PART 2

ENDING INTERNAL DISPLACEMENT

Relocated internally displaced people access the water supply in a New Public Site in Baidoa, Somalia. Photo: IOM/Hyungbin Lim, July 2019.
Internal displacement cost the world about $20 billion in 2019. This economic burden is borne by displaced people themselves, the communities that host them, struggling frontline government agencies and an overstretched humanitarian system. The figure does not include longer-term or indirect costs, but it still equates to an average of $390 a person for each year of displacement just to provide basic services and account for temporary loss of income.

Based on such rough estimates, the past eight years of ongoing displacement in Syria have cost nearly $43 billion. The figure for Iraq is around $20 billion since 2009. The burden this represents for national economies is significant. The cost of meeting the needs of Somalia’s 2.6 million IDPs and accounting for their loss of income for a year adds up to just over $1 billion, which represents around 21 per cent of the country’s GDP. Such figures make it clear that the cost of protracted displacement is untenable for countries and communities, which should make sustainable solutions and international support for them a priority.

With 45.7 million people worldwide living in internal displacement as a result of conflict and violence, and around 5.1 million because of disasters, it is glaringly obvious that the phenomenon cannot be addressed through humanitarian interventions alone. The costs involved are significantly higher than the budget of most government and UN agencies that assist IDPs. Civil society fills some of the gaps, and in the absence of more comprehensive support so do many displaced people and their hosts. The impacts of displacement that both groups absorb are multidimensional and affect almost every aspect of their lives and communities.

After more than two decades of local, national and international efforts to respond to internal displacement as a humanitarian issue, the gulf between international principles and aspirations and local and national realities is as wide as ever. This makes it apparent that solutions to displacement will have to be found elsewhere, namely via longer-term development initiatives and funding.

One-size-fits-all approaches to durable solutions will also have to be replaced with more granular processes, adapted to the distinct situations of different groups and individuals. Displaced women, men, children, older people and those with disabilities each have specific needs and resources that must be taken into account in designing better policies and programmes to support them.

We estimate that at least 6.6 million children under five were living in internal displacement worldwide as of the end of 2019 with particular development and nutritional needs. Another 11.7 million were between five and 14, and in need of primary or secondary education. Older people may also have specific needs in the form of long-term care or financial support if they are no longer able to work. At least 3.7 million IDPs were over the age of 60 as of the end of 2019 (see Figure 20). A more detailed breakdown of the number of IDPs not only by age, but also by gender, disability status, socioeconomic level and other criteria would inform better targeted and more inclusive emergency responses and development plans.

**FIGURE 20:** People internally displaced by conflict, violence and disasters as of 31 December 2019, by age group
Solutions to displacement are rarely if ever achieved in a single step. In addition to the 50.8 million IDPs worldwide as of the end of 2019, almost 13.5 million people displaced by conflict had made some degree of progress toward durable solutions. They may have chosen to return to their place of origin, integrate locally or resettle elsewhere, but they have only been able to partially re-establish their lives and still have vulnerabilities related to their displacement. We have accounted for this group separately from those still living in displacement, but recognising that they are still to fully resolve their situation means that more than 64 million people worldwide may still suffer from the consequences of their displacement (see Table 3, p.105).

Given the growing scale of the problem, the quest for solutions and robust data to inform them is ever more pressing. The good news is that promising approaches have emerged in recent years, from establishing effective and inclusive coordination mechanisms in Indonesia and comprehensive monitoring systems in Mali, to formally making internal displacement a visible part of development efforts in Afghanistan. These serve, among other things, to highlight the specific nature of local situations.

This part of the GRID presents further examples from countries trying to address internal displacement and discusses the main ingredients of future practice intended to bring about durable solutions and lasting change. These fall into one or two of three areas: improving evidence, strengthening capacity and fostering political commitment (see Figure 21). In other words, practices that contribute to knowing what to do, being able to do it and being willing to do it now and for the foreseeable future.

**FIGURE 21: Three areas for action needed to end displacement and reduce displacement risk**
POLITICAL COMMITMENT AS THE BASIS FOR ACTION

When asked what is missing for significant progress on internal displacement to be made, many commentators reply, “political commitment”. It may also be called political will, institutional buy-in or national ownership, but whatever the term it is commonly held to be lacking. There are, however, examples of newly emerging commitment to be found.

Official statements or mentions of internal displacement in speeches and reports can be a form of “expressed” political commitment. A number of countries have gone further to demonstrate their expressed commitment by reporting on internal displacement, including against the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (Sendai Framework) (see Philippines spotlight, p. 83).

Expressed commitment may also translate into clearly demonstrated institutional or budgetary commitment via the development of policies, the adoption of laws, the allocation of funding and the implementation of programmes. These may be instruments and initiatives specific to internal displacement in their own right, or measures integrated into broader development strategies, programmes and budgets.

The Afghan government, for example, is committed to making land available to returning refugees and IDPs, and collaborated with UN agencies and international NGOs to develop a new legal framework on land rights and ownership. This culminated in a presidential decree issued in August 2018 on the identification and allocation of suitable land and the construction of affordable housing for returnees.

Ethiopia, which already had a complex set of policy frameworks on displacement, launched the Durable Solutions Initiative (DSI) toward the end of 2019 intended to establish a coordinated approach under national leadership. In the Pacific region, the UN Human Rights Council set a precedent in recognising the risk of new and protracted displacement associated with climate change impacts when it ruled that there may be instances in which people fleeing them would have to be afforded international protection. Individual states including Fiji and Vanuatu are also developing domestic policies.

Recognising and properly framing internal displacement is critical to government action

Recognising and accurately framing internal displacement has the potential to catalyse major shifts in political attention and institutional commitment. In Somalia, for example, changes in how the phenomenon came to be understood played a significant role in reshaping national policy and practice.

Somali officials had long favoured return as a way of resolving displacement, and policies were geared toward IDPs going back to their places of origin. Many were evicted from their temporary homes and land as a result and sought refuge in peri-urban areas around Mogadishu, where they were at risk of further displacement. Aided by consistent engagement of various humanitarian and development organisations, however, the government’s thinking shifted. It began to recognise local integration not only as a viable solution but also IDPs’ preferred option in many cases. It launched a DSI in 2016, which it leads, and a regional durable solutions secretariat led by civil society to put its new policy angle into practice.

The country’s 2017 national development plan recognised IDPs’ rights and included provisions to support their local integration in urban areas, and the Benadir regional administration established a durable solutions unit in the mayor of Mogadishu’s office. It also launched a durable solutions policy for IDPs. This regional initiative has since spawned a federal effort, including a new national policy on IDPs adopted by the cabinet and the country’s durable solutions secretariat with significant political buy-in and ownership. Chaired by the Ministry of Planning, the secretariat incorporates 14 government institutions, including the Office of the Prime Minister and the National Commission for Refugees and IDPs. Somalia also ratified the Kampala Convention.
SPOTLIGHT

Internal displacement under the SDGs and the Sendai Framework

Forty-seven countries published voluntary national reviews (VNRs), the follow-up mechanism for reporting progress against the SDGs, in 2019. Fourteen of them were countries affected by conflict displacement, but only seven - Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cameroon, CAR, Chad, Ghana and Iraq - included the phenomenon in their reviews. This still constitutes a modest improvement on previous years. Only three of the countries with conflict displacement did so in 2016, four in 2017 and five in 2018. The Philippines also recognises disaster displacement and sets out options to address it in its 2019 VNR.

There was also greater emphasis on internal displacement in the 2019 VNRs. Those in previous years tended merely to mention the issue or list the number of IDPs in the country, but the latest reviews go further in unpacking the causes of displacement and how to address them through preventive measures and support for durable solutions. Azerbaijan’s 2019 VNR also stresses the need for disaggregated data and for IDPs to be involved in the implementation of the SDGs and the preparation of related reports. It also mentions concrete measures taken to support IDPs, such as increasing their monthly allowance from 40 to 60 manats ($24 to $36).

Bosnia and Herzegovina’s VNR identifies lack of access to work as one of the main obstacles to sustainable return for both IDPs and refugees. It also reports an example of good practice in the form of the government’s provision of small business, agriculture and vocational training support for around 1,000 returnee households.

2020 marks the fifth anniversary of the adoption of the SDGs and a higher number of VNRs are likely to be submitted as a result. Fifty are already under preparation, including 19 from countries with people displaced by conflict or violence. DRC, Libya, Syria and Ukraine will present their first VNRs, as will the Russian Federation.

The Sendai Framework, which the UN General Assembly adopted in 2015, complements the SDGs by outlining seven targets and four priorities for action for member states to protect development gains from the risk of disasters. It recognises displacement as a major global consequence of disasters, and target B is to reduce the number of people affected by disasters, including those who are displaced, by 2030.

Target E is to substantially increase the number of countries that adopt and implement national and local disaster risk reduction (DRR) strategies in line with the framework by 2020. More than a third of the 69 national DRR strategies reviewed refer to displacement, but only a quarter were created or have been revised since 2015 and so are aligned at least in part with the Sendai Framework’s provisions.

Vanuatu’s DRR strategy is a good example. It calls for attention and support to be given to IDPs’ specific needs, and the development of a national policy on internal displacement to strengthen disaster recovery arrangements. India’s DRR strategy also refers to the Sendai Framework and emphasises the need to avoid secondary displacement in the aftermath of disasters, calling for customised relocation packages that support recovery and access to livelihoods.

As under Sendai’s predecessor, the Hyogo Framework for Action, member states can document their progress toward global targets by providing validated data on 38 indicators into the Sendai Framework’s online monitoring tool. Twenty-six countries provided data on housing destroyed by disasters in 2018, but only 11 did so in 2019. This is unfortunate, because such information serves as a useful proxy for displacement and provides a baseline to advocate for more investment in risk reduction.

FIGURE 22: Internal displacement and the SDGs
These developments show how a shift in the way internal displacement is framed and a country’s recognition of the scale, nature, risks and impacts associated with it can radically alter the institutional landscape and create opportunities for action.

In Brazil, newly proposed provisions in the national civil defence plan and policy would recognise disaster displacement and have the potential to improve promising efforts to account for and address the phenomenon. The government set up the Integrated System for Information about Disasters (S2ID) in 2012 to compile official data on disaster losses and publish damage reports. Lessons from the country with the highest number of disaster displacements in Latin America show that fuller national recognition of the potential duration, severity and complexity of displacement has the potential to become the bridge between emergency responses and broader policies that address the issue more holistically in the aftermath of disasters.

Whether dedicated or integrated, policies on internal displacement need to align with national priorities

National policies that address internal displacement comprehensively as a humanitarian and development issue can catalyse the establishment of institutions and mechanisms dedicated to preventing and responding to it in a more coordinated way. Other national policies that recognise displacement, including development plans, peacebuilding strategies and DRR frameworks, may also help to prepare the ground for more coherent and effective protection and assistance, and investments in preparedness, risk reduction and prevention.

Uganda has a dedicated national policy on IDPs that covers both conflict and disaster displacement and includes measures that range from prevention to facilitating durable solutions and mitigating broader social impacts. Developed, as so often happens, in response to a crisis, it pays only limited attention to reducing displacement risk, but it is still a good example of a strong standalone policy that has provisions for different displacement situations. South Sudan’s national framework on return, resettlement and reintegration of 2017...
was also developed in response to a crisis, but because the displacement involved was associated with conflict, it only provides for durable solution initiatives for people whose flight was triggered in that way.439

Burundi’s IDPs are recognised as victims of the country’s 1993 to 2005 civil war and included in the national strategy for socioeconomic reintegration, but no prevention measures are included.440 The strategy does, however, include measures to mitigate the negative consequences of conflict and displacement for groups other than IDPs, and this is an important step toward fostering social cohesion and maintaining peace.

Creating direct links between efforts to support IDPs and achieving national development goals, such as poverty reduction and stability, has been shown to be a promising avenue toward sustainable progress. Somalia’s last national development plan includes provisions for IDPs and other vulnerable groups, and Afghanistan has recognised internal displacement as a significant challenge to poverty reduction in its SDG reporting (see Internal displacement under the SDGs and the Sendai Framework spotlight, p.71).

More and more countries have also started to include the phenomenon into their national DRR policies and strategies.441 Burkina Faso and Namibia have developed national disaster risk management plans that include displacement risk, prevention measures and the provision of assistance for those displaced and their host communities.442 Fiji, Tuvalu and Vanuatu have also developed a range of policy instruments that address displacement, including relocation guidelines, migration policies and national development plans.443

**Regional and global initiatives can act as catalysts for national commitment and local action**

Regional and global initiatives play a vital role in generating political support for issues that may be difficult to tackle at the national level. The African Union (AU) and other regional and sub-regional bodies on the continent have done much to encourage the implementation of national laws and policies on internal displacement.444 Other regional bodies, such as the Organization of American States (OAS) and the Council of Europe, had previously called on their member states to develop legislation and national policies in line with international standards, but it was in Africa that the first legally binding regional instruments for IDPs’ protection were developed.445

The 2006 Pact on Security, Stability and Development in the Great Lakes Region, also known as the Great Lakes Pact, and its protocol on IDPs’ protection and assistance require member states to incorporate the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement into their national legislation.446 The AU adopted the Kampala Convention, a landmark instrument that established a common regulatory standard for IDPs, in 2009. The convention also draws on the Guiding Principles and is the first regional framework to define roles and responsibilities for a wide range of institutions and organisations operating in displacement settings.

Regional economic bodies such as the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) and the Southern African Development Community (SADC) have also promoted dialogue and policy development on internal displacement by drawing together a wide range of stakeholders to exchange experiences in supporting IDPs’ resilience and their achievement of durable solutions.447

IGAD’s attention to the issue triggered a sense of competition between countries in the Horn of Africa to make their efforts to support IDPs more visible.448 Examples from across the region show that there is no one way to facilitate dialogue on internal displacement and that increasing attention to it is a long-term process. Consultative and less formal processes are also conducive to peer-to-peer learning and increasing ownership.

The continent marked the 10th anniversary of the Kampala Convention in 2019, which the AU declared the Year of Refugees, Returnees and IDPs. A review of the year’s achievements shows that it acted as a catalyst in strengthening national normative frameworks.449 Equatorial Guinea, Somalia and South Sudan all ratified the convention. Ratification does not equal implementation, but it does constitute an important step in raising the political profile of displacement by reinforcing national responsibility. Continent-wide regional meetings that included a large number of civil society organisations may also have helped raise awareness of the issue in the media and among the general population.
At the global level, the High-Level Panel on Internal Displacement set up by the UN secretary general, António Guterres, in 2019 is a strong sign of renewed political attention on the part of the UN system and member states. The panel’s main aims are to identify concrete and long-term solutions to protracted displacement, develop a realistic agenda for the prevention of future displacement and mitigate its negative effects.\footnote{450}

Ongoing reform of the UN development system also presents an opportunity for greater international coordination to support governments in tackling internal displacement at the operational level. The new UN sustainable development cooperation frameworks could be a potent platform for increased visibility of the phenomenon at the country level.\footnote{451} The frameworks are based on UN common country assessments (CCAs), which review country-specific data on risks to development, including conflict, displacement, climate change and disasters, to improve UN support and prioritise its resources.\footnote{452}

The UN’s regional monthly reviews (RMRs) are an opportunity to integrate displacement risk considerations into the system’s global horizon scanning exercises, which in turn may encourage more forward-looking approaches.\footnote{453} The enhanced role of resident coordinators (RCs), who lead UN country teams and are managed by the UN Development Coordination Office (DCO), also presents an opportunity to develop comprehensive strategies to address internal displacement in line with national needs and development priorities. The RC offices in Ethiopia, Iraq, Somalia and Sudan already have durable solutions advisors or teams in place, and others are beginning to show interest in providing similar support.
Countries with robust governance mechanisms, including a clear allocation of responsibilities across sectors and administrative levels, adequate human, technical and financial resources and transparent budgets, are best placed to develop strong capacity to address internal displacement. This section discusses how governments, international agencies and NGOs have stepped up their efforts to strengthen planning, implementation and monitoring capacities at the national and local level.

**National governance mechanisms and levels of decentralisation have direct implications for countries’ capacities to address internal displacement**

An analysis of short and long-term responses across different contexts shows how both formal and informal governance structures already in place influence a country’s ability to address protracted displacement. Capacity to account for and respond to the phenomenon needs to be strong across the board, which often requires additional resources, particularly at the local level. This includes involving IDPs and their host communities in planning and in the provision of basic services and supporting them in developing new skills. The planning and implementation of initiatives and the monitoring of progress in countries with truly decentralised systems and budgets will be led by local administrations as a matter of course, but basic local capacity to undertake assessments and collect data is also needed in those with more centralised systems.

Despite progress in Somalia since the launch of the country’s DSI in 2016, it has become clear that more capacity investments need to be devolved from the national to the municipal level. This should include the devolution of responsibilities, budgets and decision-making power, not only in urban centres such as Mogadishu, Baidoa or Kismayo, where the international presence is strong and technical assistance available, but also in secondary cities such as Burco, Galkayo and Qardho.

At least 6.6 million children under five were living in internal displacement worldwide as of the end of 2019. A project in Tegucigalpa, Honduras, supports permanence of students in school. Photo: Mariel Almuniña, 2019

**GRID 2020**
Colombia’s Transitional Solutions Initiative has been recognised as good practice beyond the country’s borders. Implemented from 2012 to 2016, it was a concerted effort by the government and its partners to address protracted displacement in some of the most affected areas of the country. It did, however, encounter challenges in terms of local-level involvement and it may also have increased the population’s dependence on external assistance and threatened to create tensions in communities with weakened social fabric.

A key lesson from this significant investment by both humanitarian and development stakeholders was the important role that local committees played. They brought communities, municipalities and local, national and international NGOs together for biweekly meetings, emphasising the importance of involving local authorities in the design, implementation and continuation of international responses.

Georgia has also recognised the need for better coordination between national and local stakeholders. The country set up a strong mechanism in the form of a dedicated ministry for IDPs and a steering committee made up of several ministries, UN agencies and civil society organisations, which operated until early 2019. It has more recently developed a promising multiyear decentralisation strategy that has the potential to grant local government entities more powers to deal with internal displacement. Georgia’s experience shows that strong coordination between a national focal point and other national and local stakeholders is essential for effective implementation, and that such a mechanism is also a clear signal of political commitment.

Funding for sustainable solutions must prioritise local initiatives

Sustainable solutions to displacement require predictable long-term funding at the local level. This is particularly the case for rapidly growing cities that become a destination for large numbers of IDPs but which may not be prioritised in national budgets. Despite growing recognition of the fact, there is still a yawning gap between the overall funding available and the small percentage channelled to those “at the frontline”.

This issue is not specific to internal displacement, and a number of lessons can be drawn from other areas. Of all the global climate funding available to help developing countries reduce emissions and adapt to climate change, less than 10 per cent was earmarked for local action between 2013 and 2016. A series of factors prevent more funds from trickling down, including how success is measured and the transaction costs involved in managing small versus large funding flows.

The dominance of large international organisations and development banks as intermediaries also acts as a barrier because they are less able to finance or support small-scale projects, and many donor countries still prefer risk-averse funding mechanisms to the detriment of more innovative instruments that might reach local stakeholders more easily. As a result, “few funds provide capacity support for building local capacity, and those that do seldom allow sufficient time to build the skills needed”.

Somalia’s DSI experience confirms this. Limited local-level capacity means municipalities struggle to deal with the increasing numbers of IDPs who want to integrate locally. Despite a range of federal and state policies and guidelines introduced in recent years, services and infrastructure in many towns and cities are still severely overstretched. There is an effort, via the DSI, to increase investment in rural capacities, markets and infrastructure to reduce the pressure on urban areas, but the reality on the ground dictates that more investment will also have to be made in strengthening the capacity of urban municipalities.

Some of the best performing climate funds that target local initiatives, such as the Global Environmental Fund’s small grants programme, have participatory structures in which “local communities are able to engage directly in the design, appraisal and evaluation of climate and development projects”. Ultimately funding has to reach the people directly affected, which for the purpose of this report means IDPs, their host communities and their local representatives.

Where local-level funding is provided, whether for initiatives targeting IDPs directly or organisations that support them, experience shows it to be more successful when based on multi-year strategies and funding that connect humanitarian and development work. Some countries, such as Denmark, are responding to this realisation. Its framework for international cooperation emphasises the need to bridge humanitarian and devel-
opment action so that immediate needs can be met in parallel with longer-term work on durable solutions.470

The hope is that more predictable longer-term funding may support multi-year planning and strategic engagement at the country level. Multi-year funding and planning were key to the success of the Simon Pelé urban development programme in Haiti, which facilitated the return of people displaced by the 2010 earthquake. Habitat for Humanity’s Pathways to Permanence strategy provided a predictable five-year funding period for the programme, enabling its strategy to go beyond support for IDPs to include investments in neighbourhood infrastructure, security and DRR measures. It was the first neighbourhood-scale project to be implemented with grants from institutional donors such as the World Bank, the Canadian International Development Agency, and Canada’s Department for Foreign Affairs, Training and Development (DFATD).471

Evaluations of multi-year funding programmes in countries such as DRC and Sudan also suggest that the benefits of such arrangements remain unevenly distributed, but there are promising signs that adopting a longer-term approach helps to improve the quality of humanitarian programming and encourages organisations to adopt more integrated responses to protracted displacement.472

Predictable multi-year funding also acts as a counterweight to waning donor attention. Many examples exist of funding for longer-term reconstruction and integration efforts falling off dramatically after initial funding cycles.473 Perhaps as a result of this, the international community and humanitarian agencies tend to shy away from taking a “long-term view, as well as strengthening the State’s capacity to face the long tail of returns and stabilisation”\(^4\)474

A revisit to the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, which was intended to support implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, seems appropriate. Financing for solutions to internal displacement will have to be based on and support “cohesive nationally owned sustainable development strategies, supported by integrated national financing frameworks”.475 These may be new instruments or adaptations of existing ones, including loans.

Lessons from refugee situations show that loans can be useful if they are concessional. The Global Conces-

sional Financing Facility provided Colombia with such funds as part of a broader loan agreement to support the country in hosting Venezuelan refugees, effectively increasing the volume and decreasing the cost of the overall transaction.476

Just as providing support for countries trying to deal with large influxes of refugees is considered a global public good that may justify concessional lending, so should facilitating sustainable solutions to internal displacement be seen as an investment that brings broader regional and global benefits in terms of stability and peace and a reduction in poverty and inequality. Learning from promising financing instruments already in place will be important in changing the landscape of financing to address and resolve internal displacement.

The UN’s Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) may have a role to play in getting more funding to the local level to address the phenomenon. It is willing to take more risks in its investments than development donors and has already proved a catalyst for securing funding for large, area-based durable solutions interventions, as in Somalia.477 The more visible role the World Bank has taken in financing responses to refugee situations is encouraging, and the increased funding it has earmarked for countries affected by conflict may also be made available to finance assistance for IDPs.478 Development funds, however, are usually channelled based on poverty and vulnerability rather than status, which is why better information on IDPs’ socioeconomic conditions is vital if such instruments are to support longer-term investments.

**Accounting for displacement and reporting on progress**

A country’s ability to account for the number of IDPs on its territory, monitor assistance and report on progress toward durable solutions is a potent tool for generating and sustaining commitment at all levels. Countries with a national data strategy that enables regular reporting, which has a dedicated budget and is aligned with a legal framework are also able to communicate their efforts and intentions in ways that are more likely to attract internal and external support.

This means that national strategies to develop capacity need to include not only data collectors and analysts, but also staff from entities that will use the data and
results. These include line ministries involved in service provision, labour and employment ministries, central and urban planning departments and civil protection bodies. The capacity to generate, analyse and use robust data vary enormously from one country to another, but a number of promising practices exist.479

The security situation in Mali has been deteriorating since 2013 and the number of new displacements rose sharply in 2019. The increase, however, is in part due to the fact that the country has set up a relatively comprehensive system for data collection, verification and sharing.480 Its rapid response mechanism (RRM) kicks in during sudden and acute crises, and acts as the primary source of information on new displacements in the country.481 It provides validated alerts for population movements that it subsequently tracks. The mechanism currently operates in northern and central regions of the country and consists of a network of focal points at different levels that share information from the communal to the regional level. This is done in close partnership with the Regional Social Development Authorities and local administrations.482

There are significant differences between the collection of information on disaster displacement and that triggered by conflict and other forms of violence, an indication that government ownership of the data collection and validation processes also varies significantly depending on the trigger.483 More than 70 per cent of our disaster displacement figures are based on data obtained from government bodies, most of which are national or regional disaster agencies and local authorities.484

Sri Lanka’s government agency for DRR publishes daily weather reports, early warnings and daily updates on disaster losses, including displacement figures.485 The country’s Disaster Management Centre (DMC) also leads research that supports mitigation efforts and preparedness planning, emergency responses and the coordination of relief and post-disaster recovery.486

Indonesia follows the same protocol, recording data that includes the type of disaster, the number of people affected or displaced, and the number of houses damaged or destroyed. Most of the information is available in the DesInventar database.487 This global open resource is a unique global repository of disaster loss data. The fact that countries are unable to record the duration of displacement is a critical gap, but one that could be relatively easily filled.
The Philippines provides a particularly good example of strong government ownership of displacement data. The Disaster Response Operations Monitoring and Information Centre (DROMIC) is one of the most reliable national systems in Asia for data on displacement associated with both disasters and conflict (see Philippines spotlight, p. 83).

The country can be considered an exception in that the amount of conflict displacement data recorded in national accounting systems tends to be much smaller. Governments usually keep population registers, but the most readily available data on internal displacement is often produced by international partners that provide humanitarian assistance. They are a valuable source of information if national authorities are unwilling or unable to take on the work, but the lack of government leadership or participation can lead to a disconnect between the data produced and decision making at the national level. 488

In some countries where conflict displacement is high on the political and public agenda, national or local authorities do set up registries or multiple-source databases. Colombia’s systematic collection of information on IDPs as part of its registry of victims of the country’s civil war has been recognised as good practice for many years. The system is well resourced and supported by a clear mandate under which the government’s Victim’s Unit is dedicated to maintaining the Victims Registry (RUV) created in January 2012 and providing services to IDPs in collaboration with line ministries and departments. 489

The first comprehensive official registration of displaced people in Bosnia and Herzegovina was carried out after the Bosnian war in late 2000 and evolved into the Database of Displaced Persons and Refugees (DDPR), the main source of quantitative data on internal displacement, in 2005. Despite a solid methodology, however, the complex administrative structure makes it difficult to collect reliable data because displaced people have to submit a request or be assigned a status as such in accordance with the law to be included. That said, the fact that changes in people’s status are passed directly to municipalities means that assistance could be targeted more effectively. 490

There are many lessons to be learned from the different experiences to date with accounting systems. One of the most obvious is that for them to work and be useful to planners and service providers, they have to cover a range of indicators and metrics that offer insight and outputs to a range of stakeholders. A system intended solely to account for internal displacement will not have the same traction as one that provides information across various dimensions, time and space. Investments in broader statistical and data systems can also be starting points for the integration of information on internal displacement, particularly if there is limited appetite, capacity or resourcing for more dedicated activities.

Lessons from initiatives to improve SDG reporting show the need for the internal displacement agenda to be aligned with broader national priorities, particularly when it comes to data collection systems. 491 For capacity building to be sustainable, gain momentum and become worth the time and money invested by governments and donors, it must be integrated into existing support mechanisms.

IOM and FAO recently launched a partnership with the Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative (CADRI) in west and central Africa intended to address disaster displacement by mobilising regional stakeholders and building national capacity. 492 Using an existing collaboration of more than 20 organisations, the partnership is a promising example of how collaborative efforts can strengthen local, national and regional capacities on internal displacement. Given that both sudden and slow-onset disasters are key triggers of displacement in the region, initiatives such as CADRI could offer countries tools and services that help account for and reduce the phenomenon.

Capacity-building efforts must target not individuals, but organisations and national institutions, and they must have political support. Without it they may end up as short-term investments that peter out before new systems have been established, resulting in failure. A clear understanding of existing capacities and the challenges in different contexts is also essential.
STRONGER EVIDENCE CAN PRODUCE BETTER POLICY AND PRACTICE

Not only the quantity but also the quality of data on internal displacement has increased significantly over the past decades. There is still much to do to improve coverage and reliability, but progress is being made. Good practices are emerging from new approaches, technologies and partnerships that help to improve our understanding of the scale, nature, impacts and risk of displacement.

Better data to inform the pursuit of durable solutions

The first global survey of IDPs was published in 1998 to coincide with the launch of the Guiding Principles. It covered 56 countries and estimated that between 20 and 22 million people were living in internal displacement as a result of conflict and violence. The way that internal displacement is recorded globally has advanced significantly since, in some cases to include systematic data collection on countries, displacement events and situations and IDPs’ trajectories. Coverage has also expanded significantly in recent years. The amount of information in our Global Internal Displacement Database has increased by 274% since 2016.

The robustness of our figures and our confidence in them have also improved. Not only has the number of incidents of displacement in our database risen, but also the number of records for many events. As the range of sources has increased, so has our ability to triangulate and validate data on new displacements and people living in displacement (see Figure 23).

FIGURE 23: Increasing confidence in global estimates of internal displacement
More needs to be done, however, to generate reliable data on IDPs’ location and demographics and the patterns and duration of their displacement. Without such information, neither governments nor humanitarian and development stakeholders are able to plan effective interventions to reduce the impacts of displacement or the risk of it happening in the future.494

Given information on the spatial distribution of displacement, for example whether IDPs or certain subgroups are concentrated in urban centres or dispersed across rural areas, the provision of services and investments in infrastructure can be better targeted. In urban displacement settings as described in the first part of this report in Afghanistan, China, Indonesia, Iraq, Nigeria and Somalia, this type of information becomes vital because support has to be provided outside camps and via channels determined by existing urban infrastructure and service delivery.497

Some IDPs are displaced several times, and others undertake pendular movements between their places of origin and refuge. People tend to become more vulnerable economically, socially and psychologically with each new displacement, so knowing how many times people have been forced to flee helps to plan and prioritise support accordingly.

Understanding the risk of future displacement underpins efforts to prevent it from happening. We estimate that around 13.9 million people worldwide are at risk of being displaced by sudden-onset disasters each year.498 Eight of the ten countries with the highest risk of future displacement and loss of housing are in south and south-east Asia. In Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Myanmar, Pakistan, the Philippines and Vietnam, high hazard risk combines with the fact that large populations are exposed to fuel displacement risk.

Hydro-meteorological hazards are by far the largest trigger of displacement. They also pose the greatest risk of it happening in the future, and this risk is set to increase with population growth and the fact that climate change is making such hazards more frequent and intense. The good news, however, is that hazards such as floods and cyclones can be predicted, and early warning systems work. Information on the scale, location and nature of projected displacement can also be used to inform pre-emptive measures that mitigate risk and improve preparedness, reducing the impacts of disasters when they strike.499

This type of information helps in planning broad interventions, but not all IDPs experience displacement in the same way, even if they are displaced at the same time and by the same trigger. Data disaggregated by sex, age, disability and other characteristics is needed to design more effective programmes that tailor limited resources to specific needs.500 It is also needed to inform policy and meaningfully assess progress in reducing displacement.

Gaps in disaggregated data tend to be filled with qualitative and anecdotal evidence, with some notable exceptions. The number of IDPs of different sex and age can be estimated using demographic information about the general population. We used this method to calculate that around 21 million women and girls worldwide were living in internal displacement as a result of conflict and violence at the end of 2018.501 This figure can be further broken down by age group to identify those who may need nutritional support, early childhood or other education or reproductive healthcare.

We have also developed a methodology for gauging the severity of displacement, which uses qualitative indicators to assess IDPs’ living conditions and highlight priority areas for intervention.502 The returns index developed by IOM and Social Inquiry in Iraq similarly assesses living conditions in IDPs’ areas of origin, with a focus on livelihoods, basic services, social cohesion and perceptions of safety.503

A longitudinal study conducted by IOM and George-town University also assesses progress toward durable solutions for 4,000 Iraqi IDPs and returning refugees over four years against the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) criteria.504 A similar undertaking in Lebanon sought to understand the spectrum of what constituted returns and solutions for IDPs, less than 40 per cent of whom are estimated to have returned since the civil war.505 Applying a more nuanced assessment to returns, however, showed that several areas saw partial returns, where people returned on a seasonal basis or parts of the family returned, keeping strong ties to areas of refuge.

Understanding the short and longer-term impacts of displacement and their direct and indirect repercussions for people, societies and economies is useful to estimate the cost of responses and the benefits of prevention. The estimated $20 billion that internal displacement costs each year globally, show the potentially dramatic
economic impacts displacement can have. Combined with in-depth analysis of the multidimensional impacts of displacement on individuals and local communities, this information makes a strong case for preventive action and investment in reducing the risk of future displacement. 506

Data collection and analysis can and has to go beyond simple counting

The evidence base on internal displacement has been further improved through new ways of gathering and processing data and increased collaboration between collectors, analysts and users. Mobile technology and data from social media, which is mainly used to support emergency operations and disaster relief, has also been applied to understand displacement patterns before, during and after disasters, and its duration. This type of data can be combined with official figures on evacuation and shelter occupation in the Philippines to providing unique insight into the phenomenon (see Philippines spotlight, p.83). 507

Progress has also been made in assessing displacement via proxy indicators such as housing destruction and the extent of flooding, information about which is gleaned from satellite and aerial imagery. 512 The method is particularly suited to urban settings, where the availability of images also helps to track reconstruction as a proxy for the duration of displacement, keeping in mind that rebuilding does not always equate to return.

New technologies and modelled projections help to produce aggregate information and global estimates, but more in-depth data collected directly from affected communities is also needed. We conducted research in 15 countries involving more than 2,800 survey interviews and 200 key informant interviews which shows that a mixed-method approach is most useful in many settings. This might include household surveys, open-ended key informant interviews, observations and participatory research such as social cartography and gender walks.

Lessons learnt from decades of humanitarian and development practice show that the participation and leadership of communities in programmes that affect
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Painting a fuller picture of disaster displacement

The Philippines is one of the few countries in the world to systematically collect data on disaster displacement, and this puts it in the unusual position of being able to understand how the phenomenon evolves. Data collection on disaster displacement elsewhere tends to stop shortly after a hazard strikes, meaning that little if any information is available on how long people are displaced for and how their conditions change over time.508

DROMIC, the Philippines’ disaster response agency, collects information on the number of people evacuated and the number staying in shelters over time. When this is combined with other sources of information such as anonymised Facebook user data, it provides humanitarian responders and development planners with vital and potentially lifesaving insight into displacement flows and patterns and IDPs’ conditions.

The Philippines recorded 55 disasters in 2019, triggering 4.1 new displacements, of which more than 413,000 were triggered by nine major earthquakes. When three earthquakes struck the southern regions of Mindanao in the space of two weeks in October, DROMIC started to record damage, losses and displacement and continued to do so in the months that followed.509 Its data shows that the number of IDPs in official and unofficial shelters grew from 8,400 in the immediate aftermath of the disaster to a peak of around 190,000 in early December, before falling to about 160,000 toward the end of the month (see Figure 24).

When another 6.8 magnitude earthquake struck Matanao in Davao del Sur in December, it triggered 167,000 new displacements and prolonged the plight of many people who had fled the October quakes. DROMIC data shows that many people were still displaced months later (see Figure 24). Given the extent

FIGURE 24: Number of people displaced in the Philippines after earthquakes in October and December 2019
of the damage and the evacuation of communities in areas prone to landslides, some people may remain displaced for much longer periods, but there is no solid data to verify this.510

Facebook user data can complement DROMIC’s data-sets in such instances by showing movements through space and over time. The data is also useful in estimating daily displacement patterns, which is key to understanding how long a disaster has affected a given area and why some cities recover faster than others. When combined with DROMIC data, such information can support humanitarian response, but also authorities’ longer-term measures to facilitate return and build resilience to reduce future displacement risk.

We have been collaborating with Facebook since 2017 to build displacement maps using anonymised data aggregated at the city level. These give additional insight into the duration of people’s displacement, where they move from and to and their prospects for durable solutions.511

As the methodology is improved and refined, it will become possible to create maps for small-scale as well as larger disasters, which will help to fill further data gaps in situations not covered by official statistics. As digital technologies become more readily and widely available, other undertakings of this kind to collect comprehensive, validated and interoperable data on disaster displacement over space and time will also become possible. This in turn will better inform efforts to manage disaster risk and facilitate durable solutions.
them is essential for success. Participatory research is intended to complement analyses carried out by governments and aid providers with the perspectives of people affected by displacement, involving them not only as recipients but also as responsible agents. IDPs and their hosts have invaluable information about their personal experiences, the barriers they face and how they expect to overcome them. Without such insights, aid providers risk putting together costly programmes that will not be relevant or taken up by those who should benefit from them.

The scale, nature, impacts and risk of displacement vary greatly from one situation to another and depending on the people affected. Designing better preventative measures and responses requires taking these differences into account, and who better to highlight them than IDPs and their hosts?

Participatory approaches engage affected people, local governments, aid providers and other practitioners at every stage, from the design of policies and programmes to their implementation and evaluation. This degree of participation strengthens all three pillars of durable solutions to displacement: evidence, capacity and political commitment.

Because of the difficulties of conducting research with IDPs in often challenging settings, it tends not to be representative and findings cannot be extrapolated to all displaced people in a country or region. They still, however, offer a valuable snapshot of what needs to be considered when developing policies and programmes. Such primary research would ideally be complemented with data collected more systematically and at a larger scale.

More and better collaboration can increase the availability and accessibility of data on internal displacement

Producing authoritative evidence to inform policies and programmes that support the pursuit of durable solutions requires collaboration and partnership. Donor countries and private funders have invested in a range of data centres and initiatives over the last decade intended to inform better policies and programming on displacement. Many are simple data-sharing platforms targeted predominantly at humanitarian practitioners. Displacement data presented in ways that are useful for longer-term development planning is still not readily available, but there may be lessons to learn from new efforts in this area with refugee and migration data. Several commissions and UN regional groups have developed data-hosting centres where aggregated information on migration and displacement from different sources is made available to decision-makers and planners. Twelve countries in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia have created an online repository that includes basic migration data with guidance from the UN Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). Its counterpart in Latin America and Caribbean, ECLAC, has an open database on internal migration.515

The AU and the Moroccan government agreed in 2019 to establish the African Observatory for Migration and Development (OAMD) in Rabat. The observatory is intended to collect information, share data and analysis on migration issues and facilitate coordination between African countries based on the premise of “understanding, anticipating and acting”. It should also help to coordinate policies, harmonise national strategies and improve African countries’ interaction with partners abroad.

New initiatives to improve displacement data for specific vulnerable groups have also emerged, such as the International Data Alliance on Children on the Move recently launched by the UN Children’s Fund (UNICEF), IOM, the UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR), the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Eurostat, the UN Department for Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA) and key partners including IDMC. This unprecedented collaboration aims to improve statistics on migrant and displaced children by supporting in-country data systems and capacities, and mapping gaps, challenges and solutions. It brings together a broad range of resources to advance the objectives set out in the SDGs and the global compacts on migration and refugees.

Strengthening the evidence base on internal displacement will require the development of dedicated capacity at all levels and the institutional commitment to sustain it over time. Data collection and analysis on the phenomenon and the development of tools for planning and monitoring progress all require strong capacities and resources. Reinforcing them by creating an organizational infrastructure with a budgetary commitment in the form of earmarked allocations would be a clear expression of political will.
Ways forward: generating political incentives

Fostering political commitment helps to generate the resources and official authorisations necessary for increased data collection. The inverse is also true as better evidence on internal displacement helps to generate political incentives and can bolster political will. The incentives for governments to engage can, for example, be highlighted by contrasting the benefits of investing in durable solutions with the estimated economic cost of inaction. Assessing the impact of projected future displacement on a country’s overall socioeconomic development is another approach, as is documenting and reporting on progress in resolving internal displacement systematically.

Data on countries’ different experiences of displacement is also needed, as are lessons from specific situations that are applicable to others. There have been several attempts to document good practices and lessons from a range of displacement situations, but almost none used a systematic approach based on a coherent framework. This means we do not have a complete understanding of what works and what doesn’t in different situations, and most importantly whether overall progress has been made.

A new global initiative to support the assessment of progress seeks to address this gap. The Internal Displacement Index (IDI) is a composite measure that brings together indicators of governments’ capacity to address displacement, the impacts of current crises and the underlying drivers that may lead to future displacement or enable solutions.

The index is intended as an accessible tool to introduce non-specialists to a complex phenomenon and at the same time to facilitate the monitoring of progress in resolving displacement at the national and global level. It also helps to identify challenges and good practices from around the world. The indicators for the IDI’s policies and capacities component act as a solid checklist for measuring progress against all three pillars of durable solutions.

Applying the index’s basic principle but making it adaptable to specific countries allows national dashboards to be developed. The Georgian government developed a country-specific assessment tool in collaboration with IDMC and other national stakeholders in 2019 to monitor progress in resolving displacement more closely and better inform its efforts to support IDPs and prevent further displacement.

The tool includes indicators relevant to the situation in Georgia, which help to assess the government’s capacity in terms of data, national policies and financial and institutional resources. It also collates data on the factors such as the number and intensity of floods and landslides that may lead to new displacement or aggravate the conditions in which IDPs and host communities live. Indicators on the scale, severity and economic impact of displacement are used to evaluate the effectiveness of interventions to prevent and reduce displacement.

With nationally owned data sources that are updated at least annually, the Georgian experience provides an example of how to develop a national instrument that can help monitor progress over time more accurately and comprehensively.