

**NGO intervention on Follow-up and review arrangements (Part IV)**

**Agenda item 4**

Dear Chairperson,

This intervention reflects a diversity of views among NGOs.

NGOs appreciate details on follow-up measures but note the contraction of this section, particularly the deletion of references to key indicators, which are crucial for a credible monitoring system. The next draft would benefit from referring again to the need for indicators while the process for their development could be agreed later on. Similarly, we hope the GCR can specify what is meant by ‘collective outcomes’ or suggest a timeline for reaching a shared understanding of outcomes and context-specific targets. Based on their strong operational perspectives, NGOs can bring a clear added value to discussions on measuring progress on responsibility-sharing and improved socio-economic conditions for refugees.

We also regret losing clear language on measuring success against the objectives of paragraph 7 and hope this can be reinserted, together with a measure of progress on protection. Ensuring progress is achieved on all CRRF objectives is crucial. These, however, do not sufficiently capture the level of protection afforded to refugees. Moreover, success should also focus on tangible improvements in the lives of refugees and host communities.

Outcomes should therefore capture progress on indicators of success which were previously in Draft 2, paragraph 7: improved responsibility-sharing, strengthened protection systems, enhanced protection and socio-economic conditions, and reduction in protracted situations. It is particularly vital to reflect progress in refugees’ ability to exercise fundamental freedoms including freedom of movement and right to work. As previously proposed, an independent ‘*state of protection report*’ could be a useful added tool to evaluate improvements in protection and track relevant legal and policy pledges.

Measuring the impact of hosting, protecting and assisting refugees could provide a useful baseline to evaluate responsibility-sharing and set targets for improvement. Clearer details on this process would therefore be useful.

We welcome the Global Refugee Forum as a vehicle for pledging, taking stock, and measuring progress. The Forum should allow for evaluating progress on responsibility-sharing and improvements in socio-economic conditions. We also recommend establishing a mechanism to review progress on the GCR implementation beyond tracking pledges. Commitments expected of other actors, including NGOs, should be defined so that they can also demonstrate progress. Moreover, regional and national contexts being dynamic, reviews over short timespans will be necessary to adapt responses to evolving situations. Yet, the Forum will only convene every four years. ExCom and the General Assembly could also be used for annual review of progress on GCR implementation and the Support Platforms.

We regret the absence of SDGs in this section. Linking the compact's monitoring framework to SDGs would promote inclusion of refugees in national development plans. Aligning with existing frameworks would also reduce the burden of reporting. This will require adapting existing data gathering procedures to include refugees. As such support for national statistical offices will be needed, and the compact should specifically call for assistance in this regard. Such support should ensure that data collected reflects AGD considerations. Where national capacities to coordinate data collection remain limited, clear responsibilities will need to be set in terms of agencies that could support this endeavour, including NGOs.

Facilitating refugee participation in the Global Refugee Forum is positive. This will require appropriate mechanisms to systematically collect and hear the voices of refugees, including for follow-up and review. This could include supporting refugee-led agencies to organise a series of pre-sessions to widely consult refugees, which could then be presented at the Forum by refugee participants. In this perspective, capacity building of refugee-led organisations should be part of the mechanisms adopted to review the GCR. Participation of host communities will also need to be detailed.

Finally, we believe the draft still fails to emphasise accountability towards refugees. Promoting accountability will particularly require facilitating participation of refugees in national and regional refugee coordination structures, where they can directly influence programme decisions. Disseminating accessible information on GCR progress and providing opportunities to discuss and gather their inputs, will be also crucial.

A detailed version of this intervention is available on [icvanetwork.org](http://icvanetwork.org)

Thank you.