

Global Compact on Refugees – Fifth Formal Consultations

12 – 13 June, Geneva

Agenda 2: Mechanisms for burden-and responsibility-sharing

Brazil on behalf of GRULAC

- Reality requires cooperation with relevant entities dealing with humanitarian assistance.
- Welcome provision in para. 18 that pledges may take different forms including review of policies with the aim of strengthening international systems. These must be carried out in accordance with national policies and frameworks.
- Encouraged that Global Refugee Forum will take place in Geneva ensuring participation of all Member States. The Forum should enable implementation of pledges and measuring progress towards achieving the objectives of the compact.
- Solidarity conferences could be organised when they add value and avoid duplication.
- Regional and sub-regional approaches should be encouraged without prejudice to global support. Implementation of MIRPS provides an outstanding example of interaction between global, regional and national levels.
- On conditionality, important to have safeguards that preserve the needs-driven nature of the compact; development assistance should not undermine the prerogative of States to develop according to their policies; appreciate UNHCR emphasise that. Additional development aid should directly benefit refugees and host communities.
- Welcome inclusion of GA Resolution on the repositioning of the development system (A/72/I.52); welcome partnerships.
- Para. 48: on measuring the impact of hosting, protecting and assisting refugees, mention UNHCR will coordinate with host States besides relevant partners.

Uganda on behalf of the Africa Group

- Take note of changes made in this section. Welcome the proposed Global Refugee Forum as the main avenue for measuring progress for the GCR implementation. To keep the refugee agenda on top, and ensure close follow up and review, the Forum should take place on a more regular basis. We propose that the Forum be convened every two years.
- Reviewing pledges should be a regular feature; it must commence immediately and build upon the refugee response framework; request this to be stated in para. 19.
- Maintain that the compact should not be a vehicle to change national policies, and request related language in para. 18 be deleted.
- Additionality of funding should apply to development and humanitarian funding and not only to development as is currently stated. This funding should be flexible, multiyear and predictable. Current humanitarian assistance is inadequate, and does not meet existing needs; this should be clearly indicated in para. 35.
- Additionality of development assistance should take into account national policies and priorities; indicate clearly in para. 35 to ensure that partnership is undertaken in accordance with national leadership and implemented in a manner that does not negatively impact implementation.
- Take note of various tools for burden and responsibility-sharing, but concerned how all of these will work together. Emphasis on strong coordination is important to avoid duplicity.

- Important to strengthen national capacities in data and evidence collection in respect with relevant national data policies.
- Reflect that any review of national laws and policies must be in accordance to modalities set by States, and review process should not turn into naming and shaming.

European Union

- First, we commend the balance found in new para. 12; important to cooperate with IOM and others. Consider this formulation appropriate; need for operational coordination as far as mixed flows are concerned.
- Support para. 13 referring to all forms of sexual violence, discrimination and disability.
- Strong partnership approach is key to the success of GCR.
- Welcome para. 14, recognising contribution of host countries.
- Welcome streamlining of para. 16 as well as the new link with ExCom regular discussion.
- Satisfied with Global Refugee Forum, and the role of the UN Secretary General.
- Para. 17: support the broad nature of pledges, which are voluntary and also that now Part 3 B serves as a non-exhaustive guide.
- Para. 19 is formulated adequately; welcome clear formulation of national arrangements.
- Para. 21: refer to voluntary repatriation since it is an important durable solution.
- Satisfied with the Support Platform; welcome humanitarian and development nexus and emphasis on host country leadership.
- Para. 24: welcome activation and deactivation process. And understand link to other Support Platforms and UNHCR reporting to ExCom should include consultation of support involved. Support reporting to General Assembly.
- Accept formulation of regional and sub-regional approach.
- Welcome partnerships; separate humanitarian and development funding; welcome humanitarian principles and emphasis on fraud prevention; there could be reference to data protection.
- Welcome that humanitarian assistance is needs-based; in para. 34, refer to the humanitarian, development and peace nexus; reference to humanitarian and development action positive, but need more specification in para. 35.
- Para. 36: ask for more role with UN Country Team and Refugee Coordination.
- Para. 37: satisfied with local authority; refugees could also be included.
- Welcome the role of parliament in para. 39.
- Para. 40: need reference to persons with disability.
- Para. 42: first two sentences are useful.
- Para. 48: thank for clarity on the process, which we deem adequate.

France

- Welcome para. 12, which emphasises diversity of population flows.
- On the need to have responsibility-sharing mechanisms, France recognises the need to clarify mechanisms be they at the national or global level; would welcome more clarification and emphasise the need to avoid duplication.
- Recognise strengthening of language on humanitarian principles; welcome mention of burden-sharing and these must go beyond funding.
- Coherence between UN system is also important including the UN SG's reforms.
- Data compilation is useful to identify refugees; request to clarification why this was deleted.

Ethiopia

- Commend drafting of para. 12. Many host States grapple with sudden onset disasters, and in this respect partnership between UNHCR and IOM is welcome. But document needs to go beyond to ensure complementarity between GCR and GCM.
- Reviewing national plans and policies goes against voluntary nature of the document.
- Para. 20: establishment of national arrangements should build on existing structures, especially in those countries already implementing CRRF.
- Global Refugee Forum: apart from discussion and role, need to make specific recommendations to enhance mechanisms for burden- and responsibility-sharing.
- Four-year periodicity should be shortened to two-year intervals.
- Protracted situation and need for voluntary return should warrant activation of support group; exception cannot be made to participation of countries of origin.
- On national and regional approaches, appreciate expansive role but important to indicate complementarity between these.
- In addition to local actors in para. 37, wish to see community and traditional governance; they play an important role in peaceful co-existence.
- In data and evidence, there should be coordination and complementarity in data collection.
- Welcome data privacy and security included in para. 37.
- Share view aired by many that we are inching towards a document that builds consensus.

Indonesia

- Propose to add para. 21 bis, which reads: in support of national governments, international organisations like UNHCR and IOM should continue to meet the needs of refugees and this will require strengthening funding for these organisations.
- Para. 32: add 'takes into account national laws and regulations of host States'.
- Para. 38: add 'as well existing capacities' while recognising States primary responsibilities.
- Para. 46: add: 'as well as national laws'.

Austria

- Welcome revised Draft 3, which constitutes improvement; text more streamlined.
- Can accept the approach taken in paras 8 and 9 in the spirit of compromise.
- On measuring the impact of hosting refugees, thank UNHCR for the two non-papers presented on 29 May, which improved our understanding; clear need to engage technical expertise.
- Para. 49: undertaking a technical review is a good way forward.
- Para. 12: Crucial element of smuggling in persons is missing; recognise reality of mixed population movements; traffickers do not distinguish between migrants and refugees.
- Encourage UNHCR to make reference to UNODC and include the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons Especially Women and Children and this should be reflected in the text in para. 60 or through a separate para.
- On solutions, commend support for countries of origin and voluntary repatriation.
- Thank UNHCR for a transparent and inclusive way; and would like to say that the perfect should not be the enemy of the good. This will not solve all challenges, but will enhance responsibility sharing.

Colombia

- Para. 12: vital that both UNHCR and IOM work within their respective mandates.
- Global Refugee Forum: paras 17 and 19, we note it will be held every four years in Geneva; important that it is able to link with existing mechanisms to keep coherence.
- Para. 48 is central to the new architecture; important to link with the final chapter on follow-up arrangements. First sentence in para. 48: better clarity needed that UNHCR will coordinate with host States and partners to protect and assist refugees.
- On humanitarian and development nexus in paras 32, 35 and 65: need to recognise national ownership for proper development, and mention systematically that complementarity coming from international development cooperation needs to be devoted to host and refugees.

Mexico

- Convinced that the success of the future compact will depend on strengthening the international protection regime.
- Need to ensure compact is translated into action which will reduce pressure on host countries and promote self-reliance of refugees and support lasting solutions.
- National arrangement's coherence with the UN system important.
- Welcome that responsibility-sharing mechanisms will report back to ExCom, which will provide oversight.
- Without undermining new architecture, state sovereignty is important, which will be key to achieving a sense of ownership and responsibility to ensure the success of the compact.
- Need to avoid all forms of conditionality.
- Welcome regional approaches, which provide complementarity to international solidarity and stimulate dialogue between countries of origin, host and transit countries with a view to promoting coordination, strengthening protection and achieving lasting solutions.
- Welcome para. 48, measuring the impact of hosting refugees; this is a long-term task and with methodological challenges, but which is important for follow-up of the compact.

Denmark

- Welcome improvement in responsibility- and burden-sharing; description now more straightforward.
- Continue to support the Global Refugee Forum, and possible involvement of UN SG; carries potential to improve the GCR aim by enhancing burden- and responsibility-sharing.
- Appreciate simplified working regarding Support Platform and that these are in support of national arrangements.
- Comprehensive arrangements in paras 26 and 28 could interact with existing humanitarian and development frameworks.
- Appropriate support for host and refugee communities important; welcome revised wording in para. 32 on the need for humanitarian assistance to be delivered in line with humanitarian principles.
- Appreciate call for dedicated development funding and direct support for refugees and hosts.
- Somewhat sceptical about solidarity conferences in para. 27; they need to be coordinated with other humanitarian events, and doubt that these will generate development funding. Development funding is carried out through direct dialogue.

- Current draft represents a significant improvement, but need to revisit how development actors can engage in a significant manner.

Malaysia

- Welcome para. 12 to tap into operational partnerships in order to address mixed movements; need to underline partnerships and a whole-of-society approach.
- Support educational alliance including academic networks with wide range of expertise.
- Support the Global Refugee Forum as a stock-taking mechanism; participation of States should be voluntary.
- On measuring impact of hosting refugees, welcome initial steps taken by UNHCR, and we look forward to engaging in forthcoming discussions. These measures should not increase or add burden on States.

Germany

- Appreciate explicit linkages between different mechanisms.
- Welcome regular reporting to UN GA, ExCom, and at the Global Refugee Forum.
- In the introduction, appreciate cooperation between UNHCR and IOM, but note no direct reference to GCM; mixed movements present wide range of challenges in reception and admission.
- Language on trafficking should be mentioned systematically for example in para. 13.
- On Global Refugee Forum, welcome that these will be co-convened with States along with the involvement of the UN SG. They can also enable contributions from all Member States and facilitate regional and sub-regional approaches.
- On Support Platform, reiterate suggestion to prepare a draft roadmap for activation and deactivation in protracted and emergency situations.
- The draft should take into account best practices and lessons learnt from Global Refugee Forum implementation and a road map should be available so that Member States can be part of the Platform.
- Like to include reference to SDG monitoring to capture inequalities.
- Refer to reliable, comparable and timely disaggregated data.

Australia

- Welcome the emphasis on efficient and effective burden- and responsibility-sharing. Important to make use of existing resources.
- Welcome significant contributions to support host countries for more equitable and predictable responsibility-sharing.
- Pleased to see further clarity in paras 17 to 30.
- Important that States convene the Global Refugee Forum along with the involvement of the UN SG. But caution against processes that risk becoming burdensome.
- Welcome Global Refugee Forum; Support Platforms can mobilise all forms of assistance to contribute to achieve the objectives of the GCR including political and security initiatives.
- Pleased to see reference to the importance of coordination with the UN system, and note that in establishing mechanisms, UNHCR will engage partners from across the system. There must be genuine buy-in, and like to reiterate that UNHCR should lead only when others are not able to.
- Pleased to see reference to data being disaggregated.

- Call for inclusion of disability across the text.
- Include reference to biometric data in para. 47.

Turkey

- Welcome para. 12, and reference to different aspects of displacement. Need to have effective cooperation to address protection gaps. In para. 11, emphasise expeditious and timely nature of contribution and the working of mechanisms.
- The backbone should set out mechanisms to obtain tangible and sustainable support.
- Support linkages of mechanisms with ExCom; believe the involvement of the UN SG would be useful for high-level participation and raising political commitment as well as visibility.
- Success will depend on political will of the international community.
- Believe Global Refugee Forum will be important to mobilise political will and suggest indicating this in para. 17; periodicity of four years is acceptable, and may create complementarity with the migration forum to be held every four years.
- Welcome changes in Support Platform; important to operationalise under host country leadership; support option for deactivation considering circumstances on the ground.
- Solidarity conferences will be useful to generate broad-based support in a swift manner. Pleas our expectations are taken on broad. The timely mobilisation of public and private funds is key to the successful implementation of the GCR.
- Useful to know whether there will be project-based or direct contributions. On private funding include GFMD – a unique platform that brings together States and businesses.
- National laws, consultations and coordination with State institutions remain a must for this exercise.
- Appropriate that the UN system works with national governments; useful to support national infrastructure development.

Ecuador

- Well aware that it is not an easy task given the different views.
- Support para. 12, major displacements are not homogenous, but composite. Mixed migration situations are made up of refugees and migrants, who use the same routes and utilise the same services and can fall victim to criminal activities. And this is what we mean by mixed flows, recognising this is vital to strengthening cooperation to implement CRRF irrespective of their condition. Important to increase national management capacities.
- Optimistic about the Global Refugee Forum; welcome changes to strengthen mechanism.
- Para. 18: include diversity of options including changes in national policies and laws; important to ensure these do not prevent States from legislative reforms that restrict access to protection systems.
- Support holding the Forum in Geneva.
- Para. 19: indicate opportunities for States to share lessons learnt in implementation.
- Para. 48: in measuring the impact of hosting refugees, national authorities may also need to be actively involved in this.

Kenya

- Strengthened language in para. 17; Global Refugee Forum will provide the opportunity to ensure burden- and responsibility-sharing can be enhanced.
- Note deletion of first sentence in para. 27, which is now para. 26 in Draft 3. Consider it important to reinstate deleted language.

- Para. 29: approaches should be without prejudice to global support for regional contribution to resolving the situation. Regional initiatives must not only be the sole responsibility of regional actors; the onus must be on the entire international community.
- Para. 30: useful to avoid doubt on which entity will facilitate exchange of good practices.
- Concerned that in para. 32, under development action, reference dedicated to grants and high degree of concessionality has been removed. The deletion is most unfortunate and call for its re-introduction as an optimal choice if necessary.
- Para. 34: clarification needed on the type of key institutions refugees will be included in; host communities are already included in national institutions.

Venezuela

- Para. 12: 'in certain situations forced displacement may result from sudden-onset natural disasters and environmental degradation' request to replace this language. While the CRRF relates to large movement of refugees, some situations may include mixed movements, where States may seek support of the international community.
- Explained our concerns. Commitments in NYD do not allow GCR to deal with contexts other than that of refugees.
- Para. 24: Support Platform should be activated without undue interference and with consent of host States and countries of origin.
- Support Platform will be deactivated with support of host country and countries of origin, assisted by UNHCR. Add reference to the non-political nature of the Support Platform and delete 'as appropriate' with regard to country of origin participation as this is vital in a comprehensive approach.
- Para. 27: support last sentence.
- Call for deleting 'dedicated' in para. 32.
- Para. 48, the first sentence: this exercise needs to be coordinated with host States. Also take this opportunity to ask UNHCR to ensure that measuring impact of hosting refugees be connected to follow-up and review arrangements.

Norway

- Advocated for streamlining and standardisation of solidarity conferences to make them more efficient and effective. Would like to see the development of a template for State pledges as a more standardised way for tracking and reporting. Want this in para. 27.
- Para. 32: Strongly support first bullet that humanitarian funding will be needs-driven and delivered in line with humanitarian principles.
- Para. 39: reference to parliaments welcome.

Jordan

- Aspire to have a programme of action that can be a game changer.
- Para. 12 is ambiguous, and needs to be clarified with regard to legal obligations.
- Para. 16: need further clarification about the role of ExCom and how this could guarantee universality. Also call for making linkages with national laws and policies in para. 16.
- Para. 20: support language on national arrangements, to be determined by host States.
- Para 21: support national leadership; in line two, add 'in line with national policies'.
- Para. 25: we propose adding after line 6, after stakeholder: 'as appropriate'.
- Consider adding Member States as part of the stakeholders in solidarity conferences.

- Para. 29: replace 'would' with 'could' in second line; what does it mean to have comprehensive plans will build on regional and sub-regional initiatives?
- Para. 37: replace 'in coordination with national authorities' with 'consent of host States'.

Japan

- See improvements in the draft. Crucial that responsibility-sharing mechanisms are efficient and practicable. Also need to avoid duplication.
- Global Refugee Forum important to sustain political interest and see value in holding a high-level event; consider follow-up will make this effective. First meeting is an occasion to focus on announcement of pledges and contributions; believe pledges and contributions can take different forms as is mentioned in paras 18 and 19, and not focus only on financial aspects bearing in mind a holistic approach.
- As for periodicity, the first two meetings in 2019 and 2021 are too close to each other; understand the logic but point out that too short an interval for follow-up at ministerial level.
- Can go along with the idea of the Support Platform that will be activated and composed in a context-specific manner.

Canada

- Support this section, although wish to keep flexibility so to align with other events.
- Agree that the Global Refugee Forum will be the main vehicle to measure progress. We all have a shared interest in collective progress. Host country and country of origin support important for the Forum.
- Support Platform could be called upon to support regional and national approaches; UNHCR can work to further develop details.
- Welcome stronger refugee voices in the compact. This can lead to more effective responses and encourage including them in planning, design and policy dialogue.

Mozambique

- Support the way para. 17 has been improved.
- When it comes to hosting the Global Refugee Forum, like to see insertion at the end, that this should be left open; synergies with Geneva will be important, but would like to see addition that this is without prejudice to States that may wish to host them.
- Para. 37: well-crafted. Line 3 from the bottom, add: 'comparative advantages, relevant laws and policies'.

Iran

- Welcome inclusion of linkages with ExCom. Apart from that no substantial progress in responsibility- and burden-sharing.
- Para. 16 speaks of going beyond existing processes, but not clear if these multiple arrangements for voluntary contributions are fit for purpose.
- Para. 31: Reference to key tools calls to break vicious cycles overloading some developing countries with refugees, making them dependent on unpredictable generosity of others.
- Draft recognises the primary responsibility of States and devises an indicative way for dividing this international responsibility among States. Paras 32 to 44 do not have clear responsibilities as they do not mention States as the main stakeholders.
- Do not support multiple arrangements. Would like to suggest ways to make the Global Refugee Forum more effective. The Forum should be held every other year along with

annual senior level meetings. Pledges must be in cash and kind including pledges for refugee resettlement. Senior officials look to material commitment made. A bi-annual report on burden- and responsibility-sharing will enrich decision making.

- Proposed mechanism should have a determined agenda under the supervision of UNHCR to strengthen resettlement initiative for the most vulnerable groups and guarantee the quality of protection. Would request to take this proposal into careful consideration so that it promotes protection of refugees.

Bangladesh

- International obligations cannot be achieved by voluntary financing, but will also require opening and broadening resettlement. At the same time, political will to address root causes and encourage voluntary repatriation should be prioritised rather than the creation of procedural impediment. The best solution is safe, sustainable and dignified return.
- Para. 17: host country consent is important; this will avoid duplication of work.
- National ownership is important when dealing with refugees. Add in the last sentence in para. 33: 'in consultation with host country'.
- Supportive of section 'data and evidence' to improve refugees' socio-economic conditions.

UK

- Clear that responding to large refugee movements is a shared challenge and a shared responsibility of the international community. Cannot leave 'heavy lifting' to host countries.
- Current mechanisms have the potential to improve refugee responses and reduce demand on host countries.
- Support the Global Refugee Forum to galvanise and maintain international cooperation and welcome UN SG involvement. Content with the four-year cycle; co-convening the Forums with States is welcome.
- Emphasis on context for Support Platform is right; it can have a role in protracted situations and emergencies, which is not fixed but on a case-by-case basis.
- Solidarity conferences should be held only when they add value.
- Need to catalyse responsibility-sharing, but shared vision must come first.
- Language on maximising private sector contribution was better in previous text; need more language on the role of private sector in infrastructure development and job creation.
- Satisfied with para. 48. It should be considered with the follow-up section.

Syria

- Para. 12: UNHCR mandate should not expand; use 'mandate' instead of 'role' in ninth line.
- Para. 24: support proposal to add countries of origin in the second line and move the phrase 'upon request' up in the para.
- Para. 25: support the deletion of the phrase 'where appropriate' in solutions context.
- Add 'as appropriate' in para. 32; in bullet 2, support deletion of the word 'dedicated' as proposed by the Africa Group.
- Para. 48: kindly delete the word 'local'; support the position of Colombia, and in this line, add reference to host States in the second line.
- Propose deletion of footnote 27 and 29; as highlighted earlier footnotes that are not outcome of inter-governmental processes or meetings, and are not agreed by all Member States, should not stay in the document.

Montenegro

- Welcome new language in para. 12, which clarifies 'other contexts' mentioned in the last draft; welcome strong language on gender in para. 13.
- In part A, para. 17 of Draft 2 has been removed, but several important elements have been kept in para. 16 with efforts to avoid duplication, streamline and the intention to go beyond business as usual.
- Satisfied with revised text on Global Refugee Forum and on national arrangements.
- Welcome reference to voluntary repatriation in para. 24 and we can support it.
- No specific comments on the Support Platform and regional and sub-regional approaches.
- Would like more simplification of roles with regard to implementation.
- Role of the UN system is important in para 36; the implementation of the GCR is the task and responsibility of the entire UN system along with other stakeholders; support a clear role for the UN Resident Coordinator and UNCT in implementation of UNDAF.
- Welcome inclusion of older persons in para. 44. Welcome reference to more human rights laws and States' obligations in para. 46 with regard to data protection.

USA

- Welcome efforts to simplify language and prioritise support to host countries to protect and assist refugees and countries of origin to create conditions for voluntary repatriation.
- Welcome UN cooperation and consistency with the SG's reform agenda.
- Welcome inclusive participation.
- The Global Refugee Forum could be valuable to share best practices. Welcome reporting progress on refugee protection and the broadening of the support base, but concerned with the two-year periodicity between the two Forums. As CRRF implementation shows, two years is too short to show impact. Holding the first Forum in 2019 may be premature, and it could instead be held in 2021, which gives more time for us to be informed by implementation. Instead of including specific dates, and locking this into the timeline, would recommend for consideration adding language where we assess whether to organise additional Forum after each Forum.
- On the Support Platform, welcome emphasis on national ownership; early engagement of development actors is welcome. Request UNHCR for cost estimates of managing activation and deactivation of the Platform.
- See significant overlaps in solidarity conferences with other pledges. Also raises a problem with unearmarked funding in relation to our Grand Bargain commitments.

Guatemala

- Support inclusion of mixed flows in para. 12; mixed flows are not specific to a region. We decided to be part of the MIRPS to provide efficient protection to people in need. There is cooperation between international organisations according to their respective mandate and in partnership with IOM.
- Global Refugee Forum: how will we define which States will co-sponsor this. Support calls to review policies and laws; States are sovereign but the goal of the compact is to provide better refugee response and countries must voluntarily review their restrictive policies.
- From the development of MIRPS experience, political will, State in the driving seat, relying on regional and international cooperation, these are all vital elements.
- Para. 46: data protection and privacy is important and must be included in heading of Section 3.3.

Italy

- Appreciate formulation in para. 12, which reflects reality and complex challenges on the ground. Believe complementary responses to large flows can build upon this to narrow protection gaps and improve complementarity between the two compacts.
- Support language in para. 13 including references to ending all forms of sexual and gender-based violence.
- Para. 18: support broad definition of pledges and clarification that Part 3 is non-exhaustive.
- Welcome new language in para. 37; at least 60% of refugees now live in urban areas, so critical to maintain global perspective.

Nigeria

- Welcome reference to Support Platforms that guarantee situation-specific support for comprehensive plans, and links between solidarity conferences and contribution of fair share of pledges at the Global Refugee Forum.
- Four year gaps between Global Refugee Forums would be too long to share experience and measure progress. Annual regional review of specific refugee response and exchange of experience should be encouraged.
- Welcome reflections on the deactivation of the Platform.
- Recommend deletion in para. 37 of: 'while ensuring this does not lead to weakening of local actors'. Last sentence could be modified: 'recruitment of qualified local staff by humanitarian agencies should be encouraged in line with relevant policies'.
- Reiterate the need for additional development assistance. State and development actors must take into account national policies; funding should be different from ODA, and must be dedicated to refugees and host communities.

New Zealand

- Grateful to UNHCR for streamlining the text. Hope further work can be undertaken. Agree with all that the end is within sight.
- Overall, believe the text is moving in the right direction. Support that para. 5 will guide the work of refugee responses.
- Last month, the High Commissioner requested to agree on key elements and leave granular elements for later. But we are still missing important details. Our overall concern is on cost of the different initiatives raised by the text. What will this mean for UNHCR's budget? We do not want resources that could be delivered to support refugees withheld and diverted for this. What additional burden these initiatives will place on the Secretariat?
- Agree timing between 2019 and 2021 is too tight and need to have sufficient time for implementation to take place.
- Welcome greater clarity on Support Platforms; NGOs spoke about fatigue and this issue remains unresolved. Support colleague from Denmark that solidarity conferences are not adequate to mobilise development resources. Our priority remains that the new architecture is efficient and effective and will actually deliver results.

Netherlands

- Comfortable with the revised wording of this Section. Paras 12 and 13 are welcome.
- Comfortable with the factual and operational nature of this text as well as the need for operational coordination.

- Reiterate the need for the text to refer to the international community as a whole.
- Clarified in para. 19 that taking stock of pledges should not only be limited to Member States and rightly stipulated will be open to other stakeholders; this is a key element to broaden the support base. Contributions should not only be limited to financial means.
- Also like to see the new notion of reporting on the working of the Support Platform in the Global Refugee Forum, which will change the set up and character of the Forum.
- Supportive of reference in para. 32 that support should go beyond funding; welcome UK comments on private sector involvement.
- Welcome the word 'meaningfully' with regard to refugee participation, and in this regard welcome comments made by Canada.

South Africa

- True that population movements are not homogenous, but concerned that para. 12 still goes beyond the mandate given by NYD for the development of a process.
- Welcome clarification on modalities for the Global Refugee Form including convening of the Forum; important for the Forum to provide safe space for constructive engagement, where countries can raise challenges.
- Welcome details on Support Platform; welcome triggers for activation in part on criteria.
- Clarify timeline for the Support Platform after a pre-announcement has been requested.
- With regard to funding, against conditionality.
- On data and evidence, my delegation remains concerned by the inclusion of development actors in footnotes 27 and 29 as these are neither developed nor have received broader support from UN Member States; would like these to be deleted.

Holy See

- Important to be centred on the human person to ensure better protection for refugees in countries affected by large refugee flows.
- Request para. 13 refers to diverse needs instead of diversity considerations as this captures the whole spectrum of displacement taking into account all dimensions of the human person.
- Important to have a continuum of care to alleviate suffering in mixed flows. Encourage relevant cooperation between UNHCR and IOM for a coordinated approach.
- Would welcome in the GCR the role of Faith-Based Organisations. FBOs are often first providers of protection. Their strengthened cooperation with inter-governmental organisations will ensure protection mandate is better achieved.
- Response of FBOs is driven by solidarity, not creed, and is needs-based; their role should be identified in Support Platforms too.

Switzerland

- Appreciate new para. 12, and changes to para. 8. They reflect reality of displacement. Wish to see more explicit language in para. 12 though, with different statistics; migrants and refugees have the same needs and similar vulnerabilities.
- Recruitment of local actors should not be at the detriment of local actors.
- Coordination between development and humanitarian actors is important and we need to find better ways to promote complementarity while respecting respective *modus operandi*.
- As mentioned by Denmark, mechanisms to engage development actors is still missing.

- Humanitarian assistance has the primary aim of helping refugees and development aid is aimed at building institutional capacity to meet the needs of populations and refugees; amend para. 35 accordingly. Language makes undue shortcut.

Costa Rica

- Express satisfaction with para. 12. Goes in the right direction to address ground realities and reflects coordination with stakeholders given their function and expertise.
- We believe it is positive that the Global Refugee Forum will be held in Geneva; this will guarantee participation of all States. Welcome the diverse nature of contributions as well as the non-exhaustive nature of Part 3 B.
- In addition to making pledges, the Forum is also an opportunity to monitor the implementation of the compact.
- Support Platform is a key component when it comes to added value and hope that this can be done at the sub-regional level too.
- Resources should be made available not just to address large flows but also for emergencies and crises.
- Para. 36: commend the role envisaged for UN SG.
- Para 48 covers a fundamental exercise, but request clarification on local partners.

Algeria

- Still believe all arrangements are not fitting the purpose of establishing robust mechanism for burden- and responsibility-sharing; most already exist and have proven of limited efficiency. They do not have the capacity for protection approach; ask for accommodating other forms of arrangements that better reflect potential.
- Endeavour for burden- and responsibility-sharing to be pursued and informed by the needs of refugees; regret that fair share of responsibility was taken out.
- Consider it prerequisite that the world provides appropriate response also for implementing durable solutions.
- Para. 16: replace at the end of the sentence by another sentence so as to ensure better sharing of burden resulting from hosting large numbers of refugees.
- In para 17, to keep the refugee agenda on top, stocktaking at the Global Refugee Forum should take place on regular basis and it is better that the Forums are held every two years.
- In line with position expressed during the Fourth Formal Consultations, any review of national laws and policies must be determined by, and at the request, of host States.
- Reiterate the view that working modalities of national arrangements to be determined by host countries.
- Para. 21: delete 'linkages with existing regional and national plans including for development and disaster response'.
- Para. 23: the third bullet point is beyond the scope of GCR as support for the implementation of national development strategies should not be conditioned on forcible displacement, and wish that point to be deleted.
- Delete reference to pledges in the second bullet point in para. 23.
- Para. 24: wish to see 'upon the request of host country' before the role of UNHCR.
- Last sentence in para. 25 is cumbersome.
- Para. 32: not clear how development actors here are part of regular development programmes; more clarity required; need criteria to shed more light on this issue.

- Humanitarian action should be safe from conditionality; use of 'dedicated' is revealing.
- Para. 37: cooperation with local actors should not only be in coordination with national authorities, it should be upon their request.
- Para. 42: private actor involvement should not create issues with needs-based humanitarian funding; search for funding should not be at the expense of humanitarian principles; concerned by conditionality.
- Involvement of the private sector should be linked with pre-requirements.
- Still doubtful about the global education network.
- Para. 47: wondering why data for solutions was deleted.

Tuvalu

- Strong support for para. 12. Some say protection of people by environmental degradation and climate-induced disasters should not belong to GCR, others say should not belong to GCM. It should belong to GCR but be separate from the 1951 Refugee Convention.
- Need to read carefully para. 12. It does not apply protection, only appropriate responses to groups of people affected by environmental degradation and in need of protection. Most States have laws and policies. We have to show strong courage so that GCR can better facilitate addressing climate-induced displacement. Request not to weaken the language of para. 12.

Pakistan

- Take note of improved formulation in para. 12. Synergies in tackling complex displacement situation vital and support this.
- Request last line in para. 21 to be deleted.
- Para. 22: second line includes that the Support Platform is optional and links with Global Refugee Forum must be rectified.
- Bullet 3, para. 23: formulation of Draft 2 could be restored.
- Para. 35: suggest including in coordination with national authorities.
- Surprised by the absence of data on solutions.

Lebanon

- Burden- and responsibility-sharing mechanisms proposed hinges on smooth interaction between different layers. If burden-and responsibility-sharing fails to generate additionality, it will be another blow to multilateralism. Still need to see well-functioning responsibility-sharing mechanisms during this important phase.
- Still think Global Refugee Forum does not measure up to the urgent aspect of refugee crises, and worry that momentum will wane.
- Complementarity between humanitarian and development funding in para. 32 is important and should be pursued.
- These foreshadow some important outcomes. Final verdict once this is translated in reality.
- Part B must be read in line with Part A.
- Commend UNHCR for integrating host country concerns by making it less prescriptive. Nevertheless, GCR contains more obligations for a bigger and sophisticated support, and do not feel comfortable. Still need to overcome voluntary contributions of States and how this will translate into reality.
- Host countries are over-stretched. In Part B, any cooperation should be at the request of States and this process should not jeopardise host country leadership.

- Welcome multi-stakeholder approach; do not take for granted support FBOs can provide.
- Seek deletion of reference to tolerance as it has a negative connotation and think promoting peaceful co-existence suffices.
- Para. 34: welcome inclusion of refugees in decision making processes.

Brazil

- Interaction between global, regional and national mechanisms is clear. Appreciate language in para. 16, creating linkages between proposed responsibility-sharing mechanisms and ExCom. Believe architecture stemming from the global compact should not affect UNHCR governance structure and ExCom should play an important role in overall UNHCR activities.
- Welcome Global Refugee Forum as a convening group for promoting responsibility-sharing initiatives; important that it feeds into ExCom and GA so it allows the international community to adjust course.
- Believe periodicity of the Global Refugee Forum is too long, and propose an intermediate two-year review coinciding with the High Commissioner's Protection Dialogue.
- Protection could take review of national laws and policies, but by doing so could have a negative impact; believe GCR's mission is to affect asylum policies as a means to increase responsibility sharing. This could be addressed by pledges in the Global Refugee Forum.
- On funding, humanitarian action should be needs-driven and aligned with humanitarian principles. Development assistance should respect country ownership; need to acknowledge concerns to address conditionality. Favour more direct wording on this, in spirit of partnership and avoid measures that may affect the primacy of national leadership.
- Development action should benefit host community. For dedicated and additional resources for development, ensure that these are over and above existing levels.
- Finally, acknowledging the important role of cities in coordinating immigration, we present the delegation of Sao Paulo as a member of the Brazilian delegation.

Sao Paulo city official (talking as part of Brazil delegation)

- Wish UNHCR to invite cities to contribute. Local authorities are first responders to large scale refugee situations. Important role of cities in integration policies is recognised.
- GCR should incorporate cities expertise. These are part of the solution and central to GCR success and to better humanitarian response in coordination with national government.
- They must be able to participate in the Global Refugee Forum and define pledges, follow-up and review.

International Parliamentary Union

- Welcome new language relating to the role of national parliaments and pleased to see that they are mentioned in a multi-stakeholder approach.
- The legislative branch plays an important role in translating commitments to national laws and welcome fine-tuning of agreed language.
- Refer to GA 72/78 on interaction with UN, which was adopted on 22 May 2018 and sponsored by 90 UN Member States.
- Parliaments represent the voice of citizens and adopt budgets and reflect international commitments in national laws.

- We therefore recommend amending current para. 39 as follows: ‘likewise engagement by national parliament in budgets and relevant national arrangements is encouraged with a view to reconcile different groups and foster dialogue and inclusion’.

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

Closing remarks: Volker Turk

- In all, 44 statements on Agenda item 2.
- Some States said we are close to the finish line. Other delegations have asked for reconsideration of some text; have to achieve the right balance. Need to lift it to the level where we can find consensus based on mutual listening exercise, where common ground can be reflected in the text adjustment.
- Some concrete text adjustment in para. 12; strong endorsement by the vast majority for some of the changes put forward. In May consultations, some representatives of transit countries argued that this needed to be reflected. So, we included this in accommodation of those interests. The delegate from Tuvalu mentioned that it is not about extension or expansion of legal obligations, but rather reflects operational reality. This then invokes the interest of UNHCR, and in trying to be pragmatic some countries, on the African Continent or other continents, could seek support if they are faced with a situation of large population flows that is not homogenous.
- Para. 13: will reflect victims of trafficking.
- Global Refugee Forum: we are faced with a conundrum. Listening to you, the periodicity should range from two to five years. We will have to come back to you as there does not seem to be a consensus. I think we have a shared objective. As Lebanon and Pakistan said, the proof in the end lies in implementation, and whether the Forum, at the senior level, can keep momentum on track. Periodicity is still an area that needs to be resolved.
- Germany mentioned that it would be good to have a roadmap on the Support Platform. Ahead of the Global Refugee Forum, we will seek to engage with all of you and will indeed work on a template.
- Type of pledges, some are reflected here and this goes beyond the financial aspect and will include various measures; it also includes, we heard it on previous occasions, review of policies and legislation. Going back to 2011 Ministerial Conference almost all pledges related to concrete undertaking by countries to review legislation or policies. It would be unfortunate if that richness did not come out in the announcement of inclusive policies so that it can specifically respond to challenges countries face. Actual capturing of national policy changes can be turned into pledges. Of course, this is not a question of external influence, and will come about if a country owns a change.
- Number of comments in relation to the Support Platform and regional processes to ensure exchange of practice by ensuring heads of these agencies can benefit from mutual exchange in relation to forced displacement area. Could be done through dialogue in the Global Refugee Forum.
- In the UN system, what is the role of the Resident Coordinator in UN country teams, in light of the UN development reform? Had an exchange with our own country representatives to work out in light of the UN development system reform and adoption of GCR. It was an interesting exchange. This is the starting and UN system-wide reforms are just adopted, so lots of lessons to be learnt including from the CRRF.
- We heard comments on data and evidence and wish to ensure this is captured in the text.

- Role of countries of origin: Took it out because many delegations asked it to be taken out.
- On role of ExCom, heard divergent views: stronger role on one side but also making sure universality does not get lost. Global Refugee Forum would ensure universality and will be open to all Member States; ExCom is limited in terms of State participation.
- On footnotes; will go through again and caution against any addition to text. Overwhelming view is not to add more to ensure streamlining, so would like to keep that balance.

Floor opened again

New Zealand

- On this matter, our concern has been that the Global Refugee Forum does not lose steam; we were interested in the proposal by Brazil that if the Forum is held at a four-year interval, it could be useful to hold a mid-term review during the High Commissioner's Protection Dialogue. Would be interested in that proposal.
- Like others, we are concerned about the tight timing between 2019 and 2021. Difficult to focus minds of ministers to attend different conferences. 2021 is an important year and by focusing on the Convention, could make a big push on universalization by holding an event in New York during the UN GA; so, we are pushing on all fronts and in different centres.
- Heard from Canada that they are flexible as to where the Forum might take place. Don't have a firm position on this and recognise there is a natural audience and ease of holding it in Geneva. But wonder if we are missing on universalization of the Convention by taking it to different regions and other regional centres.

Brazil

- Our proposal was indeed to highlight mid-term review; we think it would be a good compromise but open to hear other proposals in this regard.

Final remarks: Volker Turk

- Will come back to you for consensus text that you can all subscribe to; will need to think this through with those of you who have strong views; see how issues could be addressed.
- The cost issue was raised. UNHCR headquarters is in Geneva. Organising the Global Refugee Forum will require considerable secretariat support. Even if we were to move it to New York, we would have some cost implications, given that we have our headquarters here. The Refugee Convention was signed in Geneva, so there is some linkage there, and the humanitarian hub is here. This does not take away the importance of other locations.
- On periodicity, let's remember that the High Commissioner's Dialogue is not part of the governance system and not part of the formal format.
- Can rely on you for text adjustment so that we can present something ahead of the July consultations.