

Section 1: Background of the Policy Consultation and Development Process

In December 2017, a policy consultation and development process was launched through the collaboration of the Asylum and Migration Research Centre (IGAM), Oxfam, The Turkish Refugee Council, Human Resources Development Foundation (IKGV), Support to Life (STL), Ravda Nur Foundation, Asil Vakfi, and Foundation for the Support of Women's Work (KEDV), Education Reform Initiative (ERG), Economic Development Foundation (IKV) and Network for Refugee Voices. The initiative began with **an online multi-language survey in Arabic, English, Turkish, Spanish and French, as well as in-depth interviews designed with an aim to better understand the views and perspectives of refugee-led and national civil society organizations (CSOs) from the world's top refugee-hosting countries constituted part of this process.** To date, almost 500 online surveys and 79 in-depth interviews have been completed. Responses to the online survey include views from nine of the world's top refugee-hosting countries, covering 47 countries in total.

Identifying sustainable, long-term policy propositions and frameworks for refugees was identified as a priority area within the consultation process which has, subsequently, led to the creation of a thematic working group around durable solutions. As with other working groups who will be working on specific thematic areas, the Durable Solutions Working Group is expected to be chaired by refugee-led and national CSOs from the world's top refugee-hosting countries who, collectively, will lead the development of thematic policy positions and recommendations. This background paper aims to support the working group through providing a brief analysis of relevant international frameworks, the top host country governments' responses and positions in relation to the Global Compact on Refugees, and policy positions of CSOs from the world's major refugee-hosting countries on issues particularly relevant for discussions around durable solutions, including, *local integration, voluntary repatriation, responsibility sharing (as a tool and a mechanism), resettlement, and addressing root causes.*

Section 2: The Context

According to UNHCR statistics, there were 22.5 million refugees around the world at the end of 2016, but less than 1% were resettled that year.¹ The 2017 statistics don't paint a positive picture either; UNHCR was provided with resettlement places for only **75,188 refugees in 2017, a 54% drop compared to 2016.**² In terms of repatriation and returns, the numbers have been increasing over the years; during 2016, 552,000 refugees returned to their countries of origin, doubling the number from the previous year.³ **Considering the fact that 84% of refugees are hosted by developing regions**⁴, the importance of finding durable solutions for refugees, becomes a highly complex and important policy

¹ <http://www.unhcr.org/resettlement.html>

² <http://www.unhcr.org/5a9d507f7>

³ <http://www.unhcr.org/globaltrends2016/>

⁴ <http://www.unhcr.org/globaltrends2016/>

For internal use only

discussion not only from the perspective of major refugee-hosting states, but from international agencies and civil society organizations as well.

Section 2: International Frameworks

In collective efforts to strengthen and build on the 1951 Convention with regards to protection of refugees, the Programme of Action produced in 2003 highlighted several objectives; among those was a specific goal on “**redoubling the search for durable solutions.**” Analyzing the extent to which different international frameworks have referred to durable solutions and how this concept has evolved over time, this section provides an overview of how various international frameworks and policy papers have referred to perspective of local integration, resettlement, voluntary return, as well as addressing root causes; some of these documents include the 1951 Convention and Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees, Durable Solutions and Refugee Protection (1989), the Programme of Action (2003), the UNHCR Framework for Durable Solutions for Refugees and Persons of Concern (2003), and the 10-Point Plan of Action on Refugee Protection and Mixed Migration. Towards the end of this section, the zero and first drafts of the Global Compact for Refugees will be analyzed briefly from the perspective of offering durable solutions for refugees.

Local Integration

It is important to note that none of the durable solutions mentioned above was explicitly mentioned in the original 1951 Convention, including local integration. Although the Statute of the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (1950) called upon states to cooperate with the High Commissioner on issue areas that can (to a lesser extent) fall under providing long-term solutions (for example calling states to become parties to international conventions to provide protection of refugees, enter agreements to execute measures that can improve the situation of refugees, and promote voluntary repatriation of refugees⁵), a more contemporary concept of durable solutions was developed later on and referred to within international frameworks. Building on the renewed attention for local integration, the Agenda for Protection highlighted the importance of local integration in a comprehensive strategy for durable solutions, as well as the achievements of self-reliance for refugees.

[The Programme of Action from 2003](#) highlights local integration as a “proven [instrument] in resolving the plight of particular refugees or groups of refugees.” For that reason, the Programme mentions the importance of having local integration as part of a comprehensive strategy for durable solutions, **and calls for solutions around local integration that are sensitive to refugees’ needs, international and national standards, as well as the socio-economic realities of hosting countries.** The Programme also calls for states to examine “when and how” to promote legal status and residence rights (including opportunities for becoming citizens) for refugees who have already attained a degree of

⁵ <http://www.unhcr.org/protection/basic/3b66c39e1/statute-office-united-nations-high-commissioner-refugees.html>

For internal use only

socio-economic integration. Later, the Programme calls for states to have a “more rigorous” integration policy which would enable refugees to have rights and opportunities in the social, economic and cultural life of the country (with regards to education, language training, skills development), labour market, family reunification, and citizenship.

Local integration is particularly a complex term as it has been referred to with different meanings attached over the last few years. In one of the research reports conducted within the *Legal and Protection Policy Research Series* by UNHCR in 2006, local integration was referred to as:

The end product of a multi-faceted and on-going process, of which self-reliance is but one of the parts. Integration requires preparedness on the part of the refugees to adapt to the host society, without having to forego their own cultural identity. From the host society, it requires communities that are welcoming and responsive to refugees and public institutions that are able to meet the needs of a diverse population.⁶

According to the [10-Point Plan of Action on Refugee Protection and Mixed Migration - Chapter 7: Solutions for Refugees](#), there are certain groups who can be considered on a “priority basis” for local integration; including refugees born on the territory of the host country who may otherwise be stateless, refugees who do not have the possibility to repatriate in the foreseeable future, and refugees who have established close links to the host country. Additionally, the Action Plan notes that host countries may lack sufficient resources and require assistance from the international community in integrating refugee populations. For those countries, the “Development through Local Integration” plan was initiated which aims to provide additional financial support for host countries and communities.

[Development through Local Integration \(DLI\)](#) which was created within the UNHCR Framework for Durable Solutions for Refugees and Persons of Concern was proposed in 2003 with the aim to solicit additional development assistance for states opting to provide opportunities for gradual integration of refugees, who are unable to repatriate and are willing to integrate locally. The key components of local integration outlined in the strategy includes the following: **economic component** (refugees to become less reliant on state aid or humanitarian assistance), **social and cultural component** (enabling refugees to live amongst the host population without discrimination or exploitation through interactions), and **legal component** (granting refugees wider range of rights which respond to the rights enjoyed by local citizens; including access to education, labour markets, public services, health facilities, property rights, as well as capacity to travel with valid travel and identity documents.)

Voluntary Repatriation

⁶ <http://www.unhcr.org/44bb90882.pdf>

For internal use only

One of the main issues that have been mentioned within the 1951 Convention with regards to durable solutions is the concept of “*non-refoulement*”; a concept whose limits and implications still being discussed within policy circles today. According to the Convention, “no contracting state shall expel or return [*refoule*] a refugee in any manner whatsoever to the frontiers of territories where life or freedom would be threatened on account of his /her (emphasis of the writers) race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group of political opinion.”⁷

Voluntary repatriation was highlighted within the [Durable Solutions and Refugee Protection, and](#) endorsed by the Executive Committee of the High Commissioner’s Programme in 1989. The recommendations call for strengthening joint international efforts to deal with cases of flows of asylum seekers and refugees in order to avert new flows and facilitate the voluntary repatriation of refugees where appropriate.

The concept of voluntary repatriation has been developed further with later documents supporting the 1951 Convention. The Programme of Action called for countries “to commit themselves to respecting the right to return and receiving back their refugees within an acceptable framework of physical, legal and material safety...” Within the plan, a specific recommendation should be noted for calling upon states to facilitate the participation of refugees, including women, in peace and reconciliation processes and making sure that potential agreements recognize the right to return and contemplates measures to encourage repatriation, reintegration, and reconciliation.⁸ One of the main objectives regarding returns is to make sure repatriation is sustainable.

One of the more comprehensive UNHCR-led documents to cover voluntary return and repatriation was actually the [Repatriation/Reintegration/Rehabilitation/Reconstruction \(4Rs\)](#) which was created within the UNHCR Framework for Durable Solutions for Refugees and Persons of Concern. Proposed by the High Commissioner as an “integrated approach” which aimed to bring together humanitarian and development actors and funds, the concept calls for ownership by host governments of the processes outlined in the 4Rs integrated planning process at the country level by the UN Country Teams, strong institutional cooperation and commitment, and participation of actors (including UN agencies, bilateral, and multilateral institutions) who form part of the development community.

[10-Point Plan of Action on Refugee Protection and Mixed Migration - Chapter 7: Solutions for Refugees](#) also mentions the importance of voluntary repatriation “where and when feasible.” Additionally the Action Plan calls for cooperation arrangements between stakeholders to ensure “an appropriate framework for sustainable return is established both in the host country, through the provision of information, documentation and financial support, and in the country of origin through legal guarantee for amnesties, property restitution and reintegration projects.”

⁷ 1951 Convention. <http://www.unhcr.org/3b66c2aa10>

⁸ <http://www.unhcr.org/protect/PROTECTION/3e637b194.pdf>

For internal use only

Responsibility Sharing

The proposed activities outlined in the Programme of Action are framed around sharing burdens and responsibilities more equitably and building capacity to receive and protect refugees. It calls for states to contribute to realization of local integration through “burden-sharing” which can provide necessary resources for self-reliance and local integration and sustain the viability of local communities affected by their presence.

The concept of responsibility sharing has also been highlighted within the [Development Assistance for Refugees \(DAR\)](#) component, which again, was produced under the UNHCR Framework for Durable Solutions for Refugees and Persons of Concern (2003). DAR calls for additional development assistance to improve burden-sharing for countries hosting large number of refugees and promote better quality of life for refugees pending durable solutions, as well as a better quality of life for host communities. Specifically, DAR has highlighted the following objectives; burden sharing with the host country; compensation for the burden aspect of the host community; development of the host country; development of the host community, gender equality, dignity and improved quality of refugee life; and empowerment and enhancement of productive capacities and self-reliance of refugees, particularly of women, pending durable solutions.

Third-Country Resettlement

The Programme of Action highlights resettlement as both a protection tool and a durable solution. While calling for resettlement to be used more effectively “as a tool of burden-sharing,” the Programme also calls upon states to “examine how more flexible resettlement criteria could be applied with regard to refugees.”⁹ Although there are no exact percentages or quotas given, the Programme also encourages states which don’t have yet resettlement programmes to make resettlement places available.

Within the [10-Point Plan of Action on Refugee Protection and Mixed Migration - Chapter 7: Solutions for Refugees](#), resettlement has been referred to as an “effective mechanism for burden sharing and international cooperation” which provides options to assist first countries of asylum. The Action Plan highlights the importance of negotiations between resettlement countries and countries of first asylum in establishing the parameter for resettlement programmes, including multi-year resettlement agreements and assistance for local integration.

The Global Compact on Refugees on Durable Solutions

According to the zero¹⁰ and first draft¹¹ of the Global Compact on Refugees, , one of the primary objectives of the compact is to increase the availability of durable solutions. With regards to issues

⁹ <http://www.unhcr.org/protect/PROTECTION/3e637b194.pdf>

¹⁰ Zero Draft: <http://www.unhcr.org/Zero-Draft.pdf>

For internal use only

around returns, integration, resettlement, responsibility sharing, and addressing root causes, the compact provides the following recommendations:

- On **voluntary repatriation**, the zero draft states that voluntary and sustainable repatriation is the first and foremost responsibility of the *country of origin* to its own people. Referring to voluntary repatriation as the “preferred solution of many refugees,” the draft calls for supporting conditions and opportunities favourable to voluntary and sustainable repatriation (including safety, security, rule of law, access to essential services and documentation, economic recovery and reconciliation.) The Compact also calls for interested states and relevant stakeholders to provide technical, financial, and other support to scale up the availability of voluntary repatriation **and makes a recommendation about adding measures for voluntary repatriation and reintegration in political settlements, peace agreements, and crisis recovery strategies.** Building on these points, the first draft has called for states and relevant actors to contribute resources and expertise to support countries of origin to address root causes, to remove obstacles to return, and to enable conditions favorable to voluntary repatriation. But, as a controversial point which may lead to further discussions within different stakeholders and countries, the first draft continues by saying that **voluntary repatriation “is not necessarily conditioned on the accomplishment of political solutions in the country of origin, in order not to impede the exercise of the rights of refugees to return.”**
- On **resettlement**, the zero draft calls for states to *consider* establishing, or increasing the scope, size and quality of, resettlement programs to meet the annual global resettlement needs by UNHCR. In addition to the possibility of UNHCR to establish a core resettlement group that could facilitate a coordinated response, the draft mentions that **“where possible, states will seek to resettle at least 25% of annual resettlement submissions within 6 months of UNHCR referral.”** On the other hand, the first draft mentions a new process through which UNHCR and traditional resettlement countries will develop a 3-year strategy to “enlarge the pool of resettlement countries and to consolidate emerging resettlement programmes” – without necessarily giving details about how the strategy would be developed. **Lastly, the drafts mention other pathways for admission to third countries and calls upon states contributions particularly for expanded family unification mechanisms, private or community sponsorship programmes, humanitarian visas, educational opportunities, and labor mobility opportunities for refugees.**
- Voluntary repatriation is highlighted as a preferred method among durable solutions for many refugees; but for refugees who are unable to return to their countries of origin (or for whom local solutions are preferable), the Compact says that states have found it useful to move towards the **full integration** of refugees, including providing durable legal status, permanent residence, and naturalization where appropriate. To assist these countries in providing **local**

¹¹ First Draft: <http://www.unhcr.org/5aa2b3287>

For internal use only

solutions, the Compact calls for interested states and other stakeholders to dedicate funding, materials, and technical expertise to support the development of a strategic framework for local solutions.

- Addressing root causes is briefly mentioned under Programme of Action within the Compact which is based on the recognition that humanitarian, development, and peace efforts are complementary and reinforce each other in order to address many issues regarding refugees, including addressing the **root causes** of forced displacement. It is also mentioned that in support of host countries and communities leading the response, the UNCHR will convene a global platform which could also support the search for solutions and measures to address root causes of displacement.

Section 4a: Positions of Major Host Countries

Local Integration – social cohesion, social harmony

While integration efforts of some countries mostly deal with the need to provide basic needs to the refugee population (like Chad), other refugee hosting states have different policy practices which range from encompassing comprehensive integration policies to dismissing integration as an available durable solution.

In terms of integration policies, countries like **Ethiopia and Uganda** have been developing and implementing policies around for a long time. Ethiopia is one of the countries that have taken concrete measures in recent years to support integration of refugees; in fact, it was one of the first countries to begin implementing the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework in 2017. Under the implementation of CRRF, the **Ethiopian** government has been planning on phasing out encampment policies in the next 10 years and facilitates the integration of refugees into host communities and access to their basic rights.¹² While doing this, the Ethiopian government has also been paying attention to providing support for the host community; representatives at the GCR thematic discussions have stated that the government in the process of finalizing a livelihood strategy which will provide 30,000 jobs to refugees and 70,000 to citizens.¹³ **Uganda's** refugee integration and management policies are grounded on the model whereby refugees and host communities have access to the same rights and are treated equally. The Refugee Act 2006 recognizes *prima facie* refugees, as accorded by the 1969 Organization of African Unity (OAU) Convention. The government has also practiced and implemented tenets of the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework for many years.¹⁴ In addition to incorporating refugees into their National Development Plan (NDP11),

¹² 68th Session of ExCom “a Special Segment on the Application of the CRRF” - Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia ARRA

¹³ Thematic Discussion 3 Panel 3

¹⁴ Minister for Relief, Disaster Preparedness and Refugees. *Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework in the context of Uganda's Refugee Management Model*, 2 October 2017

For internal use only

the Ugandan government has allowed refugees to elect their own leaders in Refugee Welfare Councils (RWCs) and ensure their political participation for social integration.¹⁵ Kenyan officials have also underlined the importance of registering refugees so as to provide protection mechanisms and allow access to basic services such as health and education. In screening during large arrivals, Kenyan officials have noted the importance of institution *prima facie* refugee status, and recommended the need to account for gender sensitivities in the screening process for refugees.¹⁶

Some of the refugee-hosting states have made statements that agree with UNHCR's proposition to integrate refugees into national development plans. **German government** has highlighted the following priorities; integrating refugees into the labour market (though improving employability, ensuring fair working conditions, trainings); education and labour market integration through language training and integration courses; sensitivity to the needs of special groups such as gender in integrating refugees; normalize cash-based support to refugees; integration of children; family unification and labor mobility.¹⁷ Other countries, **like DRC**, have stated that they extend the same rights to refugees which they grant to their citizens.

The importance of providing additional assistance and support for host communities is especially mentioned in places where host communities continue to live in vulnerable conditions. In Chad, for example, the host community is sometimes considered more vulnerable than refugees who have been receiving humanitarian aid support for a number of years.¹⁸ The lack of financial support has also led some countries to develop their own initiatives; DRC, for example, has focused its efforts on empowering refugees through allocating land to both host community and refugees to engage in agricultural work together.

Underlining the need to support refugee-hosting communities, the government of **Iran** also emphasized the need to provide capacity building of national authorities, associations, organisations, and communities which are concerned with refugees and the needs of host communities;¹⁹ according to the government, refugee protection should not compromise the host community's right to develop itself, suggesting that there needs to be more robust support to hosting communities. Iran says local solutions should be selected based on the proportion of the state's absorbing capacity and demographic situations of the country, and those decisions on integration and local solutions should be country-specific.²⁰ Uganda, on the other hand, has policies which ensure that there is adequate

¹⁵ Minister for Relief, Disaster Preparedness and Refugees. *Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework in the context of Uganda's Refugee Management Model*, 2 October 2017

¹⁶ Thematic Discussion 2, Panel 3

¹⁷ Thematic Discussion 4 Panel 3

¹⁸ https://static1.squarespace.com/static/506c8ea1e4b01d9450dd53f5/t/560b2d8de4b0a1d8c243a70b/1443573133844/150709_chad.pdf

¹⁹ Solution Strategy for Afghan Refugees (SSAR) <http://www.unhcr.org/afghanistan/solutions-strategy.pdf>

²⁰ 4th Thematic Discussion, Panel 1 on Voluntary Repatriation

For internal use only

support to host communities; in fact the Development Assistance for Refugee Hosting Areas (DAR) specifically targets support for communities which host larger numbers of refugees as a part of their wider integration efforts.²¹

For some of the major refugee-hosting states, a successful implementation of the global compact and development of social cohesion projects also require additional financial resources. During the First Formal Consultation on the Global Compact, the government of Turkey has called upon development actors to mobilize additional sources, not only for emergency response, but for social cohesion projects as well.²²

Where return of refugees is a more prominent priority for refugees, local integration does not necessarily feature as a durable solution. According to **Jordan**, for example, integration of refugees is not a long-term durable solution, and is a temporary measure which is awaiting the return of refugees.²³ From the perspective of the state, local solutions and integration measures should directly be related to obtaining access to other durable solutions in the future. **Lebanon**, on the other hand, has stated that local integration of refugees is not an option as the country opts for voluntary repatriation instead; the officials have publicly stated that there is no option for Syrian refugees, for instance, to permanently settle in Lebanon.²⁴ But Lebanon is conscious of the effects of hosting refugees on their host communities. To that end, the Lebanon has signed the Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP) and the Lebanon Compact, both of which attempt to refugees and vulnerable host community members alike.

Voluntary Repatriation

Voluntary repatriation has been emphasized by many refugee-hosting states as one of the most favorable durable solutions, and some refugee-hosting states have begun signing agreements with countries of origin to facilitate voluntary returns; **Chad, DRC, and Iran** can be taken as examples. Chad has gradually begun facilitating the voluntary repatriation of refugees, primarily to Sudan. In May 2017, Chad and Sudan signed a Tri-Partite agreement to facilitate for the return of refugees from Chad to Sudan, and vice versa. Under the plan, the two states, with the support of UNHCR, organized a go-and-see visit (GSV) for Sudanese refugees in Chad.²⁵ Considering voluntary repatriation to be “one of the best solutions”, the government of DRC has signed Tri-Partite agreement with Rwanda and UNHCR to facilitate the reciprocal repatriation of refugees between Rwanda and DRC. Iran also favors voluntary repatriation as the most “soluble” of durable solutions and supports the need to

²¹ Minister for Relief, Disaster Preparedness and Refugees. *Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework in the context of Uganda's Refugee Management Model*, 2 October 2017

²² <http://www.unhcr.org/events/conferences/5a8a97a97/statement-turkey-first-formal-consultation-agenda-item.html>

²³ Excom 2017, Notes from ICVA

²⁴ <https://www.thenational.ae/world/mena/trump-s-call-for-refugee-resettlement-causes-a-stir-in-lebanon-1.630702>

²⁵ <http://reporting.unhcr.org/sites/default/files/UNHCR%20Chad%20Factsheet%20-%20October%202017.pdf>

For internal use only

provide economic reintegration for refugees to their countries of origin as the country has also signed a Tri-partite agreement with Afghanistan and UNHCR for the repatriation and reintegration of Afghan refugees to Afghanistan.

Where resources are not available to facilitate safe return of refugees, governments call for the involvement of the international community. **Kenya**, for example, has called upon the international community to fulfill its obligations towards supporting repatriation processes²⁶ and providing sufficient support towards capacity building in the country of origin; the government has called states to involve civil society in voluntary repatriation processes by helping to improve the governance for voluntary repatriation.²⁷

Recently, the government of **Germany** has been attempting to increase the number of people choosing to return to their countries of origin voluntarily through an online portal called “Returning from Germany”. Managed by the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF), it provides information for people who are interested in returning voluntarily and attempts to make voluntary return the most desirable option for refugees.²⁸

On the other hand, some countries state that returns should not be conducted in situations where safe conditions do not exist; **Ethiopia**, for example, stresses that returns should have a comprehensive regional approach which has a program of action involving peace-building, reconstruction, and economic recovery of the country of origin, and that returns should be conducted in partnership with humanitarian and development actors under a multi-year strategy. **The Turkish government** has also called for problems causing massive displacement in origin countries to be solved politically in a peaceful manner in order to support voluntary and sustainable returns.²⁹ While highlighting voluntary repatriation as the best long-term solution for refugees, the **Ugandan** government has also stated that returnees should be participating and engaging throughout the entire process and an implementation mechanism needs to exist which allows for funding for returnees and for refugees’ input.

Pakistan is one of the major-refugee hosting states who have had extensive experience with refugee flows, particularly from Afghanistan. The National Policy on Afghan Refugees (July 2013) and the Solutions Strategy for Afghan Refugees (SSAR) initiated in 2011 between Pakistan, Afghanistan, and UNHCR focuses on voluntary repatriation with safety and dignity and sustainable reintegration in Afghanistan. The repatriation of Afghan refugees in Pakistan, however, has become a state priority due to “declining donor assistance, weak economy, refugee fatigue, and the growing threat of

²⁶ HLM in NY, September 2016, Round table: Global Compact for responsibility sharing for refugees and respect for international law; 4th Thematic Discussion, Panel on Returns

²⁷ HLM in NY, September 2016, Round table: Global Compact for responsibility sharing for refugees and respect for international law; 4th Thematic Discussion, Panel on Returns

²⁸ <http://www.dw.com/en/returning-from-germany-online-portal-to-boost-number-refugees-leaving-voluntarily/a-38797249>

²⁹ Fourth Thematic Discussion Measures to be taken in pursuit of solutions, 14 November 2017

For internal use only

terrorism.” Despite the low rate of crime among the Afghan refugee population, the Pakistani state has associated Afghan refugees and the refugee camps in which they reside to the growing threat of terrorism, making repatriation an urgent matter. Indeed, the Pakistani state’s focus on addressing voluntary repatriation of refugees in protracted refugee situations is clear when observing Pakistan’s preliminary proposals on the zero draft of the Declaration and the Global Compact which focus on the need to emphasize the special conditions set by protracted refugee situations and emphasize the need to prioritize eventual voluntary repatriation to the countries of origin.

However, there is a variance of opinions between refugee-hosting states when it comes to voluntary return; for countries like **Jordan and Lebanon**, safe conditions in countries of origin is not a prerequisite for the return of refugees. Statements from the Jordanian government tend to focus on the need to facilitate voluntary repatriation after the cessation of protection mechanisms in the hosting country; therefore, building the safe conditions for return to the country of origin is secondary to the need for refugees to return. Lebanon carries a similar approach; repatriation is the only durable solution available for Syrians in Lebanon, as they are cautious about local integration of refugees in Lebanon due to their financial and institutional constraints.³⁰ The country, therefore, calls for more international support to prepare countries of origin to create conditions for refugees to be able to return (and without necessarily waiting for the reconstruction of the countries of origin to be complete.³¹) Contrary to other refugee-hosting states that have signed tri-partite agreements, Lebanon officials have stated that return can be facilitated between the country of origin and the hosting country without having a Tri-Partite agreement with UNHCR.³²

Responsibility Sharing

Responsibility sharing from the perspective of refugee-hosting states can be analyzed at two fronts; 1) financial responsibility sharing, and 2) responsibility sharing when it comes to resettling vast number of refugees in other countries.

Chad has noted there is lack of funding from the international community for Chad to continue to support refugees; which leads to greater food insecurity, lack of health services, risk of outbreak of epidemic, lack of access to education, lack of drinking water, and lack of protection for displaced people. Similar concerns were raised by the government of DRC who has stated that the lack of funding support directly affects the implementation of durable solutions, such as the integration and protection of displaced persons.

Statistics on international assistance for refugee-hosting countries and statements from refugee-hosting states demonstrate the magnitude of the problem. The UNHCR Fact Sheet on DRC dating

³⁰ Thematic Discussion 4 Panel 1 on Return

³¹ Thematic Discussion 1 on Resettlement, 10 July 2017

³² Thematic Discussion 4 Panel 1 on Return

For internal use only

September 2017, for example, shows that **DRC** had only met 21% of their funding requirements for the entire year.³³ **Ethiopia**, on the other hand, cited that they only received 25% of the funding required for their operating plan in 2017; thus stating that the international community has not sufficiently financially supported Ethiopia in applying the CRRF. To rectify this, the government of Ethiopia has proposed diversifying funding sources, expanding to non-traditional donor bases, and encourages greater participation from the private sector in meeting funding needs.³⁴ This is similar to the concerns raised by the **Kenyan** government which has called for the international community to make more commitments and provide “predictable” funding³⁵ as there is a need for reliable source for funding to support refugees. Frustrated by the failure of the international community to meet the country’s funding needs, the **Jordanian** government has also remarked on funding that goes towards arm spending in conflicts that cause displacement.³⁶ Jordan stresses the need for the international community to live up to their obligations towards refugees in order to appease the burden on refugee hosting countries. The Jordanian Response Plan (2016-2018), for example, includes specific instructions on financing and building the resilience of Jordanian host communities through grants. These efforts are connected to supporting Jordan’s macroeconomic framework and addressing Jordan’s financial needs.³⁷

Lack of long-term funding and overstretched domestic resources have caused concerns from the perspective of majority of refugee-hosting states, leading countries to make appeals to the international community for years. **Lebanon**, for example, has called for more-equitable burden and responsibility sharing and these principles to be based on international togetherness and solidarity; not on geographical location or proximity. The Lebanese officials have noted that that the state is still looking for other countries’ support to develop and implement its own national plan, as national infrastructures and resources in Lebanon are currently overloaded.³⁸ As an example of this demand, **Lebanon criticized a proposed paper on local solutions during the thematic discussions for the GCR because it lacked any mention to creating an international solidarity system or burden-sharing mechanism, and only proposed providing expertise on funding to the host communities.** From Lebanon’s perspective, such forms of support are insufficient.³⁹ Building on that, refugee-hosting states also believe that long term investment is needed to increase the resilience of host communities. According to a statement **of Turkey** to the First Thematic Discussions in Geneva,

³³ <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/UNHCR%20DRC%20FACTSHEET%20AS%20OF%2031%20SEPTEMBER%202017.pdf>

³⁴ Thematic Discussion 3 Panel 1

³⁵ Thematic Discussion on RS 10 July 2017 - Notes from the Oxfam colleagues in Geneva

³⁶ Crown Prince Hussein at the 72nd General Assembly - http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/72/PV.13

³⁷ Executive Committee of the High Commissioner’s Programme Sixty-Eighth Session, Special segment on the comprehensive refugee response framework, Jordanian National Commission for Women, Geneva, Switzerland, 2 October 2017

³⁸ UNHCR ExCom 2017 - Notes from ICVA

³⁹ Thematic Discussion 4 Panel 4 on Local Solutions

For internal use only

humanitarian aid and assistance should be a long term investment into collective security which is crucial to increase the resilience of host countries and communities.⁴⁰

Germany, as a high-income refugee hosting state, shares sentiments around the lack of a comprehensive responsibility sharing mechanism. In order to promote more equitable responsibility sharing, **Germany proposes that the Programme of Action for more equitable responsibility sharing should do two things:** 1) establish a mechanism which can better assess a country's contribution, as well as the way displacement has affected the hosting country; and 2) establish a core response group which can mobilise the rest of the world in responding to the needs of refugees, especially in light of large scale displacement (which, according to Germany, can be led by UNHCR and representatives from governments, private sector, and NGOs). **In terms of financial responsibility sharing, the German government has also called for more involvement from financial actors like the World Bank in addressing global displacement and called for a capital increase for the institution.**⁴¹ However, it should be noted that this idea can be challenged in the near future as other developing refugee-hosting states may not be open to the idea of borrowing loans for hosting refugees; at the 3rd Thematic Discussion on the Global Compact, for example, the representative of **Pakistan stated that states hosting refugees should not be forced to take out development loans in order to meet their humanitarian and development needs.**⁴²

Governments' position on responsibility sharing demonstrates the importance of developing a mechanism that can take countries' contributions and capacities into consideration. Iran, for example, has called for a responsibility mechanism proportionate to the capacities of the hosting country⁴³; a clear mechanism which facilitates responsibility sharing to make burdens on states as equitable as possible. As a suggestion, the government of Iran has mentioned the need to conduct mapping on responsibility sharing.⁴⁴ **Jordan** shares this sentiment in the sense that has called for responsibility sharing to be balanced based on demography of the hosting country and considers the capacities of the hosting country.⁴⁵

For many refugee-hosting states, financial responsibility sharing does not only help the current situation surrounding refugees, but it also helps build the resilience of communities. During the 2nd Thematic Discussion on the GCR, the **Ugandan** government has commented that having better resources will mean better preparedness for large flows of refugees, as these resources can build the

⁴⁰ Statement of Turkey to the First Thematic Discussion 'Past and current burden and responsibility sharing arrangements' 10 July 2017 Geneva

⁴¹ Thematic Discussion 2 Panel 1

⁴² Third Thematic Discussion on the Global Compact on Refugees, Panel One: How we mobilize more resources. 18 October 2017. Available from: <<http://webtv.un.org/search/panel-one-how-we-mobilize-more-resources-3rd-thematic-discussion-unhcr-global-compact-on-refugees/5614696850001/?term=thematic%20discussions&sort=date&page=1>>.

⁴³ Thematic Discussion 2

⁴⁴ Thematic Discussion 1 on Resettlement, 10 July 2017; Thematic Discussion 3, Panel 1; HLM on Refugees and Migrants in New York in September 2016, Roundtable on RS - official statement; Thematic Discussion 2

⁴⁵ Jordan at ExCom 2017 - Notes from ICVA

For internal use only

local and institutional capacities of the place facing an influx of refugees.⁴⁶ Therefore, financial responsibility sharing should extend to created preparedness contingency plans. At the thematic discussion on responsibility sharing, the **Ethiopian** government has also highlighted the need for not only responsibility sharing, but better long-term building and emergency response planning.⁴⁷ It notes that there must be better responsibility sharing due to the pressure that hosting refugees can cause on countries that are already overstretched.⁴⁸

From a different perspective, some of the other refugee-hosting states are more critical about financial responsibility sharing. **The Permanent Representative of Iran**, for example, stated that “responsibility sharing should not be reduced to financial aspects only as it refers to a broad notion across the full cycle of forced displacement, including prevention, protection, and solutions.”⁴⁹

Third-Country Resettlement and Other Pathways for Admission to third countries

Financial aspects are only a part of the story when it comes to responsibility sharing for many of the refugee hosting-states. Turkey, as the biggest host country of refugees in the world, is an advocate for resettlement as the Turkish government sees resettlement as a tangible form of burden and responsibility sharing. The government supports the idea of open and transparent multiyear resettlement pledging process in order to create a coherent global resettlement response; calling for an increase in the number of resettlement countries and also for an increase in the resettlement quotas.⁵⁰ In the 2016 High Level Meetings in New York, the Lebanese government had also shared a similar sentiment that the international community needed to grow their burden-sharing by increasing their resettlement quotas.⁵¹

In Ethiopia’s view, resettlement provides a valuable opportunity to ‘[unleash] the potential of refugees and is a tool to combat xenophobia, racism, and discrimination.’⁵² According to Ethiopia, the obstacles to resettlement are largely procedural and operational, as resettlement suffers from tedious procedures. To address this concern, Ethiopia calls for more support to be provided to first countries of asylum in order to allow for more conducive resettlement opportunities.⁵³ Furthermore, Ethiopia stated that expanding and investing in complementary pathways, such as family reunification, sponsorship, labor mobility schemes, humanitarian visas, and academic scholarships, are all important for expanding resettlement programs.

⁴⁶ 2nd Thematic Discussion

⁴⁷ Thematic Discussion 1 on Responsibility Sharing, 10 July 2017

⁴⁸ International Dialogue on Migration 2017 - official statement

⁴⁹ Statement by H.E. Dr. Mohsen Naziri Asl, Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran in the High Commissioner’s Dialogue on Protection Challenges: Towards a global compact on refugees, 13 December 2017

⁵⁰ Fourth Thematic Discussion (Measures to be taken in pursuit of solutions, 14 November 2017).

⁵¹ High Level Meeting in New York on Refugees and Migrants, September 2016

http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/71/PV.4B

⁵² Thematic Discussion 4 Panel 2

⁵³ Thematic Discussion 4 Panel 2

For internal use only

Hosting refugees and providing resettlement opportunities, for many refugee-hosting states such as Germany, is seen as a form of responsibility-sharing.⁵⁴ The German government has highlighted the urgent need to increase the global quotas for resettlement; as the current co-chair of the Annual Tripartite Consultation on Resettlement in 2018, the government is planning to discuss new pathways for development procedures for resettlement.⁵⁵ Germany sees a need to expand complementary pathways for resettlement, such as through family reunification and allowing for labor mobility in order to reduce the number of asylum seekers stranded in transit countries and and reduce irregular migration.⁵⁶ The Ugandan government has tied responsibility sharing to answering demands for resettlement; the government has said that resettlement is a means for responsibility sharing for countries which do not share ‘frontiers’ or borders with countries in conflict.⁵⁷

Externalization of resettlement policies has led to the creation of various alternative agreements between countries. Member states of the EU (France, Italy, Spain, and Germany), for example, have coordinated a new plan with the government of Chad, Niger, and Libya to establish asylum processing centers in the three African countries. France has committed to taking 3,000 asylum seekers through these centers. The plan was formed so that the EU could deter people from migrating irregularly across the Mediterranean under the exchange of development finance for Chad.⁵⁸

Root causes

Refugee hosting states place a great emphasis on resolving the root causes of displacement. The government of Chad, for example stated that any approach to supporting refugees must “take action aimed at the root of the evil rather than limiting ourselves to addressing the consequences.”⁵⁹ Tackling root causes has also been voiced by countries like DRC, who highlighted the importance of having concerted efforts to resolve the root causes of displacement which are described as “poverty, armed conflicts, and the lack of resilience to disasters”; according to the government, addressing root causes will also help in achieving the objectives set out in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Ethiopia shares a similar concern as the country calls for creating development programs to address root causes of displacement and implementing the SDGs to build the resilience of countries of origin.

Underlining the importance of tackling root causes of displacement, some countries have started to dedicate more resources to initiatives on preventing large-scale displacement. Starting in 2014, the German Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development ministry has provided

⁵⁴ UNHCR ExCom 2017, 2 October 2017

⁵⁵ Thematic Discussion 4 Panel 2 on Expanding Resettlement; UNHCR ExCom 2017, Notes from ICVA

⁵⁶ UNHCR ExCom 2017, Notes from ICVA

⁵⁷ Minister for Relief, Disaster Preparedness and Refugees. *Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework in the context of Uganda’s Refugee Management Model*, 2 October 2017

⁵⁸ http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_STATEMENT-17-2981_fr.htm

⁵⁹ http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/71/PV.4B

For internal use only

development funding towards initiatives that tackle the root causes of displacement, such as the “Tackling Root Causes of Displacement, Reintegration of Refugees” initiative, the Stability and Development in the MENA region” initiative, and the “ONE WORLD - No Hunger” initiative.

For refugee-hosting states that place a greater emphasis on voluntary repatriation as a durable solution, addressing root causes becomes more important. The State Minister for the Affairs of the Displaced of Lebanon has noted that there is not sufficient attention on addressing root causes, stating, “we are not addressing the root causes. This is where our collective efforts to have a contingency plan for future conflicts is important...we need to preempt conflict.”⁶⁰

Section 4b: Civil Society Positions

Understanding local needs, promoting local leadership, and taking contextual differences into consideration was an important point that was raised by civil society organizations in international policy discussions on durable solutions. Within the NGO Key Messages for the 10th High Commissioner’s Dialogue on Protection Challenges, the International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA) called for the UNHCR “to foster localized approaches and better engage local actors and communities in looking for durable solutions to ensure ownership, local relevance and social cohesion for locally led and relevant solutions.”⁶¹ Within the same report, NGOs also called for regional level initiatives (like IGAD Nairobi Declaration) to be supported.

As a national civil society organization in Lebanon, **ALEF act for human rights**, has called for the decentralization of decision making with regards to the refugee response and allow local governments and communities to identify needs and design responses. This is also to ensure that programs are designed in a manner to prevent conflicts between host communities and refugees; **according to ALEF, “one solution-fits-all approach will tend to create further resentment among communities which are the ‘first-responders’ to the crisis.”**⁶² Taking contextual differences into consideration when developing and implementing policies for refugees has been highlighted by civil society organizations across the spectrum especially when it comes to understanding how the Programme of Action, for example, could be applied in various refugee-hosting countries. **The Action for the Needy, a national NGO based in Ethiopia**, has called for clarification as to “how” the Programme of Action could be designed and implemented within a given context defined by set of cultural beliefs and practices.⁶³

⁶⁰ Mouin Merhebi, State Minister for the Affairs of the Displaced, Lebanon.

<http://www.unhcr.org/news/latest/2017/7/5964977c4/action-needed-share-responsibility-refugees.html>

⁶¹ NGO Key Messages for the 10th High Commissioner’s Dialogue on Protection Challenges

<http://www.unhcr.org/events/conferences/5a33d5917/ngo-key-messages-tenth-high-commissioners-dialogue-protection-challenges.html>

⁶² <http://www.unhcr.org/events/conferences/5a0abf1f7/written-contribution-alef-act-human-rights-lebanon-thematic-discussion.html>

⁶³ <http://www.unhcr.org/events/conferences/5a562f517/preeminence-cultural-competence-programme-design-implementation.html>

For internal use only

With regards to civil society reactions to the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework, NGOs have also called for the CRRF planning to focus on measures that would increase self-reliance of refugees and integrated programming which would need to factor in considerations around economic, social, and environmental components.⁶⁴ As done by some of the major-refugee hosting states, NGOs also call for integrating displacement and durable solutions into national development programs and integrate the voices of refugees and returnees in key areas like health, education, and good governance.

Understanding the grievances and issues faced by host communities is also being reflected by some civil society organizations in different parts of the World, a common issue that has been voiced by many governments in refugee-hosting states. According to a report by Caritas, host communities in Uganda face growing issues like competition for limited resources and social services, increased cost of living, infrastructure degradation, as well as questions over the sustainability of support given to host communities.⁶⁵

With regards to finding durable solutions, some of the national civil society organizations located in refugee-hosting states have raised concerns regarding the encampment of refugees. During the World Humanitarian Summit, **the Refugee Consortium Kenya** has raised the issue of refugees living in camps for more than 20 years with “no decent form of living and no durable solutions.” According to the statement, resettlement quotas have been limited and local integration has not been an option.⁶⁶ The repatriation of refugees back to their countries following the close down of two refugee camps in Kenya has also raised concerns among civil society organization who considered the decision as “misguided and poorly timed.”⁶⁷ Similar concerns were raised by the Norwegian Refugee Council in Ethiopia which stated that “self-reliance” of in-camp refugees was identified as an issue area which left refugees without any durable solution to look at in the camps.⁶⁸

When it comes to resettlement, civil society organizations, particularly international NGOs, have been trying to lobby against governments to increase their resettlement numbers. As an example, Care called for the international community and donor states to expand resettlement to demonstrate that they are willing to share the burden fairly back in 2016.⁶⁹ Again in the same year, a coalition of INGOs also called for the European countries, including the UK, to “urgently develop and increase safe and

⁶⁴ NGO Key Messages for the 10th High Commissioner's Dialogue on Protection Challenges

<http://www.unhcr.org/events/conferences/5a33d5917/ngo-key-messages-tenth-high-commissioners-dialogue-protection-challenges.html>

⁶⁵ <http://www.unhcr.org/events/conferences/5a5779927/presentation-christine-laura-okello-caritas-uganda-thematic-discussion.html>

⁶⁶ https://www.rckkenya.org/?media_dl=846

⁶⁷ <https://kituo-chasheria.wordpress.com/2016/05/18/kituo-cha-sheria-expresses-disapproval-of-the-governments-decision-to-close-down-refugee-camps-and-the-department-of-refugee-affairs/>

⁶⁸ Samuel Hall/ NRC Report "Living out of Camp" <http://samuelhall.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Living-Out-of-Camp-Alternative-to-Camp-based-Assistance-in-Ethiopia.pdf>

⁶⁹ <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/2016AssessmentoftheSituationofUrbanSyrianRefugees%26VulnerablJordanians-FullReport.pdf>

For internal use only

legal routes to their territories, including via resettlement, humanitarian visas and expanded application of family reunification schemes.⁷⁰ On the other side of the Atlantic, against the rising trend of politicians and policies trying to prevent refugee flows and decrease resettlement numbers, the **Refugee Congress in the US** has reached out to its constituents to call their representatives in the Congress and demand the US government to “make sure that the US welcomes each and every one of the 45,000 refugees who were promised to resettle...”⁷¹

State-level discussions on when/how to process voluntary returns was discussed in the previous section; many civil society organizations, including refugee-led, national, and international organizations, believe that insecurity within countries of origin can hinder the intentional and voluntary returns of refugees; those who stay after returning can be exposed to insecurity and anxiety, thus face poor infrastructure and poor living conditions.⁷² The Somalia NGO Consortium, for example, has stated that limited or lack of livelihood opportunities in Somalia can dishearten refugees’ willingness to return and settle back in Somalia. This concern was also highlighted by the INGO Consortium who stated that refugees living in Nigeria and Lake Chad Basin were only willing to return under certain conditions (such as guarantees of security and assurance that they will have safety, access to basic services, as well as livelihood opportunities), adding that “displaced people should not be encouraged to return where service providers and local authorities have not.”⁷³ On the other hand, **ARDD, a national civil society organization in Jordan**, called the European Union to stop readmission or removal of people to third countries and violate fundamental rights and rule of law, including the principle of *non-refoulement*.⁷⁴

In terms of developing long-term planning to address issues faced by refugees around the world, some civil society organizations highlight the need to have sustainable funding for their operations. During UNHCR Thematic Discussions, **the Norwegian Refugee Council in Kenya** has called for “better predictability and a forward-looking approach” within the Global Compact on Refugees, especially when it comes to understanding how issues like climate change affect the resilience of refugees.⁷⁵ Resilience of refugees is often highlighted by host community organizations as well. Action for the Needy has made positive remarks about the New York Declaration in the sense that it “focuses not only on humanitarian but also on development efforts with a vision to move the needle from encampment to entitlement and empowerment of refugees with a trajectory towards resilience and self-reliance.”⁷⁶

⁷⁰ <https://www.refugeecouncil.org.uk/assets/0003/7446/bn-safe-haven-140416-en.pdf>

⁷¹ https://docs.google.com/document/d/1lJZszPmqdPX_hxMCYSuEVxD-mwAQBUD1HGZUiKwSiCw/edit

⁷² Somalia NGO Consortium. <http://somalianoconsortium.org/download/578571d68fc12>

⁷³ <https://www.refugeesinternational.org/advocacy-letters-1/2017/2/16/nigeria>

⁷⁴ https://ardd-jo.org/sites/default/files/resource-files/0607_final_joint_ngo_statement_with_signatories.pdf

⁷⁵ <http://www.unhcr.org/events/conferences/5a13f4577/statement-norwegian-refugee-council-thematic-discussion-five-panels.html>

⁷⁶ <http://www.unhcr.org/events/conferences/5a562f517/preeminence-cultural-competence-programme-design-implementation.html>

For internal use only

Building resilience of communities is related to some of the focus on addressing the root causes of displacement. According to a statement made by the INGO consortium on durable solutions for current displacement surrounding Nigeria and Lake Chad Basin, building resilience and addressing long term solutions were identified as policy recommendation. Underlining the effects of a range of crisis and hazards, including conflict, climate change, environmental degradation, deep-rooted poverty, joblessness, and lack of good governance, the consortium stated that while maintaining humanitarian assistance and meeting urgent needs, it was also crucial “to tackle the underlying causes of the conflict.”⁷⁷

Consultation with Civil Society Organizations

According to the findings of the international consultation process that was carried out as preparation for the International refugee congress, , priorities and needs of refugees underlined in policy papers and advocacy positions worldwide are parallel to the perspectives of refugee-led, national, international, and women’s organizations highlighted throughout the consultation process.

“Access to durable solutions” was identified as one of the policy priorities across countries and different organization types in the analysis of the consultation process⁷⁸. **Respondents from the major refugee hosting countries in general cited issues affecting their workforce and society to be higher policy priorities than other countries**, perhaps reflecting the importance of such issues for integration and the general wellbeing of their country’s populations. In particular, issues such as child labour, access to education, and social cohesion and harmony represent domestic issues of particular concern to major refugee hosting countries compared to other countries.

According to the analysis surrounding the online and face-to-face consultations⁷⁹, expectations for international community differ starkly from those for national governments. Responsibility sharing was cited as the top expectation and was also echoed in the second highest cited expectation to increase resettlement. International community is expected to support host countries and address the individual needs of host countries, an expectation that likely reflects host countries’ need for funding and different forms of support. This was further highlighted in expectations such as monitoring funding and resource management and financial responsibility sharing. Overall, macro expectations such as addressing the root causes of displacement and finding solutions are placed on international bodies rather than on national governments, which instead are tasked with providing different forms of access in order to support the lives of refugees rather than finding an end to the conflict that created them. When asked about the least well-addressed policy issues, the respondents identified root causes as one of the main issues that has not been properly addressed by national and international policy makers.

⁷⁷ <https://www.refugeesinternational.org/advocacy-letters-1/2017/2/16/nigeria>

⁷⁸ Based on the consultation report, to be finalized in March 2018.

⁷⁹ Ibis.

For internal use only

Section 3c: What is missing? Comparison of international, national, and civil society positions

One of the most discussed issues surrounding refugees and displaced people is resettlement. On this highly politicized issue, no specific mechanism or quota is recommended to systematically implement resettlement programs between refugee-hosting states and third countries. While this is one of the primary priorities of refugee-hosting states, no specific detail has been shared within discussions around the global compact or international frameworks. The Compact often *encourages* states to take action and mentions the possibility of establishing a resettlement group to facilitate a coordinated response.

Voluntary returns and repatriation remains a contested topic, as well as local integration. According to UNHCR documents and international frameworks, one of the widely covered topics is about returns and repatriation; according to UNHCR itself, return remains as the most preferred option for refugees. And for some refugee-hosting states, voluntary return is also the most viable long-term solution. But the question as to *when* and *who* should ensure physical, social, and economic well-being of returned refugees in their country of origin remains as a blurred area. While the Global Compact puts the responsibility of improving the conditions for refugees on the shoulders of the countries of origin, some of the refugee-hosting states do not necessarily prioritize improving the conditions to facilitate the return of refugees. Hence, there is an important question to be answered in terms of clarifying *when* returns should take place, *who* should be responsible for facilitating repatriation and returns, and *what* conditions need to take place to ensure safety of refugees in this process.

Addressing root causes is only mentioned briefly in the international frameworks, especially the Global Compact for Refugees. This is especially interesting when one considers the official statements made by many of the major-refugee hosting states and their strong focus on resolving the root causes of displacement as a priority.

Section 4: Guiding Questions for the Durable Solutions Working Group

Questions written below aim to stir discussions for the Durable Solutions Group as the group members embark on their journey to develop policy recommendations ahead of the International Refugee Congress. The list is not exhaustive; the WG members are encouraged to discuss issue areas as they see fit and relevant.

- When looking at state positions, it can be seen that countries have different priorities and stands when it comes to defining durable solutions for refugees. As civil society organizations, what do you think should be the priorities of states when it comes to providing durable solutions for refugees?
- What conditions (if any) should be met for facilitating voluntary returns for refugees? How should this process be facilitated? Are bilateral agreements between governments sufficient to facilitate the process, if not, what kind of agreements/protocols should be in place to

For internal use only

implement this process? What other stakeholders should be involved in ensuring safe and dignified voluntary repatriation?

- Resettlement is seen as a part of responsibility sharing by countries. What do you think should be done to promote a better resettlement scheme for refugees? What other measures can be included in responsibility sharing beyond resettlement and financial support? How should responsibility sharing should be organized and monitored?
- Integration is a term that has been discussed in policy circles for decades. What should integration policies entail? Beyond acceding to the 1951 Convention Relating to the status of Refugees, what can relevant stakeholders do to ensure local integration?
- What do you think should be done to promote and enhance host community-refugee relations in major refugee hosting states? What should different stakeholders do to enhance these relations?