



**United  
Nations**

UN Secretary-General's High-Level  
Panel on Internal Displacement

# **SYNTHESIS REPORT ON RESPONSES TO CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS TO THE PANEL**

Secretariat of United Nations Secretary-General's High-Level Panel on Internal Displacement

## Table of Contents

Forward.....	3
Situations and populations of concern .....	4
Cross-cutting themes .....	6
Addressing the drivers of displacement .....	8
IDP Rights and Laws and Policies .....	10
State responsibility, political will, and accountability.....	12
Technical assistance and support .....	15
State institutional frameworks .....	16
Solutions .....	18
Integrated approaches to solutions to displacement.....	21
Strengthening humanitarian responses.....	24
Financing .....	25
Data, evidence, and research.....	28
Considerations for the Panel during its lifespan .....	31
Annex 1 – List of submitting entities .....	33

## Forward

The following document provides a synthesis of responses to the [Call for Submissions](#) launched by the UN Secretary-General's High-Level Panel on Internal Displacement in March 2020. A total of **91 submissions** were received by 25 September 2020, all of which were analyzed in detail and continue to inform the Panel's ongoing work.<sup>1</sup>

The Call for Submissions was distributed widely to states, UN agencies, NGOs, academic institutions, and relevant initiatives and platforms. It was also disseminated proactively through the Panel's Twitter account and posted on the Panel's website. The Panel will continue to welcome new submissions up until May 2021.

Given the volume of information provided to the Secretariat, it is not possible to cover every topic or reflect the full richness of the submissions in this condensed report. Rather, this document aims to outline key trends, points of convergence and divergence, and specific recommendations that emerged from the submissions. Greater detail can be found in the individual written contributions, the majority of which are available on the Panel's website [here](#).

Although the Secretariat proposed a series of questions in the Call for Submissions, the majority of responses chose to follow a free format. As such, this synthesis is organized by theme rather than by question.

This document was originally prepared by the Secretariat for the Panel in July 2020 following the initial deadline of the Call for Submissions. It was updated at the end of September 2020 to incorporate new written contributions and was subsequently revised in this version for public dissemination. Some elements in this public version have been anonymized or removed to respect the confidentiality of certain submissions. Submissions received after 25 September 2020 are not reflected in this synthesis but are available on the Panel's website.

HLP Secretariat / Geneva / October 2020

---

<sup>1</sup> Annex 1 provides a list of public submissions

## Situations and populations of concern

Before going into the thematic priorities that emerged in the submissions, it is important to first note the different displacement contexts and populations of concern.

### Displacement contexts

Submissions addressed displacement linked to a number of key drivers: conflict and violence, disasters and climate change, technological disasters and development-induced displacement, and individual persecution. Urban displacement was also noted to require particular attention given the high volume of IDPs living in cities and urban environments. Additionally, submissions highlighted the risks to IDPs created by the COVID-19 pandemic. Each of these issues is discussed briefly below.

#### Conflict and violence

The vast majority of submissions addressed displacement driven by situations of **conflict** and violence, which continue to be the primary drivers of protracted displacement worldwide. The Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre's latest *Global Report on Internal Displacement* found that there were 45.7 million internally displaced persons at the end of 2019 who had fled their homes as a result of conflict and violence. This is the highest number on record.

Submissions noted that **other situations of violence**, such as the gang and drug violence, may also require attention by the Panel. Submissions highlighted that there are often unique complexities associated with solutions in these environments, particularly in contexts where the threat or violence persists. Individuals displaced by other situations of violence may also face challenges in being recognized as a displaced person and receiving appropriate support.

#### Disasters and climate change

Over two thirds of submissions spoke about the key role of **disasters and climate change** in contributing to displacement. As various submissions noted, more people are newly displaced by disasters each year than by conflict. Submissions addressed **sudden-onset, slow-onset, and multi-hazard** disasters, and noted that all three require additional attention. Submissions also noted that attention also needs to be given to how disasters intersect with conflict and other risks. Submissions highlighted that in the case of displacement associated with slow-onset crises or multi-hazard disasters, there can at times be challenges in ensuring that IDPs are recognized and supported, which as [Kaldor Centre](#) noted, could be creating a significant protection gap.

#### Technological disasters and development-induced displacement

A less frequent but severe driver of displacement are **technological disasters** – for example, the Fukushima nuclear disaster in Japan in 2011. The researcher [Ana Mosneaga](#) noted that displacement in the context of technological disasters tends to be more protracted, often due to the long-lasting impacts of environmental contamination. Submissions also noted the potential for **development projects** to trigger displacement. These dynamics will have distinct implications for solutions options available to displaced persons, and merit additional consideration.

## Individual persecution and human rights violations

Submissions also addressed displacement driven by **individual persecution perpetrated within communities** and noted the need for greater clarity around whether this can be recognized as a driver of displacement – and if so, what protection and assistance should be provided to such individuals. The submission from [GARPAB](#), the group leading follow-up on the Brazil Plan of Action that emerged from the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Cartagena Declaration on Refugees, gives the example of LGBTI individuals who have been driven from their homes by members of the community, effectively rendering them into a situation of displacement.

## Urban displacement

Submissions highlighted that a large proportion, potentially even the majority, of IDPs are living in **urban areas**. While there are gaps in understanding the exact numbers of these populations given that they are often dispersed rather than congregated in camps, submissions note that the urbanization trend and unsustainability of camps means that far greater attention needs to be paid to urban displacement dynamics.

In a dedicated joint submission focusing on urban displacement, [IIED, JIPS, and UN Habitat](#) noted that “More than simply context, urban systems – including municipal authorities, networks of basic service provision, markets for goods and services, social infrastructure – should be seen as active potential contributors to IDP protection, well-being, self-reliance and integration.” They suggest that assistance should be channeled through local government service providers as far as possible. Submissions also noted the importance of applying an urban planning dimension (with participation of affected communities) in both prevention of and response to displacement. Various resources on urban displacement are available, including ICRC’s 2018 report [Displaced in Cities](#).

## COVID-19

In light of the current global pandemic, submissions highlighted the particular risks COVID-19 poses for internally displaced populations. These risks were noted on a number of fronts: physical risks associated with crowded living environments, lack of access to health care, and exclusion from COVID-19 response measures; economic risks associated with the declining global economy; stigmatization and exclusion risks associated with perceptions they could be COVID-19 carriers; and risks that prevention measures such as border closures may jeopardize their rights or physical security. The submission from APRRN notes that a number of incidents have already occurred linked to COVID prevention that compromised the protection of displaced persons. Submissions also noted that there may be less attention and funding for displacement generally due to COVID-19’s global impacts.

The submission from [UNDRR](#) suggests that “COVID-19 must be seen not only as a global health emergency but also an example of systemic risk, characterized by its cascading impacts.” They note that there is value in looking at lessons learned from COVID-19 to integrate a comprehensive risk lens in post-COVID policy discussions and actions, including in ensuring that economic support packages reduce risks and build resilience for the future.

## Populations of concern

In addition to the general displacement contexts, submissions highlighted a number of specific populations of concern.

## Age, gender, and diversity

A key trend that emerged from submissions was the criticality of the Panel ensuring that its recommendations respond to the specific needs of individuals linked to their **age, gender, and diversity** characteristics. This was reinforced most strongly in a [joint submission](#) that received 51 individual signatories from Member States, UN Agencies, and NGOs. The joint submission and others highlighted that age, gender, and diversity characteristics both shape vulnerability to risks as well as impact people's experiences and needs during displacement. Efforts to effectively prevent, respond, and achieve solutions to displacement must consider these unique dynamics rather than assuming that a one-size-fits-all solution will appropriately meet everyone's needs. Recommendations also need to consider how the intersection of different characteristics may further impact individual experiences.

The joint AGD submission requested that a **dedicated meeting on age, gender, and diversity be convened once the Panel's recommendations start to take form** so that input can be provided on how to ensure recommendations appropriately incorporate age, gender, and diversity considerations.

## Host communities

Many submissions also highlighted the importance of recognizing the experiences, needs, and capacities of host communities. As with IDPs, submissions noted that it is important that host communities are able to be meaningfully engaged in decisions that affect them, and that they can benefit from assistance where their need is comparable to that of IDPs. This inclusive approach is not only essential in respecting the rights and needs of individuals, but it is also in developing sustainable approaches and in reducing the risk of tension between communities. Throughout this report, "affected communities" should be understood to include both displaced and displacement-affected (namely, host) communities.

## Cross-cutting themes

In addition to the contexts and populations of concern noted above, submissions also touched on a number of cross-cutting themes. These most notably include the need for a protection-oriented approach and ensuring meaningful participation of affected communities.

## Protection

Many submissions highlighted the importance of the Panel supporting a **protection-oriented approach** to internal displacement, including by ensuring that IDPs' safety, rights, and dignity are respected and supported. Subsequent sections of this report will discuss the need to prevent risks and violations of international and regional law and ensure that IDPs' basic protections are upheld. From an operational perspective, however, submissions highlighted a number of protection service priorities that they believe to be key in promoting recovery. These include:

- Prevention and response to sexual and gender-based violence
- Mental health and psychosocial support
- Child protection, including family reunification
- Prevention of forced recruitment
- Prevention of all forms of exploitation
- Issuance or recovery of civil documentation
- Avoidance of negative coping strategies

- Access to justice and legal services
- Ensuring freedom of movement
- Ensuring equal access to citizenship and nationality rights

In all of the above, support needs to be accessible to people of all ages, genders, and diversities, and needs to take into consideration any pre-existing vulnerabilities. Particular attention also needs to be given to individuals who may be marginalized or stigmatized by communities, for example people with different sexual orientations or gender identities.

Effective responses to protection require that **protection services be recognized as lifesaving**. This is often not the case. There is also a need to recognize that protection risks persist even in disaster settings. [UNHCR's](#) submission encouraged the Panel to consider ways to ensure protection and accountability are prioritized across the spectrum of prevention, response, and solutions. This includes in the UN Secretary General's Prevention Agenda, the IASC Policy on Protection, and the SDGs.

### Participation of affected communities and locally led solutions

As will hopefully become clear in subsequent sections of this report, the importance of the **participation of affected communities** was one of the most cross-cutting themes in all submissions. Participation was noted as being critical for a number of reasons, including that: people have a right to be consulted in decisions that affect them; the effectiveness of decisions is greatly improved when decisions are informed by the realities of people's lived experiences; it promotes agency, dignity, and inclusion; and fourth, it promotes sustainability of the solutions. It also is critical in ensuring that leaders and responders are accountable to the people they seek to serve.

Many submissions noted that effective participation requires individuals across **all ages, genders, abilities, and diversities** to have a voice. This also includes individuals from minority or indigenous groups, and individuals who may be perceived as opposing the current government.

Participation was noted as being **crucial at all stages of preventing, responding, and achieving durable solutions** to displacement. Affected communities can provide invaluable insights into underlying root causes of crises, effective prevention strategies, appropriate response modalities and needs, and means of supporting solutions. Many submissions also highlighted the important role for affected communities in peace processes. Efforts to promote their engagement needs to be authentic and continuous, rather than a one-off consultation designed to tick a box. The [Center for Global Development's](#) submission provides a number of concrete recommendations on participation, including, for example, to "enhance the direct representation of IDPs and other crisis-affected people in Humanitarian Country Teams and Country-Based Pooled Funds advisory boards, exploring the creation of 'people's advocate' roles and/or affected people's advisory bodies."

A number of submissions noted that **enabling participation may require resourcing**. Platforms for engagement need to be accessible, which may require an investment in either bringing those platforms to the people or supporting people to access decision-makers. Efforts will need to be made to share information and receive feedback in minority languages, rather than assuming all affected communities can communicate effectively in the predominant national languages. Governments should also remove any barriers that prevent IDPs from being able to vote, register, and engage in political processes.

Submissions noted that failures to enable effective participation may sometimes be due to a lack of familiarity with how to effectively provide a platform for participation. In the absence of strong commitment to participation, decision-makers may instead rely on representatives or indirect means of hearing from affected communities, which may reduce the likelihood of hearing from marginalized individuals. To mitigate this, [GARPAB](#) suggested that it would be useful to have a **best practice guide on IDP participation** tailored for governments and decision-makers.

In addition to ensuring the participation of affected communities, submissions also highlighted the criticality of supporting **locally led action and solutions** (often referred to as “localization” within the humanitarian sector). As [Catholic Relief Services](#) noted, “Those who are closest to the problems should be the architects of the solutions.”

## Addressing the drivers of displacement

Turning now to the thematic priorities that emerged from the submissions, **prevention** stood out as a clear priority. In general, submissions emphasized the need to address three components of prevention: underlying root causes, triggers of displacement, and recurrence.

### Addressing underlying root causes

Nearly a third of the submissions highlighted the need for states and the international system to dedicate additional attention to addressing the **underlying root causes** of conflict, violence, and disasters. Submissions noted that these root causes are often a combination of **social, economic, political, and structural factors** that contribute to tensions, create vulnerability, and exacerbate risks. While addressing immediate triggers of displacement is important, submissions noted the criticality of working together with affected communities to understand and more intentionally address root causes that drive these triggers in the first place. Subsequent sections of this report, particularly on Integrated Approaches, provide additional recommendations on how this could be achieved.

The Panel received a number of detailed submissions on **the role of climate change in displacement** and particularly its function as a “threat multiplier.” Submissions noted the need to inject considerations of displacement into global, regional, and national dialogues on climate change and adaptation, where presently it is often lacking. Submissions also highlighted the urgency of addressing climate change through implementation of the Paris Agreement, which they note is fundamental in preventing future displacement. This will require a shared global commitment. At the local level, strengthening community resilience and national systems to manage climate change was also noted as critical.

As was noted by the [KNOMAD submission](#), the World Bank is currently conducting research on “Internal Climate Migration” and has found that without action to reduce emissions and improve development equality, there could be more than 143 million people who move internally by 2050 in Sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and Latin America. The UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of IDPs will also be presenting a report to the UN General Assembly on climate change and internal displacement in August 2020.



## Addressing triggers of displacement

In addition to addressing root causes, many submissions spoke about the need for the Panel to address the main triggers of displacement – notably, conflict and disasters. In both cases, addressing how conflict and disasters occur is key to not only preventing future displacement, but also to unlocking protracted displacement and enabling solutions.

### In situations of conflict

A large number of submissions encouraged the Panel to consider ways to promote **adherence to international law**, particularly International Humanitarian Law (IHL). As the [Danish Refugee Council submission](#) noted, “There continues to be a significant compliance gap in adhering to international humanitarian law obligations, with civilians, including IDPs, bearing the brunt of armed conflicts across the globe.” Submissions highlighted that the conduct of hostilities relates to displacement in a number of ways: targeting or attacks on civilian areas can drive displacement, denials of humanitarian access can exacerbate conditions in displacement, and damage, destruction, or contamination of civilian areas can have impacts on the ability of individuals to find an end to their displacement. Active hostilities, whether in conflict or gang settings, is also a key impediment to returns and solutions.

Submissions included a number of recommendations for how adherence to international law could be strengthened. First, submissions noted the importance of **integrating IHL into national policies and developing practical guidance** on how it will be operationalized by armed forces. The [submission from the International Committee of the Red Cross](#), the global custodian of IHL, noted that it has seen a positive impact from integrating IHL into formal training and compliance mechanisms, and also through linking IHL obligations to contextual and local norms. [InterAction](#) called for states to implement the UN Secretary-General’s 2018 recommendation to adopt national protection of civilian’s policies, and noted that there could be value in creating a platform or **mechanism for member states to share best practices and lessons learned** on reducing harm to civilians in their military operations.

A second area that was highlighted in promoting adherence to international law, and specifically IHL, was the need to **strengthen accountability for violations**. One confidential submission noted that in their country-context, the accountability gap appeared to be partly “a result of other States favor[ing] their bilateral relationship with the Government for development, international trade and counter-terrorism objectives at the expense of concrete steps to rein in policies and practices harmful to the civilian population, including IDPs.” In this respect, the submission noted the **shared responsibility of member states** in promoting accountability. It also noted the particular criticality of accountability in cases where the Government is both requesting assistance to respond to displacement and simultaneously perpetuating its creation or duration.

While there were few recommendations on how accountability could be achieved in the context of IHL violations specifically, some suggestions on mechanisms for how the Panel can promote accountability for displacement more broadly are included in the State Responsibility section of this report further below.

### In disaster settings

The critical role of **disaster-risk reduction (DRR)** was highlighted in over 29 submissions as being a key opportunity to prevent future displacement. Submissions noted that while the natural hazards themselves may not be immediately preventable, the known and cyclical patterns of many hazards mean that much can be done to prevent a hazard from becoming a disaster.

To do this, submissions noted the need to **better consider displacement in national DRR strategies** and in global, regional, and national platforms dedicated to DRR and climate adaptation. The [submission from the Platform on Disaster Displacement](#), a state-led initiative whose submission was endorsed by a number of other UN, NGO, and academic actors, noted that “While the majority of national laws and policies on disaster management address evacuation, almost all, with a few exceptions, remain silent on finding durable solutions for internal displacement.” [UNDRR](#), the global custodian for the Sendai Framework on DRR, has developed *Words into Action* guidelines on disaster displacement which multiple submissions noted as being useful in supporting the integration of displacement into DRR strategies. UNDRR and others also noted the **potential to use Target E of the Sendai Framework**, which calls for the development of national DRR strategies, as an opportunity to address this gap (though some submissions noted that the August 2020 deadline for achieving this target is perhaps unrealistic).

Effective disaster risk reduction also requires **preparedness**, as well as efforts to strengthen **community resilience** and promote **community-led approaches**. The [Kingdom of Tonga](#) noted, for example, that indigenous knowledge of effective DRR strategies could be better utilized. Submissions have likewise noted that effective planning must consider the entirety of the risk equation (the hazard, vulnerability, and exposure), as well as recognize the **intersection between climate, disaster, and conflict**. Operational preparedness, including having pre-existing MOUs between governments and response organizations and having run simulations and trainings, can be critical in mitigating the worst impacts of a hazard if and when it strikes.

Finally, submissions noted that **early warning mechanisms** can be a critical tool in mitigating the impacts of hazards and threats. The [submission by Ethiopia](#), for example, emphasized the role of early-warning systems and collaboration between humanitarian, development and social safety net sectors as being critically important to prevent drought-related displacement. While early warning systems are often thought of in connection to disasters, submissions noted the valuable role they can also play in situations of conflict and violence. These systems require resourcing, however, and strong connections with affected communities.

## Preventing recurrence

Preventing the recurrence of displacement is a critical component of finding lasting solutions to current displacement crises. Subsequent sections of this document will look at how to ensure sustainability of solutions, but there are two elements relating to the discussion above that are worth highlighting here: first, the criticality of addressing **peacebuilding, reconciliation, and social cohesion** in communities recovering from conflict and violence; and second, the importance of a “**build back better**” approach to disaster recovery. Equally, there is a need to ensure **Do No Harm** is upheld, including through the use of conflict-sensitive approaches and ensuring that disaster recovery doesn’t expose people to new risks or prevent people from returning to homes where it is safe to do so. Affected communities, including people across ages, genders, and diversities, need to be meaningfully engaged in processes aimed at prevention and recovery.

## IDP Rights and Laws and Policies

The need for the Panel to consider means to **promote respect for IDP rights** was one of the most cross-cutting messages across all submissions. As the [Office of the UN High Commissioner on Human Rights](#)

[noted](#), “Human rights violations are both a cause and a consequence of internal displacement, and also play a key role in the achievement of durable solutions.”

Eighteen submissions called for the Panel to specifically consider how to strengthen **adoption and implementation of IDP laws and policies** building on the *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement*. There were a number of recommendations for how this could be achieved. First, submissions noted the value of **peer-to-peer exchanges on normative frameworks**, both at regional and national levels. Submissions noted that this is something the **Panel could help formalize**, building on the work of GP20 and others.

Second, submissions noted the valuable role of **regional normative frameworks as a catalyst** for national action. Supporting the development of additional regional frameworks, similar to the Kampala Convention, was noted as a possible means of spurring the development of legislation at national level. Reflecting on the value of the Kampala Convention, the [African Union recommended](#) that this be further pursued at international level through the development of a **global treaty on IDPs**, following the blueprint of the Kampala Convention.

Third, submissions noted that it would be useful to have **practical guidance** that can support states to better address displacement in national laws and policies, as well as guidance for countries that have already passed IDP legislation but are struggling to fully put the measures into action. Submissions from the [Kaldor Centre](#) and [UNDRR](#) also noted the potential need to support understanding of how normative frameworks relate to disaster-induced displacement. This type of guidance is potentially something that could emerge from the peer-to-peer mechanism mentioned above, or else through various other models outlined in the Technical Capacity section further below.

A number of submissions addressed the “**implementation gap**” of existing laws and policies – namely, that some (even many) states have adopted national legislation or policies, but have failed to effectively implement the frameworks. A submission from researcher [Phil Orchard](#) notes that out of the forty states that have laws and policies protecting IDPs, only twelve were implemented in a consistent manner and even those did not always align to international standards. Submissions offered a number of suggestions for how this could be addressed, including through technical advice and capacity building, but also through **strengthened accountability**. Recommendations for this accountability component are addressed in the next section on State Responsibility.

Submissions highlighted the potential to **better engage national human rights institutions** (NHRIs) on internal displacement, including through the Global Alliance of NHRIs, which has over 114 national members. The Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of IDPs produced a report on the role of NHRIs in 2019 which could be a useful source of further information. Other suggestions for promoting accountability include the potential to **engage regional and international human rights monitoring procedures** to address internal displacement, and to link IDP laws and policies to other domestic institutions to promote internal accountability.

Finally, a number of submissions highlighted the critical importance of ensuring that **affected communities can play a meaningful role** in the development of new IDP laws and policies, as well as the need to ensure that laws and policies take into account the specific needs of people across ages, genders, and diversities, and **do not discriminate** in their protections.

## State responsibility, political will, and accountability

Submissions strongly reaffirmed the importance for the Panel to **promote state responsibility** for internal displacement. A crucial starting point of this is **recognition of internally displaced persons**, which many submissions noted as a critical challenge. Lack of recognition was highlighted as being linked to diverse causes, ranging from the potential role of the state as a real or perceived perpetrator, narrow interpretations of drivers of displacement that lead to exclusion (particularly in relation to disasters, gang-violence, development-induced displacement, and individual human rights violations), to lack of data to demonstrate the full scope of the displacement problem.

Linked to recognition, but also to broader questions of state responsibility for responding to displacement and finding solutions, is the question of political will. Subsequent sections will look at capacity, institutional frameworks, and other related elements in greater detail, but without political will, little can be achieved.

### Political will as a spectrum

As a starting point, submissions suggested the value of thinking of **political will as a spectrum** rather than as a binary state. As the [Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre \(IDMC\)](#) noted in their submission, "Governments' investment and commitment will be determined by the priority they give to the issue of internal displacement." This level of priority will in turn be impacted by the state's other objectives, including by their understanding of how displacement relates to other structural challenges they face.

With this framing, the objective would then become **increasing the relative priority of displacement**, rather than necessarily creating political will entirely from scratch. The following sections outline suggestions of how this could be achieved.

### Enablers of state responsibility and political will

Submissions contained a large number of recommendations for how state responsibility and political will could be catalyzed. For the sake of clarity, the following sections are broken down by level, looking first at steps that could be taken at the global level or by international actors, then looking at steps at the regional level, then national level, and finally at the individual or community level.

#### At global level and/or by international actors

First, a number of submissions called for the Panel to recommend the **establishment of a Special Representative of the Secretary General on internal displacement**, either by elevating the mandate of the Special Rapporteur on Internal Displacement or by creating an additional position. This has been a long-standing recommendation of many actors and submissions reiterated the need to have a position with greater authority (reporting to the UN Secretary General rather than the UN Human Rights Council) and greater resources (the Special Rapporteur position is currently unpaid and poorly resourced), among other elements. Many submissions noted that **high-level expert visits**, including by the Special Rapporteur but also by entities like the Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS), were critical in catalyzing visibility for internal displacement and national action.

Second, as was noted in the Law and Policy section above, a number of submissions recommended the development of a **global normative and commitment framework for IDPs**. [UN Women](#) noted that this could take a similar form to the New York Declaration, Global Compact on Refugees, and Comprehensive

Refugee Response Framework. [France also noted](#) the potential to further utilize General Assembly resolutions, in addition to the bi-annual resolution elaborated by the Third Committee.

Third, the US-based network of NGOs [InterAction noted](#) the **potential role for International Financial Institutions**, working in partnership with other actors, to catalyze policy change. Their submission reflected on the success of “Compacts” that had been developed in a number of refugee contexts, notably with the leadership of the World Bank, which have contributed to “groundbreaking policy reforms for refugee rights and self-reliance” in a number of countries. They note that the **Compact model** presents “a rare opportunity to implement approaches that have already been piloted and from which lessons can be drawn to chart potential ways forward in internal displacement contexts.

Fourth, a number of submissions again highlighted the potential benefit of having a **platform for peer-to-peer exchange** among governments addressing situations of internal displacement. Submissions noted that not only could such a platform serve as an opportunity to exchange technical learnings, as is discussed elsewhere in this document, but it can also help to build momentum among affected states.

Finally, submissions highlighted the value of **data and analysis** in contributing to political will. IDMC noted that increasing the relative prioritization of internal displacement by state actors requires states to have knowledge and understanding of the scope of the problem and how it relates to other issues that are a priority to them. [UNHCR](#) and [Switzerland](#) both noted the potential value of analyzing the long-term economic impact of protracted displacement – in other words, the **cost of exclusion**. In this way, Switzerland noted, internal displacement can be reconceptualized as an essential component of long-term development and peace. Submissions also noted **the value of collaborative data and analysis processes**, such as those organized by JIPS, in building shared understanding of the problem and generating domestic ownership of displacement data.

#### By regional actors

A number of submissions noted that **regional cooperation can incentivize government action**. As the [GP20 submission](#) notes, “State to State exchanges on internal displacement in the ECOWAS and IGAD regions co-convened with the GP20 initiative prompted some states to make further commitments to the issue (Cape Verde, Senegal, Somalia). Among other outcomes, ECOWAS agreed to move ahead on incorporating the Kampala Convention into ECOWAS community law, while IGAD agreed to galvanize further momentum on internal displacement through appointed National Coordination Mechanism on Migration focal points. Also in Africa, Regional Protection Dialogues on the Lake Chad Basin have resulted in legal tools to support and advocate for IDP protection, and Ethiopia learned directly from Somalia’s experience in designing, gathering support for and implementing a durable solutions initiative. The Council of Europe and Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe’s work on internal displacement has catalyzed improved protection of IDPs in Member States (Kosovo, Georgia, Ukraine). In the Americas, the Brazil Declaration and Plan of Action (2014), Comprehensive Regional Protection and Solutions Framework, and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights have all spurred commitment and action on internal displacement at the national level.” Submissions noted that considering **how to support further regional leadership** on internal displacement is could be a significant achievement of the Panel.

#### At the national level

At the national level, many submissions highlighted the need to **build general awareness and visibility** on internal displacement. El Salvador noted the need to position internal displacement as a shared, public

priority, and frame it as a social problem that requires collective action and responsibility. Many submissions also noted the need to promote recognition of addressing internal displacement as a critical step to **achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)**, and noted that countries should be encouraged and supported to include internal displacement in their voluntary national reviews for the SDG process. The availability of data was noted as being key to this process.

One concrete recommendation for how this could be promoted is through the development and use of **National Reporting Frameworks**. This model, explained in greater detail in [IDMC's submission](#), would entail countries reporting on not just the scale of internal displacement, but also the steps they have taken to address it (including the development of policies or strategies, levels of investment, etc). The reporting framework would also be ideally aligned with broader national development goals and indicators, with progress monitored over time. IDMC notes that such a model would “would present a strong basis for budgeting, fundraising and reporting to donors and investors, as well as countries’ citizens and stakeholders.” IDMC suggests that the exact model for the National Reporting Framework would ideally be developed at country level, but following a set of guiding principles outlined in IDMC’s submission.

#### At the individual and community level

Critically, submissions noted that affected communities can play a role in promoting state responsibility, and that civil society actors and faith leaders can sometimes assist in facilitating this. [GARPAB noted](#) the possibility for engaging through the justice system and using strategic litigation as a tool to advance recognition and response to internal displacement. They noted that in El Salvador, it was a court case brought by a displaced family, working together with the NGO Cristosal (who also made a [submission](#) to the Panel), that initially triggered the Supreme Court decision to compel the creation of IDP legislation and policies and protocols aimed at preventing and responding to internal displacement. While this was one step of many, it shows the critical role affected individuals can play.

#### Accountability

In addition to looking at ways to support states to take responsibility, submissions also noted the need to **hold states accountable** for their efforts to address internal displacement. Some of the recommendations for doing this have been noted above – for example, the National Reporting Framework proposal from IDMC. Other recommendations include the possible value in compelling states to **report on internal displacement in other formal reporting processes** – for example, to the Committees on the Rights of the Child, the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), and the Rights of People with Disabilities (CRPD). Other submissions noted the value of also formalizing reporting on displacement as part of the SDGs and Sendai Framework.

While self-reporting mechanisms are valuable in reinforcing state ownership, submissions also emphasized the need to have external mechanisms to ensure accountability, including in cases where states are unwilling to self-report. A confidential submission from actors working in one displacement-affected country **called for the Panel to establish an independent mechanism designed to analyze state capacity and willingness** to respond to internal displacement, and to monitor their progress in doing so. Such a mechanism would then produce assessments, which would ideally then inform the decisions of member states, donors, and response organizations, including in the allocation of funds.

IDMC’s submission notes that they have developed a global Internal Displacement Index, which may have similarities to the independent mechanism recommended above. The Internal Displacement Index is a

“composite measure that brings together indicators of national governments’ capacity to address internal displacement, of the contextual drivers that may lead to future crises or may enable solutions to displacement, and of the impacts of current crises.” IDMC suggests that this index could be a strong starting point for any global accountability framework.

The value of an independent or regional monitoring mechanism was also noted in a number of submissions from Latin America, which highlighted the example of the Observatory of Human Rights for Displacement in Central America that came out of the Brazil Plan of Action.

Finally, submissions noted that it is important for individuals across all ages, genders, and diversities to have a means to hold their governments accountable. The creation of a **domestic dispute mechanism** where IDPs can raise complaints was one suggestion, but it would also be important to include a **participatory platform** in any other accountability mechanism that is established at the national, regional, or global level.

### Shared responsibility

A number of submissions noted that while individual state responsibility is important, there is also a need for the Panel to recognize the **shared responsibility of other states**, particularly in the case of states whose policies or practices are creating or perpetuating displacement. The [submission from ACT Alliance](#), a global alliance of churches and faith-based organizations, noted the relationship between internal displacement and migration and border policies, for example, and highlighted that while displacement-affected countries must uphold the rights of their citizens, other countries must also uphold their obligations with regard to access to asylum and *non-refoulement* – violations of which could essentially force individuals into a state of internal displacement. The [submission from Denmark](#) also notes that displacement crises are sometimes the victim of geopolitical disputes, big power rivalry, and proxy wars, and that solutions may not be possible through the action of one state alone.

Other submissions noted the need for states to uphold their commitments from the Global Compacts. Related to this, [Afghanistan highlighted](#) the need for refugee-hosting countries to ensure that returns are safe, orderly, and voluntary to avoid a situation in which returnees become internally displaced. Additionally, [Armenia noted](#) that “there should be no hierarchy of displacement - all types of forced displacement deserve equal attention.”

### Technical assistance and support

A large number of submissions from all types of actors noted the importance of strengthening technical capacities around internal displacement. Below is a non-exhaustive list of some of the areas around which submissions noted technical advice and information exchange would be valuable:

- Development and implementation of IDP laws, policies, and solutions strategies
- Displacement as a component of disaster risk reduction and disaster response management
- Incorporating displacement response and solutions into national development planning
- Best practices for generating a whole-of-government approach to IDP responses
- Dynamics associated with specific displacement contexts, including urban displacement, other situations of violence, and slow-onset crises, among others
- Best practices for data collection, analysis, and use

- Understanding the specific needs of individuals linked to age, gender, and diversity
- Best practices for enabling participation of affected communities in all elements of decision-making
- General awareness of IDP rights and obligations of duty-bearers under domestic, regional, and international law

Submissions noted that a wide range of actors would benefit from technical advice and assistance. It was noted that **affected states** in general may benefit from this support, but many submissions also particularly highlighted the importance of **building technical capacity at the local or municipal level**. It was also noted that technical capacity building is needed **within the international system**, for example to support Resident Coordinators to provide more effective leadership on internal displacement issues, to assist disaster specialists to better integrate displacement considerations into risk reduction and response, and to ensure humanitarian and development actors better understand one another’s roles and can work together more effectively. Submissions also highlighted the need to support **affected communities** to understand their rights.

### Possible mechanisms to facilitate capacity building

Two main recommendations emerged from the submissions on how the Panel could support technical capacity: first, as has been mentioned previously in this report, submissions encouraged the **Panel to recommend the creation of a platform for peer-to-peer information exchange** between states and with support of international experts. Submissions note that such a platform would require support for creation and ongoing facilitation. This platform could build on the work of GP20, which is in the process of preparing a *Compilation of Effective Practices on Preventing, Addressing and Resolving Internal Displacement* based on discussions with and between states.

A second, and possibly related recommendation, is the potential creation of a formal **technical assistance mechanism**. A number of submissions noted that the lack of a dedicated global agency on internal displacement at times leads to gaps, including for states seeking support on matters relating to internal displacement and solutions. One private submission from a state noted that, “unified and coordinated support of the United Nations to advise decision-makers, as well as to build capacities on internal displacement, could make a big difference in resolving this problem.” The exact form this technical assistance mechanism should take is not specified – it is possible that its intent could be realized through a platform for peer-to-peer exchange like the one noted above, or through other earlier recommendations such as appointing an SRSG on Internal Displacement. Some of the recommendations linked to coordination may also address this point, and are included further below in the section on Integrated Approaches.

### State institutional frameworks

A large volume of submissions highlighted the critical role of institutional frameworks and **whole-of-government approaches** in enabling effective responses to displacement. Submissions noted the need for engagement across government departments to mainstream internal displacement into all relevant policies, strategies, and systems, rather than relegating responsibility for IDPs into one single department or ministry. “Having the right, institutional, legal and policy frameworks, adequate funding and capacity to act at the operational level also influences governments’ ability to prevent, address and resolve



displacements, both conflict and disaster related,” the [European Union’s submission](#) suggests. They note that “Many countries have adopted frameworks, but their implementation may be lacking behind due to political will or capacities.”

In practical terms, this would entail the education department incorporating internally displaced children into their national education strategy, the health department ensuring the needs of IDPs are reflected in pandemic contingency planning, and so on.

A number of state submissions highlighted the steps they have taken to address displacement issues in their countries, which may offer useful lessons for others. [Somalia’s submission](#) describes how they are “applying a whole-of-government approach through the newly formed Durable Solutions Secretariat at the national level as well as similar structures at the state and municipal levels.” They explain that this new system brings together 14 government institutions that “provide technical expertise and high-level strategic guidance and oversight” across all levels of government. [Nigeria’s submission](#) highlights their approach to providing an overarching coordination through the creation of a Federal Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs, Disaster Management and Social Development.

Within this whole-of-government approach, however, submissions highlighted the need for clear lines of responsibility and accountability. To this end, a number of submissions noted the importance of designating a **single coordinating authority** with the mandate and legitimacy to ensure appropriate action. Submissions also highlighted the value of identifying a senior-level **IDP focal point within each government department** to ensure there is a clear entry point and line of accountability.

Submissions also noted the importance of building **strong linkages between national and local authorities** in addressing internal displacement, noting that it is often local and municipal actors who are the on the “front line” of the government’s response to displacement. Despite this, submissions noted that at times there can be a disconnect between local and national actors. Submissions highlighted the importance of ensuring that local authorities are trained, supported, and adequately resourced to respond to displacement, and flagged that local authorities, in turn, need to integrate IDPs into local development plans and consider steps like city-level durable solutions strategies. Submissions highlighted that local authorities should be empowered to directly coordinate with humanitarian and development actors, among others.

National budgetary systems were also noted as being important in enabling effective whole-of-government responses. As a starting point, submissions identified the need to ensure **sufficient budgetary resources** are allocated to addressing internal displacement. Within this, submissions particularly highlighted the importance of allowing flexible use of budgets allocated to ministries to enable them to prioritize support to displacement-affected communities, as well as the need to allocate funding in line with the real or de facto population figures rather than waiting for census data or official statistics.

Finally, submissions noted the need build responsive and inclusive governments that employ a **whole-of-society approach** to designing and implementing initiatives related to internal displacement. This includes hearing from affected individuals across all ages, genders, and diversities, as well as collaborating with faith actors and other community leaders who may have unique insights or influence.

## Solutions

Consistent with the Panel’s TOR and the Call for Submissions, nearly every submission touched on the need to find more effective means of supporting solutions to internal displacement. Submissions noted, however, that there is no one-size-fits-all recipe for doing this – each context needs to be addressed individually. At a general level, solutions that are appropriate for situations of conflict are often different from situations of disaster, and displacement arising from gang-violence, development-induced displacement, or technological disasters all have their own unique complexities. The intersection of multiple hazards or risks can further compound the challenges in finding solutions.

Fundamentally, submissions highlighted the need to **agree on what we’re aiming towards** when discussing “solutions.” Many submissions recognized the value of the IASC *Framework on Durable Solutions for Internally Displaced Persons*, but suggested that more practical guidance and consensus is needed on when solutions can be considered to have been achieved. The submissions point to differing views: [Denmark](#) and the [World Bank](#), for example, suggest viewing solutions in the context of the broader socioeconomic environment for non-displaced individuals. [Azerbaijan](#) and [Georgia](#), on the other hand, emphasize the criticality of the right to return. As the data section will elaborate further, these types of issues have implications for our understanding of the scope of the problem, our ability to effectively prioritize resources, and our collective coherence in working towards solutions.

Many submissions also noted that there is frequently a “**return-bias**” in discussions on durable solutions – that is, return being seen as the preferred option by responders and decision-makers over local integration or settlement elsewhere. [GP20](#) and others noted that this is often problematic: “return is not always physically possible or desired by IDPs.” Ongoing violence, destruction of infrastructure, or contamination can all prevent returns from being a viable option. The [Norwegian Refugee Council’s \(NRC\) submission](#) also notes that, “Return being the preferred solution is a concept largely tied to the refugee regime...Return being the preferred solution in the refugee context is not simply about people moving back to their place of origin but is also about a State being able to resume its responsibility to protect its citizenry. This is not the case in IDP contexts.”

NRC highlighted the need for greater clarity and directives around the standards of safety and dignity that must be met in returns processes, as well as the need to explicitly limit any coercive measures designed to influence solutions outcomes, such as setting targets and quotas for return, restricting legal stay in the location of displacement, or limiting access to humanitarian assistance, basic services, and livelihoods. Similarly, [France](#), the [Danish Refugee Council](#), and others reinforced that attention needs to be given to ensuring that the focus on solutions doesn’t lead to premature closures of camps or sites or forced returns to unsafe areas. As [Afghanistan noted](#) in their submission, returns that are not safe, orderly, and voluntary run the risk of creating secondary displacement. All of these points speak to the need for ensuring **Do No Harm in solutions processes**.

Importantly, submissions noted the need to challenge this return preferencing and to **treat local integration and settlement elsewhere as equally valid solutions options**. The [submission from Norway](#) stressed the importance of understanding how IDPs can contribute to their host communities, rather than “than assuming that return is the priority solution for the IDP and the host community. IDPs need a chance to start a new life that is sustainable and in harmony with the host community.”

Many submissions also noted the importance of taking a more **individual approach** to durable solutions, recognizing the different needs of individuals linked to their pre-existing vulnerabilities and/or age, gender, and diversity characteristics. [Corporación Opción Legal](#), a network of legal departments of Colombian universities noted, “The public policy vision that regards the overcoming of vulnerability as a linear, unequivocal and automatic process (is a problem. It is) disconnected to the concrete and material reality of the persons and families who are victims of armed conflict.” Submissions noted the need to meaningfully engage affected persons in designing solutions approaches, and to recognize that progression towards solutions may not always be linear.

Linked to the above, many submissions highlighted the importance of considering the **sustainability of solutions**. Reflecting on its own experiences of conflict, [Lebanon noted](#) the need to recognize that truly durable solutions require more than simply returning IDPs to their homes – consistent with previous sections of this document, they noted that it also requires addressing underlying root causes of displacement, physical security, support for reconciliation, and economic opportunity, among other factors. Other submissions highlighted the importance of also considering climate and environmental factors, for example to ensure that IDPs don’t settle in a high-risk area from which they may be displaced yet again.

Finally, a number of submissions highlighted that **reparations, restitution, and compensation** can be an important part of the solutions process. They note that this relates both to the practical element in supporting displaced persons to rebuild their lives, but also symbolically in promoting healing. Colombia highlighted that they have developed strategies and subsequently policies aimed at providing “guarantees of non-repetition,” which have included both a preventive and reparative element and have been crucial in promoting recovery.

## Recommendations on durable solutions

Many of the enablers and recommendations on durable solutions have been noted elsewhere in this document – in its own way, each section of this synthesis report speaks to an essential component of the solutions process. In that context, the various recommendations will not be repeated here. There are, however, two recommendations that relate specifically to the durable solutions issue at its core (and both possibly linked to the technical assistance mechanisms discussed previously).

First, the [Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre](#) highlighted that there would be value in developing a **systematic, global assessment of what drives progress towards lasting solutions**. This was linked to the information exchange platform discussed previously, and would require a “global partnership to systematically collect, evaluate, share practices, and facilitate peer-to-peer learning and support.”

Second, [Denmark suggested](#) that a “**toolbox**” be developed to support operational initiatives in countries where there is political will to achieve solutions. This would ideally be complemented by an operational mechanism to enable follow-up at country-level. The following section on integrated approaches may offer suggestions of what such an operational mechanism could look like.

## Sectoral responses that enable solutions

Additionally, submissions highlighted a number of sectoral responses that are particularly critical in enabling solutions. These include education, livelihoods and economic opportunities, and housing, land

and property, among others. Importantly, submissions highlighted that responses should benefit both IDPs and host communities.

### Education

Nineteen submissions highlighted the importance of **education as a critical enabler to solutions**, noting that half of all IDPs are children and that education is both a right and an urgent need in displacement contexts. The submissions from [Save the Children](#) and [UNICEF](#) provided additional background detail, noting that education is essential in both avoiding risks prior to and during displacement, as well as in facilitating long-term recovery, solutions, and development. Research from Save the Children found that children in emergencies and protracted crises are more than twice as likely to rank going to school as their top concern compared with immediate needs like food, water, shelter, or money.

Submissions noted the importance of ensuring that education is inclusive and can be accessed by girls, children with disabilities, older students, and students from minority groups, among others. Students who have missed schooling due to conflict or disaster may need additional support and catch-up classes.

Submissions emphasized the need for governments to ensure IDP children have access to national education systems, and to remove policy and practical barriers that may exclude them. There may be a need to strengthen the national education system to allow for this.

Finally, the [submission from Ukraine](#) highlighted that education for children can also be closely connected to access to livelihoods for their parents. Ukraine noted that “For many women, a prerequisite for employment is the availability of a place for the child in a pre-school educational institution.”

### Livelihoods

A second area that was widely recognized as being key to solutions is **livelihoods and economic opportunity**. Without the means to independently support themselves, families will struggle to achieve a lasting solution to displacement.

Submissions noted a number of considerations relating to livelihoods. First, submissions highlighted the importance of considering how to support access to livelihoods for women, including in cases where women are heads of households. Second, submissions noted the value of supporting technical and vocational education and training to help build skills. Third, submissions highlighted that challenges can arise when livelihoods in areas of origin differ significantly from the location of displacement or settlement. Given the increasing rural to urban trend, this can be particularly acute for individuals whose livelihoods were primarily agricultural. It can also be a challenge for individuals who have lived in protracted displacement in urban settings but then are either unable or unwilling to take up their traditional agriculture livelihoods if/when the opportunity presents itself to return home or settle in an alternative rural area. To address these challenges, submissions highlighted the need to work with governments to alleviate legal and de-facto barriers for IDPs, invest in livelihood interventions, generate better data about the skills profiles of IDPs, and include host communities in programming. Finally, submissions note that despite being citizens, IDPs sometimes face exclusion from employment opportunities. The [International Labor Organization shared](#) a number of programs and initiatives that could be drawn from in addressing these points.

## Housing, Land, and Property

Another area that was emphasized in submissions is the importance of addressing housing, land, and property in solutions planning. The criticality of housing was noted in submissions from a number of countries that have experience with displacement, including [Ukraine](#), [Montenegro](#), [Georgia](#), and an NGO submission from Kosovo ([FDMC](#)). Damage or destruction of property, loss of tenure documents, or discriminatory inheritance practices can all present major impediments to return or the achievement of solutions, particularly for women. Ukraine also noted that the lack of income or affordable housing sometimes forces IDPs to return to unsafe areas. [NRC's submission](#) and others describe how programs that support access to documentation, creative housing alternatives, or compensation for damages can all enable solutions.

## Integrated approaches to solutions to displacement

One of the most consistent and overarching messages that emerged from submissions was the need to take a more **integrated approach** to displacement and solutions. As [Switzerland put it](#), “the challenge of internal displacement needs to be reconceptualized as a humanitarian-development-peace challenge,” rather than a purely humanitarian pursuit. Other actors noted the importance of also linking in with discussions on climate, environment, and disasters.

A more integrated approach between humanitarian, development, and peace actors is often referred to as the “nexus” or the “HDPN.” As [IOM](#) notes, “There are two main interpretations of the nexus: ‘distinct but complementary’ versus ‘merged but principled’.” Despite the frequency with which the nexus is discussed, however, the IOM submission notes that definitions and approaches continue to be debated and there is limited guidance on how to operationalize it.

Nevertheless, there were a number of recommendations on how a more integrated approach to displacement could be pursued, which are noted in greater detail below.

### Joint analysis

As a starting point, many submissions noted the value of carrying out **joint analysis** between different types of actors as a means of promoting shared understanding, ownership, and responsibility. Some submissions, including [from the UN Development Coordination Office](#), specifically emphasized joint analysis between international humanitarian, development, and peace actors, for example through the UN Common Country Analysis, while others emphasized the value in pursuing joint analysis with government actors.

Recommendations for the focus on this analysis covered many of the topics noted elsewhere in this document – for example, the underlying root causes of displacement, experiences of people of different diversities, and enablers and inhibitors of solutions. Crucially, submissions emphasized the need to use a whole-of-displacement lens, including recognizing the potential for refugee returnees to become IDPs once again.

### Need for a comprehensive approach to durable solutions

Based on the joint analysis, numerous submissions highlighted the need to develop a **comprehensive durable solutions roadmap**. The *Durable Solutions Programming Principles* developed in Somalia by the

Regional Durable Solutions Secretariat (ReDSS, who also [made a submission](#)) was noted as being a potentially useful guide, and emphasizes the need for solutions to be “government-led, area-based, collective and comprehensive, participatory and community-based, rights- and needs-based, sensitive to AGD, and sustainable.” Submissions emphasized the importance of planning and moving towards durable solutions even in the midst of a crisis, and to support the government to take the lead as far as possible. Submissions also highlighted the need to ensure that strategies and responses consider both IDPs and host communities.

## Integrating displacement into development strategies and investments

Many submissions noted the importance of **including internal displacement in development plans** and other public policies and systems. [GP20 highlighted](#) that this process has already been done or is already underway in Colombia, Somalia, South Sudan, and Ukraine. Inclusion in development relates both to national development plans led by state actors, as well as to investments and programming strategies by international development actors. Submissions highlighted that while development actors are often quick to arrive in disaster contexts, this is not always the case in conflict settings. Linked to this, submissions suggested that development actors should step up their willingness to engage in fragile and volatile areas.

Submissions noted that there are different approaches to addressing displacement in development initiatives – for example, development initiatives may specifically target displaced persons, or may seek to integrate them into broader development planning and investments. The [World Bank noted](#) their preference for the latter, and suggested that the overarching goal should be ensuring that displaced persons are able to benefit equally from general development assistance. This is discussed in greater detail in the financing section further below.

The point about ensuring **IDP access to government or public services** also emerged in a number of other submissions, particularly in reference to ensuring their inclusion in social safety net mechanisms and protection schemes, especially in the midst of the current COVID-19 crisis. Submissions also noted the importance of ensuring access to education, health systems, and registration and voting rights. They likewise reiterated the importance of ensuring that services are accessible to people of all ages, genders, and diversities, without discrimination to particular IDPs who may be perceived to have been in opposition to government actors.

The need for IDPs themselves have a **voice in development planning** – both in state-led efforts and those of the international system – was highlighted in a number of submissions. This is critical in designing effective strategies, as well as for accountability and **Do No Harm**. Linked to the latter, and in recognition of the particular sensitivities of conflict settings, [Denmark emphasized](#) that “For development actors, the aim should be to exercise much more self-discipline and self-awareness in terms of who, what, and where they provide assistance in vulnerable contexts and for what purposes. Sometimes they should consider whether to provide any at all.”

## Integrating displacement, disaster risk reduction, and development

As the section on prevention noted, many submissions highlighted the need for better **inclusion of displacement in disaster risk reduction** and disaster management strategies. Complementary to this, submissions noted the need for inclusion of **disaster risk reduction as part of development planning**, particularly with a focus on building resilience. Disaster and development plans also need to consider

possible intersections with other risks, such as conflict or other pre-existing vulnerabilities. [IDMC highlighted](#) the good example of the regional endorsement of a “Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific.” IDMC further notes that Tonga and the Solomon Islands are working to develop comprehensive displacement risk assessments.

### Peace, peacebuilding, and human security

The “peace” component of the humanitarian-development-peace nexus is often seen as more difficult and potentially controversial. Nevertheless, submissions noted the important role of peace and peacebuilding actors in enabling and sustaining solutions to displacement. While the inclusion of security actors in the nexus is often sensitive for humanitarian actors concerned with upholding the humanitarian principles, many submissions did support **peacebuilding, social cohesion, and reconciliation** as essential. The joint [submission from Switzerland and HPG](#) called for the Panel to “urge the Review of Peacebuilding Architecture to recommend integrating displacement-affected communities in peacebuilding processes and identify specific measures to do this.” The [submission from IOM](#) also noted that a paper is being developed as part of the IASC Results Group 4 that explores the peace component of the nexus.

While fewer submissions spoke specifically about the role of “hard” peace and security actors or of high-level peace processes, those that did noted the critical role of considering displacement in these mechanisms and ensuring displaced people have a voice in peace processes. The Swiss/HPG submission noted that “A third of peace agreements fail within five years, and recent UN resolutions require more attention to building and sustaining peace...a sustained, joined up approach that incorporates improving human security, progressing peace agreements, promoting transitional justice, reconciliation and dispute resolution, and building long-term resilience is required.”

### Adopting a whole-of-society approach

Many submissions spoke of the need to broaden the types of actors who are engaged in solutions processes. There was strong encouragement for the adoption of a “**whole-of-society approach**” that actively engages a more diverse network of stakeholders. This critically begins with affected communities themselves (including host communities and people of all diversities), but can also include the private sector, justice and judicial actors, academia, faith actors, and local and traditional authorities, among others.

In the case of the **private sector**, submissions noted their potential contribution in a number of areas. These included in providing employment and livelihoods opportunities for IDPs, housing solutions, access to goods and services through vouchers, and technological solutions, among others.

Submissions also noted the importance of supporting **locally-led efforts towards solutions**. Wherever possible, international actors (including donors) should seek to enable local initiatives to respond to displacement, enable solutions, and promote reconciliation and recovery. Submissions noted that Grand Bargain commitments to funding local humanitarian actors has still not been achieved and that donors need to redouble their commitments to support local humanitarian action.

### Coordination

Finally, many submissions noted that an integrated approach to displacement and solutions will require **stronger coordination** between different types of actors.

On the part of the international system, many actors highlighted the **potential role of the UN Resident Coordinator (RC) as a natural anchor** for these efforts. The [submission from the UK](#) suggests that “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.” While submissions noted the need to potentially build their capacity in this respect, their empowered leadership and mandate for both development and humanitarian efforts in displacement settings was identified as a critical opportunity to bring together humanitarian and development actors (as well as peace actors in UN Mission settings).

Under the leadership of an empowered RC, submissions highlighted the potential value in establishing a **durable solutions unit** or working group in the RC’s office to coordinate efforts within the international system. This unit or working group could convene a broad range of actors and work with the government in the development of a comprehensive durable solutions strategy. This unit should also ensure the participation of affected communities in these efforts.

Submissions noted that within both the international system and state-led efforts, it will be critical that there is clear understanding and agreement on **roles and responsibilities of each actor**. This includes action at both the national and local level. Within the international system, submissions suggested the need to better utilize “**Collective Outcomes**” as a means of defining how each actor will contribute towards the achievement of solutions. The joint Swiss/HPG submission suggested that donors should use their funding instruments to incentivize this approach.

Submissions also highlighted that in disaster settings where there are fewer political sensitivities, international actors need to ensure their actions support, not undermine, state-led efforts. Integrating displacement into disaster risk reduction coordination mechanisms was also noted as valuable, and the Regional Disaster Displacement Working Group in the Asia Pacific Region was noted as being a successful model that addresses disasters and displacement holistically. In more general disaster risk reduction forums, [NRC suggested](#) that it can be useful to (at minimum) designate a displacement focal point.

## Strengthening humanitarian responses

In addition to the submissions that looked at coordination across different types of actors, some submissions also highlighted the need to **examine the effectiveness of the humanitarian system** specifically. The submission from the United States went into the most detail in this respect, noting that “inadequate accountability and specificity have, at times, been major challenges for relief operations and delivering results for IDPs in some contexts, while fostering unconstructive organizational competition around IDP issues in others.”

To address this challenge, the USA recommends that the Panel “conduct a **review of IASC operations** and make recommendations for an **IASC IDP policy**.” The IASC, or Inter-Agency Standing Committee, is the most senior leadership structure within the humanitarian system and defines the humanitarian coordination model used in IDP responses. The USA notes that the review of the IASC would ideally aim to improve protection, solutions, and assistance delivery by seeking to “clarify and address accountability issues and adherence to organizational roles and responsibilities within and across the IASC system, including with regard to the role of Humanitarian Coordinators; and consider if and how the working methods of the IASC can be improved to better protect and assist this population.” In the view of the USA,



“A review is necessary, yet unlikely to happen in a credible manner absent the kind of external, high-level leadership the Panel uniquely offers.”

This recommendation was echoed by others such as [Germany](#), who recommended, “an update of IASC policies on internal displacement, a review of IASC coordination structures in IDP situations, and a review of the roles and responsibilities of the organizations involved in humanitarian responses to IDP situations” and [UNDP](#), who recommended, “updating and renewing of the IASC Framework on Durable Solutions as an integrated protection framework with a whole-of-society approach” by “commissioning independent meta-review and/or evaluation of ongoing joint-programmes and initiatives on prevention, response and solutions in internal displacement settings that works for IDPs and host communities.”

Perhaps linked to the above, submissions noted the need for **greater predictability and accountability** for roles and responsibilities in humanitarian responses in IDP settings. In contexts at high-risk of disasters, the articulation of MOUs between the UN and individual governments on how coordination will be managed in the event of a crisis was noted as best practice by submissions from both [PDD](#) and [NRC](#). Submissions also noted that in both disaster and conflict settings there is a need for greater agreement on responsibilities for the different elements of protection.

A number of submissions looked at the role of government actors in humanitarian responses, including in cases where the government is an active party to conflict or is otherwise unable or unwilling to uphold their protection and assistance responsibilities. A confidential submission from actors working in one displacement-affected country suggested that **guidance is needed on the appropriate level of involvement by government actors** in humanitarian operations in settings where the government is a party to conflict or implicated in human rights violations. They noted that in their context, “national authorities control the movement of humanitarian personnel and cargo, set restrictions on the amount of fuel available to each aid agency, chair humanitarian clusters, approve work plans and determine which areas and populations are to be served. It is therefore difficult to advocate for IDPs and mobilize the necessary support [without] fearing repercussions, the withdrawal of consent to humanitarian operations or risking various ‘partnerships’.”

Finally, it is worth noting that not all submissions agreed on the extent to which the panel should focus on humanitarian operations. The [submission from Denmark](#), for example, urged the Panel to “resist proposals to focus on humanitarian assistance,” noting that humanitarian actors “cannot by themselves ensure prevention or secure lasting solutions to internal displacement.”

## Financing

The Call for Submissions included a question on new and creative financing options that could be used to address displacement. Given that national budgetary systems have already been discussed in the section on institutional frameworks, the following section looks primarily at financing by international actors.

### Accessing existing funding

First, submissions noted the value in working to **access existing funding opportunities**. This included general development funding that could be used to address internal displacement in protracted settings, as well as disaster-risk reduction and climate change funds that could be tapped into to address disaster displacement.

## Ensuring funding is fit for purpose

A second priority, and one that was noted in many submissions, was **ensuring that existing funding for internal displacement is fit for purpose**. Financing mechanisms need to enable transitions from emergency relief to recovery, for example, and provide for flexibility to address contextual changes. The use of “crisis modifier” provisions in grant agreements was noted as a good practice, allowing responders to quickly reallocate funds to respond to major situational developments. A number of donors also emphasized the need to build upon the OECD-DAC [Recommendation on the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus](#), which is now part of the basis for future peer reviews of DAC donors. A joint report from NRC, FAO, and UNDP on [Financing the Nexus](#) was also noted as containing possibly useful recommendations.

Submissions also referred to the need to **expedite implementation of the Grand Bargain commitments**, particularly in reducing the administrative burden on implementing organizations and in providing multi-year, predictable, and flexible funding. The [submission from NRC](#) noted that the urgency to quickly respond to COVID-19 tested progress on these Grand Bargain commitments, and demonstrated that even some of the “low hanging fruits” have not been achieved. The submission from [OECD](#) called for more flexibility for humanitarian financing “so that it can follow mobile populations in contexts that evolve rapidly and can be difficult to predict.” It pointed out that tightly ear-marked funding can prevent humanitarian and development actors from being able to effectively respond to needs, and funds that single out displaced persons exclusively risk creating tensions with other communities in need.

## Financing models

Submissions included a number of suggestions for financing mechanisms that could be better explored. The first is **anticipatory or forecast-based financing**, which [GP20 notes](#) is currently being provided to communities at risk of displacement in 60 countries. While anticipatory financing is often discussed in relation to disasters, [HPG noted](#) that, while not without challenges, it would be worth exploring the better to utilize this mechanism in conflict settings as well (for example, in connection with early warning systems).

Linked to the above, a number of submissions recommended looking at **insurance models** and supporting social safety nets. HPG recommended engaging with the Insurance Development Forum, which brings together insurance and development actors.

Submissions also suggested exploring **impact bonds** and results-based financing.

A number of suggestions recommended considering the potential to use **microfinance** in displacement settings, building on its long use in development contexts. This could be coupled with the use of **crowdfunding** and **institutional investment**. HPG highlighted the example of the microlending organization Kiva, which has used crowdfunding to lend \$13 million to more than 15,000 refugee entrepreneurs. Kiva is now working to raise institutional investment to further expand.

Building on the pooled funding mechanisms used in humanitarian responses, the [Netherlands suggested](#) the potential to set up a dedicated **country-based pooled fund mechanism** that is focused specifically on durable solutions.

Submissions also noted the need to examine **individual giving**, including in recognition of the role of the diaspora in sending remittances to displaced family members. Submissions also highlighted the potential to engage with religious actors to support religiously-affiliated charitable contributions (for example, Zakat) to be directed to displacement issues.

Finally, submissions noted the value of **providing funds directly to affected persons**. The use of cash transfers is increasingly growing in the humanitarian sector, and was one of the areas of focus in the Grand Bargain commitments. Submissions suggested that these efforts should be redoubled.

### International Financial Institutions

A number of submissions highlighted the need to consider the role of **international financial institutions** in contexts of internal displacement. Given that the World Bank, among others, has been expanding its engagement in fragile and humanitarian contexts, the USA recommends analyzing lessons learned from these experiences. Other submissions noted that the Bank's considerable weight can play a crucial role in influencing policy change. The [submission from the World Bank](#) highlights that they are indeed analyzing how they can work to address internal displacement, though they flag that they will likely take a more integrated approach rather than making funding available to address IDPs specifically. This is discussed in greater detail under the Responsible Donorship section below.

### The private sector

Many submissions also highlighted the need to engage with the **private sector**. While most submissions discussed private sector partnerships from an operational perspective (for example, working with local businesses to provide employment opportunities to IDPs or agree on a voucher system), some also looked at how the private sector can also be engaged financially. Submissions noted the importance of **de-risking private sector investments** and suggested that working on financing alone may have limited impact unless there are also efforts to overcome systemic barriers to private sector investment.

Submissions also highlighted the potential to explore partnerships with private sector entities as part of their Corporate Social Responsibility or through their foundation wings. Material donations could be one example of this. However, submissions note the need to exercise caution in private sector partnerships and ensure that these relationships uphold due diligence and respect the humanitarian principles.

### Who and what to fund

Submissions highlighted a few parameters that they believed donors should consider in their funding.

First, a number of submissions noted the need to direct a **greater proportion of funding to local actors**. Despite the Grand Bargain commitment to allocate 25 percent of humanitarian funding to local responders, analysis showed that in 2019, the funding proportion allocated to local responders was still only five percent.

Second, many submissions emphasized the value in supporting a **needs-based and area-based approach** to funding rather than singling out IDPs. Submissions noted that ensuring that host communities can benefit from assistance where their need is comparable to IDPs reduces the risk of tension and promotes a more holistic approach to long-term recovery and development.

Third, while recognizing that response programming often yields more visible results, submissions also emphasized the need to **fund prevention and preparedness** measures. Despite the frequent calls for greater attention to conflict prevention and disaster-risk reduction, funding does not always materialize.

### Responsible donorship and investment

Finally, a number of submissions highlighted the need to ensure **responsible donorship** and a Do No Harm approach to financing. As a starting point, many submissions emphasized the need for donors to ensure that affected communities have a voice in designing intervention strategies, and to ensure that this participation is meaningful, includes people of different ages, genders, and diversities, and occurs throughout a project lifecycle rather than as a box-ticking exercise during initial assessments.

Submissions also noted the need to **avoid creating perverse incentives** that lead to the creation or prolongation of displacement. While this was particularly noted in relation to bilateral funding to states, it could also apply to other types of financing mechanisms. Linked to this, the World Bank has decided to focus on ensuring that IDPs can access and benefit from general development assistance.

Submissions also highlighted the importance of conducting **sustainability assessments** as part of investments. Sustainability should be considered from both a social perspective as well as an environmental perspective.

Finally, in considering the unique complexities of conflict environments and particularly those cases in which the state is implicated, submissions highlighted the importance of **directing funding to apolitical actors**.

### Data, evidence, and research

A large volume of submissions suggested that there is a need for **better data and statistics** on internal displacement. As the [Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre noted](#), “Critical blind spots remain concerning the drivers, patterns and impacts of internal displacement across different contexts, as well as future displacement risk.” Other submissions noted that considerable data already exists, but in the words of the [UNHCR/World Bank Joint Data Centre](#), it is “far from harmonized or complete, has mixed quality standards, and is not readily accessible.”

Many submissions highlighted the need for greater standardization and definitions in data, beginning first and foremost with **who constitutes an IDP**. This is closely linked with the discussion in the Solutions section on when durable solutions can be considered to have been achieved. In protracted settings, there is need for agreement on whether the benchmark is comparative socioeconomic status or the fulfillment of all or specific rights (for example, right to return to original homes). Agreeing on these basic definitional issues could lead to dramatic changes in global displacement figures, and the World Bank and the Joint Data Centre suggest that conducting socioeconomic surveys or profiling could also be valuable (particularly if a definition is agreed that sees solutions in the context of comparative socioeconomic conditions).

Linked to these definitional issues, submissions noted the need for greater **guidance and agreement about drivers of displacement** to ensure that individuals do not miss out on protections to which they are entitled. This was noted specifically in the context of other situations of violence, individual persecution

by non-state actors, development-induced displacement, and technological disasters. Submissions noted that direction from the Panel on these types of questions would be invaluable.

A number of submissions identified the need to **build capacities** on the collection, management, use, and maintenance of data, including at the local, national, and international level. In the case of national actors, many submissions highlighted the value of the Expert Group on Refugee and IDP Statistics (EGRIS), and specifically the need to **support implementation of the International Recommendations on IDP Statistics (IRIS)**. It was noted, however, that national statistics (the focus of IRIS) are generally not sufficient in meeting the operational needs of humanitarian and development actors, and thus will need to be complemented with other data collection models that may also require capacity building support. Submissions also highlighted the need for building capacities on **Do No Harm in data**, both among national and international actors, and generally flagged the value of creating a platform to **share best practices and lessons learned** on data management.

### Uses of data

As the [submission from JIPS](#) highlighted, **data should be a means to an end**, not collected for its own sake. In this context, it is important for the Panel to consider how data can be used as a tool to advance its other mandated objectives: strengthening prevention, responses, and solutions to internal displacement.

Previous sections of this document have already touched on areas in which strengthened use of data could be beneficial. These include in building understanding and capacity to prevent and respond to internal displacement, creating political will and improving accountability, ensuring that approaches reflect the distinct experiences of people of all ages, genders, and diversities, and informing operational responses, among others.

One area where submissions felt displacement data could be better utilized is in the articulation of **development strategies**. While a wealth of displacement data already exists, submissions noted the need to ensure that this informs and is aligned with those pursuing development interventions rather than purely humanitarian. Means of promoting this coherence is discussed shortly in the Data Platforms and Processes section below.

### Data gaps

Submissions highlighted a number of areas in which better data and research was needed. These include:

- Better age, gender, ability, and diversity disaggregated data generally
- Data on solutions
- Data on displacement driven by slow-onset crises
- Data on urban displacement trends
- Data on displacement associated with other situations of violence
- Data on displacement linked to development projects
- Data on internal and cross-border displacement associated with disasters and climate change
- Longitudinal data on disaster displacement
- Data on socioeconomic situation of IDPs, including as compared to local community
- General data on how the situation of IDPs differs from members of non-displaced communities
- Data on rural displacement

- Data at country-level on progress towards durable solutions

Many of these data gaps were noted to be linked to challenges in how data is collected and shared between actors.

### Data platforms and processes

In considering how to improve the availability, quality, and functionality of data, submissions noted a number of key elements.

First, submissions flagged the importance of **ensuring data is collected and organized in a way that allows it to be used by different types of actors**. Some submissions took this one step further and suggested the value in creating a common IDP database. Linked to this point on interoperability, submissions highlighted the value of developing data indicators that can feed into SDG or Sendai reporting and to ensure that data is collected and analyzed in a manner that facilitates this. Given the maturity of these reporting systems, [IDMC highlighted](#) that displacement reporting systems could build on their model.

Careful consideration of who carries out data collection was also highlighted as a priority in a number of submissions. IDMC noted the important role for actors with **specialist expertise** in data collection and methods, including national statistical offices, specific UN agencies, academia, and public/private sector organizations. Other submissions emphasized the importance of a **collaborative approach** to data collection, highlighting the need to engage a broad cross section of local, national, and international actors, as well as affected communities themselves. The [joint submission from Switzerland and HPG](#) also noted the value of joint analysis and collaboration between actors who have different mandates and areas of expertise, including humanitarians, development actors, and peacebuilders.

In recognition of the large number of actors that conduct data collection and analysis on internal displacement in the humanitarian sphere, submissions suggested that there is a need for **greater coordination, clarity, and agreement about respective roles and responsibilities** with regard to data. The [World Bank/UNHCR Joint Data Centre submission](#) noted that the current environment results in gaps and duplicative efforts, creates a competitive environment, leads to wasted resources, and places an unnecessary burden on affected populations. [IOM suggested](#) that “The HLP should support to strongly advocate and contribute to joint assessment, data collection and analysis, across stakeholders and partners, at global and country level. Encourage the establishment of data sharing protocols, joint analytical framework, and collaboration in order to avoid duplications, share best practices, streamline innovative techniques and methodologies [in line with Gran Bargain point n.5 (Improve joint and impartial needs assessments) and the various data-related exercises such as JIAG/JIAF or EGRIS].”

At the national level, many submissions discussed the value of establishing **national IDP data, registration, and analysis systems**. Numerous positive examples of this are already emerging in affected countries and their experiences could serve as a valuable learning for other affected countries.

As a complement to national systems, IDMC suggested the need for a **global or regional mechanism to sustain follow-up and reporting on internal displacement**. IDMC notes that this could take a number of forms, including a global reporting system similar to the SDGs and Sendai, a self-assessment coupled with peer review (as is practiced by OECD DAC members), or a dedicated forum within the UN General Assembly.

Submissions noted the possibility for **new technology** to contribute to better data and understanding of internal displacement. This could include exploring big data, data linking and modelling, satellite and geo-spatial data, online/phone-based surveys, as well as data anonymization and artificial intelligence that enable safe sharing and responsible open data.

Finally, the [submission from Translators without Borders](#) (TWB) noted the **critical role of language**. Data collection that takes place in a language that is poorly understood by respondents may exclude participation and/or lead to inaccurate results. TWB suggests that greater investment is needed to conduct data collection in minority languages to improve the accessibility and representativeness of results.

### Data accountability

As with all aspects of work with displacement affected communities, submissions noted the importance of **accountability in data**. In addition to the Do No Harm components noted above, this also requires accountability in how data has (or has not) been used, and the extent to which data has informed decision-making. Strengthening this aspect of data accountability will be critical in reducing unnecessary and extractive data collection that places a burden on communities and resources.

## Considerations for the Panel during its lifespan

Some submissions included recommendations for actions the Panel should take during its lifespan. The most consistent of these messages was the need for the Panel to begin laying the foundation early for a **follow-up mechanism** to take forward the High-Level Panel's recommendations. The Grand Bargain process that followed on from the High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing was often noted as a good example of this. [InterAction noted](#) that this could be driven forward by an eminent person (including a Panel member) or a dedicated senior-leadership body with high-level visibility and political influence.

Linked to the above follow up mechanism, submissions noted the need for a guiding framework to enable **operational follow-up at the regional and national level**. The Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework was noted as a potential example for such a model.

A different approach, proposed by InterAction, would be for the Panel to use its lifespan to develop a series of individual, country-level roadmaps on achieving solutions to internal displacement. These would include prescriptions for action by states, donors, UN agencies, private sector, IFIs, and other key actors, and would lay the foundation for eventual "Compacts" as have been seen in a number of refugee hosting countries. More details are included in the InterAction submission.

A number of submissions highlighted the need for the Panel to **"walk the talk" on participation**. This requires direct consultations with IDPs, including across ages, genders, and diversities. Submissions have likewise strongly emphasized the need for the Panel's recommendations to respond to the specific needs of people of different diversities, and to uphold the protection of IDPs first and foremost.

Finally, a number of submissions encouraged the Panel use its weight to raise visibility on internal displacement issues, including in relation to the COVID-19 pandemic. [UNHCR called](#) for the panel to support the UN Secretary General's appeal for global ceasefire, advocate for IDP inclusion in health care

services and social safety nets, urge non-discrimination of IDPs from all backgrounds, and advocate against any COVID-related measures that risk forcing return to insecure areas of origin.



## Annex 1 – List of submitting entities

(Submissions received before 25 September 2020)

ACT Alliance
Afghanistan
African Union (AU)
Ana Mosneaga
Andrés Lizcano Rodriguez
Andres Moya
Armenia
Asia Pacific Academic Network on Disaster Displacement (APANDD)
Asia Pacific Refugee Rights Network (APRRN)
Azerbaijan
Burkina Faso
Canada
Catholic Refugee Services (CRS)
Center for Global Development (CGD)
Climate Migration and Displacement Platform (CMDP)
Colombia
Corporación Opción Legal
Cristosal
Croatia
Danish Refugee Council (DRC)
Denmark
El Salvador
Ethiopia
European Union (EU)
Faith Action for Children on the Move (FACoM)
Forum for Development of Multiethnic Collaboration (FDMC)
France
Georgia
Germany
Global Campaign for Equal Nationality Rights (GCENR)
Global Engagement Network on Internal Displacement in Sub-Saharan Africa (GENIDA)
GP20
Grupo Articulador Regional del Plan de Acción Brasil (GARPAB)
Humanitarian Policy Group (HPG)
Indonesia
InterAction - Roadmap to Durable Solutions (InterAction 1)
InterAction - Minimizing Civilian Harm (InterAction 2)
Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC)

International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)
International Labor Organization (ILO)
International Organization of Least Developed Countries (IOLDC)
International Organization of Migration (IOM)
International Organization of Migration – Displacement Tracking Matrix (IOM-DTM)
Japan
Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS)
Joint AGD Submission
Joint Data Centre (JDC)
Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS)
Joint Nigeria NGO submission
Joint submission from International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), the Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS), and UN-Habitat (UN) - (IIED/JIPS/UNH)
Joint submission from Switzerland and Humanitarian Policy Group (Swiss/HPG)
Kaldor Centre
Knowledge Platform on Migration and Development (KNOMAD)
Latin America Research Network (LANTAM)
Lebanon
Mozambique
Mexico
Middle East Research Network
Montenegro
Morocco
Netherlands
Nigeria
Norway
Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)
Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
Office of the UN High Commissioner on Human Rights (OHCHR)
Oxfam
Phil Orchard
Platform on Disaster Displacement (PDD)
Poland
Rebecca Enobong
Regional Durable Solutions Secretariat (ReDSS)
Save the Children
Somalia
Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI)
Switzerland
Tonga
Translators without Borders (TWB)
Ukraine

UN Children's Fund (UNICEF)
UN Development Coordination Office (DCO)
United Nations Development Programme
UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
UN High Commissioner for Refugee (UNHCR)
UN Major Group on Children and Youth (UNMGCY)
UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction
UN Women
United Kingdom
United States of America (USA)
Women's Refugee Commission (WRC)
World Bank (WB)