Concept Paper on Issues and Challenges before the Secretary-General's High-Level Panel on Internal Displacement

Prepared by the Secretariat of the SG's High-Level Panel on internal displacement for the Panel's first meeting, February 2020

I.   INTRODUCTION

It has been more than 20 years since the international community began to direct dedicated attention to the problem of internal displacement. Since then, the number of internally displaced persons (IDPs) has skyrocketed and internal displacement has become nothing short of a global multi-causal and multi-faceted crisis with dramatic short- and long-term consequences across the board. Efforts to prevent, mitigate or find solutions to displacement have been mixed but have largely failed. The Secretary General has thus established the High-Level Panel on Internal Displacement to come up with concrete and practical recommendations to step up the responses to the phenomenon with particular emphasis on solutions. This concept paper provides an overview of some of the key challenges and issues before the Panel in each of the five priority areas of its Terms of Reference; overviews the potential opportunities in those contexts; and identifies some initial guiding questions for the Panel's consideration in doing its work.

II.   BACKGROUND

While internal displacement caused by violent conflict and disasters has been a major humanitarian challenge for centuries, the phenomenon has only started to attract wider international attention relatively recently. The elevation of humanitarian concerns in international affairs brought about by the end of Cold War, along with an evolution in the attitudes to the limits of sovereignty, offered an opportunity to improve the situation of the millions of people displaced within their country's borders.

National governments have the primary responsibility to protect and assist people who have been uprooted from their homes within their own countries. In practice, though, many Governments did not live up to their responsibilities, were often unwilling or unable to respond to their needs.

In order to examine the issue, the UN Secretary-General, in 1992, designated his first Representative (RSG) on internally displaced persons. (In 2010, the RSG mandate was succeeded by the establishment, by the Human Rights Council, of a Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of IDPs). On the humanitarian side, the UN General Assembly, that same year, gave the Emergency Relief Coordinator the mandate to coordinate humanitarian assistance to people affected by humanitarian crises, including IDPs.
Since then, evolving constellations of Governments, United Nations agencies, NGOs and universities have promoted a more consistent and effective approach to internal displacement. Highlights of achievements since 1992 include:

- The [Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement](#), spearheaded by the RSG, and issued in 1998, present a definition of an Internally Displaced Person and 30 Principles reflecting international law to prevent forced displacement, address protection and assistance needs and the measures to be in place to foster durable solutions.

Definition: Internally Displaced Persons are persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized State border.

- Among the rights of IDPs spelled out in the Guiding Principles are those linked to adequate standards of living, to liberty of movement, to be protected from forced return to or relocation in unsafe places, to participate in the planning and management of their return or resettlement and reintegration and to recover, to the extent possible, their property and possessions or to receive compensation. The Guiding Principles were recognized by the 2005 World Summit of States and a series of General Assembly Resolutions as 'an important international framework for the protection of internally displaced persons.'
- A range of practical tools were developed to improve the way internal displacement is addressed, including guidelines on developing legal instruments, durable solutions frameworks, protection tools, data and monitoring tools on internal displacement. Among the most prominent are an [IDP Protection Handbook](#), a [Manual for Policy Makers on IDP protection](#) and the 2010 [IASC Framework on Durable Solutions](#).
- The IASC Framework is particularly relevant as it defined, for the first time, the concept of Durable Solutions as a state which is achieved when IDPs no longer have any specific assistance and protection needs that are linked to their displacement and can enjoy their human rights without discrimination. The IASC Framework is also significant for establishing that return to the area of origin is not the only valid durable solution for IDPs, but that, depending on circumstances, settlement elsewhere in the country and local integration might even be preferable. In 2011, the Secretary-General issued further [guidance](#) for the United Nations on how to support durable solutions in the aftermath of conflict, but the guidance has not been widely applied and is mainly used as a point of reference for the UN to stress the importance to adopt a comprehensive approach towards solutions.
- The 2005 Humanitarian Reform, in great part triggered by the poor response to IDPs in Darfur, enabled a more structured response to IDPs' needs. UNHCR and IOM in particular assumed the responsibility to coordinate sectors highly relevant to IDPs, i.e. protection, shelter and camp management. This new "humanitarian cluster system" brought some predictability to the emergency response to internal displacement (*See* [Ten Years After Humanitarian Reform: How Have IDPs Fared?](#)).
- The 2009 [African Union Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa (Kampala Convention)](#) is the first (and so far only) continent-wide binding treaty on internal displacement and had been ratified by [29 African States](#) as of December 2019.
- Over the past five years, several international agreements have included measures to address IDPs' needs: the Sustainable Development Goals, the Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (Paris Agreement and Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage) and the New Urban Agenda.
- At the national level, since the Guiding Principles were issued, Governments have adopted national laws, policies and strategies on internal displacement, established new Ministries or provided for other specific institutional arrangements to address internal displacement. At present, some 40 countries have developed [laws and policies on internal displacement](#).

Despite these advances, the number of IDPs due to conflict and violence has close to doubled from what it was 20 years ago, reaching a record high of 41 million by the end of 2018. This increase can be attributed to the rise in the number of armed conflicts over the past decade, in particular in the Middle East and Sub-Saharan Africa, where the majority of conflict-affected IDPs are located, and to the lack of durable solutions for millions of IDPs.

Every year, on average, an additional 20 million people flee their homes due to disasters according to the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre. The number of disaster-displaced is expected to grow manifold in coming decades as the adverse effects of climate change will intensify. Yet, these figures do not even take into account displacement as a result of slow onset disasters – such as drought-induced famine, or sea-level rise and accompanying coastal erosion and inundation - as a result of climate change. The World Bank estimates that, if no action is taken, by 2050 there will be more than 143 million internal climate migrants in Sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia and Latin America alone, many of whom might have hardly any choice to leave.

During the first six months of 2019, new displacements due to conflict and violence numbered 3.8 million people, while 7 million fled disasters, the majority due to storms and floods. In fast moving humanitarian crises, people flee, often multiple times, due to serious violations of international humanitarian law and human rights law.

This tremendous increase adds to the millions who have remained displaced for years, without solutions, many in poor urban settlements without the guarantee that they will be able to stay there nor have the possibility to return home. According to 2014 figures, people have been living in internal displacement situations for over 10 years in some 50 countries. This increase in protracted displacement is largely a function of the rise in the number of protracted conflicts (research shows that today's armed conflicts tend to last longer than those 20 or 30 years ago) as well as the fact that conflict and violence are increasingly intertwined with climate change-related factors such as droughts and floods.

People who are displaced face serious protection needs. Women and girls are at particular risk of sexual violence and abuse. Children are severely affected, at risk of forced recruitment, forced labor or trafficking, and millions of internally displaced children do not go to school. In reality, the primary responders to IDPs' needs remain the communities with whom they find refuge. Meanwhile, those communities, too, are often heavily affected by internal displacement, placing additional burden on constrained resources, such as water, arable land, housing and employment, potentially leading to intercommunal tension.

Against this background, advancing durable solutions for the internally displaced faces significant challenges. First, in areas with ongoing violent conflict, conditions might not be conducive to advance durable solutions and our best hope in those areas might be for humanitarian action to strengthen community resilience. Second, while many national Governments do turn to humanitarian organizations for help, in practice the latter often face security and bureaucratic constraints to access IDPs whether in territories controlled by Governments or by armed groups. Third, other Governments might deny the problem altogether, actively standing in the way of efforts to assist. Fourth, even where conditions are conducive and affected Governments supportive of efforts to advance durable solutions, national and international actors often struggle to mount the coordinated and comprehensive interventions able to address this multidisciplinary challenge. Fifth, we often lack quality data necessary to inform effective and tailored responses to internal displacement. And finally, funding to advance durable solutions is often difficult to mobilize for a number of reasons. The High-level Panel is expected to develop policy recommendations that might help overcome these challenges.

III.   The Five Focus Areas with which the Panel has been tasked

The Terms of Reference of the High-level Panel identify five areas on which it is expected to develop recommendations for consideration by the Secretary-General. This section will identify key challenges and opportunities associated with each issue area:

Focus Area #1: Strengthening the capacities of Member States and the UN System to prevent displacement, protect and assist IDPs, and support durable solutions in line with international standards.

Challenges:
National Governments are accountable for the welfare of the people living on their territories, including those at risk of displacement or who have been displaced. In practice, advancing durable solutions to internal displacement is a complex and multidisciplinary challenge calling for a whole-of-government approach, which in effect rarely materializes. While some Governments have designated specific Ministries, Departments or Commissions to deal with internal displacement, these institutions are often under-resourced and sidelined or their mandates are limited to humanitarian responses. There is often a gap between national policies and realities at the local level – where IDPs have the most interaction with Governments. Few line ministries are represented at the local level and local authorities who are often the frontline responders usually lack sufficient capacity. Some 40 Governments have developed specific laws, policies and strategies to address internal displacement, but they generally remain poorly implemented. Some of these laws have created a special "IDP status," which tend to be linked to immediate benefits but often have the unintended consequence of further separating IDPs from the rest of the population, making it more difficult for them to integrate locally and find solutions. Few Governments have developed laws and strategies focusing specifically on durable solutions. When they do, they have presented general principles rather than specific plans.

Even less efforts have been directed so far on the issue of prevention of displacement. This relative neglect results from a combination of the fact that sovereignty barriers tend to be even higher before than after displacement crises, and that there are situations where we should embrace – or even facilitate - displacement as an often a lifesaving coping mechanism.

On the conflict side, attention remains on preventing violations of International Humanitarian Law (IHL) by parties to the conflict, including the respect of provisions generally prohibiting the forced displacement of civilians (see ICRC's Displacement in times of armed conflict: How international humanitarian law protects in war, and why it matters). But in contexts where armed actors are fragmented and do not have strict chains of command and of situations where one side is viewed as terrorists needing extraordinary measures to counter, the respect of IHL is a struggle.

Three areas in particular might offer additional opportunities to advance the discourse and practice of preventing internal displacement. First, humanitarian action needs to further invest in efforts to strengthen communities' resilience (see ODI report Protracted Displacement: Uncertain Paths to Self-Reliance in Exile). Second, there is room for improvement in terms of ensuring that climate adaptation measures and national disaster risk reduction plans better take into account populations vulnerable to internal displacement. And third, emerging field of anticipatory financing – such as disaster risk insurance or pre-agreed contingency financing for the UN and multilateral banks – might hold some promise to help communities better prepare for sudden-onset disasters – and reduce the risk of displacement along the way. (Approaches to anticipatory financing are introduced in greater detail below under "ISSUE #5).

Once people are displaced, resolving internal displacement should be seen a process, not just an end point, which requires an integrated approach from the outset, addressing humanitarian, protection, development and peace considerations along the way. Some Governments, at the

national, regional and local levels, may be committed to support durable solutions but do not know how to do so in practice or lack the implementation capacity or struggle to find the necessary funding. The IASC Framework on Durable Solutions includes 8 criteria to determine whether durable solutions have been achieved, but some are difficult to measure and reach in practice: 1) long-term safety and security, 2) adequate standard of living, 3) access to livelihoods and employment, 4) mechanisms for resolving Housing, Land and Property disputes, 5) documentation, 6) family reunification, 7) participation in public affairs and 8) access to remedies and justice.

Planning for durable solutions requires in-depth assessments of the displacement context, and of the return or resettlement area, including the needs of the displaced and the availability of infrastructure and basic services. Such assessments are a prerequisite to plan for broad sets of interventions around permanent housing, access to basic services and livelihoods, often in places where Government capacity is generally very weak. States remain poorly prepared to deal with displacement in the context of conflict or disasters, let alone supporting communities so that they are not forced to abandon their homes in the first place.

People increasingly seek safety in cities or within cities. While cities offer some advantages, including more anonymity and livelihoods compared to isolated areas, IDPs often end up living among the urban poor and join the informal economy. IDP camps and informal settlements in peri-urban areas of Mogadishu, Bogota or in areas of Darfur, have become permanent fixtures which lack social services and are not formally integrated in government urban plans. IDPs are then at serious risk of being evicted, lacking security of tenure. Local governments are faced with sudden influx of people without getting additional resources. Some organizations, such as UN Habitat, are working to integrate IDPs in urban planning efforts, but these initiatives are far from systematic.

The issue of securing housing and access to land and property more generally is often a big impediment to reaching durable solutions. Land and houses of IDPs in areas of origin are often occupied or destroyed, or IDPs may have sold their property under duress when forced to leave. More generally, in countries with less formalized legal and judicial systems, enforcing property rights and resolving land disputes is usually extremely complex, especially for IDPs. Going back to the situation prior to displacement may also mean returning to systems where women and minorities lacked access to property. Ensuring security of tenure in areas where IDPs are displaced to promote local integration is challenging as well. The United Nations has developed the Pinheiro Principles to guide how to address housing, land and property issues in case of displacement.

At the international level, the focus has remained on providing emergency assistance, particularly in camp settings, while the reality is that the majority of IDPs live among host communities in poor parts of urban areas [See ICRC's Displaced in Cities].

Multiple UN agencies, INGOs and national NGOs are involved in providing protection and assistance to IDPs, or support solutions. Since 2005, in order to enhance predictability, accountability and partnerships to the humanitarian response, humanitarian organizations have coordinated their action through the "Cluster Approach", whereby each cluster represents a sector, such as protection or health, with clearly designated responsibilities for coordination and under the overall coordination responsibility of the Humanitarian Coordinator. Clusters rarely include a focus on solutions. An exception was the Early Recovery Cluster, which could have enabled the coordination of resilience programming and support to durable solutions. However, this cluster has not been seen as successful and there is a lack of systematic international mechanisms or of an entity to deal with solutions.

Among the efforts of the UN, the Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of IDPs is part of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee, the primary inter-agency coordination platform for emergencies, but internal displacement has rarely been discussed in depth in this forum over the

last ten years and there has been a loss of literacy on the issue of internal displacement among international humanitarian actors overall compared to 15 years ago. While UN peacekeeping missions mandates generally have the mandate to protect civilians, including IDPs, and a few are also tasked with facilitating durable solutions, blue helmets are at best able to physically protect a small percentage of those affected by displacement and have not played a significant role to enable durable solutions. Internal displacement is not specifically discussed in UN development and peacebuilding forums and there is little coordination among development actors or between humanitarian and development actors, including due to capacity constraints in the offices of UN Resident Coordinators. A major hurdle is the lack of a coordination mechanism between humanitarian and development actors, which makes it difficult to plan collectively to support the self-reliance of IDPs and implement solutions.

Opportunities:
Over the last few years, there has been a change in the international discourse on internal displacement. International agencies and donors have increasingly recognized that the starting point to address internal displacement is that IDPs are citizens or residents of countries they live in and that both affected states and affected communities must have a central role in local and national discussions to advance solutions in this area. Member States with IDPs are also showing greater willingness to take responsibility for this issue.

Future efforts, including those of the High-level Panel, can build on initiatives undertaken over the last years to engage States affected by internal displacement in order to support their capacities and share good practices and experiences, rather than just focusing on what went wrong. The Nansen Initiative and its follow up, the Platform on Disaster Displacement, as well as the GP20 Plan of Action offer knowledge exchange platforms and technical expertise on a range of issues related to internal displacement. Regional initiatives, such as the international NGO network ReDSS in East Africa, also offer valuable expertise on durable solutions. Likewise, the Institute for International Humanitarian Law in San Remo provides training to Government officials on internal displacement.

There may also be room for improvement in the humanitarian system's ability to ramp up emergency response capability when faced with unexpected large-scale crises. Strong surge capacities exist in case of disasters, as the response to devastating cyclones in southern Africa showed last year, but there is also a need to boost the capacity to respond to massive displacement due to conflict. This may require shifting from solely building the Government's capacity to providing direct assistance and protection to IDPs and other affected people in line with humanitarian principles (see MSF, Displacement and humanitarian response in Ethiopia: challenges and dilemmas in complex crises).

Questions for consideration:
- How can we prevent forced internal displacement?
- How can we incentivize Governments to show political will to prioritize solutions, recognizing the differences in Government capacity and the need for context-specific approaches?
- What are the critical Government institutional capacities and mechanisms which need to be in place to deal with internal displacement, in particular to enable durable solutions? What are effective ways to ensure a whole-of-government approach?
- What can be done to enhance the capacity of sub-national authorities and local governments to address internal displacement?
- What international expertise is needed to support solutions as early as possible?
- How do we ensure that the expression "IDP" doesn't trigger a blanket response, but takes into account the specific profiles of IDPs, i.e. gender, age, minorities, disability, etc. in a specific context, including in urban areas?
- How do we ensure the sharing of knowledge/literacy on internal displacement among States but also among relevant actors providing international support, e.g. regional exchanges, platforms?
- How can we ensure that IDPs and host communities have a central role in shaping the response to their needs, including to end displacement?

Focus Area #2: Advancing the collaboration between humanitarian and development actors, and where appropriate, actors on climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction and peacebuilding.

Challenges:
Overcoming the humanitarian-development divide is at the heart of the challenge of advancing durable solutions to internal displacement. The UN and the international community are actually performing well, overall, in delivering life-saving humanitarian assistance, including to IDPs, in emergency situations. The key challenge that we struggle with is to create better links between emergency responses and longer-term solutions as IDPs often rely on life-saving humanitarian assistance year after year. Aid organizations may inadvertently create dependencies instead of focusing efforts on helping the displaced to reestablish their livelihoods and become self-sufficient. Achieving durable solutions is thus as much of a development challenge as it is a humanitarian one. Lack of development contributes to making people vulnerable, making it more difficult to cope with natural hazards or even conflict. Displacement also impacts a country's development, weakening the resilience of host communities and creating poverty (see World Bank's Forcibly Displaced). Depending on circumstances, peacebuilding and climate change actors loom equally large.

In 2016, the World Humanitarian Summit put a spotlight on the issue of protracted internal displacement, and a range of Governments, UN Agencies, NGOs and private sector actors subscribed to this notion of internal displacement requiring humanitarian, development, and political actors to work hand in hand. As highlighted in the Secretary-General's report for the Summit, achieving this goal requires several fundamental changes:
1) from treating IDP situations as a short-term issue to be fixed through international humanitarian aid, to working actively with national, municipal, and local governments to better integrate IDPs;
2) from meeting the needs of IDPs through short-term humanitarian response to joint analysis, multi-year planning and predictable multi-year funding for humanitarian and development organizations to promote access to jobs/livelihoods, housing and land, basic services, etc., and achieve sustainable solutions;
3) from care and maintenance regimes targeted primarily at displaced people in camps to localized systems that benefit both internally displaced people and local communities;
4) from approaches that marginalize IDPs to ones where the legal, regulatory, fiscal and organizational actions necessary to contribute to economic and social life are in place; and
5) from general approaches to IDPs towards development approaches that recognize the specific protection needs of IDPs.

This approach was subsequently detailed in the study Breaking the Impasse: Reducing Protracted Internal Displacement as a Collective Outcome. The study presents five case studies and a step-by-step approach to define and achieve specific objectives to increase resilience and achieve durable solutions to internal displacement.

In practice, implementation of these shifts has been slow for a number of reasons. In many places (e.g. CAR, South Sudan), development actors are largely absent, and very little development funding is available. In other places, some development actors are present but do not work together with humanitarian actors, including due to the lack of financial incentives on both sides and short-term planning and financing on the humanitarian side. Development actors do not generally coordinate among themselves either. Finally, the absence of institutional cultural shifts on the part of international organizations means the idea of sequential action (humanitarian, then development) remains prevalent, and rarely is there consideration of durable solutions from the outset of crises.

With the impact of climate change increasingly being a factor in driving displacement, climate action, too, needs to be better integrated into efforts to prevent and respond to displacement. Indeed, in 2019, 13 of the 20 countries most vulnerable to the effects of climate change had an inter-agency humanitarian appeal (most of them focused on conflict-affected populations). Yet, our understanding of the dynamics surrounding internal climate displacement remains rudimentary at best. Moreover, as OCHA's 2020 Global Humanitarian Overview (GHO) acknowledges, "climate adaptation efforts are not prioritized as a

part of humanitarian response". The GHO cites an unpublished recent study looking at humanitarian response in five highly disaster-vulnerable countries between 2016 and 2018 which found that only 3 per cent of projects included in inter-agency appeals in these countries had a climate change component, and less than half of these received funding.

Finally, peacebuilding/peace considerations are increasingly seen as essential to address durable solutions to internal displacement. This includes issues such as addressing the root causes of displacement, reestablishing the rule of law and combatting impunity, addressing housing, land and property disputes and issues, furthering reconciliation between IDPs (or former IDPs) and surrounding communities, and ensuring that IDPs can exercise their political rights. In practice, few peace negotiations include IDPs as stakeholders (an exception was the peace process in Colombia) and IDPs are generally not a focus of peacebuilding actors.

Opportunities:
The empowerment of Resident Coordinators (the highest UN official in countries in which there is no peace operation) is a central element of the reform of the UN Development System rolled out since early 2019. It provides an opportunity for better coordinated "One UN" approaches to internal displacement, particularly across the humanitarian-development divide. Some countries have adopted "collective outcomes", including on durable solutions like in Somalia, to drive a common vision among the Government, humanitarian and development partners.

Institutionally, the Durable Solutions Initiatives (DSI) in Somalia (since 2016) and Ethiopia (since 2019), which on the UN side are institutionally anchored within Resident Coordinators' offices, offer promising models to incentivize UN inter-agency and whole-of-government coordination on the issue of internal displacement.   These initiatives create entry points for constructive discussions with national governments and foster coordination among UN Country Teams on durable solutions, including measures at the policy, legislative, institutional, planning and operational levels. In Somalia, approaches to durable solutions are reflected in government planning frameworks, including resilience and peacebuilding frameworks, national and local urban plans, ratifying the Kampala Convention, joint humanitarian-development planning and joint or complementary programming.   Area-based and community-based programming supports collective approaches at the humanitarian-development-peace nexus and encompassing both conflict- and disaster-induced displacement, including due to the adverse impacts of climate change. In practice, it has led to progress at the legal and institutional levels and to multi-year innovative programs, thus improving the resilience and local integration of some IDPs in Somalia with the support of donors. A similar approach is now developed in Ethiopia.

Beyond the DSI, organizations have been working to ensure that IDPs are included in other agendas, e.g. promoting the inclusion of displacement risk in disaster risk reduction plans (see UNISDR's Words into action Guidelines: Disaster Displacement: How to Reduce Risk, Address Impacts and Strengthen Resilience), including in the context of climate change (e.g. PDD, NRC), regularizing IDP settlements as part of urban planning strategies (e.g. UN Habitat) or advocating for the inclusion of IDPs in political processes (e.g. OHCHR). Such initiatives could be scaled up and made more systematic. On the peacebuilding side, the review of the UN Peacebuilding architecture may offer an opportunity to strengthen the focus of actors such as the UN Peacebuilding Commission and of the Peacebuilding Fund to contribute to durable solutions to internal displacement.

Questions for consideration:
- In light of two-decade long international efforts to bridge the humanitarian-development gap under different labels (early recovery, resilience, the transition from relief to development, New Way of Working), what are the key hurdles impeding humanitarian-development collaboration and what incentives can be developed to promote better coordination between humanitarian and development actors? Who can the United Nations be better organized to support solutions from the outset of a crisis or disaster?
- What other initiatives and projects, e.g. those documented by OCHA or the upcoming study by GP20 on effective practices, can we draw from to recommend more systematic and successful approaches

to improve the lives of displacement-affected communities and to promote durable solutions?

- How can we encourage humanitarian and Disaster Risk Reduction actors to work together more closely at the national and local levels?
- How do climate adaptation and peacebuilding actors fit into the equation?
- What elements should be in place to replicate national Durable Solutions Initiatives in other contexts?
- How can we ensure a modular approach whereby durable solutions led by Governments are promoted, while maintaining the capacity for agile and responsive humanitarian action to IDPs and other affected people based on their needs, assessed independently, far from political agendas, safeguarding humanitarian principles?
- How can we better support IDPs to regain self-sufficiency, and in particular ensure more robust action on livelihoods
- How can we support community cohesion and that IDPs/host communities benefit from peacebuilding initiatives?
- How can we promote public-private partnerships, in particular in regard to housing and employment, benefiting IDPs and host communities?

Focus Area #3: SDGs and IDP inclusion

Challenges:
While the Millennium Development Goals did not take IDPs into account, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development adopted in 2015 does specifically refer to IDPs as one of the vulnerable groups which should not be left behind in a country's development efforts. This is welcomed as large-scale protracted displacement may jeopardize the achievements of a range of SDGs. IDPs are however not mentioned in the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) nor in the related 169 targets devised to reach them (*See* IPI's Reaching IDPs to achieve the 2030 Agenda).

Still, several countries – such as Afghanistan, Iraq, Nigeria and Ukraine – have included the needs of IDPs in their plans to reach the SDGs, even if specific targets for IDPs were not specified. Some SDG processes have included consultations with IDPs (e.g. Ukraine), but these positive actions remain exceptions. Very few countries affected by internal displacement have actually included IDPs in their SDG plans and even fewer have consulted IDPs about such plans. Two obstacles are the lack of mandatory reporting on IDPs in national SDG plans and the lack of standardized indicators on internal displacement for reporting on progress towards the SDGs. Only a few countries, such as Colombia and Somalia, have included durable solutions for IDPs in their national development plans.

Opportunities:
The UN supports Governments to reach the SDGs through various mechanisms, including tailored support to accelerate progress towards the SDGs. In countries where IDPs represent a significant part of the population, relevant UN mechanisms should ensure that SDG support includes a focus on IDPs. Governments could also be encouraged to include internal displacement in their voluntary SDG reporting during the High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development.

However, many countries are off track to meet most of the SDGs and focusing on ensuring the inclusion of IDPs in National Development Plans may present a nearer-term opportunity. This will require meaningful consultations with displacement-affected communities, including the youth and the elderly who may have specific views on what is a durable solution for them. Making durable solutions a part of a country's development strategy will help to ensure this issue is addressed in a sustainable way, rather than through a project by project approach. This inclusion could be mirrored in UN Cooperation Frameworks, i.e. multi-year plans agreed to by national Governments and United Nations Country Teams.

Another promising avenue is the integration of internal displacement in national development plans to help implementing a whole-of-government approach, attract development financing, scale up efforts and move beyond a project-by-project towards common goals.

Finally, in order to measure the extent to which projects under National Development Plans contribute to durable solutions to internal displacement, a "durable solution marker" could be implemented, incentivizing development actors to systematically ask themselves how their development projects contribute to durable solutions in areas affected by displacement. A similar process on the humanitarian side with a "resilience marker" would allow humanitarians to ask themselves how humanitarian projects contribute to local capacity and resilience. Such markers have been successfully tested in Somalia.

Questions for consideration*:*
- How can we ensure that IDPs and host communities as citizens are included in a country's development efforts with due regard to their specific needs, including in relevant national development plans?
- How do we promote the meaningful participation of IDPs in National Development Plans and SDG processes?
- How do we ensure that UN efforts to support SDG roadmaps pay systematic attention to internal displacement in countries with high numbers of IDPs?
- What is the promise and potential of "durable solutions markers" and could we tie it to new financing mechanisms?

Focus Area #4: Improving the collection, analysis and use of quality data relevant to internal displacement taking into account gender considerations and age-sensitive approaches

Challenges:
The availability of quality data on internal displacement is a necessary prerequisite for our ability to measure progress towards international goals and commitments related to IDPs (such as the Secretary-General's commitment in his Agenda for Humanity, to reduce internal displacement by 50 percent by 2030) as well as to devise and evaluate effective policies addressing internal displacement. Quality and relevant data are also a prerequisite for national governments to plan and monitor the results of policies and programs addressing internal displacement.

In practice, much of the available data on internal displacement is based on what has been produced for humanitarian purposes, e.g. specific assessments, programs, humanitarian response plans, rather than coming from official statistics. A few national data systems do exist, such as in Ukraine and Colombia, where the IDP database is now used to ensure reparations for victims of the conflict. However, overall, disparate systems accounting for IDPs, their needs and aspirations often co-exist in different countries. In some cases, IDPs are formally registered, while in others sampling methods are used to estimate the characteristics of the larger internally displaced populations. Some of the systems developed by operational humanitarian actors include IDP tracking systems (e.g. IOM's DTM, Impact/REACH and, to a lesser extent, systems managed by UNHCR or OCHA). The Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS) offers an inter-agency service to support extensive displacement profiling, including in protracted displacement settings, particularly in urban areas, in order to identify displacement-specific vulnerabilities and progress towards durable solutions. JIPS and the Special Rapporteur have spearheaded an initiative to define durable solutions indicators, which have been adapted to specific contexts (e.g. by REDSS).

Despite this wide range of data gathering efforts, the IDP data we have available suffer from a range of shortcomings. First, in the absence of an agreed-upon statistical framework and in light of differing data collection methodologies, different datasets are often not aligned, interoperable, or of sufficient quality to be used as a basis for decision-making. This also makes it difficult for development actors to trust and use humanitarian data. Second, because these data systems focus on displacement events rather than the journey of IDPs, we struggle to capture or overcount multiple displacements occurring to the same people and have little data on solutions, particularly on local integration. We are also unable to capture situations when IDPs flee abroad and are then categorized as refugees or vulnerable migrants or when returning refugees become de facto IDPs. Third, there is little visibility on who are the most vulnerable IDPs, in part due to the lack of disaggregated data on IDPs (sex, age, disability, etc.), the lack of mapping of IDPs' capacities, as well as the dearth of information on absorption capacity of education facilities/housing, basic services, and the lack of macro-economic data on the wider impact of internal

displacement. Fourth, even when we have data on those who are displaced, we often lack contextual and comparative data of the needs of their host communities.

An additional challenge is that in some cases, understandably, people do not want to be formally identified as IDPs, due to potential repercussions on their security, particularly in situations of armed conflict or violence where they may fear being identified as aligned to a party to the conflict or to a certain actor.

Opportunities:
There is a growing recognition of the importance of data and we have seen in recent years increased investments in data gathering mechanisms. These investments also reflect an increasing understanding that displacement is a phenomenon which impacts entire communities, and therefore data collection should focus on displacement-affected communities as well as IDPs and must go well beyond accounting for immediate humanitarian needs:
- There are ongoing efforts to standardize national data on IDPs, to support Governments to include IDPs in their national data systems, and to strengthen international IDP data governance (*See* report to the UN Statistical Commission).
- IDMC has developed predictive models, particularly for disaster-displacement.
- International data centres, such as UNHCR- World Bank's center on forced displacement, OCHA's Humanitarian Data Center and IOM's Global Migration Data Analysis Centre, offer opportunities to strengthen international IDP data governance and support complementary approaches. These organizations could also help reflect on how progress on IDP data can take advantage of the Big Data revolution.

Questions for consideration:
- How can we leverage the different data systems used to account for the situation of displacement affected communities, their needs and aspirations to ensure we have the data needed to plan for and monitor solutions? Should different models and systems be used in cases of conflict/violence and of disasters?
- What is the role of national bureaus of statistics and how can we strengthen their capacity, particularly on evidence/data needed to plan for and monitor solutions?
- How do we account for the vulnerabilities and capacities of displacement affected communities, including the specific needs of women, men, girls and boys?
- How can we promote a shared understanding of risks and vulnerabilities among Governments, humanitarian and development actors in situations where some IDPs do not want to be identified?
- How do we account for multiple displacements or situations where IDPs become refugees/migrants or returnees become IDPs?
- What tools are available to Governments -- and which ones needs to be developed -- to help them plan for potential displacement and for responding to the needs of communities affected by internal displacement, in situations of conflict, violence and disasters?
- What could be the comparative advantages and complementary action of international data centers to support data systems to develop comprehensive pictures of the impact of internal displacement and to account for progress towards durable solutions (including through longitudinal studies)?

Focus Area #5: Innovative financing and funding

Challenges:
The UN's global humanitarian appeal for 2019 totaled USD $29.67 billion, a more than 15-fold increase since 2000. By the end of the year, donors had contributed USD $17.41 billion - a record high that still fell 40% short of global needs. This shows that, although humanitarian funding has steadily increased over the past two decades, the gap between available and needed funding has grown in parallel. Unsurprisingly, this trend also applies in the area of internal displacement, where donor funding failed to keep up with rapidly growing needs in the face of rising numbers of IDPs. (No figures are available on the spending on IDPs but a 2014 ODI study estimated that roughly 50% of humanitarian funding goes to refugees and IDPs, without further differentiating between the two types of displacement).

In addition to the gap in humanitarian funding, there are particular challenges associated with financing durable solutions to protracted displacement, which tends to reflect the broader challenges of financing the humanitarian-development gap. On the humanitarian side, the United Nations global emergency response fund (CERF) provides multi-donor funding to new and underfunded emergencies, but there is no similar fund bringing humanitarian and development donors together, or a "fund for solutions". A recent study by the Centre on International Cooperation concluded that continued fragmentation of humanitarian and development funding streams within donor agencies was "among the most commonly cited constraint when it comes to bridging silos." Meanwhile rigidities in donor budgets prevent the allocation of humanitarian funds for purposes other than life-saving ones, even if they would effectively reduce humanitarian needs and help to restore and build resilience. In turn, development budgets are often constrained in their use in humanitarian emergencies or situations that may no longer qualify as emergency but are considered to be too volatile to justify long-term investments. Moreover, there is often a complete absence of development actors – and a resulting scarcity of available development financing - in conflict-affected low-income countries. And donor support tends to decline as displacement crises transition from acute emergencies to protracted situations, undermining efforts to transition to self-reliance.

Opportunities:
At least rhetorically, there is now a well-established consensus around improving humanitarian - development collaboration, including in terms of financing, and the High-level Panel on Internal Displacement can build on a considerable body of analytical groundwork and well-established Member State commitments in this respect.

The 2016 High-level Panel on Humanitarian Financing laid out a broad agenda the implementation of which would significantly facilitate financing of durable solutions to internal displacement, including:
- greater targeting of ODA towards situations of fragility (building on commitments made by world leaders in 2011 in Busan);
- systematic investment in resilience-building (echoing a similar recommendation in the 2014 Review of the UN Peacebuilding Architecture);
- greater investments in risk reduction and preparedness - and ready access to emergency reserve funds and dedicated DRR budget lines – in disaster-prone countries (as called for by the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030);
- greater resort to cash-based assistance as well as flexible, predictable and multi-year financing commitments: (in line with the "Grand Bargain" emerging from the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit.)

Moreover, The OECD-DAC (Development Assistance Committee) developed guidelines in 2019 to strengthening the coherence between humanitarian, development and peace efforts. While these guidelines do not specify internal displacement, they could, if applied, provide a helpful framework for the financing of durable solutions initiatives which are neither purely humanitarian nor solely developmental.

These recommendations, commitments, and guidelines notwithstanding, funding and financing instruments, and approaches have yet to adapt to the new policy agenda towards greater humanitarian -development collaboration. As a result, it remains difficult to mobilize the necessary funding for durable solutions to internal displacement.

This reflects that the above-described difficulties and constraints have yet to be overcome. As one recent study on "financing the nexus" points to some remaining challenges: "Processes for [development and humanitarian actors jointly] developing "Collective Outcomes," [as called for by the World Humanitarian Summit], have demonstrated limited scope to influence existing planning frameworks and funding decisions. There is also limited appetite at the country level for new layers of process and planning. Leadership in the development of Collective Outcomes was also noted as problematic, which makes securing participation extremely challenging, particularly among development partners and governments. There are major gaps in coordination and disincentives to coordinate across the nexus. This is particularly

true for development partners who have limited incentives to allocate resources to support a collectively agreed plan, which is not clearly endorsed by the partner government."

The issue of internal displacement lends itself particularly well to drive innovation and experimentation on how to overcome these remaining difficulties. Indeed, durable solutions initiatives offer a tangible area in which the interests and objectives humanitarians and development might coalesce, inviting concrete joint action with dedicated financing mechanism. Encouragingly, some donors are increasingly testing funding frameworks to incentivize joint humanitarian-development planning, some with dedicated focus on forced displacement (e.g. EU, Dfid, Denmark, Netherlands).

- Approaches that seem to hold particular promise to address the humanitarian-development gap in general, and durable solutions to internal displacement in particular, include:
- Further efforts to promote joint analysis and planning among humanitarian and development actors (as foreseen in the concept of "Collective Outcomes").
- Inclusion of funding and financing considerations in the process of developing Collective Outcomes.
- Greater efforts to involve multilateral development banks in discussions around durable solutions. International Finance Institutions have themselves increasingly underscored the importance to be more engaged in forced displacement contexts (See WB's [Forcibly Displaced: Toward a Development Approach Supporting Refugees, the Internally Displaced, and Their Hosts](#) and the [joint statement](#) by Multilateral Development Banks at the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit). The World Bank is now engaged in some internal displacement contexts, including by providing social safety nets to IDPs (e.g. CAR).
- Inclusion of internal displacement in Sustainable Development Cooperation Frameworks and national development plans.

A particularly promising area of finance in terms of advancing resilience is the use of anticipatory financing, including disaster risk insurance. People who flee for their lives in cases of disasters generally are already the poorest, in lowland areas or in slums not adapted to withstand shocks. They are also rarely insured. Expanding coverage to them could enable faster recovery. Such arrangements already exist at the regional level, for example the Caribbean Catastrophe Risk Insurance Facility, in case of onset disasters, and the African Risk Capacity (ARC), led by the African Union, in case of drought. However, the costs of such policies remain high and the payouts are generally small. More work remains to make these programs affordable for communities which are often already at the bottom of the economy. Another model of anticipatory financing is pre-agreed contingency financing for the UN and multilateral banks to release money the moment disasters strike. Current examples of such programs exist with the World Bank's International Development Association (IDA) funding and the World Bank Crisis Response Window, for use by national governments. So-called "catastrophe bonds," financed by private investors, are also used, to insure against earthquakes and other disasters, and their use could be expanded (see [ERC lecture on anticipatory financing](#)).

- *Questions for consideration:*
- What are the key challenges impeding funding to address internal displacement situations, particularly to support solutions?
- How can we best build on existing frameworks and commitments to "finance the humanitarian-development nexus" to advance funding of durable solutions to internal displacement?
- In our efforts to devise modalities to finance durable solutions, should we prioritize bottom-up approaches in the field that can be scaled up or is change driven more effectively through global/headquarters-level efforts?
- How can we support the implementation of the OECD-DAC guidelines and of humanitarian-development frameworks to finance durable solutions?
- How can we ensure that advances in anticipatory financing also benefit communities at risk of displacement or mitigate the impact of displacement in the context of disasters and

climate change? What lessons can be applied to conflict and violence situations?

- What types of financing tools combining flexible multi-year humanitarian and development funding are best suited to address durable solutions and how can they be promoted?

IV. CONCLUDING CONSIDERATIONS

In examining the five focus areas overviewed above**,** the Panel should consider as cross-cutting issues the interconnected, varying effects of internal displacement on women, girls, men and boys and the gender approach. It should also pay attention to the varying risks for and impact of displacement on specific groups and individuals such as minorities, the elderly and disabled people.

Also, while not specifically articulated in the Panel's Terms of Reference, there are issues which, drawing from the history of the establishment of the Panel, will certainly emerge during consultations with various constituencies. One of these is the attention that has been drawn to the need to deal with UN response arrangements and the lack of a UN "visible institutional home" on internal displacement. Also, as the Panel's Terms of Reference ask it to consider a range of actors, their responsibilities and capacities, the question of not only national and regional capacity, but also international solidarity and responsibility sharing to advance durable solutions to internal displacement will most likely be an important consideration.

Ten essential readings on Internal Displacement (by date):

1. Wilton Park, **Internally Displaced Persons: towards more effective international protection and durable solutions** (September 2019)

2. UNDRR, **Disaster Displacement, how to reduce risk, address impacts and strengthen resilience** (September 2019)

3. IDMC**, Global Report on Internal Displacement** (May 2019)

4. Walter Kälin, **Innovative Global Governance for Internally Displaced Persons**, World Refugee Council Research Paper No. 10 (April 2019)

5. NRC, UNDP and FAO, **Financing the nexus,** Gaps and opportunities from a field perspective (2019)

6. ICRC, **Displaced in cities** (2018)

7. Walter Kälin and Hannah Entwisle Chapuisat, **Breaking the Impasse: Reducing Protracted Internal displacement as a collective outcome (**2017)

8. World Bank Group**, A Response to Global Forced Displacement** (November 2015)

9. Chaloka Beyani, Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of IDPs, **Internally displaced persons in the context of the post-2015 development agenda (part III)** (March 2015)

10. Elizabeth Ferris, **10 years after the Humanitarian Reform**, Brookings Institution (December 2014)