

UNNM Speaking Points Session V

Thank you Jonathan, thanks to the panel and those who have already spoken

My name is Laurel Townhead and I am Human Rights and Refugee Representative for QUNO.

[Welcome the examples we have heard so far this afternoon – one/two key points]

Value to opportunity to hear more about and comment on the Network's work plan but as with any agreement - be it political or hard law - implementation is first and foremost the responsibility of States.

The successes of the IMRF belongs also to States – the Network created a conducive environment and States rose to it in many ways – with VNRs, high level engagement, pledges and a consensus Progress Declaration. This is a strong foundation for the next phase of delivering on the promise of the GCM for people centred migration governance.

The next phase is not about Geneva and New York. It is about the regional and country levels. I'll limit myself to three questions and three suggestions today – but look forward to more discussion and shared activities to come:

My questions for all the Member States in the room:

- What do you need but - more importantly - what can you do so that the regional reviews are not VNRs-light but real conversations about regional migration realities?
- What do you need but also what can you do so that the clear call from the IMRF of nothing about migrants without migrants is not only heard but acted upon?
- What do you need but also what can you do so that you learn from your peers – mostly at capital-to-capital level – and share your learning on specific objectives or specific guiding principles?

And for suggestions from me:

- National level
On your recommended actions to accelerate implementation on meaningful participation reflected in paras 51, 53, 56 of the Progress Declaration.
The Network's guidance for States on implementing the GCM contains clear steps on operationalising a whole of society approach – roll out of this in all regions should be a way to build more and better participatory processes. Where additional guidance is needed – let the Network know – and let us in civil society know so that together we can help bridge those gaps. Migrant Advisory Councils or similar mechanisms at national, regional and global UN level could support this, ideally creating a race to the top through exchange of learning from and with such advisory groups. Any sharing of practice would also respond to your recommended action on peer learning (PD para 72)
- Regional level
Welcome the informal rapporteuring/championing role that Canada and Colombia took on at the IMRF on gender responsiveness and child sensitive approaches respectively. This should be built on for the regional reviews with rappoerteuring on these and potentially other guiding principles – drawing out the cross-cutting aspects, and ensuring they are not lost in agendas built on clusters of objectives.

- Global level

Whilst the focus of attention will rightly be at country and regional level Geneva and New York are not irrelevant - GCM Champions played a significant role in the IMRF preparation and Progress Declaration negotiation – in terms of what next, I would like to see clustering within the Champions on specific issues – for example around similar pledges, aspects of the PD, objectives or guiding principles. Working together you can use your combined voice to keep attention on the GCM and the PD. But beyond statements you could also be creating and populating spaces for technical discussion, dialogue and exchange – potentially using the Hub for this.

[We sit in a place where we can look at what has been done since the adoption of the GCM and enjoy the view – but the work is far from finished and we need to use the progress as a stepping stone to move forward from together.]