UNHCR
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
Haut Commissariat des Nations Unies pour les réfugiés

60 YEARS • ANS

Expert Meeting on International Cooperation to Share Burdens and Responsibilities

Amman, Jordan, 27 and 28 June 2011

Summary Conclusions

The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) convened an Expert Meeting on International Cooperation to Share Burdens and Responsibilities in Amman, Jordan, on 27 and 28 June 2011.

This expert meeting is one in a series of events organized to mark the 60th anniversary of the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees.[1] Participants included 23 experts drawn from governments, non-governmental organizations, policy institutes, academia and international organizations. A discussion paper was prepared by UNHCR.[2]

Building on the conclusions of the 2010 High Commissioner's Dialogue on Protection Challenges: "Protection Gaps and Responses" ("High Commissioner's Dialogue"),[3] the purpose of this expert meeting was to explore ways in which international cooperation to address refugee challenges could be enhanced. In particular, the development of a *framework on international cooperation*, consisting of *a set of understandings* and an *operational toolbox* was considered. As a starting point, and in order to provide a foundation for this framework, the focus was on taking stock of existing cooperative arrangements to develop a better understanding of their elements and lessons learned.

These Summary Conclusions do not necessarily represent the individual views of participants or UNHCR, but reflect broadly the themes and understandings emerging from the discussion.

Part A summarizes some preliminary understandings of the concept of "international cooperation". Part B brings together common elements and lessons learned from past cooperative arrangements to address different refugee situations. Part C recommends some initial elements that could make up a *framework on international cooperation*. Part D provides input regarding the role of UNHCR in cooperative arrangements. To capture the richness of the discussion in the four working groups, a summary report is provided in Annex I. The agenda for the meeting and the list of participants are contained in Annexes II and III respectively.

---

[1] For more information and documentation relating to the 2011 Commemorations see: UNHCR, *Commemorating the Refugee and Statelessness Conventions*, www.unhcr.org/commemorations. All documents from the expert meeting will also be available at UNHCR, *Expert Meetings*, http://www.unhcr.org/pages/4d22f95f6.html.

[2] UNHCR, *International Cooperation to Share Burden and Responsibilities: Discussion Paper*, June 2011, http://www.unhcr.org/4df871e69.html.

[3] UNHCR, *Breakout Session 2: International cooperation, burden sharing and comprehensive regional approaches - Report by the Co-Chairs*, 8 December 2010, http://www.unhcr.org/4d09e4e09.html. See also UNHCR, *High Commissioner's Closing Remarks, 2010 Dialogue on Protection Gaps and Responses, 9 December 2010*, http://www.unhcr.org/4d0732389.html.

A. Understanding "International Cooperation"

1. The need for international cooperation is a pressing issue for many governments, regardless of whether they are origin, host or destination countries. The focus on "international cooperation", rather than other terms such as "responsibility sharing", "burden sharing" or "international solidarity", was welcomed. It was felt that a lengthy discussion on terminology (especially on the merits of "burden" versus "responsibility" sharing), at the expense of making concrete progress on enhancing cooperation in practice, needs to be avoided. However, some further clarification of the meaning and scope of "international cooperation" in the refugee context would be useful, not least to ensure that all stakeholders share a common understanding.

2. Some tenets of "international cooperation" were identified during the meeting. International cooperation is an underlying principle of international law, stemming from the Charter of the United Nations.[4] The 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and other instruments also place particular emphasis on the need for international cooperation in light of the international scope and nature of refugee challenges.[5] These instruments, however, do not specify how international cooperation is to be implemented in practice.

3. International cooperation is best understood as a principle and methodology. It can be manifested in many forms, including material, technical or financial assistance, as well as physical relocation of asylum-seekers and refugees.

4. Cooperation is, however, not to be used as a pretext for burden shifting or to avoid international obligations.

B. Stocktaking: Elements and Lessons Learned

5. In exploring how international cooperation to address refugee challenges can be enhanced, it is important to build on lessons learned from past examples and to adopt a concrete and practical approach. Past and present cooperative arrangements to address four situations were considered in separate working groups: larger-scale situations (including mass influx), protracted refugee situations, rescue at sea emergencies involving asylum-seekers and refugees, and mixed movements and

---

[4] *The Charter of the United Nations*, Articles 1, 13, 55 and 56, http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/index.shtml (UN Charter); *Declaration of Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation Among States in Accordance with the Charter of the United Nations*, 24 October 1970, 4th Principle, http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/3dda1f104.html.

[5] Preamble, *1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees*, entered into force 22 April 1954, and the *1967 Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees*, entered into force 4 October 1957, http://www.unhcr.org/protect/PROTECTION/3b66c2aa10.pdf (1951 Convention). For a summary of references to international cooperation in other relevant international and regional instruments see: UNHCR, *International Cooperation to Share Burden and Responsibilities: Discussion Paper*, June 2011, http://www.unhcr.org/4df871e69.html, footnotes 2 and 3. For a summary of UNHCR Executive Committee Conclusions on international cooperation, including burden and responsibility sharing and international solidarity, see: UNHCR, *A Thematic Compilation of Executive Committee Conclusions (4th edition)*, August 2009, http://www.unhcr.org/3d4ab3ff2.html, pp. 38-62.

refugee protection (including irregular onward movements).[6] In practice these situations are not mutually exclusive and may overlap and blend into each other.

6. Some common elements and lessons learned that were identified across all situations are summarized below.

Cooperative Arrangements – some elements and lessons learned

- Clear ownership and political leadership by states, as well as adequate follow up and monitoring arrangements, can assist to ensure that cooperative arrangements are sustainable.

- Cooperative arrangements can provide for differentiated contributions by interested states, according to needs and capacities. This can be a good way to incentivize cooperation and create political momentum.

- Early involvement of countries of origin can be valuable, where appropriate. Caution is required to ensure that this does not limit protection space or create a risk of *refoulement*.

- Preparedness, management and partnerships are important. Establishing pre-existing "pools" of funds or resources can ensure that responses are timely and effective, while not limiting flexibility and adaptability to the specific circumstances. Such "pools" could include funds (e.g., European Refugee Fund) or pledges of additional resettlement places that may be drawn on in emergencies.

- Close cooperation among stakeholders, including regular communication, can support effective implementation of cooperative arrangements. Stakeholders may include countries of origin, host states, states outside the region, UNHCR and other international organizations, non-governmental organizations, and affected refugee and host communities. Interagency cooperation on the basis of complementarity of mandates and responsibilities is to be encouraged.

- Cooperative arrangements may be incorporated into or build on existing regional processes and/or go beyond refugee protection issues, where useful, as long as adequate protection safeguards are included.

- UNHCR has played a central role in triggering and supporting cooperative arrangements, including through leadership (see Part D below).

[6] A summary of the discussion in each of the working groups is contained in Annex I.

C. Looking Ahead: A *Framework* on International Cooperation

7. The development of a *common framework on international cooperation to share burdens and responsibilities* could be a practical next step to explore the ways in which cooperation can be enhanced. The framework could be made up of (1) *a set of understandings* on international cooperation; (2) *an operational toolbox* to facilitate the conclusion of bilateral and multilateral agreements.

I. *Set of Understandings*

8. A *set of understandings*, building on the initial suggestions indicated in the box below, would support the framing of specific cooperative arrangements.[7]

Set of Understandings – some preliminary suggestions

- The objective of cooperative arrangements is to enhance available protection space, including prospects for durable solutions for refugees.
- International cooperation is a complement to states' protection responsibilities and not a substitute for them. Cooperative arrangements share, and do not shift, burdens and responsibilities between and among states.
- Cooperative arrangements reflect a common approach and take into account the particular interests of and challenges for all states implicated and engaged.
- Cooperative arrangements are guided by general principles, such as international cooperation, humanity and dignity, and must be in line with international refugee and human rights law.
- Cooperative arrangements take into account the autonomy of individual asylum-seekers and refugees to the extent possible, especially where they involve physical relocation.
- Successful cooperative arrangements are adapted to the specific situation to be addressed.
- States remain responsible for meeting their international obligations and cannot devolve this responsibility to international organizations or NGOs through cooperative arrangements. The involvement of international organizations and NGOs in cooperative arrangements is important, but the nature and extent of this involvement will depend on the circumstances.

[7] The preliminary points outlined here may be supplemented by additional understandings, including with respect to specific situations, as well as further clarification on terminology.

II. *Operational Toolbox*

9. The goal of the *operational toolbox* would be to provide a set of templates, actions and instruments that may be drawn on to develop cooperative arrangements to address particular situations.

Operational Toolbox – some preliminary suggestions

- **Compendium of practical examples**: this could ensure that stakeholders are aware of previous cooperative arrangements to address a range of situations, their elements and lessons learned.

- **Further guidance on temporary protection**: this would clarify the nature and scope of temporary protection schemes, relevant international legal standards, and the protection safeguards to be employed.

- **Humanitarian evacuation or resettlement arrangements**: the development of a checklist or standard operating procedures with important considerations and lessons learned from previous experiences could facilitate future arrangements.

- **Sample regional cooperation framework**: this could provide an overview of some elements to consider in addressing, e.g., mixed movements and refugee protection, as part of a regional approach.[8]

- **Sample framework for cooperation in distress at sea situations**: this could outline the rights and obligations of the various actors involved, international standards, and protection safeguards. It could also establish a mechanism for allocating responsibilities between and among states (e.g, differentiating between responsibilities for rescue, disembarkation, processing, and the provision of solutions).

- **Sample readmission agreements**: these would be useful for addressing irregular onward movements. They could emphasise the international standards that apply in the event of transfer of responsibility for processing asylum claims, as well as the importance of including readmission as part of a broader cooperative arrangement to address the causes of irregular onward movements.

[8] For instance, building on the "10-Point Plan of Action": UNHCR, *Refugee Protection and Mixed Migration: A 10-Point Plan of Action*, 2007, http://www.unhcr.org/4742a30b4.html or along the lines of the "Regional Cooperation Framework" developed in the South-East Asia region: UNHCR, *Regional Cooperative Approach to Address Refugees, Asylum-Seekers and Irregular Movements*, November 2010, http://www.baliprocess.net/files/Regional%20Cooperation%20Approach%20Discussion%20document%20-%20final.pdf.

D. UNHCR's Role

10. UNHCR plays an important role in enhancing international cooperation between and among states to address refugee challenges. Some of the suggested ways that UNHCR could contribute have been summarised below.

Role of UNHCR – some suggestions

- UNHCR could, for example, act as a broker to facilitate cooperation between and among states (including through a high level diplomatic role). One possibility could be for the Office to develop a roster of high-level envoys, including both current and former UNHCR officials. It is necessary to continue to build the capacities of UNHCR staff in mediation and political negotiation.

- UNHCR could play an operational role in specific cooperative arrangements, depending on the nature of the agreement and whether or not the Office is a party. UNHCR's role could include: providing emergency assistance and relief (particularly during mass influx situations); carrying out registration, mandate refugee status determination, or monitoring operations; or serving as secretariat.

- The Office would, however, not be involved in cooperative arrangements where this would be seen as devolution of state responsibility to UNHCR or contribute to a shrinking of protection space.

- UNHCR could continue to develop templates and practices to facilitate cooperative arrangements, and draw attention to past successful experiences in different regions, as well as lessons learned.

ANNEX I
Summary of Working Group Discussions

This annex provides a summary of the discussion in the four working groups. Each working group considered cooperative arrangements to address a particular refugee situation: larger-scale situations (including mass influx); protracted refugee situations; rescue at sea emergencies involving asylum-seekers and refugees; and refugee protection and mixed movements.

I. Working Group 1: Larger-Scale Situations (including Mass Influx)

1. The term "larger-scale situations" is used to refer to situations ranging from "mass influx"[9] to steady but relatively high number of arrivals over time. Such larger-scale situations may involve primarily asylum-seekers and refugees, but they can also consist of "mixed movements". Understanding the context, including the causes of flight and the profiles of persons arriving in the territory of host state(s), is a crucial first step in order to tailor responses, including in relation to calls for international cooperation and assistance.

2. Larger-scale situations are dynamic, and can change rapidly. They can also turn into protracted situations (see Working Group 2). Early cooperation to ease the pressure on frontier states is important. Taking advantage of momentum in the early stages of a crisis is also key to garnering international attention and support in the longer term. It is useful to establish pre-existing frameworks for cooperation and burden sharing, including, for example, "pools" of emergency funding, humanitarian evacuation or resettlement places. Emergency evacuation or resettlement is best coupled with expedited processing and security clearances to arrange for speedy departures (e.g., UNHCR's Global Solidarity Resettlement Initiative for North Africa).[10] The need for evacuation platforms of a larger capacity than the current emergency facilities in Romania and Slovakia was also mentioned.[11]

3. The autonomy and choice of the refugee is to be taken into account to the extent possible in the operationalization of cooperative emergency responses, particularly where these involve physical relocation. One important aspect of this is the provision of proper information about the particular programme and associated rights to those affected.

---

[9] "Mass influx" is generally understood to involve considerable numbers of persons arriving over an international border; a rapid rate of arrival; inadequate absorption or response capacity in host states, particularly during the emergency phase; and individual asylum procedures, where they exist, are unable to deal with the assessment of such large numbers: UNHCR, "Ensuring International Protection and Enhancing International Cooperation in Mass Influx Situations", EC/54/SC/CRP.11, 7 June 2004, para. 3, http://www.unhcr.org/40c70c5310.html.

[10] Under the Global Resettlement Solidarity Initiative in response to North Africa, resettlement states were called upon to consider contributing a first target number of 8,000 places, rising to possibly 20,000 if needs should demand. The primary aims of the Global Resettlement Initiative are to alleviate the burden on the frontier states of Egypt and Tunisia, and to provide durable solutions for refugees in protracted situations in Egypt. See further http://www.unhcr.org/4e11735e6.html.

[11] For further information see: UNCHR, *Guidance Note on Emergency Transit Facilities*, 4 May 2011, http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/pdfid/4dddec3a2.pdf.

4. While border closures have been used by some receiving states to trigger cooperation and attention from other countries in the face of large numbers of arrivals, they have regularly had longer-term costs, not least in terms of state credibility. It was underlined that an absence of international cooperation does not allow states to avoid their international obligations to asylum-seekers, refugees and other persons in need of international protection.

5. In some cases, temporary protection schemes could be one component of a cooperative approach to address certain larger-scale situations. The term "temporary protection" refers to short-term emergency protection schemes employed in situations of "mass influx" of asylum-seekers. This should not be used to undermine existing obligations or compromise international standards. But it may be particularly apposite in countries that are not party to the 1951 Convention and/or other relevant instruments. Temporary protection schemes could also be usefully employed where the nature of the protection needs or the volatility of the situation calls for a time-bound response, at least initially. Temporary protection was considered generally inappropriate in situations that have their roots in long-standing conflicts or events, and where return to the country of origin is not likely in the short-term. Its continuing suitability as a protection tool in a particular situation calls for constant monitoring. The scope and implementation of temporary protection schemes as part of cooperative arrangements requires further development, not least the need for a better understanding of the differences between national, regional and international schemes as well as the relationship between temporary protection and existing international standards.

II. Working Group 2: Protracted Refugee Situations

6. Protracted refugee situations[12] were identified as one of the cases where international cooperation is most needed. They are also among the most complex situations to address, because their resolution often is dependant on a successful engagement with the causes of flight. One particular challenge in "unlocking" protracted situations through international cooperation is the development of sufficient political momentum. Successful historical examples demonstrate the importance of context-specific sustained engagement, usually multi-year; clear ownership of the process; differentiated support and participation; a clearly defined role for civil society; a special facilitator role for UNHCR; and good partnerships.

7. Identifying an appropriate balance of solutions (resettlement, local integration and voluntary repatriation) may encourage a range of interested states to become involved according to their capacity. Cooperation to address protracted situations is not limited to resettlement, but includes also material, technical and financial assistance. The engagement of countries of origin to facilitate sustainable return, where appropriate, was acknowledged as being an essential part of many successful arrangements. The key role of refugee leaders in finding solutions was also noted, provided that refugee leadership reflects the broad and myriad interests of refugee communities.

[12] A protracted refugee situation is one in which refugees find themselves in a long-lasting and intractable state of limbo. Their lives may not be at risk, but their basic rights and essential economic, social and psychological needs remain unfulfilled after years in exile. A refugee in this situation is often unable to break free from enforced reliance on external assistance: UNHCR, *Protracted Refugee Situations*, June 2004, EC/54/SC/CRP.14, http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/4a54bc00d.html.

8. The concept of "local integration" requires further development. It was observed that local integration is a process, and that there are different forms and levels of integration. Access to the labour market and freedom of movement are baseline indicators of a local integration process. The role of the host community is particularly important to the success of this solution, not least the management of access to labour and economic markets.

9. Further thinking on the "strategic use of resettlement" is also called for. Limited third country resettlement has not always triggered other solutions to protracted situations. There may also be refugees and their families who do not wish to be resettled. Strategies for residual caseloads would always be needed. In some situations, resettlement can be a way to relieve pressure on camps in terms of space and quality of life. The impact of remittances on refugee communities in first countries of asylum was also mentioned as an added benefit of resettlement.

10. It was felt that the use of migration, as part of a cooperative approach, merits further exploration, e.g., by conducting a survey of countries that admit refugees into international migration quotas, or conducting a pilot project. Caution is needed, however, to ensure that the use of migration channels to provide solutions to some refugees does not inadvertently lead to a shrinking of protection space or confusion between refugees and other groups without international protection needs. Safeguards for refugees taking up migration opportunities were highlighted, including protection against *refoulement* and from trafficking and exploitation. Other ideas that could form part of a broad cooperative approach to address protracted situations included "field innovation centres", located near long-standing refugee camps/settlements and bringing together external expertise from, e.g., economists, political scientists and migration specialists to analyze the situation and to propose various solutions; or the expanded use of the High Commissioner's Personal Envoy scheme to target particular situations.[13]

III. Working Group 3: Rescue at Sea Emergencies involving Asylum-Seekers and Refugees

11. Cooperative arrangements to address rescue at sea emergencies involving asylum-seekers and refugees will be guided by, and build on, the global legal framework provided by the international law of the sea alongside international refugee and human rights law. This includes, for instance, the obligation to rescue persons in distress regardless of their status or the circumstances in which they are found.[14]

---

[13] See e.g. UNHCR, *UNHCR High Commissioner's Personal Envoy Visits Croatia*, http://www.unhcr.hr/eng/index.php/press-releases/unhcr-high-commissioners-personal-envoy-visits-croatia.html.

[14] 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), entered into force 16 November 1994, Article 98; 1974 International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS), entry into force 25 May 1980, Chapter V, Regulation 33(1); 1979 International Convention on Maritime Sea and Rescue (SAR), entry into force 25 March 1980, Chapter 2.1.10. See further: UNHCR and IMO, *Rescue at Sea – A guide to principles and practice as applied to migrants and refugees*, http://www.unhcr.org/450037d34.html.

12. Although there have been some significant developments in this global framework in recent years,[15] it nonetheless has legal and operational shortcomings which can result in ambiguity of state responsibility for Search and Rescue (SAR) services and/or disembarkation and processing. This can in turn lead to loss of life at sea and the risk of *refoulement*. Legal and definitional gaps include, e.g., lack of clarity about the definition of "distress" and "place of safety", and the absence of a system to allocate responsibility for disembarkation. Operational gaps result from institutional, capacity or political limitations. There is also a lack of burden-sharing mechanisms to ensure that (coastal) states along major maritime migration routes do not become overburdened. These issues can be addressed in part through the development of practical cooperative arrangements. More broadly, exploring ways to encourage cooperation through an emphasis on the short- and long-term humanitarian, political and financial costs of non-cooperation was seen as a priority.

13. Clarifying and sharing responsibilities between states may encourage cooperative approaches. For instance, a state may be prepared to provide a place of disembarkation and processing if another state is able to offer durable solutions to some refugees through resettlement. Along these lines, the development of sample frameworks containing mechanisms to allocate responsibility for rescue, disembarkation, processing, and follow up including solutions for refugees could be considered. A system of joint processing for rescuees could also be developed in certain regions, although this would require further elaboration. A regional asylum support office may be one way to facilitate operationalization of such a system.

14. Regional cooperation to address rescue at sea emergencies is particularly important, as there will necessarily be differences in challenges and capacities between regions. Practical cooperative arrangements would be best developed at the regional or even sub-regional level to ensure that these specificities are taken into account. However, these need to be guided by international principles. They could also involve stakeholders from outside the region and support from the international community as appropriate. Meetings and conferences can also play a crucial information-sharing role and build political support for particular approaches.[16]

IV. Working Group 4: Refugee Protection and Mixed Movements

15. The increasing number of bilateral and multilateral regional processes dedicated to tackling irregular migration, including human trafficking and smuggling, suggests that regional cooperation between states in this area may become more frequent. It is essential to ensure that this cooperation includes protection safeguards and, indeed, expands protection space for refugees. Reconciling access to protection with border security measures, particularly measures to counter smuggling and trafficking in persons, is one challenge. The development of protection-sensitive entry systems

[15] For example, recent amendments to the SOLAS and SAR Conventions, as well as accompanying Guidelines issued by the International Maritime Organisation (IMO), underline the duty of all statesparties to co-ordinate and co-operate in rescue at sea emergencies: SOLAS Convention, Regulation 33, 1-1; SAR Convention, Chapter 3.1.9; IMO Resolution MSC.167(78), Annex 34, *Guidelines on the Treatment of Persons Rescued at Sea*, 2004.

[16] UNHCR is convening an expert meeting on distress at sea situations involving asylum-seekers and refugees in November 2011. This will be an opportunity to build on the tools and concepts discussed in Amman with respect to this one specific situation.

while avoiding pull factors for persons without genuine international protection needs is another important consideration.

16. Addressing the various aspects of "mixed movements"[17] was cited as a goal for cooperative arrangements. These aspects include the entry phase (e.g., differentiating between and providing access to appropriate procedures for various categories of persons), reception arrangements and access to self-reliance over time, as well as the end phase of the displacement cycle (e.g., ensuring a range of different outcomes/solutions, including for persons who are not in need of international protection).

17. States within a region faced with mixed movements may have different systems and standards, which can lead to irregular onward movements[18] and be an obstacle to cooperation in practice. Subject to protection safeguards, mechanisms for the transfer of responsibility between countries for determining and meeting international protection needs may be part of cooperative responses to irregular onward movements through return or readmission agreements. At all times, such arrangements need to meet international standards, including protection against *refoulement*, basic human rights, respect for dignity, and provisions for those with specific needs. Transferring states remain responsible under international law for ensuring that protection standards are met in the country to which people are transferred. In addition, regional cooperative approaches can be used to harmonize access to and standards of protection between states, including through technical, financial and material assistance to develop capacity. It is important that harmonization be designed to improve standards across the region, rather than justifying a "race to the bottom".

[17] "Mixed movements" involve individuals or groups of persons travelling generally in an irregular manner along similar routes and using similar means of travel, but for different reasons. They may affect a number of countries along particular routes, including transit and destination countries: UNHCR, *Refugee Protection and Mixed Migration: the 10-Point Plan in action*, February 2011, http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/pdfid/4d9430ea2.pdf.

[18] Irregular onward movements involve refugees and asylum-seekers who move in an irregular manner from countries in which they have already found protection in order to seek asylum or permanent settlement elsewhere: ExCom Conclusion No. 58 (XL) (1989), http://www.unhcr.org/41b041534.html.

ANNEX II
Expert Meeting on International Cooperation to Share Burden and Responsibilities
Amman, Jordan, 27 and 28 June 2011

AGENDA

DAY 1 – Monday 27 June 2011

09.00 – 12.30 Introduction and Overview (Plenary)

09:00 – 09:15 *Welcome*
Mr. Imran Riza, UNHCR Representative in Jordan

09:15 – 10:30 *Introduction*
Ms. Anja Klug, UNHCR

10.30 – 11.00 Coffee Break

11.00 – 12.30 *Common Challenges and Cooperative Arrangements – Elements and Lessons Learned*
Presenters: Ms. Eltje Aderhold, Germany
Mr. Breno Hermann, Brazil
Ms Kathleen Newland, Migration Policy Institute
Chair: Ms. Alice Edwards, UNHCR

12.30 – 14.00 Lunch

14.00 – 15.30 Working Groups on Cooperative Arrangements to address Specific Refugee Challenges (Session One)

Working Group 1 – Cooperative arrangements to address mass influx situations
Facilitator: Mr. Nadhavathna Krishnamra, Thailand
Presenters: Dr. Alexander Betts, University of Oxford
Rapporteur: Dr. Alice Edwards, UNHCR

Working Group 2 – Cooperative arrangements following rescue at sea operations involving asylum-seekers and refugees
Facilitator: Ms. Margaret Pollack, United States
Presenters: Dr. Thomas Gammeltoft-Hansen, Danish Institute for International Studies ; Mr. Roel Debruyne, Danish Refugee Council
Rapporteur: Ms. Anja Klug, UNHCR

The following questions may be discussed in the Working Groups

- What are some examples of cooperative arrangements to address these situations?
- What were the elements and characteristics of these cooperative arrangements? (e.g. actors, their roles, framework used, forms of burden and responsibility sharing, scale (targeted or comprehensive?), temporal scope, phases of the "displacement cycle" addressed?)

- What worked well?
- What were the challenges and obstacles?
- Lessons learned from the examples?

15.30 – 16.00 Coffee Break

16:00 – 17:30 Summary of Day One (Plenary)

16.00 – 17.00 *Reports from Working Groups and Discussion*
Presenters: Ms. Margaret Pollack, United States
Mr. Nadhavathna Krishnamra, Thailand
Chair: Ms. Anja Klug, UNHCR

17.00 – 17.30 *Summary of Day 1*
Ms. Anja Klug, UNHCR

18.00 – 19.00 Cocktail Reception

DAY 2 – Tuesday 28 June 2011

09.00 – 09.15 Introduction to Day Two (Plenary)
Dr. Alice Edwards, UNHCR

09.15 – 10.45 Working Groups on Cooperative Arrangements to address Specific Refugee Challenges (Session Two)

Working Group 3 – Cooperative arrangements to "unlock" protracted refugee situations
Facilitator: Mr. Ratna Raj Pandeya, Nepal
Presenters: Mr. Bill Frelick, Human Rights Watch
Rapporteur: Dr. Alice Edwards, UNHCR

Working Group 4 – Cooperative arrangements to address refugee protection and mixed movements
Facilitator: Mr. Assad José Jater Peña, Colombia
Presenters: Dr. Maria-Teresa Gil-Bazo, Newcastle Law School; Mr. Robert Johnston, Australia
Rapporteur: Ms. Anja Klug, UNHCR

The following questions will be discussed in the Working Groups
- What are some examples of cooperative arrangements to address these situations?
- What were the elements and characteristics of these cooperative arrangements? (e.g. actors, their roles, framework used, forms of burden and responsibility sharing, scale (targeted or comprehensive?), temporal scope, phases of the "displacement cycle" addressed?)
- What worked well?
- What were the challenges and obstacles?
- Lessons learned from the examples?

10.45 – 11.15 Coffee Break

11.15 – 13.00 Conclusions and Recommendations (Plenary)

11.15 – 12.00 *Reports from Working Groups and Discussion*
Presenters: Mr. Ratna Raj Pandeya, Nepal
Mr. Assad José Jater Peña, Colombia
Chair: Dr. Alice Edwards, UNHCR

12.00 – 12.30 *Conclusions and Recommendations*
Chair: Ms. Anja Klug, UNHCR
Closing: Mr. Imran Riza, UNHCR Representative in Jordan

12.30 End of Expert Meeting

12.30 – 14.00 Lunch

ANNEX III
List of Participants*

1. Mr. Robert Johnston, Department of Immigration and Citizenship, Australia
2. Mr. Breno Hermann, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Brazil
3. Mr. Assad José Jater Peña, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Colombia
4. Mr. Hassan Omar Mohamed, Ministry of Interior, Djibouti
5. Ms. Eltje Aderhold, Permanent Mission of Germany to the UN Office in Geneva, Germany
6. Judge Asqhar A. Al-Musawi, MODM, Iraq
7. Dr. Nawaf al Tal, CSS, Jordan
8. Mr. Ratna Raj Pandeya, Government, Nepal
9. Mr. Nadhavathna Krishnamra, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Thailand
10. Ms. Margaret Pollack, Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration, United States
11. Mr. Akrm Algunaid, Ministry of Health, Yemen
12. Dr. Alexander Betts, Oxford University
13. Mr. Roel Debruyne, Danish Refugee Council (Nairobi)
14. Ms. Kate Dorsch, International Catholic Migration Commission (Beirut)
15. Mr. Bill Frelick, Human Rights Watch
16. Dr. Thomas Gammeltoft-Hansen, Danish Institute for International Studies
17. Dr. Maria-Teresa Gil-Bazo, Newcastle Law School
18. Mr. David John, International Organisation for Migration (Jordan)
19. Ms. Kathleen Newland, Migration Policy Institute
20. Dr. Alice Edwards, UNHCR
21. Ms. Anja Klug, UNHCR
22. Ms. Giulia Ricciarelli-Ranawat, UNHCR
23. Ms. Claire Inder, UNHCR

* Institutional affiliation given for identification purposes only.