<u>UN High-Level Panel on Internal Displacement – UK Submission</u>

<u>Core UK objective:</u> Improve the humanitarian and development architecture to respond more effectively to the needs of IDPs. This architecture needs to be effectively coordinated and structured, ensuring strong joint analysis and assessments in order to promote the protection of IDPs, facilitate humanitarian access and support durable solutions. The IDP architecture also needs to ensure better financing, planning across the nexus, and joint learning, to meet the acute and protracted needs of IDPs.

1) What are the key issues, problems or imperatives which, as you see it, should be prioritized by the Panel in its analysis of the crisis of internal displacement today and how can prevention, response at large and solutions be effectively advanced?

<u>Four UK Priorities</u>

The UK has four key priorities for the High-Level Panel, which build on the overarching core UK objective set out above. These are protection and access, data and evidence, the nexus and financing, and coordination.

1. Protection and access

To address protection issues, compliance with International Humanitarian Law (IHL) and International Human Rights Law (IHRL) should be enhanced and there should be greater adherence to, and operationalisation of, the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement and the Kampala Convention. This includes the monitoring of adherence to these frameworks, to ensure that government ratification of them leads to tangible implementation.

A formalised working institutional relationship should also be fostered between the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and Resident and Humanitarian Coordinators, to improve the protection of IDPs (including from gender-based violence, sexual abuse and exploitation) and to integrate protection and durable solutions at the outset of any humanitarian response. This could build on the joint note produced by UNHCR and OCHA in 2014 on simplifying and streamlining leadership and coordination.

The Panel should identify the specific protection risks of IDPs, including how these differ from other vulnerable groups, and which measures would help address them. This should take account of the risks faced by internally displaced women and children, and their specific needs. The acute vulnerabilities associated with households being displaced multiple times, often over several years, should also be considered – this is particularly common in protracted conflict contexts, such as Yemen.

The Panel should review issues relating to actual or *de facto* detainment and arbitrary restrictions on freedom of movement, especially during conflict. Finally, on the issue of protection, the Panel should look at how efforts to provide IDP documentation and identification can be strengthened, given that the lack of civil documentation often impacts legal rights and impedes access to services.

Regarding the issue of access, humanitarian programmes and response plans should systematically include and consider displaced populations, in tandem with host communities and wider crisis affected populations. This is important to ensure no one is left behind and to support access to land and labour markets, freedom of movement and access to services for all groups.

Marginalised groups of IDPs - such as women, people with disabilities, LGBT people, older people and those marginalised due to their faith or non-belief, ethnicity or race - face significant barriers in accessing support and services. This includes inaccessible communications that do not account for

people with sensory impairments and inaccessible infrastructure that excludes people with mobility issues. Stigma and discrimination against those with disabilities, older people and other marginalised groups can result in a denial of basic rights, whilst discriminatory attitudes and unequal power relations can make it more difficult for women and girls to access services. Within this context, access to sexual and reproductive health services, and quality, gender-sensitive education, should be enhanced.

Linked to these points, responses to crises should better design strategies to ensure equity of access through vulnerability mapping, prioritising the most in need in Humanitarian Response Plans (and other response plans), and ensuring the participation and leadership of marginalised groups within planning, needs assessments and responses. Regular political economy analysis should be undertaken to identify the political barriers to meeting the needs of IDPs that exist within states and governments themselves (at national, regional and local levels), alongside any additional barriers that might prevent access.

Finally, on the issue of access, as well as compliance with IHL, there needs to be appropriate civil-military coordination, where necessary. Civil-military coordination is critical in conflict contexts to ensure assistance can reach IDPs. It should be a priority, but it is often under resourced and de-prioritised.

2. Data and evidence

Better investment in data collection is needed, to ensure IDPs most in need are identified and can access what they need the most. This should be facilitated by sharing anonymised data and building on evidence of what has worked in the past. The Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC), IOM, UNHCR, the World Bank, OCHA, REACH, ACAPs and others are all currently involved in the gathering and analysis of data on IDPs. Better joint analysis between these organisations is crucial to develop an inter-sectoral understanding of the needs, risks and vulnerabilities of IDPs, and to ensure response interventions are targeted according to clear prioritisation criteria that is based on the severity of need. Greater metrics should be developed to understand how much of the response is going to the most vulnerable, including to IDPs.

Data that is collected should be disaggregated by age, gender and disability amongst other characteristics, to ensure no-one is left behind. Evidence on what works to reach marginalised groups, for example people with disabilities, is currently poorly understood. Better-quality disaggregated data, as well as gender and conflict-sensitive analysis, is essential to fill the knowledge gap. COVID-19 may result in unexpected flows of IDPs and better data on the acute needs of IDPs could help anticipate and respond to this.

Greater data transparency should be promoted at all levels, including through services such as OCHA's Humanitarian Data Centre, and UNHCR and the World Bank's Joint Data Service. Contributions from specialist analytical organisations (such as the Joint Inter-Agency Profiling Service) and the private sector should be explored further.

IDPs - particularly women, people with disabilities and other frequently excluded groups - should also be given the opportunity to participate in the management of their affairs, most importantly in the gathering, usage and management of data. They should be aware which data is being collected and why; ensuring this could involve, for example, creating a GDPR for IDP data. If IDPs choose to withhold consent for data collection, there should be mechanisms to ensure that they remain able to access assistance.

The collection, storage, sharing and analysis of personally identifiable and aggregated statistical data should be responsible, safe, ethical and effective. It should also involve understanding the risks and

harm that can come from both collecting and processing data about people and making informed decisions about its handling and usage.

3. Humanitarian-development-peacebuilding nexus and financing

IDP responses should be part of more effective solutions in protracted crises, which ensure a gender and conflict-sensitive approach. The Panel should explore the lack of durable solutions and housing, land and property rights, and the need for longer-term assistance through joined up humanitarian, peace and development planning. It should also look into government led solutions for safe, voluntary and dignified returns or resettlement/local integration, as well as inclusive access to basic services and livelihoods. Finally, the Panel should consider the inclusion and participation of IDPs in the Sustainable Development Goals, national and local peace efforts, humanitarian, peace and development responses, broader poverty reduction efforts, and anticipatory action on climate related displacement.

Currently, emphasis is placed on responding to IDPs in situ, but as some become refugees a more 'people-focused' approach to displacement could be more effective. Being more 'people-focused' also links closely to the points around data and vulnerability mentioned above under UK Priority 2.

Financing is a key element of the nexus points above and could provide an opportunity for innovation in the way IDPs are supported to return, integrate, or resettle. There needs to be a clearer demarcation on which chronic vulnerabilities facing IDPs should be addressed through humanitarian funding and which should be addressed through development funding. This is important for not over-stretching humanitarian resources, for example by expecting them to take on the larger investments that are required under 'urban development' frameworks.

4. Coordination

In line with the UK's policy priorities on reform of the international humanitarian system, there needs to be better coordination between agencies, civil society, local NGOs (including women's groups and disabled people's organisations) and between different ministries within governments when responding to IPDs. This includes coordination cutting across the humanitarian, development, human rights and peace architecture.

Specifically, during acute IDP responses in humanitarian contexts, it should be clear which UN agency leads on meeting the needs of IDPs and this should be agreed quickly. It is important that UN agencies work where they have comparative advantage, that there are incentives in the system for coordination over competition, and should the need for more than one coordination system arise, these are complementary and do not overlap. In countries with multiple responses led by different UN agencies, there can be a discrepancy between the services provided to refugees and those provided to IDPs – with the latter often being limited. This can exacerbate tensions between host communities, IDPs and refugees.

Finally, within government structures, there should be clear inter-ministerial coordination mechanisms, based on a whole of government approach, which hold civilian responsibility for IDP management and responses.

Other key issues

There are three additional key issues which will be important to consider: COVID-19, accountability and participation of IDPs, and prevention. These are set out below.

1. COVID-19

COVID-19 is likely to have a significant impact on development and humanitarian responses in the medium-term. The Panel should explore how to protect and assist IDPs to ensure their fundamental

rights are safeguarded, they are included in national surveillance and response planning for the pandemic (including access to testing and health-care services), and they receive the necessary information and assistance. It should also explore how to mitigate risks when national authorities are unable to take such measures.

The Panel should explore the international community's role in both advocating for, and providing assistance to, IDPs affected by the pandemic. In addition, the Panel should explore how the UN and wider humanitarian sector can coordinate to ensure that the specific needs of IDPs are incorporated into all strategic COVID-19 planning and programming.

Attention should be given to the risk of COVID-19 spreading in IDP settlements (e.g. in Informal Tented Settlements), which can contain crowded populations, and poor sanitation, disease surveillance and health services. The Panel should particularly consider the higher risk to certain groups, based on emerging research. It should also consider the severe secondary impacts of the pandemic that are disproportionately affecting women, girls and other vulnerable populations. These include a surge in gender-based violence, a potential reduction in resources for, and access to, key services (including those for sexual and reproductive health and violence against women and girls), an increase in economic challenges that can heighten the risk of exploitation, and an increase in unpaid care work.

The Panel should explore whether legal and policy frameworks can play a role in addressing the impacts of the pandemic, including adoption and implementation of the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement (specifically principle 19, which states that special attention should also be given to the prevention of contagious and infectious diseases among IDPs) and the Kampala Convention. It should investigate and outline how to prevent, anticipate and address the risks of violence, discrimination, marginalisation and xenophobia towards IDPs by enhancing awareness and understanding of the COVID-19 pandemic at community level.

Other key issues that should be explored include ensuring governments are implementing proportionate lockdown measures and supporting IDPs' freedom of movement and their rights, and ensuring humanitarian staff and relief items can reach IDPs. Further issues include return-relocation plans and ensuring that IDPs are sufficiently included in the responses of international financial institutions (IFIs) and UN appeals, to address the longer-term needs of IDPs impacted by the pandemic.

2. Accountability and participation of IDPs

The direct involvement of IDPs in the process of the Panel is important. The Panel should also consider how the international system can support civil society actors (both those led by IDPs themselves, and those seeking to represent the voices of IDPs) whilst also pushing for international and national structures, to ensure IDPs' representation, participation and ownership of, crucial decision-making processes. Effective citizen state accountability is critical to durable solutions, but this is reliant on a legal framework that includes IDPs.

More broadly, a concerted effort should be made to increase the voice and leadership of marginalised groups (including disabled people's organisations, women's groups and grass-roots organisations) in the humanitarian sector to help ensure it is responsive to their needs. This involvement should go beyond standard complaints and feedback mechanisms and explore how the participation and leadership of IDPs in decision-making can have an empowering impact and provide dignity.

Links should be made between accountability/participation and the IASC Guidelines on Mental Health and Psychosocial Support in Emergency Settings, to maximise the wellbeing outcomes of participation and empowerment of IDPs in aid delivery.

3. Prevention

The deliberate targeting and displacement of civilian populations in active conflict situations is a key issue. The Panel should reinforce the importance of the humanitarian principles and the Geneva Conventions on this subject and consider the work that ICRC and IFRC are doing to explore solutions. Inquiries should be held where investigations have determined there is credible evidence of deliberate targeting of civilians and civilian infrastructure as a tactic by a party to a conflict (in contravention of IHL). A strategy to prevent such actions should be established early in conflicts, including a monitoring mechanism.

2) Across the objectives of prevention, response and solutions, how can national political will, responsibility and capacity be catalysed and cultivated?

This is dependent on the context. In some protracted displacement and conflict situations, a national response may be difficult given for example, split governance between different areas of the country. In these contexts, it may be more effective to focus on subnational or governorate-level responses to shelter, access to services and protection, in tandem with national efforts to maintain freedom of movement and ensure civil documentation. Targeted capacity building can be facilitated by clear coordination and governance structures at the national and subnational level for IDP responses, taking into consideration the responsibilities of each ministry or government body. It could be explored whether linking funding to locations where there are high levels of engagement by local authorities, and clear commitment to invest in long-solutions for integrating IDPs, is effective. For example, this has been one of strategies employed by DFID through its durable solutions programme in Somalia.

Potential ways to cultivate national responsibility in conflict contexts should be explored, for example, through the inclusion of long-term IDP protection and assistance as components of a political settlement and/or confidence-building measures which precede a settlement (acknowledging the composition of IDP communities and that they are not a homogenous group). Another useful hook to cultivate responsibility could be the adoption of inclusive international IDP frameworks by governments, or the creation of national frameworks/guidelines that are owned by national authorities. Finally, to discourage policies that lead to displacement or prolong it, and to incentivise safe and voluntary returns, efforts should be made to raise awareness of the impact of forced displacement on local and national economies, and the long-lasting socio-political unrest it can create.

Finally, there are a range of stakeholders (legislative, executive, judiciary, religious leaders and civil society) involved in IDP issues. Efforts should be made to establish an accurate understanding of the most influential factors or stakeholders, and the bottlenecks to passing progressive policy and action. This analysis should enable a dedicated focus on unlocking specific constraints, similar to OCHA's Access Framework model. Humanitarian actors will need support from other actors to unblock these issues, but humanitarian diplomacy should be able to help promote a shared interest and voice across the nexus to cultivate political will.

3) What is the relevance and role of humanitarian, development, peace, climate change and disaster reduction action? How can a more integrated approach in these respects be fostered? Answers can also address the role of the Private Sector, Regional or International Financial Institutions and other development partners and actors.

Building on the key nexus points already articulated under question one in this UK Submission, IDP situations are at the intersection of humanitarian, development, peace, climate and Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) concerns. IDPs are likely to live in the most fragile settings and in those countries most vulnerable to climate change but are also likely to be among the most marginalised in development processes and side-lined by DRR efforts. As development and climate funding is disproportionately channelled to more stable settings, IDPs, together with the wider population of their country, are more likely to be deprioritised from the process of development. This leaves them doubly vulnerable as the climate and conflict shocks that have driven their displacement can also drive

cyclical conflict and recruitment into armed groups; and because long-term solutions for them are not currently prioritised. This vulnerability can be exacerbated by other characteristics such as gender, age and disability.

In order to remedy this, different approaches to financing, coordination, planning and data are needed. In terms of financing, (particularly at global and in-country levels) donor and multilateral level funding strategies that better align with fragility levels and with high concentrations of IDPs, are needed. Underpinning financing strategies should be country development plans and donor-government cooperation frameworks, that are more IDP sensitive.

On the coordination front, it should be recognised that in most fragile and conflict affected states, where strong coordination between humanitarian actors does exist, it is scarcely replicated by strong coordination across the entirety of the nexus (humanitarian, development and peace). This can be due to weaker national capacity – as well as potentially weaker commitment to human rights and inclusive development. A coordination architecture that brings together humanitarian, development, peace, and climate around common frameworks and objectives, works inclusively with local-level actors, women's groups and disabled people's organisations, and is not unduly burdensome, could be effective. The Global Refugee Compact has provided positive examples for this, notably in Uganda, with stakeholders dedicating political capital and resources to help the forum work. The new and empowered Resident Coordinators could play a catalytic function to help coordinate across these various parts. In addition, Peace and Development Advisers should use their coordinating function within Resident Coordinators' offices to ensure coherence between the humanitarian, development and peace activity at country level.

To support joined up approaches, joint-funding mechanisms that cut across usual siloes could be catalytic, including at global, regional and country levels. Global funds and Education Cannot Wait are some examples of mechanisms that go broader than traditional humanitarian or development delivery models. DFID is part of a range of multi-donor initiatives that whilst developmental in design, also seek to deliver against humanitarian and peace objectives (e.g. on health in South Sudan and in Myanmar, and on livelihoods in Myanmar). These types of joined up funding mechanisms can offer a good channel to provide coordinated funding in a specific sector or thematic area.

In many contexts, the number of IDPs within the humanitarian caseload is so significant that underfunded appeals do not realistically enable all those in need to be reached with assistance and services. IDPs that are sheltering in camps are often prioritised, as they tend to indicate a greater severity of humanitarian need when Multi-Sector Needs Assessments data is aggregated up, particularly when camps are below standards. However, underfunded appeals also mean that there is a trend of urban IDP caseloads living in host communities *outside* of camp settings, which may be marginalised from receiving assistance. The international community should work with host governments to mitigate this issue including by encouraging development and private sector actors to target the most vulnerable, including communities with prolonged IDP populations, such as urban dwellers. These groups should also be considered as part of the additional need for public services in a given area and not continuously considered as a caseload for the humanitarian system to respond to. IFI funding for infrastructure could seek ways to support IDPs and host communities as part of urban development planning and means to boost economic growth. International assistance and other incentives should also target host households and communities, so they see benefit, rather than burden, in hosting.

The Panel should also explore why climate finance does not systematically reach climate IDPs, and how international climate finance and instruments can be tailored to be more sensitive and adaptive to situations of fragility and conflict, and to forced displacement.

The private sector can play a critical role in supporting more effective and holistic solutions for IDPs. Most IDPs are themselves private sector actors, working for instance in agriculture and petty trade. Improving access to finance and financial inclusion for both IDPs and the micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs) that employ IDPs, is critical to enable IDPs to become self-reliant. In addition, helping governments to create a more conducive environment for the private sector, which enables informal MSMEs to move to the formal economy, can also improve IDPs and MSMEs' access to finance, whilst also generating government tax revenue.

IDPs also face barriers to land ownership which hinder their economic opportunities. Promoting initiatives to improve access to land can enable IDPs to engage in economic activities and foster their self-reliance. Further suggestions on the role of the private sector include improving IDP representation in private and public utility boards (such as water management boards), to strengthen IDPs' participation in services that affect them (linking to the points on participation and accountability under Question 1 of this UK Submission). Expanding opportunities for mobile transfers and lowering the cost of internal remittances could also boost economic relations between IDPs, internal migrants and their areas of origin.

Finally, related to the points on data and evidence in Questions 1 and 6 of this UK Submission, the Panel should explore whether there is a role for the private sector in improving the profiling of IDPs, specifically the identification and analysis of IDPs through the collection of detailed disaggregated data on their status, intentions and the length of their displacement. This data is currently lacking and poses a major obstacle to implementing an overarching IDP strategy, which should ideally encompass the entire HDP Nexus, from emergency assistance through to durable solutions.

4) Focusing on solutions, what are your perspectives on what has led to many situations of internal displacement remaining stalled for many years and how can effective solutions be catalysed, driven forward and supported?

The protracted nature of most IDP crises can often be characteristic of limited capacity or political commitment to resolve conflicts peacefully, protect populations, safeguard human rights, and deliver inclusive development. In some countries with high IDP caseloads, instability and the resulting displacement can potentially be used as political tools. Without increased efforts by all to stop these conflicts, displacement will continue.

Situations can remain stalled due to conflicts over housing, land and property rights, as well as local community hostility to IDPs that are from different areas of the country, ethnicity or tribe. Situations can also remain stalled because of political considerations over elections (e.g. a significant number of IDPs from one ethnic background settling in an area and changing political dynamics), and different expectations between IDPs and government/host communities of acceptable durable solutions (e.g. returns versus local integration). The relatively greater security and better access to services provided by urban areas can have a pull factor on protracted displacement situations. The marginalisation of IDPs - heightened by their absence from national census, development planning and peace processes - can further stall progress in these situations.

Solutions are not simple, quick or straightforward. During periods of active conflict, it can be difficult to engage with displacement issues as part of recovery/development agendas. Upstream work to build countries' conflict risk management capacity can help stall and counter the process of social degradation once conflicts materialise.

Empowering marginalised populations and IDPs to hold states, local authorities and other stakeholders (including development and humanitarian agencies) accountable, and engage in development and political processes, is key. To enable this, the legal rights of IDPs (e.g. voting and

access to services) must be protected and included when finding solutions to civil documentation. The participation of marginalised communities in peace processes is also key. This includes promoting the leadership and empowerment of those often excluded from political processes, such as people with disabilities, and women.

Building on the response to question three of this UK Submission, financing mechanisms and adequate resources are critical to enable this. Many of the issues affecting IDPs (land access, documentation, livelihoods) still fall between the cracks of humanitarian, development, peace and climate responses, and are under resourced. Policy tensions across the nexus may mean that some challenges cannot be addressed in a way that meets the best or acceptable practice for all involved, resulting in no action rather than compromise. Further work needs to be done to identify and address these areas to promote progress. Dedicated financing commitments are key and should consider non-displaced communities where relevant to avoid creating new forms of marginalisation.

In some contexts, there may be incentives by some parties to maintain the IDP *status quo*, in order to capture resources. These incentives need to be addressed, in order to make any significant progress. Such incentives can lead to resistance at multiple levels to develop objective and transparent criteria to identify when an IDP no longer maintains their displacement status and transitions to 'urban poor'. In Somalia, DFID has supported the development of a 'local integration index' to better understand the specific vulnerabilities facing IDPs, compared to host communities/urban poor, with a view to a) measuring the performance of durable solutions programmes in a more objective, systematic manner; b) ascertaining which IDP-specific vulnerabilities should be addressed through a durable solutions framework; and c) advocating for IDPs who have been assessed as 'integrated' to be removed from the IDP caseloads. These issues also link to question six of this UK Submission.

5) Are there new or creative financing solutions which can be built up or better utilized in enabling more effective responses to displacement and the achievement of durable solutions?

The responses to questions one and three of this UK Submission raise key issues regarding financing challenges and solutions. Building on these points, the financing of reconciliation and land, housing and property restitution processes is often a gap. While urban planning, basic services, and market support are often funded through traditional channels, the underlying cause of displacement (insecurity or land misappropriation) often remain 'unsolved', thereby prolonging uncertainty and displacement situations.

6) What are the critical issues or questions as you see them in respect to data and evidence in the response to internal displacement including gaps, shortcomings and challenges in approaches or implementation and how these can be addressed?

Humanitarian and development assistance are critical to meet the needs of IDPs, but current levels of funding are insufficient and may not always be going to those most in need. Building on the key data and evidence points already raised in question one of this UK Submission, it is critical that humanitarian and development resources are targeted in the most effective and efficient way, to ensure those most in need are able to receive what they need most. It is crucial that accurate data (disaggregated by gender, age and disability), and joint needs analysis (informed directly by the views of affected populations), clearly prioritise limited humanitarian resources to the most acute and severe needs, while development resources target self-reliance, resilience, and reconstruction.

An exercise to understand the socio-economic differences of types of vulnerable groups in different contexts and to assess their different needs, could be useful. As IDPs are not a homogenous group and may not always be the most in need in a given context per se, the approach to needs assessments should be nuanced, delivering against the specific needs of different groups. For example, the needs of IDPs that make it to host communities and families may be different from those in Informal Tented

Settlements (ITS) or camps. Needs are also likely to vary within these groups, particularly for women, children, people with disabilities and other excluded groups. This type of analysis should be context specific and useful for needs identification, to help ensure the most vulnerable are then prioritised in response plans and individual appeals themselves.

Where humanitarian actors are unable to reach IDPs due to finite resources, under the auspices of the Resident and Humanitarian Coordinators, data should be (sensitively) made available across UN Country Teams (UNCTs). Metrics for success for development actors should evolve to accommodate supporting outcomes for long-term IDP communities and their hosts. Gap analyses should also be conducted on a quarterly basis as part of the Humanitarian Project Cycle and inform periodical strategic discussions. As part of this, the humanitarian community discuss the targeted people in need that it is not able to service and seek alternative sources and forms of assistance for them.

The humanitarian system can create incentives for competition over scarce resources. This in turn can create a disincentive for coordination and collaboration with regards to responding to the needs of IDPs. The separation of needs assessments from aid delivery and monitoring and evaluation, could introduce greater accountability to affected populations. This should be paired with ongoing data collection, to understand whether support continues to meet needs over time, as well as evidence of adapting assistance accordingly.

A focus on durable solutions, intention surveys, and joint planning for multi-stakeholder solutions, is important and should be included in recovery and development budgets. Though these measures are often out of scope for humanitarian budgets, without this data it can be difficult to enter negotiations with national authorities, host communities, and displaced populations. Evidence of processes, assessment tools and data sets that have successfully helped advocate for durable solutions should be collated and used to develop this approach further.

7) What steps could be taken to strengthen the effectiveness of response management, coordination and accountability at all levels in contexts of internal displacement?

Better coordination between agencies, civil society, local NGOs, and between different ministries within governments will be critical in the response to internal displacement. This includes coordination cutting across the humanitarian, development and peace architecture.

Building on the points raised under question one of this UK Submission, the Panel should consider bodies and oversight/accountability mechanisms that would ensure that IDPs are given equal weight in responses and that resources are focused on the most vulnerable people. Options could include, for example, a cross-cutting body that is responsible for IDPs in each context, or an independent body that ensures the most vulnerable groups (including IDPs) are prioritised during a response. The current work to empower and strengthen the Resident/Humanitarian Coordinator's role could also offer opportunities to ensure IDPs are considered across response, recovery, resilience and durable solutions.

There might be lessons learnt from the Risk-informed Early Action Partnership (REAP) as it aims to coordinate and convene development, humanitarian, DRR and climate groups.

Additionally, there are existing system wide commitments on accountability (including IASC commitments on leadership and accountability, the Core Humanitarian Standard, Grand Bargain commitments, and agencies' individual commitments on accountability), which could be more systematically implemented. The international system should explore how best to tackle the barriers to implementation and to accountability, which are set out comprehensively in literature.