grand Bargain is not a document negotiated by Member States and implicates states in different ways, so important to ensure host countries are not burdened. This should be deleted.
- Host countries should not be forced to take up loans to deal with refugees.
- Global academic network is not equal to responsibility sharing and resembles more a scholarship program.
- On data, the UNHCR and World Bank partnership is not objective.
- We need to respect universal standards on data and respect confidentiality.

Bolivia

- Support mechanisms aimed at safeguarding human rights of refugees.
- There must be complementarity and solidarity between people and states. The GCR is for refugees and not for states. As long as mechanisms are open-ended and allow for broad participation and without conditions, we welcome them.
- Need to ensure that global refugee summits, Global Support Platform and solidarity conferences will not be manipulated and need to focus on how to improve living conditions of refugees.
- Fact that Global Support Platform is focused on protecting refugees is commendable and should not lead to intervention.
- Resources should be subject to transparency. Funds earmarked for development should not be used here. GCR funding must be additional to development cooperation.

Venezuela

- Necessary to provide safeguards for voluntary returns. This must be organized in coordination with countries of origin.
- Global refugee summits, Global Support Platform and solidarity conferences, all seek financial and technical contributions: refugee summits are to raise funds, Global Support Platform raise financial and material resources, and solidarity conferences also seeks to raise funds.
- These contributions are financial in nature and do not meet the objectives of burden sharing.

- For the Global Support Platform, not clear on what will be the platform's activities or how does it will share the arena of refugee summits or solidarity conferences.
- Global Platform it is said, could be triggered by UNHCR, but we worry this could be used to politicize humanitarian response. This should guarantee participation of all states. How does the platform decide to launch the solidarity conference? How do you guarantee the participation of all actors? NGOs must respond to the priorities of national legal framework.

Costa Rica

- Believe that responsibility sharing mechanism should be bolstered by developing the concept of Global Support Platform, which should not only be to support states receiving large refugees but also for countries who receive constant flows.
- Underscore the support mechanisms; we have been implementing them in the region, where national policies come together to identify gaps and propose solutions for comprehensive response.
- Important to seek synergies with regional structures.
- Lastly, international cooperation should remain important and need predictable and un-earmarked financing.

Syria

- Concerns about references to certain meetings like the World Humanitarian Summit or the Grand Bargain; they do not represent UN processes and we ask for their deletion.
- Concerned about references to voluntary returns as it stands now, must include reference of consent of countries of origin for voluntary return of refugees.
- Recall clearly that there is no one-size-fits-all and note that in para 77 and 78 there are indirect conditions on countries of origin. Also, the same paragraph constitute interference in the internal affairs of countries of origin. Ask for the deletion of these details.
- GCR is meant to help in refugee crisis, however conditionality imposed on countries of origin for voluntary returns will surely prolong refugee status for all refugees and overburden hosting countries.
- Support all concerns by delegation of major host countries.

Azerbaijan

- Text still requires strengthening. Know the GCR is not legally binding, but at the same time commitments in para 6 must reflect commitment made in the NYD, the GCR parent document.
- Welcome references to human rights, international humanitarian and refugee law but the GCR must also be guided by international law and the UN Charter.
- Refugee responses must be tailored to each country and region.
- References to prevention and root causes is welcome; resolving large numbers of refugees needs complementarity.
- Interconnection with IDP deserves attention, and thus we would be in line with para 20 of the NYD, and also SDGs (leave no one behind).

Dominican Republic

- Admit that GCR is not legally binding. Nevertheless, clarify the idea that CRRF is implemented with states that receive large numbers of refugees.

- States is the only entity that can grant refugee status. Legal framework of action before mass entry should fall under the law of every state and regulated by international convention.
- Response depends on each country's capacity to grant status.
- No state commitment in the global refugee summits should be undertaken if state has no capacity and cannot enforce or if the commitment is unmanageable.

Portugal

- Echo calls regarding universalization of several law instruments.
- Clarity between the two compacts will have positive impact in better protecting the rights of asylum seekers, particularly when their requests are pending.
- Important that data collection be reliable; analyzing, which indicators will allow the implementation of the GCR.
- Need greater focus on health and education for refugees.

Finland

- Appreciate clear and action-oriented formulation.
- In terms of mechanisms, thinking has evolved in positive direction. Commend explicit references to address root causes right in the beginning and welcome elaboration on Global Support Platform, and welcome further discussion on this.
- In principle we support the summits proposal, national/regional arrangements and the implication of various stakeholders.
- Support flexible and un-earmarked funding as well as dedicated development resources.

Ireland

- Draft strong basis for discussion.
- Positive elements include language on gender and protection alongside improving resilience.
- Welcome focus on root causes and echo comments with regard to inclusion of humanitarian principles in the document and would like to see specific reference to this, particularly to necessity for humanitarian access.
- On responsibility sharing, we would welcome more clarity and how these will complement for example humanitarian pledging conferences. How various mechanisms will complement each other.
- Centrality of refugee voices is also paramount, notably women and youth should be seen as a priority.

Senegal

- In line with Annex 1 of CRRF, objectives should focus on refugees and reducing burden on host country.
- PoA is ambitious and provides new elements for responsibility sharing and international cooperation and this must reflect ongoing inter-state solidarity.
- We would need to set up a specific fund to deal with refugees and organizing global refugee summits to ensure better follow-up of commitments important.
- Security, economy and cultural aspects are important too.

- Concerns of refugees linked to threats of *refoulement*, statelessness, access to decent work, etc. are all important.
- Would also like to see included a paragraph in the introduction that focuses on difficulties for those who have to move because of natural disasters or climate change and cannot be recognized as refugees.
- World Humanitarian Summit needs to be reasserted in para 74 and 90.

Nigeria

- Welcome the SDGs and actionable structure, which gives right direction to realizing the NYD.
- Welcome the link of PoA to broader UN reforms and protection of human rights. However, the document does not indicate how stakeholders can support the global campaign to counter xenophobia, which often leads to forceful repatriation. We need more focus on this and other forms of intolerance, hate speeches as well as smuggling and related human rights violations.
- Supports the right to voluntary returns and greater reference to the principle to non-*refoulement*. We advocate to drive this process.
- On mechanisms for responsibility sharing, efforts must be geared towards reducing financial burdens. Use of existing of national and regional mechanisms is recommended.
- Better data and evidence of the cost implications of hosting refugees is welcome and efficient data is required for sustainability and accountability.
- Support the Global Support Platform. But it should avoid engaging in operational activities and duplicate coordination mechanisms. At all levels, mechanisms should continue to align with existing coordination frameworks.
- Would like to see references to the Sendai framework, Paris climate change agreement and Addis Ababa declaration on financing.

Austria

- Welcome the revised draft and new language on prevention. Reference to control the use of explosive weapons, a major driver of displacement, important.
- Further clarify links between different responsibility sharing mechanisms, and in this regard the flow chart is helpful.
- Appreciate information on the future role of ExCom in the implementation of the GCR.

Cuba

- This is a complex process because it involves states, civil society and UN agencies. Surely, this process will be successful and lead to a more effective dialogue among parties.
- Main goal should be that host countries receive all resources and training needed to address refugee flows, which place a great deal of pressure on the authorities of countries involved.
- It is vital that the legal framework must include references to existing legal regimes as well as human rights and refers to the UN Charter.
- Also, important to look at humanitarian principles and include UN resolution 46/182, which sets the principles for humanitarian assistance.
- Vital not to politicize the issue of refugees and there should be no confusion with regard to refugee status determination and migrant status. Believe compact should strengthen refugee status determination process for those who genuinely require refugee status and not be mixed up with those who migrate.

- It is also vital to find links with the GCM, while recognizing the distinction between the 2 compacts.
- Grateful for the regional approach, but need to be cautious because the GCR needs to be a global document, and delegations representing host countries have highlighted there needs to be a global response. We need to encourage the global approach and strike the right balance.
- Approach should also not overlook that there are diverse contexts.
- We welcome statements from GRULAC and the Africa group highlighting host countries perspectives.
- More specifically, any new mechanism in burden sharing must prove how it is actually distributing and sharing burden, without overlapping with other mechanisms. All mechanisms must be inclusive, allowing all states to participate.
- Also believe in interconnection between various mechanism, for example, more details on how the Global Support Platform will function in this perspective.
- Initiative that do not fall under UN framework, which were adopted in the WHS should be deleted.
- Funding is the backbone of the compact; funding needs to be different from development funds to see that compact is providing new, additional resources.
- Having some type of follow-up and monitoring mechanisms is important to see if the compact is operating appropriately.
- When it comes to disasters, states agreed to define indicators to assess the compliance of goals. At the disaster risk reduction conference, states agreed on indicators and there was an expert group to assess compliance of global goals. This could be example to look at.

Trinidad and Tobago

- Note elaboration on the PoA, revision encapsulates different comments. Good basis for deliberation.
- Note precision in capacity development, there could be further development for support for regional approaches as well as further elaboration on the platform so that it is a fully understood mechanism.
- Invite UNHCR to work on coherence between the two compacts.
- For review, would be useful to have a copy highlighting the changes made in the first draft of the GCR and for future iterations.

Pakistan

- Appreciate more clarity that has been brought in the draft. Confident that by the time we are adopting the compact it would have matured to address the needs of host countries.
- Specific comments, in para 15, appreciate burden mapping is discussed. This is a sound basis to bring fairness in mechanisms and see more equitable distribution.
- On para 17, a template for pledging conference would be useful and would like to see this develop while we are in the consultations phase because after adoption, it is difficult to streamline.
- On the use of terms “specific measures matched by contributions”, brings up some kind of transactional approach. This terminology could be replaced with something that does not appear to be conditional.
- Use of other innovative methods for responsibility sharing: would like to see these are not at the cost of existing funding mechanisms.

- In para 22, need to mention the contribution of other stakeholders and some linkage with respect to conformity to national laws.
- The platform should set a threshold of funding requirements to be met and would allow to see if calling for a solidarity conference is needed (para 24).
- In para 28, appreciate development funding is clearly mentioned as a source but this should not be substitutive.
- In para 29, suggest to change wording from “the global compact *is premised* on a multi-stakeholder approach” to “the global compact *encourages* a multi-stakeholder approach”, otherwise the text is too prescriptive.
- Local authorities need to have linkage with national authority so we will have policy, coordination and response coherence.
- In para 39, believe that categorization of data sets may not be appropriate at this stage, categorization can be left out this stage.

Sudan

- Need to find new mechanisms: we have two million refugees dealt with through our local capacity.
- We hope to contribute with donors to provide technical support for registration and analysis.
- We need to address root causes and political crisis with dialogue, on the one hand, and tackling humanitarian crisis, on the other hand. We believe we must get rid of any ambiguity in the definition of refugee.

International Labour Organization

- Welcome language on responsibility sharing; goes beyond pledges and supports comprehensive responses in the context of recent refugee situations.
- Lessons learnt will support central government, civil society and refugees. Policy development through to operation, lessons will support evidence-based programming in a rapid and efficient manner.
- These be developed with UNHCR to support comprehensive responses to specific situations and embrace the concept of multi-stakeholder approach.
- And welcome data as essential tool for policy development to underpin access of refugees to labour markets.
- ILO has started to include refugees in national surveys. This will help in accessing impact of refugees in the labour market.

WHO

- Welcome this revised draft. Also applaud robust intention to integrate health and better defining the contribution of each state.
- While we fully embrace the modality of global refugee summit and the activation of national arrangements, we would welcome more details.
- Welcome mapping of data, under national arrangements, WHO sees its role in working with UNHCR, and one of the outcome could be increased joint preparatory events in rapid influx. This will help predict the needs, which involve community participation. WHO stands ready to assist countries to deliver refugee-sensitive services.

- A reinvigorated MoU with UNHCR is under review to identify gaps on refugee-oriented health services.
- WHO will continue to work on post-emergency environment and move away for parallel services, increasing access to host and refugees.
- World Health Assembly asked WHO DG to ensure the GCR includes health dimension and the one UN concept.

UNDP

- Committed to collaborating with UNHCR on SDG planning and advocating for refugee inclusion and propose joint collaboration as a basis for defining sustainable outcome for refugees by 2030.
- Welcome global refugee summits; UNDP suggests partnering with development actors. UNHCR may also wish to draw inspiration from the Global Fund and Green Fund and provide support and guidance to countries.
- Global Support Platform proposes a predictable and joined up programming. Pooled funds for joint programming important.
- Consider a distinct section focused on access to justice, grievance mechanism and improving social cohesion.

Joint NGO statement on Agenda item 2 can be found [here](#).

Volker Turk: closing remarks

- 63 people took floor on the topic of responsibility sharing, which shows the interest.
- First feedback for us is that we are moving in the right direction. We have been listening with an ear to how we can move to the next iteration.
- Crucial that we move from what is perceived to be a charity-based framework to a mechanism allowing for more equity. Need to **square the circle between a non-binding exercise and one that is engaged in stronger engagement and commitments**. But with right attitude, we can move to give content to what is within the UN Charter (principle of international cooperation on humanitarian matters).
- Possible within the constraints to advance the agenda and respond to what is identified in the CRRF to ease pressure on host countries.
- GCR is universal, with each and every state. We should avoid artificial distinctions between resettlement countries, donor countries, host countries, etc. It is about a framework of cooperation. It responds to a gap in predictability and equity, scope and scale of support. By defining mechanisms, it is possible to establish a more predictable framework.
- Some mentioned the **refugee definition**. It is clear from UNHCR perspective that we have a concept essentially revolving around whether a person is able to go home or not. This encompasses different legal instruments at the core of which is the 1951 Convention/1967 Protocol, International Law, Customary International Law and non-*refoulement*. It is about serious risks to the person and as long as this risk does not go away, international law protects that person. States have decided to deal with their own obligations in different ways, e.g. through specific legal instruments (AU convention etc.). These apply in the regions which adopted these instruments.
- Agenda for protection promoted a common understanding of protection. It is built on existing law. Environmental degradation and climate change are not part of the refugee definition.

- We only had two ministerial events in the last 65 years dedicated to refugees (in 2001 and 2011), and given the importance of these issues, it is not too much to ask for ministers to come for one day to address issues of global concern. Require a sustained and focused attention from political leadership around the world. We do not have yet a periodicity that can sustain international attention and mobilize the means, forms and ways of cooperation. We will refine the language, based on the 2011 exercise. The objective is to have voluntary pledges and announce positive measures but also to pledge what the country within its capacity can contribute to countries particularly affected.
- Some language may imply conditionality and we believe in collective learning, which triggers a change in law, but not based on conditionality. Will carefully look at that language.
- If a **refugee summit** is to be organized in 2019, we will not have a HC dialogue that year. Looking forward to co-host and that it does not fall on UNHCR, and we will make sure UN SG is invited. Would provide more clarity also so that other stakeholders could pledge. Will refer to the 70th anniversary of the Convention and use the anniversary year to organize another summit in 2021, but also link with SDGs in 2025 and 2030.
- On the **Global Platform**, took note of what you said, it is meant to be a vehicle of support for countries affected by large scale or protracted situation, and can cover a number of situations. Where solutions strategy is drafted, a global platform would be an important tool to ensure that there is lot of international support behind this. It would trigger and activate support by states that are most interested to support this possibility.
- We heard interest on a simulation exercise. We may organize this over lunch, at the April Formal Consultations, stimulating a mass influx situation and protracted situation, to walk through the various options.
- We need to bear in mind that this is a new way of working, bringing additionality but not replacing or duplicating what exists. It should be lean, flexible and yet predictable in relation to a very concrete situation, and ensuring that regional actors are part of it, and activated in relation to specifically identified situations.
- One tool is that it would lead to is a **solidarity conference**, which could be comprehensive way to garner support. It should not be seen as a purely financial pledging exercise. We have seen at regional level some aspects of this (e.g., MIRPS; IGAD and other historical examples which broadened the base of support looking not in the abstract but at needs identified for particular countries or situations.
- Will develop another diagram of how existing mechanisms relate to GCR and also identify what will be new in this, and will make sure all this is interacting in a proper way.
- Number of comments related to national arrangements to make sure state prerogative is fully recognized, and takes into account sub-regional organizations.
- Interlinkages with other mechanisms is important and the intention is not to create new mechanisms. Role of ExCom is important. It is a governing body within the UN and this is why we made that link in the first draft. Other mechanisms include the HCD, ATCR, etc. We might develop another diagram showing how existing mechanisms would be fed with content from the GCR, what would actually be new. Make sure we develop the proper interactions, taking advantage of what we have and work together.
- We heard useful comments on national arrangements and the need to make sure state prerogative is fully recognized, taking into account sub-regional organizations as well.
- We have heard comments on funding and existing use of resources. We will see that reference to UN processes is reflected. And the need to see the private sector could be seen broadly.
- On **Multi-stakeholder approach**: were thinking we could rename the section as” Multi-stakeholder approach and principles of partnership”: partnerships need to be part and parcel of what we are trying to achieve here. How they could contribute to different elements. Hope

that future GRS would be opportunity for partners to pledge on how they could contribute. In future iteration when you see how a summit gets underway, we would hope to see very robust partnerships in place that would give us that predictability.

- **Academic network** will tap into existing academic and research world so that they could provide us with data and evidence. UNHCR does not want to lead or organize this, but we hope to tap into research and have dialogue with the academic community for evidence-based approach. Give inspiration for them to be in close contact with us. A clear stakeholder that we could organize better.
- There were a number of areas where there were different views: one was local authority vs national authority. We need to bring more clarity on this.
- Some advocate stronger language on **disaster displacement** and others cautious about it, how one would reflect this. We need your guidance on this.
- How much do we reflect the phenomenon of **mixed migration**, bearing in mind that GCM is relevant to mixed movements as well, especially in reception and determination of international protection needs? We might see more with the GCM draft 1. UNHCR will meet with the co-facilitators and touch base on this next week. How to reflect mixed migration and elements that link both compacts will be looked at.
- **UNHCR-World Bank Data Centre**: collaboration started last year, still working through the details, it is meant to help tap into the expertise of the World Bank. Improvement of statistics is a recurring theme and one that must be tackled so we are better informed about humanitarian and development activities.
- Will make sure language on impact reflects omnibus resolution. Data and evidence there is huge potential in the collaboration with the WB and we have heard from other UN agencies that they could also contribute.
- Took note of **complementarity** and see how both compacts are complementary.
- Mentioning of **IDP**, we took note that there is interlinkage. Some of it is reflected in part B but we take note that this may need to be reflected also in other parts.