



Fifth Round of Formal Consultations
on the Draft Three of the Global Compact on Refugees
Geneva, 12-13 June 2018
STATEMENTS OF LEBANON

Item 2: Mechanisms of burden and responsibility sharing:

- We would like to thank the UNHCR for the GCR new draft that it has provided us with.
- We do believe that the success of the mechanism of burden and responsibility sharing as proposed by the GCR new draft, hinges on a smooth interaction between all those layers.
- The smooth and efficient interaction of the layers will constitute a litmus test for the international community, to indicate if it is living up to the principle of burden and responsibility sharing.
- Needless to say that if the GCR fails to prompt greater solidarity, more commitment and burden sharing, it will constitute one additional blow to multilateralism.
- We cannot preempt how the GCR implementation phase could look like, but we cannot help feeling certain unease in front of the lack of predictability in funding humanitarian and development efforts that we still sense in the GCR new draft, and that we have already underpinned in previous statements.
- When we go through the mechanisms of burden and responsibility sharing as crafted in the GCR new draft, we still have the same concerns that we have already expressed during the previous round of consultations.
- We still think that convening a high level refugees' forum every 4 years doesn't measure up with the urgent aspects of refugees' crisis. If this forum doesn't take place more regularly, any momentum, how much strong, could easily wane.
- On the same issue, in paragraph 18, we would like to seek the replacement of "different forms" by "complementary forms" of pledges and contributions.
- At a later stage in the text, we sense the fine tuning of the GCR new draft about the complementarity that should be pursued between the three pillars of the GCR: the humanitarian funding, the development action and the private sector contributions.
- Seen on paper, paragraph 32 is of paramount importance, and its formulation in the new GCR new draft could foreshadow some positive outcomes. Nevertheless, and once again, final verdict should be reserved to once the paragraph will start to be translated into reality.
- We agree with the GCR new draft that part B should be read in light with part A and what is proposes in terms of mechanisms of burden and responsibility sharing.

- As important as it is, paragraph 49 states the obvious, that the conditions of the success of the part B implementation hinging “on robust and well functioning mechanisms of burden and responsibility sharing.” Once again, this is what still needs to be seen, during the implementation phase, after the GCR is adopted.
- We commend the efforts made by the UNHCR to integrate the host countries requests in the new draft, by making part B less prescriptive, at least in tone. Nevertheless, we still sense that the GCR new draft contains more obligations and demands on host countries, for a bigger and more sophisticated support to refugees. And this is an aspect that we still don’t feel comfortable with.
- The GCR new draft tries to overcome this by a systematic mention to the contributions in resources and expertise that States, international organizations and other relevant stakeholders would contribute, in support of host countries. Even if attractive on paper, we still need to see how these ideas will translate into reality.
- Meanwhile, we would like to state that host countries are already overstretched providing, to a large extent, what is extensively detailed in part B, within the limits of available resources.
- In the same vein, we welcome the clear emphasis, throughout part B, on the fact that any cooperation should be made at the request of States concerned by large movements of refugees, and that the process should be kept under their national control leadership.
- While we still welcome the multi-stakeholders approach, we do not take for granted that faith-based organizations will play the role entitled to them in the GCR, especially in the support they could provide to “complementary pathways for admission to third countries.”
- We would seek the deletion of all the new references to tolerance towards refugees in the new draft. We think this word has negative sounds. So insisting on the need to “combat all kinds of discrimination” and “promoting peaceful coexistence”, as the GCR is already stating, suffice to serve the purpose.
- In paragraph 34, and in all other relevant paragraphs, we would seek the deletion of the mention to the inclusion of refugees in institutions and decision-making processes.
- In paragraph 37, we do sense that the second part of the sentence about recruitment of local personnel by humanitarian and development agencies sounds “patronizing” and giving the impression that local personnel is less qualified.
- In paragraph 53, the sentence reads: “UNHCR will strengthen support to host countries by sharing information on the movement of people of concern, where appropriate.” Shouldn’t this be the rule? So why use the formula “when appropriate”?

Item 3: Solutions:

- Since the release of the first draft of the GCR, we note with interest how the whole text has been reformulated, in a way that places the achievement of durable solutions, and especially the repatriation of refugees to their countries of origin, as our common main target.
- More specifically, we also note with satisfaction the way the part dedicated to solutions has gradually and substantially evolved.
- Since durable solutions are of major importance for Lebanon, we appreciate the efforts that the UNHCR deployed, in order to go that far in incorporating our concerns, especially in paragraph 87.
- We think that the GCR new draft is going in the right direction by clearly acknowledging that, sometimes, refugees can voluntarily return to their countries of origin, outside the context of formal repatriation programmes. Such waves of return can definitely ease the burden on host countries.
- In this context, the GCR new draft rightfully reflects the need for the international community's support to host countries during the repatriation phase, as well as to countries of origin, with their consent and close cooperation.
- On resettlement, we are still waiting to see how the GCR will bring a surge in resettlement efforts as a clear sign of the international community's commitment, especially since resettlement is both a durable solution and a burden and responsibility sharing tool.
- We do think what the new draft is still missing, is giving resettlement the position it deserves, as a cross-cutting issue throughout the GCR text.
- The GCR new draft should be able to focus on the need to expand the number of resettlement countries. This should make the GCR live up to a major principle of the international cooperation, which is universality.
- In this spirit, we would like to go back to the whole text of the GCR and suggest the following changes:
 - In paragraph 23, we would suggest the addition of the notion of resettlement as one of the tasks allocated to the Global Support Platform.
 - In paragraph 24, we would also seek the addition of the need for large-scale resettlement movements, as a response to large-scale refugees' crisis.
 - In paragraph 27, solidarity conference should also have to think into large-scale resettlement opportunities.
 - In paragraph 29 on regional and sub-regional approaches, we should be able to work towards more opportunities of regional and sub-regional resettlement.
 - More globally, we need to see in the GCR draft a step change in resettlement capabilities. The GCR draft should be able to address specific situations where large scale resettlement would be needed to solve large-scale refugee's crisis and to ease the burden on host countries.

Item 4: Follow up arrangements:

- We fully support UNHCR in its future role in following up on the GCR implementation, after its adoption.
- We trust that UNHCR will deploy all its efforts in order to ensure the mobilization of all States, in a spirit of universal cooperation.
- In that sense, we do also believe that huge efforts should be dedicated for keeping a strong momentum around the GCR implementation, and especially for addressing symptoms of donors' fatigue.
- But as we note in the new draft the complete deletion of the mention to indicators, we would like to ask about the alternative tools that the UNHCR will rely on, in order to measure the impact of the GCR implementation.
- On a more global level, we would like to have more clarification on potential plans to enhance the UNHCR's technical capacities, in order for the Organization to be able to fulfill the additional task of triggering and monitoring the GCR implementation.