

Article	Questions	NSU advice	PLO position
6.1. Objective of the solution	[Does the PLO wish to use the Israeli concept of “ <i>the two States for the two people</i> ” and raise their contradictions in territory/refugee meetings to force a complete withdrawal of the settlers from Palestine?]	No. “2 States for 2 people” implies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no return from refugees to Israel; - reinforcing possible Israeli claim for the transfer or Arab Israelis to Palestine 	
6.2. Recognition of responsibility	Can PLO accept a solution to refugees without recognition of responsibility from Israel?	No. This question is an individual right of the refugees (no compromise possible). Such recognition is necessary for “real” peace.	
	Would the PLO eventually agree to the insertion of the proposed Israeli preamble on the “ <i>recognition of the suffering & loss endured by both people etc.</i> ”?	No. Such a phrasing is potentially detrimental as it overlooks the singularity of the Palestinian refugee issue.	
	Would the PLO consider any way to alleviate the “burden” of Israel’s recognition responsibility?	Only if negotiations are stuck on this issue two options may be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - insisting on Israeli actions/laws taken after 1948 rather than the 1948 event - introducing a partial responsibility from the International Community along with Israel’s 	
6.3 Relocation options/Return. Resettlement, integration	What is the PLO ultimate position on the return to Israel option? As to the recognition of the right of return? As to the number of returns?	The right to return to Israel should be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - recognized by Israel on its principle; - implemented in a way that shows to the refugees that this a “real” option. On the basis of the demographic study commissioned by the NSU, we can prove that a substantial number of returns to Israel would be possible without undermining the Jewish majority in Israel.	
	How does the PLO see the coordination with Host States?	Coordination in parallel with Host States (i.e. during negs with Israel)	

		or after	
	How does the PLO see the coordination with the third States?	Coordination in parallel with third countries (i.e. during negs with Israel) or after	
	What is the PLO position on Israel's proposal to provide all Palestinian refugees with Palestinian citizenship?	NSU suggests that discussions over citizenship & residency rights should be opened at a later stage (CAPS)	
6.4. Refugee right to restitution & compensation	How does the PLO want to handle the restitution issue?	PLO should obtain the recognition of the right to restitution as it is an individual right of refugees. The implementation of this right can be adapted in consideration of practical legitimate concerns	
6.5. Host States right to remuneration	Jordanian claims or reparation are clear. How should we handle this?	Resolve the issue with Jordanians prior to pursuing the negotiations with the Israelis or put this on hold and discuss it at the end.	
6.6. International Mechanism	Which countries & entities should be resented in the IM?	We suggest: Palestine, Israel, Host States (Lebanon, Syria, Jordan) + other countries who may offer relocation options + members of the Quartet. Donors should also be represented. Ex: World Bank.	
	What should be the role of the US in this regard? What is the PLO view of the Israeli proposal of an IM established & led by the US?	PLO should push for a multilateral leadership of the IM. US would be represented in the IM.	
	The Jordanians ask that the IM mandate also extend to compensation claims from host states (i.e. different from costs relating to rehabilitation assistance & future integration of refugees). What is the PLO position on this?	PLO can choose to include this mission to the IM mandate or leave it to State to State relation. NSU recommends not adding this mission to the IM mandate. This could open the path to numerous other claims (i.e. claims from Jewish refugees) which will alter the specific mission of the IM and may paralyze its functioning.	
	How do we conceive UNRWA future role/ termination?	UNRWA's termination should be phased and coordinated with the implementation of the solution on refugees by the IM. It is in all parties' interest to use UNRWA's know how and existing	

		structures, in Host States in particular.	
6.7. Mission of the International Mechanism	The IM comprehensive mission seems to be perceived as potentially detrimental to Jordanian interests “as it would limit all options to the mechanism”	NSU recommends to meet with Jordanian ASAP to discuss their concerns and agree on a way forward.	
6.8. International Fund	Can you confirm that the PLO position is that financial contribution must be based on responsibility?	This is a legal requirement and fundamental for refugees’ satisfaction	
	Considering the responsibilities at stake and Israel’s ability to pay should the PLO ask Israel to pay for “whole package” or should it focus from the start on obtaining the funding of some specific items?	This is a strategic question. To be discussed.	
6.9. Role of the International Community	What is the PLO position on financial contributions from the International Community?	The guiding principle should remain that funding is based on responsibility. Funding from international community can however complement Israeli contributions (since it can be argued that it is partially responsible)	
6.10. IM as exclusive forum for claims	Jordan seems to disagree with this exclusiveness as it would undermine its interests. How should we handle this?	Meet with the Jordanians	
6.11. End of claims	Remarks: - I/P end of claims regarding refugees will only bind I/P in their bilateral relation in this regard; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jordanian opposes to this clause claiming that it may impact the claims of Pal refugees with Jordanian citizenships and its state claims. <p>How can the PLO ensure that “the end of claims” will bind all third parties to the agreement?</p>	Needs to be discussed.	