

## Global Compact on Refugees – Fourth Formal Consultations 08 – 10 May, Geneva

### Agenda 2: Mechanisms for burden-and responsibility-sharing

#### Uganda (On behalf of the Africa Group)

- Pleased with the inclusion of the fact that the global refugee forum will take stock and review implementation of previous pledges and share experience.
- Welcome the recognition of the prerogatives of States in composition of national arrangements as well as the recognition of national authorities.
- Welcome the emphasis on closing the technological gap.
- Welcome strengthening national instruments and measuring the cost of hosting refugees.
- Need clarity on how responsibility-sharing mechanisms will support Part B of this draft.
- Current language in para. 17: the level of commitment is weaker than it was as it now has references to good faith and common trust. Given the GCR non-legally binding nature, collective responsibility and common trust should be included in the guiding principles.
- Para. 17: clarifications needed regarding the phrases ‘within existing process’ and ‘going beyond business as usual’ in relation to mechanisms for responsibility-sharing.
- GCR is not a vehicle to change national laws and policies, so we request related language in para. 19 be deleted.
- Role of regional and sub-regional actors in resolution of refugee situations and their participation in Support Platform, with consent of all the parties, must be clearly reflected.
- Note that the function of the Support Platform may evolve; need clarification on the involvement, form and role of States in determining the evolution. Also need clarifications on the composition of the Support Platform.
- Footnote 25 on principles of partnership must be deleted as they do not enjoy universal acceptance.
- Duplication of responsibility-sharing mechanisms should be further clarified.

#### European Union

- Satisfied with adequate reference to CRRF.
- Para. 12: Welcome reference to countries of origin and ‘other contexts’.
- Welcome that para. 13 is underpinned by strong partnership involving refugee and host communities and welcome in para. 14 the recognition of the immense contribution of host countries. We can accept para. 15 also with formulation to reflect comprehensive responses. Consider the overall architecture are now more suitable for the objective.
- Welcome in para. 16 removing cost and instead mention impact.
- Welcome para. 17 especially efforts to avoid duplication; recommend to add ‘where possible’ on how to achieve these commendable objectives.
- Overall, satisfied with the revised architecture. Welcome details on the involvement of the UN Secretary General as well as the cost and location of the forum.
- Welcome, in para. 19, broad pledges which are not only financial, but also other means of supporting including through policies and cooperation with regional organisations.
- Global refugee forum is a high-level event to take stock. However, request to assess and clarify what ‘review’ concept means.

- Welcome national arrangements and national ownership, and would welcome clarification on reference to regional plans.
- Welcome Support Platform, and would request information on anticipated budgetary implications. Support Platform must be targeted and remain time bound; must be complementary to existing mechanisms and avoid duplication.
- Para. 27: welcome details on UNHCR reporting to ExCom and UN GA as well as link to standby arrangements.
- Solidarity conferences are welcome. We wish to express satisfaction with regional and sub-regional approaches for responding to refugee situations.
- Regret deletion of Grand Bargain references; would encourage mention of remittances.
- Welcome the reference to additionally in para. 36 and welcome references in para. 37 to the UN system, UN Sustainable Development Group and consideration of refugee issues in the UNDAF. Recommend visibility among UN agencies and support UN agencies. Reference to this in the previous draft was adequate.
- Welcome data protection and interoperability of data and welcome use of language from last Omnibus Resolution on measuring impact.

### **Denmark**

- Revised approach for burden-sharing has improved global refugee forum and national arrangements, but some questions remain.
- Respect in para. 18, to ensure global refugee forum reflects the truly comprehensive nature of the GCR. It could have the UN Secretary General as convenor and must acknowledge all forms of actors including multilateral and bilateral actors.
- Welcome national leadership and call for international solidarity. This should be activated by host country working with a range of actors including UNHCR.
- Concur with solidarity conference call for Emergency Relief Coordinator and Resident Coordinator to ensure coordination with broader effort reaching across the humanitarian and development divide.
- Para. 33 ought to refer to all four humanitarian principles and secondly within this framework to ensure coherence with national development plans.
- Welcome working on development action but requires recognition of a new way of working.
- Continuing focus on solutions. This remains a key element of the compact.
- In relation to unearmarked funding this approach implemented in Uganda, Ethiopia, and countries that have demonstrated willingness to address refugees' situations. And such measures deserve our support.

### **Montenegro**

- Welcome broadened partnership section and clear inclusion of various partners including refugees and host communities, strong language on anti-discrimination, and a people-centred approach.
- Para. 17: appreciate mention of avoiding duplication, while creating new mechanisms, and aligning these with current mechanisms.
- Despite non-binding nature, success will depend on our willingness to participate.
- On how to improve responsibility-sharing, well reflected good faith and common trust will be important for tangible results on the ground.
- In general, part A is well-structured and action-oriented that could ensure predictability and better interlinks between humanitarian and development action.

- We believe it is a good basis for further consultation between hosts and donors.

### **France**

- Appreciate UNHCR clarifications on various mechanisms to respond to the challenge of responsibility-sharing on a non-binding basis. These could contribute to international solidarity and mobilise lasting solutions to address refugee and protracted situations.
- Welcome clarification that efforts will be taken by UNHCR to avoid duplication, and would thank UNHCR for details in relation to the Support Platform.
- Need further details on the potential cost of these mechanisms.
- On funding, welcome details on private sector contributions, but regret deletion of Grand Bargain. Even if all States have not endorsed it, Grand Bargain aims to improve the efficacy of humanitarian funding.
- References to facilitating refugee remittances should also be made.
- Research in universities contribute to fact-based discourse and combat xenophobia speech. Also goes for gathering reliable and comparable data, which contributes to a balanced discourse on refugee.
- Welcome strong language on data.

### **India**

- Seek information on global refugee forum in terms of mandate, modality and funding as well as in relation with other mechanisms and would request a non-paper.
- To better map refugee burden, national capacities and resources must be taken into account; may require international support, and this must be reflected.
- Need details on para. 48 about technical discussion on the asylum capacity support group, the modalities/outcomes of these discussions.

### **Ecuador**

- Brings significant progress in areas such as mechanism for responsibility-sharing, and provides detailed description of the Support Platform.
- Note in para. 13 that efforts of the UN to end discrimination on race and colour and protect human rights have been deleted. This should be included in the compact and request this language be reinserted.
- On the global refugee forum, delighted that States can provide specific commitments and alternatives will ensure States can promote legislative changes assisting refugees and not impede access to protection systems. Legislative and policy processes aligned with international norms will prevent the compact being weakened.
- Need to ensure forum also be an opportunity for States to share progress on implementation; request more details on how the Support Platform and solidarity conferences can be connected, how these are related to similar annual calls to donors.
- Having a clear definition of conditions whereby solidarity conferences will be called will prevent overlapping.
- Solidarity mechanisms should operate on principles of accountability, equity and transparency.

### **Russia**

- Para. 17: needs more information on what is meant by 'going beyond business as usual'.

- Request deleting footnote 25 as principles of partnership not agreed; delete footnote 28 too as the UNHCR-World Bank joint data centre is not yet established.
- On the global education alliance, there are already many research institutes, and we need details on how would this would be financed.
- Para. 48 (measuring impact): need more information on the technical level discussions and clarity on the participation of States.

### **Malaysia**

- We note many improvements, which reflect the discussions in previous consultations.
- Welcome para. 14 and underscore the need for tangible and concrete support to host countries; some receiving countries have limited means to provide assistance.
- Efforts needed to streamline mechanisms to avoid duplication for better refugee response.
- Agree to seek complementarity between humanitarian and development assistance by ensuring stronger linkages.
- Underline the need for whole-of-society approach; welcome its iteration across the text.
- Improve data for voluntary repatriation and integration for sustainability of refugees.
- Responsibility-sharing mechanisms in the spirit of international cooperation, it is our view measures must be able to induce effective response and should not increase bureaucracies and burden on States.

### **USA**

- Critical to support host countries and support countries of origin as appropriate to create solutions for returnees.
- Lessons from past practice and CRRF are important to apply. The proposed changes bring clarity and make it stronger.
- Appeal to all to broaden the support base and involve all stakeholders. Our collective effort on refugee response system should lead to aid effectiveness and efficiency.
- Support periodic meetings that provide opportunities for concrete efforts towards technical and financial solutions and also review challenges. Appreciate self-reporting method, however, the timeline is still too tight, especially with 2 years only between the first 2 meetings, recommend a 5-year timeframe.
- We appreciate the Support Platform is to be an ad-hoc body, that its composition will change and it will be triggered when it adds value. Useful to know what costs will be covered in existing budget.
- Regarding solidarity conferences, still overlaps with other humanitarian pledges and suggest including resettlement and other complementary pathways in humanitarian platform when such conferences cover contexts involving refugees.
- Appreciate stronger language on partnership and on age, gender and diversity. Appreciate the involvement of development actors, private and faith-based actors, refugees, hosts and civil society organisations.
- Support language on data protection.

### **Colombia**

- We believe it is vital to look at internal consistency for comments.
- Global refugee forum will be vital and ensure that promised contributions and pledges are not only based on Part B, but must take into account the entire GCR including guiding principles and objectives.

- Support Platform: will need greater clarity and how it interacts and connects with existing institutions; important to go beyond ad-hoc measures, and, in para. 26, need to be clear who will decide and which States will convene.
- In terms of financing in paras 33 and 36, vital to include additional efforts of inclusion so that these do not generate conditionality like wording in para. 71.
- Para. 48 on measurement of impact of hosting refugees: this connects impact measuring exercise with the global refugee forum. The impact assessment will therefore serve as the basis for discussions for burden sharing.

## Kenya

- Para. 15: complementary action is outlined to achieve equitable and predictable responsibility-sharing through mechanisms at global, regional and national level; regional level should not preclude assistance from outside and this could be further clarified.
- Para. 16: propose to add 'gathering and utilisation' after 'better data and evidence'.
- Para. 18: we believe that the part 'what they consider their fair share' is very subjective, and the sentence must be adjusted to reflect a positive view or deleted.
- Last sentence, in para. 17, which States that the compact is not legally binding may invite latitude and complacency; willingness according to capacity and circumstance are implicit and should not appear.
- Global refugee forum will allow greater predictability and review to ease burden.
- Para. 22, national efforts for preparation and implementation of comprehensive plans with assistance of UNHCR.
- Resettlement and complementary pathways are mentioned as solutions, voluntary repatriation should also be included as the most preferred action.
- In para 33, sub-heading maximising private sector contributions, suggest proposal for including international financial institutions, engaging with local financial companies to finance them and provide loans to companies in business in underserved and marginalised areas in the region, where refugees find themselves in.

## Iran

- Programme of action is not target oriented as a real action plan should be.
- Arrangement are recipe for responsibility-shirking rather than for real responsibility-sharing. They only rely on common trust and good faith while mechanism must go beyond qualitative attributes through planning and programme.
- Do not support duplication of mechanisms and proposed measures have not been written in stone so they should be modified to serve such purpose.
- Bringing together ministers every four years will do no magic. This fundamental problem cannot be addressed by global refugee forum, meetings at ExCom and General Assembly on an annual basis; need a mechanism to ascertain how much effort each member of the international community must undertake to have a fair share of responsibility for each country. Hosting capacity should be calculated and all countries are to share responsibility.
- Countries with lower or higher capacity can try to reach agreement on their share. This must be done transparently, under UNHCR supervision and guarantee quality protection.
- We also need specific measures and targets and commit to them, for example, developing countries and developed countries to host equal numbers of refugees by 2030, or 50 per of refugees hosted by developed countries. Without a real responsibility sharing, we are set to fail and leave major hosting countries behind.

## South Africa

- Global refugee forum: we need terms of reference; who will fund if it takes place outside ExCom, and where will these be convened; clear role of UNHCR should be spelled out.
- Support Platform: details on triggers for activation and who will decide in case of large scale and complex situation, where response is required and in what timeframe when call is expressed by country.
- Support regional and sub-regional approaches; but concerned by para 30 by the use of the word '*positive* resolution of refugee situations', and request this to be deleted.
- Support mobilisation of timely and adequate funding, which is critical for GCR in para 33, and welcome humanitarian funding in this regard; regarding development action, development actors to step up their engagement in support of refugee and welcome additional resource above regular contributions, however these additional resources should not be at the detriment of international aid and conditionality should not be attached and would like to see this reflected.
- Inclusion of multilateral development banks in footnote 19 should include the African Development Bank.
- Welcome private sector support regarding supporting business-to-business exchange, but labour laws should not provide preferential treatment to refugees and such exchange will be in line with national policies in para 33.

## Japan

- Believe it is important to mobilise political will.
- Framework is described in the form of CRRF, on which basis we are drawing the GCR. What we need is to put the programme of action into practice.
- There is value to hold high-level event and believe it is effective to take stock and review actual progress rather than make it a pledging event. It should be held after few years to review good practices and this could promote implementation and allow to gain comprehensive understanding of the GCR. Note that the first event is in 2019 followed by another in 2021. We do understand thinking behind this from the point of view to keep momentum as well the importance of the Convention anniversary year, but holding the event will require a lot of work and since the objective is to review the implementation, we need to have it some years from now.
- Note that Support Platform is not a fixed body and will be context-specific and it is proposed UNHCR will activate it. We believe such a flexible scheme based on national ownership and UNHCR lead can play a meaningful role in addressing certain situations based on organising political interest.
- Para 27: 'would draw on pre-announced expressions of interest': Can UNHCR elaborate what kind of expression of interest they have in mind?
- Welcome regional and sub-regional approaches as it includes number of good practices, but respective regional bodies must contribute appropriate to the situation.
- Welcome stronger language on data protection.

## Ethiopia

- Thank UNHCR for clarifying roles and mechanism.
- Para 17: political commitment made during the NY Declaration should be reinforced and the language should reflect this commitment.

- With regard to the global refugee forum, note that first meeting will decide first location; On Support Platform, there are grey areas as the same task is given to the global refugee forum. Composition also needs to be looked into.
- Appreciate the expansive role for regional bodies; para 31 important to add as appropriate.
- Key tools in para 15: promotion of ratification and domestication need to be included.
- Data and evidence need to be complementary among different initiatives.

### **Spain**

- Seek clarification with regard to institutional framework of the global refugee forum.
- Approve strengthened regional and sub-regional framework and welcome para 19, which opens possibility for countries to contribute beyond financial mechanism.
- Underscore the role of private sector and civil society.
- Instruments such as Peacebuilding Joint Fund for 2030 could be useful for implementing the compact and the multi-stakeholder approach.
- Include young people as stakeholders in para 26 as well as other UN bodies.
- Underscore State responsibility reflected in para 24 of the text.
- Recall importance of leaving no one behind, so also need to bear in mind protracted crises.

### **Mexico**

- Welcome strengthening of national arrangements; greater clarity on responsibility-sharing architecture including on monitoring framework to ensure efficient use of resources.
- Relevance of sub-regional and regional is important. These approaches have a major added value, and stimulate frank dialogue with countries of origin with regard to finding synergies and strengthen efforts to find solutions. Our experience in the region with MIRPS is an example. Regional approaches strengthen and do not dilute international efforts.
- Measuring impact of refugees in host countries in line with the Omnibus Resolution continues to pose challenges. UNHCR does not have sufficient experience and would ask other stakeholder in this regard, such as, World Bank and OECD, to be involved.
- Need to focus on accountability and transparency and continue to hold consultations on the impact including at the next ExCom meeting.
- Language on conditionality is currently not well reflected and ask for specific language.

### **Estonia**

- Changes in Part 3 A are positive; appreciate a much clearer responsibility-sharing mechanism and welcome strong partnership; appreciate inviting regional and host countries; thank UNHCR for data protection and including reference to interoperable data.
- The draft gives a much better understanding. Encourage to further elaborate suggestion on the forum's role and anticipation of added costs related to the forum. Could UNHCR clarify whether it would replace High Commissioner's Dialogue and take place in Geneva?
- On national arrangements, welcome focus on national leadership and ownership, clear idea behind the platform, and appreciate State leadership; Can UNHCR elaborate if there are anticipated budget implications?
- Key tools on burden sharing are welcome, and the additionality of development action and of the UN system.

### **Australia**

- Significant GCR contribution is to ensure predictable and equitable responsibility sharing.

- Pleased to see measures for dedicated and actionable pledges; this must take into account State capacity to contribute. States are best to determine their contribution.
- Support Platform now takes a regional shape.
- Welcome clarity on the need to better share responsibility including tools and resources.
- Para 33: welcome alignment with UN reforms.
- Caution against processes that risk becoming burdensome as humanitarian action continues to be stretched. UNHCR should only lead efforts where it is best placed for it.
- Para 33: welcome details on how to engage in private sector.
- Disability in data collection should be included as a diversity marker; and identity management should be included in para 47.

### **Venezuela**

- Para 12: ask deletion of 'in other context as may be appropriate'.
- Para 17: With regard to 'good faith' and 'common trust': regret that this gives the impression that the level of commitment is even weaker than in previous draft and would also call for non-politicisation and co-optation.
- Support Platform: risk of politicisation. For example, we note that the role of the platform is non-exhaustive, and they may develop over time and criteria for their identification in para 26 remain vague. It should not be an open-ended mechanism. This includes the risk of politicisation.
- The compact must guarantee initiation and termination of the platform. Should not be conditioned to a suitable regional environment. We also have same concerns with regard to regional approaches.
- Involvement of local authorities should have authorisation of national government.

### **Poland**

- Welcome adjustment that can provide support in various situations.
- Welcome clear indicators to avoid duplication to streamline with processes in place.
- Welcome global refugee forum and it is needed to provide high-level platform to take stock but would like mentioned that refugee features should not be used for naming and shaming and hinder broadening responsibility sharing.
- Stronger link to national ownership is welcome, but welcome indication of cost and better mapping of overlaps with synergies with existing processes.

### **Algeria**

- Do not think the compilation of arrangements leads to proper responsibility-sharing mechanism.
- Concerned that 'good faith' and 'common trust' will reduce commitment and underline effectiveness of many arrangements has yet to be proved.
- Level of commitment is further reduced. Global refugee forum regularity should be increased.
- High sensitivity to direct or indirect conditionally and cannot stress enough that the 0.7 target for development assistance have still not been reached, and not convinced that the development pocket is well funded compared to the humanitarian one.
- This part is perspective in suggesting changes to commercial employment policies of the concerned States and goes far beyond what we are trying to achieve and request deleting unnecessary details.

- Inclusion of refugees in UNDAF is a decision of the State and GCR should not be prescriptive on this.
- Request authorisation by the State concerned when dealing with local authorities.
- Still not clear how education alliance will contribute to responsibility sharing. Do not see value in it.

### **Norway**

- Welcome new details and the idea of the Support Platform; with regard to the forum, the idea of inviting States as co-convenors and co-organisers is good.
- Global refugee forum should help to announce concrete pledges and take stock and review of previous pledges, See this as necessary to ensure delivery on pledges.
- Activation and composition of Support Platform should be context specific and not necessarily linked to solidarity conferences, which we should let stand on their own.
- Develop a standardised model for solidarity conferences, so as not to reinvent the wheel when a conference is organised.

### **Belgium**

- Reiterate call for effectiveness, efficiency and simplicity in current structures and encourage transparent cost calculation.
- Welcome strengthened text and more prominent role of the private sector and fully leveraging the UN system. this could link to other partners such IOM and others.
- Take note of deletion of 'mutually reinforcing' and Grand Bargain, although we would have preferred to have this in the text.
- Welcome modality, content and format of the Support Platform and would like to receive information on the impact on cost and administrative structure of UNCHR. Request to find balance between earmarked and unearmarked funding. Would welcome details on how Support Platform will avoid earmarking and promote un-earmarking.
- Avoiding duplication para could be strengthened further.

### **Brazil**

- Welcome para 13, especially the age, gender and diversity consideration. There are specific vulnerability linked to racial discrimination. Suggest developing strategy against discrimination of refugees based on race, religion and belief.
- Para 16: include third country solutions.
- Global refugee forum should allow for mid-term review every two years, and be held in conjunction with High Commissioner's Protection Dialogue and pledges could take different forms, not just financial.
- Part 3 must not be limited to the areas described and should be without prejudice to other areas of support.
- Welcome general outline of the Support Platform and their open-ended context-specific but require intergovernmental oversight.
- Such arrangement could strike a balance between accountability and agility and regarding solidarity conferences these must be aligned to the needs of host States.
- Region and sub-regional approaches: appreciate more details on shared experiences.
- Development actors must focus on host communities and will require additional resources over and above and add that it will be provided without conditionality.
- UN development system: align language with ongoing discussions in New York.

- After UN development assistance framework add ‘in full consultation with national government’.
- With education alliance, maintain regional balance; support measuring the impact of hosting and protecting refugees; welcome its connection to the global refugee forum.

### **Turkey**

- Expect the GCR to clearly set out mechanisms for concrete action in order to achieve predictable, effective and equitable burden and responsibility sharing.
- This should be the backbone of the GCR if it is to bring real change. Therefore, we support the stronger language in this section and the mention that such mechanisms will necessarily go beyond “business as usual”.
- Good faith and common trust in this new way of doing business are indeed crucial.
- Welcome clarifications and streamlining of mechanisms for burden and responsibility sharing: Global Refugee Forums, Support Platforms and Solidarity Conferences.
- Welcome the 4 years periodicity . It creates some complementarity with Migration Compact which foresees convening International Migration Review Forum also every 4 years.
- However, we do wish to have flexibility for this mechanism to be operationalized if and when deemed necessary for cases of large refugee crisis.
- Convening regular high-level meetings on refugees will be functional in collecting new pledges, taking stock of and reviewing the GCR implementation. Such meetings are also important to raise political commitment.
- GCR should set a roadmap to States as to how they could contribute to the global refugee response. Therefore welcome clarification and simplification on the functioning and tools of the mechanisms put forward.
- We welcome the details on the functioning of the support platform. Important to highlight the sovereignty of host States in this section. The explicit consent of the affected host States is crucial for its activation and its composition.
- Solidarity conferences on specific refugee situation could be essential in channelling broad based support in a swift manner. Engagement of development actors, civil society, local communities and private sector in solidarity conferences should clearly be called upon.
- Agree that funding and effective and efficient use of resources is key for the successful GCR implementation. Welcome elaboration on possible private sector contributions.
- An additional amendment to this end would be to add a reference to the GFMD Business Mechanism which is a unique platform bringing together States and businesses.
- Agree that GCR success also requires a multi-stakeholder approach. Welcome inclusion of humanitarian and development actors as well as the UN system among the stakeholders and partners.
- However, we should not rule out national laws and regulations of States and need for both consultation and coordination with relevant State institutions of host countries.
- Similarly, on accessing data and evidence, national laws and regulations of States should not be disregarded. The protection of personal data should always be taken into account.

### **Canada**

- Note important progress made. Fundamental objective is to promote way to better share protection of refugees and enable global action for refugees.
- Recall this be based on existing initiatives and added value to them including making links to UNHCR and ExCom and global refugee forum. Support that these meeting are to be

convened by UNHCR such partnership could contribute logistical work and benefiting from political mobilisation with regard to the meeting objective.

- Such forum should take note of implementation commitments and promote cooperation; welcome developing methodology to pledges that is adapted to the aims.
- Welcome detailed information on guiding idea according to which each platform will benefit from leadership of group of States and that the platform could initiate solidarity conference.
- All details of the Support Platform should be identified in this part of the text.
- Streamlining of partnerships with the private sector as well as exploring further options for development support and innovating financing means.
- Delighted by para 48; the importance of measuring the impact of hosting refugees should not be underestimated, and we should support these efforts wholeheartedly.

### **Slovenia**

- We note many improvements in the text.
- Full respect to international law and obligations is key, even more prioritising human rights of the most vulnerable. Support enhanced reference to legal instruments in refugee protection.
- Cooperation and partnership is crucial; regional laws complement international and national laws; cooperation could reduce burden on host country and create preconditions for voluntary repatriation and sustainable solutions in third countries.
- Support enhanced language on supporting and assisting host countries.
- A main objective is to reduce illegal migration flows and more efforts needed to resolve root causes, and cooperate with countries of origin to reduce mass and secondary movement as well as measures that support this along with legal pathways.
- Some challenges have not been addressed, e.g. recently cases of many people who cannot return have become numerous.
- Mechanism needed to provide, for instance, *prima facie* protection and GCR could provide such protection arrangement.

### **Germany**

- Appreciate language in Part A and links better with B, and 17.
- Underline moving away from business as usual, and welcome global refugee forum will be co-hosted by States. This will allow to mobilise support and suggest involving the UN SG, as high-level representation will be key to keep the high-level momentum. Welcome that refugees will be part of the forum, and recognition that they should be at the centre and their empowerment.
- Better description of the Platform and State leadership is needed. Welcome accountability to the UN GA and global efforts in refugee contexts and encourage launching a process for a draft roadmap; support activation and de-activation and task description could serve as a basis for further process and could take into account best practices from CRRF, and the road map should be available before the first refugee forum.
- Since the Platform will have regional or sub-regional and national application, it must be streamlined and links with regional bodies must be spelt out.
- Technical level discussions needed as support of World Bank.
- Welcome amendment to prevention of fraud and encourage transparency.

- Welcome complementarity between humanitarian and development. Beyond complementarity, it is important to ensure humanitarian assistance can be delivered according to humanitarian principles.
- Streamline multi-stakeholder approach, and happy to provide details in writing.
- Data protection is welcome as well as references to data interoperability.
- Synergies between two compacts are essential to account for duplicatory mechanisms.

## **UK**

- Improvement and greater clarity welcome.
- Global refugee forum remains an opportunity to gain international support. Important to aim high, involve the UN Secretary General. Holding the event every 4 years is sensible.
- Welcome more mapping of existing mechanisms to ensure we avoid duplication. Important that the forum provides opportunities not just on funding but also policy changes and finally co-hosting by States would help generate momentum.
- Support Platform gives clear added value, although some points to be defined. Context-specific nature is right and the Platform can have a role in emergencies and protracted situations could operate on a case-by-case basis. Platform could deliver short-term wins and would like to see duration of the Platform. Country expertise that are not geographically related and private sector will also have a role to play.
- Mobilising of funding and private sector will be key. Welcome strengthened language and support host and business and actively in process all essential and recognise completely initiative bringing financial experts to develop innovative financing mechanisms.
- Would appreciate UNHCR highlighting cost of convening these mechanisms.

## **Sweden**

- This must be a collective effort, but it depends on strong mechanisms for responsibility-sharing and through these revisions we are heading that way.
- Clear links between data evidence, measurement, global refugee forum stocking and mechanisms for tracking pledges.
- Welcome data and evidence measures and inclusive approach to hosting.
- Hosting global refugee forum every 4 years is a good compromise and would welcome elaboration on how co-hosts will be appointed.
- On support platform, support that triggers for activation are manifold. But how do we deal with large numbers of platforms? Need details on how regional approaches can contribute to the programme of action.
- Welcome emphasis on sharing good practices. Could UNHCR explain how this will be facilitated at the regional level?
- Welcome added bullet on multi-stakeholder approach and in para 36 humanitarian and development actors will work together from the outset; strongly appreciate para 19; important clarification that pledges should not be limited to financial pledges.
- Core support for humanitarian and development organisation must be taken into account when pledges are made.

## **Netherlands**

- Pleased with overall section; hope changes will lead to meaningful commitment; pleased with partnership approach in para 16, and expect this will find its way in GCR or in reality.

- Recognise necessity for the international community to provide tangible support; suggest referring to the international community as a whole with a view to broadening support base.
- Para 17: business as usual is not enough, and of course, we must avoid duplication.
- Comfortable with the global refugee forum, and the timeline proposed and with the proposal to organise the first refugee forum in 2019.
- Pleased with para 19 that calls for diverse pledges including from host countries themselves; looking beyond will unlock possibilities for other States to play their part, and avoid mention of only financial pledges.
- Request clarity on how proposed responsibility-sharing mechanisms will work together.
- Solidarity conferences can also play a role in broadening the support base.

### **Italy**

- Welcome focus on national leadership and the role reserved for host States and support instruments and role of host country in determining refugee needs and implementing responsibility is crucial.
- Welcome inclusive approaches for global responsibility-sharing including refugees in the programme of action.

### **Thailand**

- Welcome clear and systematic burden-and responsibility-sharing, including the global refugee forum and the Support Platform.
- Welcome expanded section on public-private partnership; involvement of relevant stakeholders is crucial in the GCR.
- Support data collection and analysing to measure the impact of hosting refugees.
- Action and sustainable solutions must be based on data and not on emotions; appreciate different use of resources and underscore resource management without duplication.
- We believe any new mechanism should complement, and not duplicate, existing ones. Need clarity on how Support Platforms could add value to regional mechanisms such as the Bali Process.

### **Switzerland**

- Burden- and responsibility-sharing are vital to achieve objectives.
- On improving protection for refugees, it is important to recall that efforts must be collective and involve all Member States; appreciate reference to broadening the support base, which can bring additional resources.
- Details on the responsibility-sharing mechanisms should be further developed; prefer to work on language and recommend not going into too much detail, only that much that suffices to generate consensus.
- Clarity on localisation of humanitarian action in para 38, local staff hired by humanitarian organisations should avoid weakening local structures.

### **New Zealand**

- Appreciate the role and leadership of UNHCR. Strongly support this process and the need of hosting States demand our action and international support.
- We stated our preference for a concise action plan; draft compact seeks to accommodate a range of positions; its growing length should remain a practical tool for refugee outcome.
- Reiterate call to assess the cost of different initiatives and budget implications on UNHCR.

- Hope different mechanisms will broaden the donor base and breed greater coordination.
- On the global refugee forum, our preference is that this event take place every 5 years, which will allow more time for States, regional organizations and civil society to make progress on the implementation of objectives.
- Agree that 2021 will be an year and support calls to mark this with a special event and attendance by States and ministerial level will maximise attention.
- Support Platform are gradually coming into focus; however, proposal still reads as work in progress and support the Indian request for a non-paper.
- More details on how other UN agencies will interact in these events.
- We face unearmarked obligation and yet at the same time convening conferences for specific crisis, so support calls to avoid duplication.

### **Cuba**

- This section is essential, and transmit our concern as EU did relating to references in various paras, in 12 and 25, of reference to complex situations or in other contexts; it is not clear what other contexts would be, what complex situations are being referred to.
- Important to avoid ambiguity and make it clear that the programme of action is as focused as it was agreed in the NY Declaration for large-scale refugee movements.
- Para 23 mentions the Support Platform and there is reference to a refugee situation; we should be prudent and cautious with regard to proposals for Support Platform to be activated for large movements of refugees. Not clear what the term 'significant' will entail.

### **Jordan**

- Under a mechanism for responsibility-sharing, we suggest replacing the 'will' with 'is'.
- Para 17, in 5<sup>th</sup> line: request clarification on what 'good faith' and 'common trust' means; worry that this may dilute commitment.
- Numerous calls that GCR is non-binding. This also means additional rights and application of rights to refugees, principles of international cooperation and responsibility-sharing are non-binding, that expanded refugee definition and non-*refoulement* is also non-binding.
- Under Section 1, para 18: 5<sup>th</sup> line, replace 'four years' with 'three years'.
- Para 19, 4<sup>th</sup> line: change to 'national laws and taking into account capacities'.
- Section 2.1, para 21: after entities before refugees add, 'where possible'; in the first add 'concerned', and in subsection, 2.2, para 23, replace 'will' with 'would'; in para 26, request clarification how regional neighbours will be involved.
- Para 27: request more information on regular information to ExCom and on part 2.3 regional and sub-regional approaches, their engagement not confined to durable solutions. In para 27, replace 'may' with 'can'.
- In Section 3.1, suggest including 'as appropriate' after, facilitate business-to-business exchange and supply chains.
- Point 2, para 38: recruitment of local personnel should be in line with national laws.
- Para 39: request clarification about reconciling the interests.
- Para 43, clarify what is the role of global academic network, and add in para 47, ground for repatriation are cleared in consultation with host States.

### **Holy See**

- To welcome and to protect refugees are common responsibilities of the international community. It is important that the GCR be firmly centred on the human person, avoiding

any ideological considerations. When responding to their needs, we are well aware that this solidarity does not happen without sacrifice. In some instances, refugees even outnumber the local population, thus presenting obvious challenges.

- Stress the importance that the GCR be firmly centred on the human person, urging that the dignity of each and every human person and his/her fundamental human rights should guide and underpin all aspects of the Program of Action.
- To ensure better protection of refugees in countries, particularly those affected by large refugee movements or in protracted refugee situations, it would be more useful to refer in para 13 to 'diverse needs' rather than to more abstract 'diversity' considerations. As the purpose of the Programme of Action is to facilitate the application of a comprehensive response (para. 12), the phrasing of 'diverse needs' would better capture the whole spectrum of those who are in need of protection.
- Therefore, the para. would read: "The Programme of Action is underpinned by a strong partnership and participatory approach, involving refugees and host communities, taking into consideration age, gender and diverse needs, as well as promoting gender equality and empowering women and girls...".
- We wish to reiterate the importance of keeping an all-inclusive and integrated approach throughout the whole Draft, with a focus on the centrality of the human person. A holistic approach remains the best way to detect and overcome harmful stereotypes, to avoid stigmatizing anyone in respect to a few specific aspects, and to take into account all dimensions and fundamental aspects of the person. This is of paramount importance for the protection of refugees but also for the respect of the local communities.

NGO statement on Agenda item 2 is available [here](#).

### **Closing remarks**

- In all, 41 statements made on agenda item 2.
- General consensus is that the second draft is stronger with regard to mechanisms, but some questions remain. This is always a bit of a struggle. By putting forward these mechanisms, it gives us a chance to make a genuine effort on the part of the international community as a whole to achieve what we are trying to achieve.
- Number of questions about the scope of the programme of action; clarifying that it is taken from the NY Declaration; and about large refugee movements and protracted situations. When we refer to other situations, this is because we listened to you, and because of interlinkages between internal displacement, refugees and returnees. The idea is to find a way to build this. We would like to work with delegations to clarify what we have in mind.
- Populations movement are not homogeneous, are composite and consist of different people on the move. It is important to reflect this, not least through the GCR, and when we discuss Part B we will discuss this.
- Some of you commented on the terminology of 'good faith' and 'common trust'. Intention was to strengthen the text, not weaken it. Will review and try to link this with indicators. It is all about efforts by the international community so that it becomes reality on the ground.
- Comments on 'business as usual': taken from Iran's earlier intervention; not about UNHCR mandate but a sea change on how the international community manages refugee contexts.
- On the global refugee forum, most Member States are comfortable with the general approach, including taking stock of pledges. We have experience of a pledging process in

the past. The 2011 inter-ministerial level meeting was a good model. Suggestion to come with a non-paper to clarify this further.

- The global refugee forum is based on experiences, and as many delegations have reminded us, it is not meant to replace financial pledges. It is meant to look holistically. To then see within a country context at the national, regional or global level. We had, for example, in 2011 pledges on national policies. It was extremely successful, we have examples from the Africa, Asia and the GRULAC region. Lot of clear comments and reflection on process that took place within governments, where many pledges were made. Some of them called for building capacities, some announced local integration. It is a chance to look holistically through voluntary processes depending on the realities of the country to enhance support. Important to capture the holistic view.
- Different views on periodicity, one to three to five years. I think there was agreement that indeed 2019 would be a good time to start and this would indeed be in lieu of the High Commissioners Dialogue, and we will be looking to you on who would like to co-host.
- We will do some costing of the various GCR aspects during the Standing Committee, when we look at HQ division to mainstream as much as possible the consequences of the GCR. Some of it will be new way of working and some will replace existing work.
- We have well taken the link with the UN SG. The March 2016 meeting on resettlement was hosted by UNHCR, but the invitation went from the UN SG who attended during the first half. The UN SG has a keen interest on this issue, and for the global refugee forum, it would be important for the him to be part of it.
- The issue of national arrangements, appreciation of national ownership will need to be looked at again.
- On the Support Platform, most Member States expressed support for the ad hoc body that is context specific, but questions regarding duration, composition and activation. The Division of Resilience and Solutions would provide support for the Platform. Take the German Delegation comment that we would need to have better language on the Platform's function as it evolves. Composition is not open-ended, and we try to achieve sufficient predictability. The Platform is not about naming and shaming, it is about concrete support for host countries.
- Para 27: clarity that platform would draw on preannounced pledges, which could be announced at the global refugee forum, and some of these details we will not be able to have now. This could be worked out in the run-up to the forum.
- Lot of support for multi-stakeholder approach; point taken on recruitment of local personnel made by Switzerland and Jordan, and will work with them to see how we can reflect this.
- Appreciate points on sensitivity of involving private sector and will look to streamline that.
- On the solidarity conferences, there was one fundamental issue: earmarking vs non-earmarking. This is not to overlap with humanitarian conferences. These would focus on one or two situations, and will provide a holistic view and looking at other measures and some of it we have seen reflected and we have already had discussions, and discussed this with the Emergency Relief Coordinator OCHA, and look at these situations in close collaboration with the Emergency Relief Coordinator.
- Revisions on data and evidence were welcomed, and we will have an oral update at the Standing Committee. We will want to include you in our discussions with OECD and the World Bank. The Joint Data Centre is one vehicle to address some of this.
- Some questions about regional and sub-regional approach. The Indonesian Ambassador said there were lots of exchanges in the migration area, but we don't have this in forced

displacement. We will have a lunch time session and invite regional organisations and regional organisations, and have an open discussion and exchange of views.

- A number of you reiterated that development funding must be additional. We will look again at the text and ensure this is properly captured including through the partnership approach.
- We can redraft Part A so that in June we have less comments and you feel comfortable with it. We will need to engage with some of you bilaterally to clarify aspects.