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The use of notes in this report

This report uses both endnotes and footnotes. Endnotes refer to reference materials and use numeric indicators that correspond to the reference, found in the endnotes section of the report. Footnotes provide additional context and use lower case letters that correspond to the text at the bottom of the page. Footnote indicators restart at “a” with each section of the report.
Introduction

The Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement were submitted to the UN Commission on Human Rights in 1998, encompassing 30 standards that outline the protections available to internally displaced people (IDPs). The same year, the UN General Assembly called on humanitarian and development organisations, especially through the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), to develop a more comprehensive and coherent system for collecting data on the situation of IDPs. The Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) established the Global IDP Project, later to become the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC), to fulfil this role.

Many countries have made significant efforts to prevent, respond to, and resolve internal displacement over the last 25 years. The number of IDPs continues to grow, however, and durable solutions remain out of reach. This milestone anniversary report provides an opportunity to take stock of the progress made in addressing the phenomenon, with the aim of galvanising and informing collective action to tackle it.

The report includes selected examples of comprehensive policies and legal frameworks introduced to address internal displacement over the past two and half decades. It also highlights promising initiatives designed to prevent displacement, protect IDPs, support them in achieving durable solutions and improve the availability and quality of data on the issue.

The report features highlights from IDMC’s Internal Displacement Index (IDI), an initiative that assesses progress made in 46 countries in addressing the contextual drivers and impacts of displacement, as well as their policies and capacities to respond to the issue (see annex B for the full methodology). The results for 2023 show improvements since the last IDI assessment conducted in 2021 for Chad, Mozambique, and Nigeria, among others.

The examples provided in the report were selected to showcase different approaches to addressing displacement, some of which are more advanced than others. They are generally considered promising practices, but they are not without challenges nor limitations. Neither are the examples by any means exhaustive, nor are they ranked. Efforts were made to avoid repetition of the countries, regions and types of entities involved.

The last quarter of a century has brought many achievements, but significant gaps remain as the scale and scope of internal displacement continues to grow. The report’s conclusion highlights the key challenges that need to be addressed in tackling the phenomenon, identifies opportunities to accelerate progress and sets out concrete recommendations to guide future action.

---

a The commission took note of the Guiding Principles in 1998 then progressively acknowledged and welcomed their use by more and more states. It was only in 2005 that the UN General Assembly explicitly recognised them as “an important international framework for the protection of internally displaced persons” (UN General Assembly, Resolution 60/1, 2005 World Summit Outcome, September 2005; Kälin W, Internal Displacement and the Law, May 2023).

b For the complete list of 46 countries included in the IDI, please refer to annex A.
Chapter I:

Policy and legal frameworks on internal displacement

“Everyone displaced by conflict or natural disaster is an individual. A person, likely a woman or a child, who may be undernourished and living in fear of recruitment or rape. A person whose potential remains unrealized, with dreams unfulfilled and contributions foregone. You have come together to forge a better future.”

Former UN High Commissioner for Refugees António Guterres speaking on 22 October 2009 on behalf of the UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon at the Special Summit of Heads of State and Government on Refugees, Returnees and Internally Displaced Person in Kampala, Uganda.

More than a decade after the Guiding Principles were presented to the UN Commission on Human Rights, the adoption of the African Union Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa in 2009 represented a policy breakthrough. Widely known as the Kampala Convention, the legally binding framework not only covers all phases and several different causes of displacement, but it also addresses the many stakeholders beside governments involved in the issue. It refers to international organisations and agencies, civil society, the African Union and non-state armed groups.

A continent-wide domino effect of ratification and to a lesser extent domestication of the convention was set into motion, and some countries have gone as far as introducing laws on internal displacement aligned with it. Since its inception the convention has been a benchmark to measure policy and legal progress on internal displacement in Africa and a gold standard for countries and organisations elsewhere.
The Guiding Principles were submitted to the Commission on Human Rights through a report in 1998, when the internal displacement landscape was very different. The number of IDPs was estimated to be 20 million, less than a third of the 71 million recorded as of December 2022. Improved data coverage accounts for part of the increase, but clearly not all of it. The difference is also stark on the policy and legal front. IDMC’s review of national policies for the IDI found that only nine out of the 46 countries had at least one framework that recognised or referenced internal displacement linked with either disasters or conflict in 1998. By the end of 2022, that number had increased to 44.

Nor had there been a single definition of internal displacement before 1998, and little guidance to illustrate IDPs’ rights and how states could legally manage the phenomenon was available. Any relevant references were scattered across other international frameworks and laws. In merging them, the Representative of the Secretary General on Internal Displacement covered legal gaps and clarified ambiguous provisions.

The representative’s mission was to put internal displacement on the map as a global phenomenon experienced by millions of people with specific rights and needs. Given, however, that IDPs had left their usual place of residence without crossing international borders, the Guiding Principles were not to encroach on states’ sovereignty. They stressed governments’ responsibility for the lives and rights of all citizens and residents, including IDPs and the communities they came from and lived in. Authorities were not alone in supporting their displaced populations though. The Guiding Principles were one of the tools offered as guidance, along with visits and technical support from the representative’s office. Displacement became increasingly available through the Global IDP Project from 1998 and country support was provided through the Joint IDP Working Service (JIPS) from 2005.

Only nine out of the 46 countries reviewed had at least one framework that recognised or referenced internal displacement linked with either disasters or conflict in 1998. By the end of 2022, that number had increased to 44.

New challenges have also emerged since 1998, such as the increasingly visible effects of climate change and growing urbanisation, and debates about durable solutions. To constitute and how to measure progress towards them, how to manage protracted displacement and how to prevent displacement from happening in the first place.

Regional frameworks

The Great Lakes Protocol on IDPs of 2006 is an early example of regional efforts to solidify commitment to addressing internal displacement. Part of the Pact on Security, Stability and Development in the Great Lakes Region, it requires the 12 member states to incorporate the Guiding Principles into national legislation, and galvanises their commitment to work towards preventing future displacement and addressing its causes. Nine of the 12 countries had adopted a national law, policy or specific instrument on IDPs as of December 2022.

The protocol was followed in 2009 by the adoption of the Kampala Convention by the heads of state and governments of the member states of the African Union (AU). The legally binding convention was the first regional instrument in which member states commit to protecting and assisting IDPs. Thirty-one of the AU’s 55 states have since ratified it, and it is gradually being integrated into domestic legal and policy frameworks. To support states in implementing the convention, the AU created a model law that could be adopted into national legislation. The AU and the UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR) also provide regular training for policymakers and civil servants to increase their understanding of international and regional instruments relevant to IDPs’ protection and assistance needs.

The Comprehensive Regional Protection and Solutions Framework (MIRPS) supports a coordinated response to forced displacement in Central America and Mexico, including a dedicated technical workshop in 2022 to help platform members improve their responses.

National laws and policies

Adopting national laws and policies dedicated to addressing internal displacement in line with the standards and commitments set out in the Guiding Principles is vital to ensure that IDPs are protected and assisted, and future displacement prevented effectively. An increasing number of countries have done so since 1998, in some cases working jointly with affected communities.

Niger’s Law on IDPs’ Protection and Assistance, adopted in 2018, was developed through workshops and focus group discussions with 1,200 IDPs and host community members from the Diffa and Tillabéri regions. The process ensured the participation of diverse voices including those of women, youth, older people and those with disabilities, and led to legislation centred on IDPs’ perspectives.

With this law, Niger became the first country to complete the process of domesticate the Kampala Convention, followed by Chad, which did so in June 2023. Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Mali, Nigeria, the Republic of the Congo, Somalia and South Sudan are all in the process of drafting laws. Uganda had a policy on internal displacement before the Kampala Convention was adopted.

Peru adopted its Law No. 28223 on Internal Displacement in 2004 and a corresponding policy the following year. The law draws its definitions directly from the Guiding Principles, and stipulates IDPs’ rights to protection, assistance,....
non-discrimination and support in their pursuit of durable solutions. It also calls on the state to take measures to prevent the displacement of indigenous people and other minority groups with a particular attachment or reliance on their land.

Law No. 28223 focuses specifically on displacement linked with conflict and violence, but Law No. 30754 on Climate Change, adopted in 2018, recognises displacement associated with environmental factors, including disasters. It is not uncommon for countries to have separate laws and policies to address displacement linked with conflict and disasters, but this can lead to differing levels of recognition or assistance for IDPs depending on the displacement trigger. It can also add a layer of complexity in terms coordination, monitoring and resourcing, particularly in situations where the drivers and triggers of displacement overlap.

This gap was recognised in Sri Lanka, where the national policy on durable solutions for conflict-affected displacement was adopted in 2016 and established the rights of IDPs, returnees and others affected by conflict. The main challenge at the time was addressing the needs of people displaced by conflict and helping them to achieve durable solutions, but the policy also recognised the need to “develop a law that addresses all displaced persons and communities”, specifically those displaced by disasters, climate change and development projects.

The policy was developed through broad consultations with IDPs, refugee returnees and other community members in areas affected by displacement, local and national authorities, civil society, UN agencies and other humanitarian organisations, and a dedicated advisory group with expertise on displacement. It draws on international and humanitarian law as well as the Guiding Principles to set out a rights-based approach to protection, assistance and support for durable solutions for IDPs and all returnees.

Legal and policy frameworks on disaster and climate displacement

All but two of the 46 countries assessed for the IDI has a law or policy that refers to displacement linked with conflict and/or disasters, but only 25 have one on climate change that references displacement. Awareness and understanding of the links between climate change and displacement have increased over the past decade, however, as the impacts of rising temperatures, sea-level rise and coastal erosion force people from their homes.

Pacific small island developing states (SIDS) are among the countries most affected. Some are experiencing rates of sea-level rise four times higher than the global average, and governments in the region are leading the way in developing legislation, policies, strategies and action plans to respond to this growing threat. Fiji has developed a set of guidelines to manage the planned relocation of communities at risk of displacement triggered by climate change. The guidelines, and their associated standard operating procedures, establish that relocations must be rights-based, community-led, transparent, sustainable and implemented in accordance with the international covenants on civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights.

To support the implementation of the relocation guidelines, the government has established the Climate Relocation of Communities (CROC) Trust Fund. The fund also supports vulnerability assessments for communities at risk of being displaced as a result of climate change and new relocation sites for displaced communities. It is fed by the environment and climate adaptation levy, a national tax introduced in 2019 on the tourism, leisure and entertainment sectors, along with donor contributions.

Vanuatu adopted a national policy on climate change and disaster-induced displacement in 2018. Developed through a consultative process involving affected communities, the policy is comprehensive and includes a dedicated section that analyses the triggers and drivers of displacement specific to the country, from climate change to slow- and sudden-onset disasters and conflict.

It also contains measures to prevent future displacement, including safeguards against forced eviction, actions to make infrastructure more resilient to disasters and provisions for temporary or permanent relocation if hazards are deemed too severe for effective adaptation or mitigation. The policy’s whole-of-government emphasis includes a systems-level approach that requires the mainstreaming of displacement considerations into national development policies and plans.

Efforts are under way to produce a Pacific Regional Framework on Climate Mobility, with government and civil society groups contributing to consultations from 2020 to 2023.

New entries and new directions: highlights of recent policies and laws

The IDI’s policy indicator, which scores national frameworks and their content on a scale from 0 to 1, has improved since 2021 when it sat at 0.70. It reached 0.73 in 2023. This is, however, still far from an ideal score of 1, which would correspond to all countries having targeted...
and articulated frameworks on internal displacement in place. The region with the largest score increase in the 2023 IDI was sub-Saharan Africa with +0.07, followed by the Americas and Europe and Central Asia with +0.06. The average scores for South Asia, East Asia and the Pacific and the Middle East and North Africa have remained stable since 2021. Among the countries with the biggest score changes were Mozambique and Nigeria with +0.5. Both introduced policies dedicated to or explicitly addressing internal displacement in 2021. Mozambique devised a two-in-one policy and strategy for the management of internally displaced people (FEGDI) in 2021. The policy clarifies roles and responsibilities in preventing and responding to displacement and assigns responsibilities to different state agencies. The government is now drafting a law on internal displacement to weave the Kampala Convention into national legislation.48

Honduras published a dedicated law on internal displacement in March 2023, and Chad domesticated the Kampala Convention in June by adopting a law on IDPs’ protection and assistance, but these developments came too late to be included in this year’s IDI scores, which only covers the period until December 2022.49

Honduras adopted its Law for the Prevention, Assistance and Protection of IDPs after eight years of work, including inputs from national human rights institutions and IDPs themselves.44 It covers displaced children’s specific needs, addressing non-state armed groups’ recruitment of minors, and also refers to IDPs’ physical and mental health needs.45

Chad’s Law on IDPs’ Protection and Assistance covers all phases of displacement, including prevention and durable solutions.44 It refers to conflict and disasters but not climate change as triggers.44 It includes clear provisions for cooperation between national authorities and international and national human rights institutions and organizations, but does not explicitly refer to development stakeholders.46

These new policies and laws have not emerged in a vacuum. They are the outcome of years of engagement by government agencies with international and national organizations. In Honduras, the UNHCR-led protection cluster, which includes the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and NRC, promoted consultations with communities affected by displacement and provided capacity-building and technical advice to government partners.47 In Chad, a working group made up of national authorities, UNHCR, ICRC and the International Organization for Migration (IOM) managed efforts to draft the new law.48

Beyond dedicated laws and policies, internal displacement can also be addressed in other frameworks, such as national development plans. These set the issue in a broader context, creating connections with other policy areas and addressing a wider audience of decision makers. They can provide timely recommendations and actions points, as is the case with Somalia’s 2020-2024 plan, which focuses on IDPs’ housing; and Colombia’s 2022-2026 plan, which honors in on reparations for people displaced by the country’s armed conflict.49

As the links between internal displacement and urbanization, sustainable development and other agendas become more common tools to tackle the phenomenon and trigger the development of readily implementable measures to address or reduce it,44 Tonga’s low emission development strategy for 2021 to 2050, for example, considers how infrastructure under construction will allow for more evacuation and relocation options for affected communities.50 Colombia for its part has integrated specific provisions for IDPs into national housing legislation.50 Such initiatives bring their own implementation challenges, but their reach and their potential or actual impacts on IDPs cannot be ignored.

New laws and policies are normative milestones and can signify political will to address the issue, but they are only the beginning of a country’s long journey towards resolving displacement. Only the consistent implementation of policies, the mobilisation of resources and the continued monitoring of progress and emerging difficulties will ensure that words translate into action.

Implementation is difficult to ascertain or monitor in many cases, because responsibility for different aspects resides with different Ministries or agencies. The IDI implementation indicator looks at three key components: whether there is a dedicated focal point for internal displacement, whether there is dedicated funding, and whether assistance is provided to IDPs. These alone, however, do not capture the quality of implementation, nor the impact of such frameworks. There is a clear need for more systematic monitoring of the implementation of laws and policies to ensure that the significant investment of time and resources translates into an improvement in IDPs’ lives.

Primary responsibility for policies and their implementation lies with national authorities, but the international community has an important role in supporting the process through dedicated resources and technical assistance.

After fleeing violence in Kukawa, Nigeria, a young woman visits a UNHCR safe space for support. Nigeria introduced a national policy on internal displacement in 2021 and is working on a law to incorporate the Kampala convention into national legislation. © UNOCHA Damilola Onafuwa

Sub-Saharan Africa was the region with the largest score increase in the 2023 IDI. Coordination to the National Institute for Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (INGD).42 National authorities are collaborating with humanitarian and UN stakeholders on implementation.46

25 years of progress on internal displacement

f Only laws and policies introduced in the first half of 2023 were considered during the drafting of the report.

© UNOCHA Damilola Onafuwa

The policy indicator score only reflects the existence of a framework and its content and does not reflect to which it has been implemented or not.
Internal displacement policy
25 years of progress

Adoption of the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement

Establishment of the Global IDP Project, which became the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC) in 2005

Adoption of the Protocol on the Protection and Assistance to Internally Displaced Persons in the Great Lakes region

Adoption of the African Union Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa (Kampala Convention)

Publication of the IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for Internally Displaced Persons

Launch of the GP20 Plan of Action on 20th anniversary of the adoption of the Guiding Principles

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

Adoption of the International Recommendations on IDP Statistics (IRIS)

Publication of the report of the UN Secretary-General's High-Level Panel on Internal Displacement "Shining a Light on Internal Displacement"

Publication of the UN Secretary-General's Action Agenda on Internal Displacement

Establishment of the Office of the UN Secretary-General's Special Adviser on Solutions to Internal Displacement

25th anniversary of the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement
Om Shadi’s story is one that many displaced Syrians could tell. Such narratives highlight how “IDP” and “refugee” can identify the same people in different phases of displacement. As long as borders between countries are porous, so will the passage from internal to cross-border displacement and vice-versa continue. Many Syrian IDPs became refugees abroad, and some returned to their country only to be displaced internally again.

More people were displaced internally by the country’s conflict between 2011 and 2017 than registered with UNHCR as refugees, but IDPs often did not get the same attention and support as those who left. The stories of Syrian IDPs and refugees brings to light the limits of siloed approaches to protection and assistance, and the need for the response to be able to adapt to complex movement patterns while recognising common needs such as livelihoods support, protection and the preservation of social and family networks across the displacement continuum.

IDMC, Returnees in Syria: Sustainable reintegration and durable solutions, or a return to displacement? November 2017

Om Shadi decided to move further north to Binnish town in opposition-controlled Idlib. The family remained there for two months, but the intense daily shelling prompted her to move to Antakya in Turkey with her youngest boy, leaving the other two sons behind. Om Shadi has lived with her high school-aged boy in Antakya ever since.
Protection in internal displacement settings

Protection lies at the heart of the Guiding Principles, which are based on international humanitarian law and human rights instruments. They highlight the protection risks and needs specific to displacement, as well as the rights and guarantees relevant during its different phases. There is no international convention that specifically protects IDPs’ rights as there is for refugees, but they are protected under international humanitarian law, international human rights law and international criminal law. The Guiding Principles help to clarify the application of these frameworks in displacement settings and provide guidance to states and other stakeholders responsible for IDPs’ protection and assistance.

National authorities hold primary responsibility for IDPs’ protection, but as UNHCR’s Handbook for the Protection of Internally Displaced Persons notes: “In those situations where States require support or where national protection is not ensured, a critical protection role falls to the international community.”

UNHCR has played a vital role in this respect at the global and national level – IDPs are one of its populations of concern – providing coordination and operational assistance. It works with governments and the international community to monitor, advocate for and ensure IDPs’ protection as lead of the global protection cluster. ICRC also plays a protection role given its mandate to protect the lives and dignity of people affected by armed conflict and other types of violence. Among its activities, it helps to address the specific needs of IDPs and host communities, prevent further displacement through dialogue with parties to conflicts on international humanitarian law and reunite separated family members.

The Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons, first appointed in 2010 to assume the functions of the Representative of the Secretary General on the human rights of internally displaced persons, a position created in 1992, also plays an important role. They are charged with mainstreaming IDPs’ human rights across the UN system and strengthening the international response to internal displacement, with a focus on advocacy and inclusive dialogue with governments to promote improved protection.

The current rapporteur, Paula Gaviria Betancur of Colombia, assumed the mandate on 1 November 2022. In a report presented to the Human Rights Council’s 53rd session in May 2023, she sets out her plans to “continue her efforts to promote comprehensive and inclusive strategies that focus on the prevention of displacement, better protection and assistance, durable solutions, the integration of issues related to internally displaced persons into national and local development plans and budgets, and the participation of internally displaced persons in peace processes and agreements and in integration, reintegration and rehabilitation processes, stressing the primary responsibility of States in that regard.”

Impacts of displacement

The Guiding Principles state that IDPs are often among the world’s most vulnerable people and that responding to their protection and assistance needs should be a priority. They refer to threats against their safety and physical integrity, health, liberty, dignity and rights. They also state that the specific needs of certain groups of IDPs, including children, women, people with disabilities, older people, indigenous people and other communities with special attachment to their land should be considered. Governments and humanitarian organizations have since sought to support IDPs in meeting their most immediate needs, but resources tend to be insufficient to provide them with the comprehensive, inclusive and longer-term assistance they need to overcome all of their displacement-related vulnerabilities.

Data from various internal displacement situations shows that IDPs’ security, health, education, livelihoods and housing conditions often deteriorate as a result of their displacement, particularly in the case of people who were already vulnerable, marginalized or discriminated against before their flight.

A survey conducted by IDMC in Cameroon in early 2023 found that IDPs earned less than a quarter of their pre-displacement income, and that a higher proportion of women had become unemployed since leaving their homes than men. The majority of IDPs also said their physical and psychosocial wellbeing had suffered, largely the result of poorer housing conditions and reduced access to food and healthcare. IDPs with disabilities were more likely to report a deterioration in their health and security than those without disabilities.

In most cases of protracted and large-scale displacement, host communities are also affected. A similar study conducted in Kenya, non-displaced respondents faced additional household expenses after IDPs’ arrival in the area. This was primarily the result of higher food prices, the need to purchase extra food or supplies for IDPs staying in their homes and increased utility bills.

In many cases, however, the support provided is not inclusive or comprehensive enough. Limited by a lack of disaggregated and inclusive data and financial resources, blanket approaches to supporting IDPs can fail to reach those who are often most at risk. A study conducted by IDMC in Qubodi, Azerbaijan, in 2019 found that despite receiving government support, displaced children from African-Colombian and indigenous communities faced more barriers to education than other displaced children. IDPs with disabilities are also often excluded from planning and responses, and are not consulted enough on the type of support they need.

Government assistance for IDPs

The third Guiding Principle sets out governments’ fundamental role in addressing internal displacement. It states: “National authorities have the primary duty and responsibility to provide protection and humanitarian assistance to internally displaced persons within their jurisdiction.” The three examples of state-led assistance below illustrate how this principle is applied in different ways to address IDPs’ legal, physical and material needs. All have room for improvement, but they have strengths that could be replicated in other situations.

Blanket approaches to supporting IDPs can fail to reach those who are often most at risk.
The government has dedicated a sizable budget to addressing the challenges IDPs have faced over the past 25 years. It has spent more than $6 billion on monthly allowances, service provision, fee and tax exemptions and the construction of housing, schools and health facilities. State university education has also been free for IDPs since 2011.

Kenya’s National Drought Management Authority (NDMA) has disbursed cash transfers to vulnerable households, including IDPs, since 2007. It targets communities in poor and arid areas in the north of the country to prevent their further impoverishment and build their resilience. It disbursed over $160 million in regular payments to more than 100,000 households in Wajir, Mandera, Marsabit and Turkana counties between 2014 and 2021. The programme was also flexible enough to increase transfers when drought worsened or other shocks occurred. NDMA paid out emergency funds totalling over $25 million to more than 200,000 households between 2015 and 2021.

Targeted households were found to be more capable of withstanding shocks without falling deeper into destitution, and the programme also connected households to state social services, boosting the impact of cash transfers on local economies. Kenya also refers to disaster displacement in its national climate change action plan for 2018 to 2022. It has carried out simulations of cross-border disaster displacement with Uganda and is the current vice-president of the Platform on Disaster Displacement (PDD).

Indonesia also provides assistance to people displaced by disasters. The National Disaster Management Agency and local authorities organise immediate support for evacuees, offering temporary shelters, food, medicine and other emergency support. As people already living in extreme poverty tend to be more adversely affected by disasters, ministries are working towards adaptive social protection for poor and vulnerable households to connect social assistance with disaster risk reduction (DRR) and climate change adaptation measures, with a dedicated roadmap upcoming.

“The strong points of these state-led initiatives, which could be adapted to other situations, include the long-term, multi-year focus of the interventions, the coordination between different areas of government to ensure effective implementation and the adaptive approach without falling deeper into destitution, more capable of withstanding shocks to changing circumstances to reduce the impacts of shocks on households that are already vulnerable.

Challenges remain, however, in all three countries. In Azerbaijan, as in all countries where state assistance is granted on the basis of legal status as an IDP rather than individual needs, as specified in the annotations to the Guiding Principles, this status can be lost and with it access to support. Kenya has addressed disaster displacement in a number of ways, but has been less active on displacement triggered by conflict and violence, and authorities in Indonesia still have difficulties in quickly reaching inhabitants of remote islands during evacuations.

Moving to the city: municipal authorities and urban displacement

Cities and towns are recognised as places of refuge for IDPs all over the world. This fosters integration policies in urban settings and presents local authorities with unique opportunities and demanding challenges. As new temporary and long-term residents arrive, municipal officials are first-line responders.

Lviv, the sixth most populous city in Ukraine, is a case in point. Located on the western edge of the country, it and the oblast of Lvivska were hosting more than 270,000 IDPs as of June 2023, of whom more than 70 per cent had been living in the area for more than a year. Within a few months of the start of Russia’s military offensive in February 2022, the government had built three shelters and opened schools, gyms, theatres and churches for the new arrivals. The mayor has also drawn international media attention to his city’s needs. Among other activities, the municipal authorities are managing a €17.5 million (US$17 million) EU grant for the construction of social housing for 700 IDPs with disabilities who will also have free access to a rehabilitation centre. The recently established rehabilitation centre has already made Lviv a national reference for patients’ treatment and recovery. The city is also putting itself forward as a forum for the discussion of recovery and reconstruction issues in Ukraine, for instance through the Lviv Urban Forum.

Despite its activities on the international stage, the city has struggled to muster resources quickly enough to deal with concurrent crises, from power cuts to waterisation needs and the temporary closure of schools used as shelters. In this sense, municipal action on internal displacement has its limits when compared with the resources available to dedicated national commissions and ministries. City councils also face many competing priorities for their relatively limited resources. Lack of familiarity with internal displacement, its impacts and legal guidelines to address it can also be an obstacle to effective local responses.

That said, municipal authorities can have a great impact on the quantity and quality of assistance and protection provided to their internally displaced residents, making them key allies for national and international responders alike. City councils and mayors’ physical proximity to residents and their potentially more detailed knowledge of local issues can provide unique opportunities for evidence-based and people-centred interventions on displacement.
Multilateral and non-governmental support for IDPs

Non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and multilateral aid institutions have supported IDPs in many countries for decades, making their protection and assistance needs more visible and humanitarian responses better adapted to their needs. Among national NGOs, the Centre de Résolution des Conflicts in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) has worked on conflict resolution and protection for more than 20 years, assisting IDPs, child soldiers and local communities in the east of the country and providing housing support and psychosocial aid for returnees. Among regional NGOs, Cristosal supported around 3,000 IDPs in El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala between 2015 and 2019, offering legal counselling and humanitarian assistance, including shelter and psychosocial support.

The national societies of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement also support IDPs in the aftermath of disasters. The Nepal Red Cross Society (NRCS), for example, has worked with the government and NGOs for years in conducting initial rapid assessments (IRAs) to determine the immediate needs of communities affected and displaced by floods, landslides and earthquakes. The assessments are carried out in collaboration with police and local authorities and endorsed by the Ministry of Home Affairs. NRCS also provides temporary shelter, sanitation, cash and other non-food items during emergencies.

IDPs themselves often lead their own organisations to support their communities. Displaced women in Colombia founded the EnRedHadas collective to support the economic empowerment of female IDPs and other victims of armed conflict. The collective creates spaces for women to sell handicrafts and advocates for displaced women’s rights in peace negotiations and public forums.

In response to the displacement triggered by the siege of Marawi city on the Philippine island of Mindanao in 2017, IDPs created Lombay ka Marawi, which translates as Arise Marawi, with support from Danish civil society. The organisation advocates for IDPs’ rights, livelihoods and shelter with local authorities implementing the regional Marawi rehabilitation programme. It also provides some in-kind support to displaced households.

In some of the most acute internal displacement crises, support from non-governmental and multilateral aid providers is coordinated via the humanitarian response plans (HRPs) published by the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). Of 25 HRP globally in 2023, 21 specifically target IDPs. Support typically includes temporary shelter and sanitation, immediate assistance in the form of food and non-food items, primary healthcare, security when needed and temporary access to education.

In terms of multi-stakeholder initiatives targeting IDPs, IDM, the UN Development Programme (UNDP) and UN Habitat cooperated closely with Somalia’s federal government on the Midimo project. Together they supported local authorities as the main interlocutors, service providers and mobilisers of local communities to meet their basic needs. All members of the community, whether internally displaced or not, were involved in identifying needs and planning for solutions. NGOs, multilateral aid agencies and the private sector then implemented a range of activities under the lead of Somali authorities to provide access to education, water, health services and infrastructure.

These examples show the array of international, national and local partners, including IDP themselves, that governments and local authorities can turn to for the provision of complementary assistance to communities affected by displacement, particularly in fragile or emergency settings.

Joining forces: emergency assistance from the private sector

Two months after the devastating February 2023 earthquakes in Türkiye, the country’s UN resident coordinator told a panel discussion on private sector involvement in the humanitarian response that it was enough to look at the rubble in the city of Hatay to realise that the UN and government alone would be unable to fully meet the humanitarian or recovery needs. Private sector stakeholders are no silver bullet in resolving internal displacement, which is the primary remit of governments, but they cannot be omitted from the prevention, response and resilience equation.

Many IDPs will have had commercial activities, salaried jobs or informal work that they lose or struggle to maintain during displacement. Minimising the disruption to their livelihoods means engaging with entrepreneurs, freelancers, employers, employees, labour unions and informal workers in affected areas to understand the challenges and opportunities. Private sector engagement can help displaced workers to re-establish their professions and income rapidly and organically.

Businesses and workers are also often among the first responders to emergencies, donating goods and offering free services to those affected.

The earthquakes in Türkiye, which had displaced almost three million people as of 22 May 2023, are a case in point. Businesses of all sizes gave free food and shelter. A federation of local businesses is supporting the provision of medium-term accommodation and temporary health and social facilities in 1,800 shipping containers, meeting the needs of as many as 6,000 people. Turkish businesses interested in humanitarian and development issues had already united in a local chapter of the Connecting Business Initiative led by OCHA and UNDP before the earthquakes struck, which made it easier for them to participate in the response.

The response to the earthquakes represents a step forward in the involvement of local and national private sector stakeholders in emergency assistance and demonstrates the potential for their longer-term participation in such efforts. Much more needs to be done though to facilitate ongoing, sustainable and systematic public-private collaborations to support IDPs worldwide.
Chapter III:
Durable solutions

On 29 August 2005, our city was forever changed. Fifteen years later, we still honour those who paid the ultimate sacrifice ... The scars run deep this time of year, but we have the ability to rise up in the face of devastation.

New Orleans mayor LaToya Cantrell commemorating the 15th anniversary of hurricane Katrina on 29 August 2020.

When hurricane Katrina struck in 2005, more than a million people were under evacuation orders, and almost 20 years later some are unlikely ever to return. Katrina highlighted gaps in disaster preparedness, which US authorities themselves recognised, and inequalities between different population groups in their pursuit of durable solutions. The hurricane also made it clear that internal displacement was a global phenomenon that challenges high and low-income countries alike.

Further sobering evidence came from the 2011 Tohoku earthquake, which triggered a tsunami and nuclear disaster in Japan. Even with readily available state funds and the launch of public initiatives in support of survivors, people remained displaced for years after the disaster. Around 31,000 were still displaced in 2022.

Regardless of their GDP and geographic location, countries dealing with internal displacement all face the long-term challenge of devising and implementing tailored durable solutions with and for their IDPs.
The IASC framework on durable solutions

As articulated in section five of the Guiding Principles, national authorities have primary responsibility for enabling and supporting the voluntary and dignified return, integration or relocation of IDPs, regarded as the three types of durable solutions to internal displacement. Recognising the need for further guidance on the topic, and following almost a decade of extensive consultations, IASC endorsed its framework on durable solutions in 2010. The framework is structured around eight criteria, as detailed in the graphic below.

### IASC framework for IDPs: 8 criteria

- **Long-term safety and security**
- **Adequate standard of living**
- **Access to livelihoods and employment**
- **Accessible mechanism for restoration of housing, land and property**
- **Access to remedies and justice**
- **Family reunification**
- **Personal and other documentation**
- **Participation in public affairs**

Source: IASC Framework

**Figure 1: IASC framework for IDPs: 8 criteria**

that are necessary for IDPs to enjoy in order for durable solutions to be possible. It recognises that doing so is a complex, gradual and often long-term process that requires the engagement of a broad set of stakeholders to ensure IDPs no longer have needs related to their displacement and can exercise their human rights without discrimination because of it.

Many countries have incorporated the framework into their laws, policies and strategies on internal displacement since 2010, including Afghanistan, El Salvador, Niger, Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan and Yemen. Some countries have developed their own tailored tools to monitor progress on durable solutions. Colombia’s tool assesses whether an IDP has overcome vulnerabilities related to their displacement, including via an index that evaluates progress over time. The data that feeds the index is updated biannually in a public dashboard and disaggregated by location, sex, age and other characteristics. Based on survey analysis, IOM Iraq measures severity of living conditions, social cohesion and safety perceptions in displacement and return locations through its returns index, displacement index and mixed methods research.

Among the global tools, IDMC’s severity assessments measure IDPs’ living conditions using an adapted version of the IASC framework and data available from multi-sector needs assessments and other sources. To translate the general guidelines of the framework into an actionable tool for measuring individuals’ and households’ progress towards solutions, the UN Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons initiated a multi-stakeholder project to develop indicators and guidance for their use. The process was led by JIPS and resulted in a library of indicators and guidance for analysis and implementation that was published in 2018. UNDP also started work on a framework on “development solutions” in 2022 which looks at durable solutions through a human development lens.

The Expert Group on Refugee, IDP and Statelessness Statistics (EGRiSS) developed the International Recommendations on Internally Displaced People on the human rights of internally displaced persons initiated a multi-stakeholder project to develop indicators and guidance for their use. The process was led by JIPS and resulted in a library of indicators and guidance for analysis and implementation that was published in 2018. UNDP also started work on a framework on “development solutions” in 2022 which looks at durable solutions through a human development lens.

The Expert Group on Refugee, IDP and Statelessness Statistics (EGRiSS) developed the International Recommendations on Internally Displaced People on the human rights of internally displaced persons initiated a multi-stakeholder project to develop indicators and guidance for their use. The process was led by JIPS and resulted in a library of indicators and guidance for analysis and implementation that was published in 2018. UNDP also started work on a framework on “development solutions” in 2022 which looks at durable solutions through a human development lens.
In the Middle East, three international NGOs established a durable solutions platform for Syria in 2016. More recently extended to the wider region, it has led to research, policy engagement and capacity development covering internal and cross-border displacement.

Persons Statistics (IRIS) to guide national agencies in producing displacement data under the mandate of the UN Statistical Commission. The commission adopted IRIS in 2020 after consultations with member states. Complementary resources that build on IRIS are under development, including technical guidance for using a tool to measure IDPs’ progress towards durable solutions and a composite measure to determine when IDPs have overcome the vulnerabilities related to their displacement and so can be removed from displacement statistics.

At the regional level, the Regional Durable Solutions Secretariat (ReDSS) was created in 2015 to maintain momentum towards resolving displacement in the east and Horn of Africa, and has used the IASC framework as the basis for developing its own tool that is specific to the region. It uses 28 outcome indicators to assess physical, material and legal safety in order to monitor IDPs’ pursuit of durable solutions. The tool is used as part of an analysis that generates a baseline of a given situation with respect to IASC’s criteria and is then run annually to assess progress.

ReDSS supported Somalia’s federal government and the UN resident coordinator’s office between 2016 and 2019 to produce district-level solutions analyses to inform safe and dignified (re)integration programming in Baidoa, Kismayo and Mogadishu. The analyses have been used to develop joint area-based action plans, providing a solid evidence base for policies and interventions to address the growing challenge of internal displacement.

Despite the sizeable resources invested at the national and international level, measuring IDPs’ progress towards the achievement of durable solutions remains a challenge. In some cases, lack of coordination has led to a duplication of efforts and data which is neither comparable nor interoperable. In others, monitoring by authorities and national statistical offices is limited or absent. “Soft” displacement impacts such as social, psychological, cultural and societal losses are also often overlooked. Such impacts may be difficult to evaluate and quantify, but they are essential to determining when durable solutions have truly been achieved.

IDPs themselves can contribute to durable solutions and their communities’ resilience.

**Durable solutions strategies and initiatives**

The Horn of Africa has led the way in securing multi-stakeholder engagement and support for advancing durable solutions, most notably through Somalia’s durable solutions initiative (DSI) and the durable solutions strategies in South Sudan and Sudan. Somalia’s DSI, which the federal government and the UN resident coordinator launched in 2016, has established normative frameworks, methodological tools, research, programming, national and local working groups and led to the adoption of a national durable solutions strategy for 2020 to 2024.

At the sub-national level, Ethiopia’s Somali region developed a solutions strategy in 2017. This was updated for 2022 to 2025 and a menu of options added to align short-term humanitarian action with longer-term development processes.

Fully adapted to Syria’s crisis, it has its own analytical framework for durable solutions based on many of the global references for monitoring progress mentioned above.

From a localisation perspective, IDPs themselves can contribute to durable solutions and their communities’ resilience. Displaced women’s groups in Adama, Ethiopia, provide aid to their community, including through informal savings, microcredit and other finance mechanisms. The initiatives serve not only as financial safety nets, but also extended social support networks.

With the involvement of host communities, such interventions have the potential to benefit IDPs’ long-term integration opportunities.

A man checks on the rainwater reservation pond he constructed to help his community secure water for use during the dry season. Countries in the Horn of Africa face leading efforts to find durable solutions to prevent displacement in the face of prolonged drought. © UNICEF/UN0141400/Sewunet
25 years of progress on internal displacement: IDMC 2023 report

Spotlight: Bridging the gap

Testing innovative solutions for humanitarian-development collaboration

The Danwadaag Durable Solutions Consortium has been working towards resolving displacement in Somalia since 2018 by supporting government capacity building, delivering integrated basic services, empowering communities to claim their housing, land and property (HLP) rights, improving tenure security, and promoting sustainable livelihoods.

Since its initial phase from 2018 to 2022, the consortium has transformed into a multi-donor initiative, including Somalia’s federal government, the EU, the US Agency for International Development (USAID) and the UK’s Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO). Embracing both humanitarian and development funding streams, Danwadaag’s objective is to facilitate the achievement of scalable solutions to the country’s ever-growing displacement crisis.

Phase one targeted the urban centres of Afgoye, Baidoa, Kismayo and Mogadishu. Phase two extends the consortium’s work to four intermediary towns near some of the rural areas most affected by drought and conflict, and which have the potential to become displacement “shock absorbers” for the primary urban centres.

To achieve impact at scale, Danwadaag has increased its focus on land tenure security and the delivery of layered service packages that provide multi-sectoral assistance to displaced families to meet their basic needs and integrate sustainably into urban centres or purpose-built city extensions. With USAID funding, an innovative “scaling solutions” process allows the consortium to bridge knowledge gaps, explore bold ideas and expand successful interventions. Taking an approach inspired by venture capital funds, it supports initiatives that other durable solutions partners may be unwilling or unable to undertake, with potential for significant long-term gains. Focus areas include land tenure, rental markets, water and housing models and sustainable livelihood solutions.

The project is intended to improve the effectiveness of the durable solutions community by promoting evidence-based programming with greater cost efficiency and improved layering and sequencing of investments through multi-sector stakeholder engagement. The consortium also fosters connections with local authorities. The Resilient Baidoa initiative, for example, supports local authority visions, leverages collective donor investment, encourages collaboration between the humanitarian and development communities, and promotes sustainable, displacement-sensitive urban development.

---

a The Danwadaag (meaning common purpose) consortium (phase 1) was a three-and-a-half-year programme supported by FCDO. The consortium is made up of IOM, NRC, Concern Worldwide, the Juba foundation, the Shabelle Community Development Organization and the Gargaar Relief Development Organization.

b Baidoa, one of Somalia’s major cities, has expanded significantly in the past decade primarily as a result of drought and conflict displacement. It is thought to be home to around 600,000 IDPs. The overall objective of the initiative is to support the implementation of the Baidoa city strategy.

© Abdulkadir Mohamed NRC
Linking with peace, development and DRM to support sustainable solutions

In many post-conflict situations, the pursuit of durable solutions requires an integrated approach that brings together humanitarian, development and peace stakeholders. Often referred to as nexus programming, such an approach is broadly accepted as a key ingredient for an effective and holistic durable solutions response, but it is not always achieved in practice.

That said, good examples of linking peace and development interventions do exist. Among them is a community-based reconciliation and (re)integration project in Iraq led by UNDP in partnership with the government.161 Many IDPs were able to return after the conflict with the Islamic State in Iraq and the Syria (ISIS) ended, but families perceived to be affiliated with ISIS faced significant barriers for fear of reprisals and a lack of community acceptance, despite receiving security clearance.

Nexus programming is broadly accepted as a key ingredient for an effective and holistic durable solutions response, but it is not always achieved in practice.

The project works to improve social cohesion and rebuild trust, beginning with a detailed conflict analysis and perception surveys to understand the community members’ perspectives. It then collaborates with community leaders to organise workshops and townhall meetings to determine the steps needed for the families concerned to return in a safe and sensitive way. The project also incorporates interventions to address basic community needs and service gaps, repairing infrastructure and providing livelihoods assistance and psychosocial support. As of 2023, it had supported the formalisation of local peace agreements and rehabilitation support packages in four pilot locations.

Humanitarian needs and development gaps, however, tend not to be caused by conflict alone. They derive from a complex interaction of violence with natural, biological, technological and other hazards.162 There is increasing agreement that conflict sensitivity, conflict resolution and peacebuilding must go hand in hand with DRM and disaster risk management (DRM) to strengthen communities’ resilience to shocks.163

One example is the disaster risk management–fragility, conflict and violence nexus programme, managed by the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR).164 Administered by the World Bank, the programme funds a variety of DRM projects, including a composite vulnerability index and post-disaster needs assessments for South Sudan that highlighted IDPs' increased vulnerability to compound risks.165

The private sector, and particularly banking, financing, investment and credit institutions, also have an important role to play alongside governments and their “traditional” partners in supporting socioeconomic development and IDPs’ (re)integration.166 International attention to inclusive financing for displaced people is increasing, with a dedicated roadmap published in 2021.167 Current projects tend to focus on refugees, but their internally displaced counterparts have been included in some initiatives, particularly in countries with high numbers of IDPs such as Colombia, Ethiopia, Iraq, Somalia and Ukraine.168 IDPs have difficulties with banking and finance as a result of their change of residence, lack of documents and perceived additional credit risk.169 Targeted measures devised and implemented with the private sector could do much to support IDPs’ pursuit of durable solutions.

At the local level, the private sector’s involvement in facilitating durable solutions in the Colombian village of El Salado is also worth highlighting. The foundation of the editorial group Semana has led private and public stakeholders in rebuilding El Salado since 2009 as residents displaced by violence have returned.170 Businesses decide whether to be involved sporadically or more extensively, and choose activities that best fit their expertise. From building the water system to providing employment.171 Learning from the experience, the foundation has supported reconstruction in other nearby rural areas.172

Looking back: displacement and paths to solutions in Croatia, Sierra Leone and Japan

There is much to be learned by looking back at previous displacement crises, and the challenges faced by countries tackling the complex issue of durable solutions. Croatia, Sierra Leone and Japan, for example, provide insights into the significant investments, interventions and political will required to address large-scale displacement triggered by conflict and disasters.

At the end of Croatia’s conflict in 1995, the country was home to 250,000 IDPs.173 The figure gradually decreased to reach 2,100 in 2011. It was then put at zero when government and UN assessments showed that remaining IDPs no longer had needs related to their displacement.174 There were, however, many challenges to overcome on the path to durable solutions.

One issue was housing. The law favoured the last occupants of the property rather than the original owners, who struggled to retake possession of their homes.175 Stagnating economies in areas of origin also made some returns difficult or even unsustainable.176 Ethnicity played a role too. Ethnic Croat IDPs were more likely to return, and to return faster, than their ethnic Serb counterparts, who faced additional HLP difficulties and obstacles to citizenship, particularly in the early 2000s.177

After becoming a formal candidate for EU membership in 2004, Croatia accelerated legal restitution, the reconstruction of private accommodation and a legal and judicial review of minority rights, especially as they applied to ethnic Serbs.178 During his visit the following year, the Representative of the Secretary General on the human rights of IDPs recognised national investments in the resolution of displacement for most, albeit not all, of those displaced.179 Croatia became an EU member state in 2013.

At its peak, Sierra Leone’s conflict displaced half of the country’s population of 4.5 million people.180 When 11 years of fighting came to an end in 2002, around 10,000 people remained displaced.181 The war devastated the country’s infrastructure and economy, leaving the population suffering physically and mentally.182 Flare-ups of violence were a risk, and efforts were made to link the return and (re)integration of IDPs, refugees and former combatants to peacebuilding and conflict resolution.183

The issue of durable solutions for IDPs and refugees had already been addressed in the 1999 Lomé peace agreement and it was taken up again in the country’s 2001 resettlement strategy and 2002 recovery strategy.184 Government officials were also trained in the content of the Guiding Principles in 2001.185

The authorities and international organisations still faced obstacles on the road to recovery though. They relied only on figures for registered IDPs, but many thousands of households had fled without registering and remained displaced or returned spontaneously without assistance at the end of the conflict.186 Even registered IDPs struggled to achieve durable solutions. Without services and infrastructure in return...
areas, secondary displacement was common as IDPs went back to urban centres, sometimes losing housing and assistance in the process. From 2001, the authorities and their international partners implemented a nationwide return and resettlement strategy for IDPs, refugees and former combatants. The government and UNHCR supported the return of around 220,000 people between 2001 and 2002 and distributed resettlement packages including food, household tools and in some cases transport. The government, NGOs and UN agencies continued to provide assistance to people in need once displacement had formally ended. The integration of gender-based violence (GBV) services in local hospitals and law enforcement systems was highlighted as a good practice.

Community truth-telling and reconciliation initiatives were also promoted. Many social, economic and psychological war wounds were still open, but post-conflict policies and programming recognised that the issue of durable solutions was inextricably linked to peacemaking and conflict resolution.

The 2011 Tohoku earthquake in Japan and subsequent tsunami and nuclear disaster displaced almost half a million people, around a fifth of them from the contaminated prefecture of Fukushima. Six years later, as many as 134,000 people were still living in displacement, a figure that had dropped to 31,000 by the end of 2022. Some areas of Fukushima deemed too dangerous in terms of future tsunami risk may never receive returnees, and as of January 2021 entry to around two per cent of the prefecture was still restricted because of continued radiation contamination.

The government identified evacuation zones and a return timeline based on radiation monitoring. The government helped 154,000 people to leave state-defined areas of evacuation, but other communities outside these areas who were concerned for their health also chose to leave of their own accord. These evacuees, deemed “voluntary”, received limited support. “Voluntary” evacuees were also more difficult to identify because their status was not formally defined.

The government set up help desks to refer IDPs to services and supported local non-profit organisations in addressing social needs. Fukushima prefecture kept IDPs informed with a newsletter and provided free screenings for thyroid cancer connected to radiation exposure. The government and local authorities lifted evacuation orders for most affected villages in 2017 and made efforts to provide housing for returnees and revitalise the local economy. Some returnees, however, continue to require assistance given the lasting psychological impacts of living through the disaster.

Local authorities in areas razed by the tsunami faced different challenges. As of 2015, 26 municipalities had decided to invest in relocations, and by 2023 the government’s reconstruction agency had reached its target of developing around 18,000 plots of residential land and 30,000 public housing units on higher ground. Authorities planned to move communities inland, acquiring land, reconstructing urban centres and recreating livelihoods. Other municipalities avoided relocation because of its significant economic, social and psychological costs. Some households with enough resources resettled autonomously, mainly in urban areas.

These cases highlight the universal challenge of leaving no one behind in the pursuit of durable solutions and the complexity of a process that can take decades to complete. All three countries mobilised significant resources to do so with varying degrees of international support, and efforts were made to target a range of groups and communities in recognition of some of the social impacts of displacement. The challenges faced, including protecting minority rights, resolving complex HLP issues and sustaining returns are pertinent for many other countries dealing with internal displacement today.

**Momentum for solutions: Secretary General’s High Level Panel on Internal Displacement**

Despite the many advances over the past 25 years, more people than ever are internally displaced, and durable solutions remain elusive for the majority. In countries such as DRC, Nige,na, Syria and Yemen, conflict involving state forces and non-state armed groups has raged and disasters have aggravated the impacts of violence, leaving millions of people in protracted displacement.

Recognising the importance of renewed focus and commitment to addressing IDPs’ needs and supporting their pursuit of durable solutions, the UN Secretary General established a dedicated taskforce in 2019. The High-Level Panel on Internal Displacement conducted extensive consultations with IDPs, host communities and other stakeholders, and received submissions from more than 100 member states, UN agencies and NGOs. The process led to the production of a report that was presented to the Secretary General in September 2021.

The report outlines 10 recommendations to advance solutions for IDPs broadly structured around solidifying political will and action, supporting multi-stakeholder engagement, improving financing and data quality and availability, better protection and assistance for IDPs, prevention of future displacement and addressing its causes.

To take the recommendations forward and maintain momentum, the Secretary General issued an Action Agenda on Internal Displacement in June 2022, which identifies three interlinked goals for states, the UN and other stakeholders to work towards: facilitate durable solutions, prevent future displacement and provide effective protection and assistance for those facing displacement.

He also appointed a Special Advisor on Solutions for Internal Displacement to support implementation of the agenda. The advisor’s two-year mandate focuses on four key workstreams: prevention, response, solutions and governance. The results of this renewed momentum for solutions remain to be seen, but it has already begun to generate new approaches to understanding pathways and progress, and reflections on how to measure their achievement.

The UN Action Agenda has already begun to generate new approaches to understanding pathways and progress, and reflections on how to measure their achievement. Stakeholders at all levels are recognising the need to prioritise solutions earlier in the response, as seen in UNHCR’s “Solutions from the Start” approach in internal displacement settings. Such an approach requires a longer-term perspective even in the early stages of an emergency response, making space for local organisations and affected communities themselves to participate in decision making and the prioritisation of resources. Despite the international community’s acknowledgement of the need for greater localisation, much more needs to be done to make this a reality in most internal displacement situations and to achieve truly durable solutions as a result.

---

**Notes:**

1. Fukushima prefecture kept IDPs informed with a newsletter and provided free screenings for thyroid cancer connected to radiation exposure.

2. Authorities planned to move communities inland, acquiring land, reconstructing urban centres and recreating livelihoods.

3. Other municipalities avoided relocation because of its significant economic, social and psychological costs. Some households with enough resources resettled autonomously, mainly in urban areas.

4. The 16 priority countries identified by the Special Advisor are Afghanistan, the Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Ethiopia, Iraq, Libya, South Sudan, Sudan, Yemen, South Sudan, Sudan, Vanuatu and Yemen.
Chapter IV:
Preparedness and prevention

This is a very prolonged drought; it will be five years. We never experienced any longer drought before, even our grandfathers didn’t experience anything like that in the history [sic]. [...] In this situation, we are not seeing any future. The future ends here. All our life has been pastoralism. We don’t know anything else.

Group of elderly pastoralists interviewed by IDMC staff in Kenya, February 2023

DRR has its origins in the 1970s, but it is only in the last two decades that the idea of a shift in paradigm in responding to displacement crises has gathered momentum.207 The key message is simple. Acting before displacement occurs rather than after minimises its financial and human costs. From protracted droughts in east Africa and the Middle East, to floods in south and southeast Asia, there is a growing body of evidence which shows that hazards need not trigger disasters and long-term displacement if adequate prediction, prevention and preparedness measures are in place.208 Anticipatory action, DRR and DRM still lag behind in international financing streams, but they are at least now integrated in global analyses and programming on internal displacement.209
Greater investments in preparedness and prevention are key to addressing the causes and impacts of internal displacement. As evidence on its triggers and drivers has grown, so has our understanding of ways to reduce its risks and impact, which will eventually lead to more effective prevention mechanisms. There is still a long way to go though in terms of analysing, estimating and mitigating displacement risk, making it difficult to measure when displacement has effectively been prevented.

As increased data and analysis on these topics becomes available, more emphasis is on the importance of investing in preparedness and prevention is greatly needed. Promising efforts are already under way in some countries to incorporate prevention approaches into national policies, resilience programming and anticipatory action mechanisms intended to reduce the risk and negative impacts of displacement on vulnerable communities. These efforts tend to focus on displacement linked with disasters and climate change, but there is also emerging evidence of successful interventions to reduce intercommunal conflict over resources through community-based resilience programming in Kenya and Somalia.

### National policies on prevention

The prevention of future displacement is an important element in solving the phenomenon and requires investments in risk reduction measures at the local and national level. Thirty-one of the 46 countries monitored for the IDI include measures to prevent displacement in their national laws and policies, both those that specifically address the issue and broader policies on DRM, climate change adaptation and related themes.

Bangladesh has made significant investments in reducing the risk of displacement associated with disasters and climate change, including the adoption of a national strategy on internal displacement management in 2021. The strategy and its associated action plan for 2022 to 2042 set out a rights-based and integrated approach to addressing the three phases of displacement: prevention, protection and durable solutions. It includes measures to prevent and adapt to the risks posed by climate-related disasters, such as the creation of resilient livelihoods and support for “safe, voluntary and dignified” solutions for people displaced by them.

The strategy also puts emphasis on better understanding displacement risk to support decision making through disaggregated data that ensures that the specific needs of particular groups of IDPs, such as women, children, older people and those with disabilities, can be addressed and their rights protected.

### Enhancing community resilience to the drivers and triggers of displacement

Substantial efforts are under way in the Horn of Africa to help communities withstand shocks that are known to trigger displacement in the region, such as drought and rising temperatures. The Building Resilient Communities in Somalia (BRCSI) consortium is a multi-sector programme that combines early warning and early action with longer-term activities to build community resilience to recurrent shocks and stressors. It also supports the diversification of livelihoods to cope with climate shocks and works to enhance communities’ capacity to manage natural resources as a means of strengthening social cohesion. With communities affected by drought and recurring failed rainy seasons, activities have helped to mitigate impacts, reduce the risk of displacement and support early recovery and resilience.

The cross-border Building Opportunities for Resilience in the Horn of Africa (BORESHA) project promotes economic development and resilience among communities in the Mandera triangle area between Ethiopia, Kenya and Somalia. The region faces recurring floods and drought, putting many people at risk of displacement. The project has implemented a number of activities to address water shortages, restore landscapes, support early warning systems and develop alternative livelihoods. This has included training on climate-smart agriculture, the provision of agricultural inputs and equipment, and animal health interventions.

The multi-sectoral interventions have helped to build communities’ resilience to climatic shocks and increase social cohesion, equipping them with positive coping strategies. A study IDMC conducted in 2022 found the project’s impact was most apparent in the village of Rhamu. “BORESHA has really reduced the number of people leaving the village,” said one key informant. “The project support we received, including training, early warning mechanisms, animal drugs and treatment as well as storage facilities for hay and fodder, have greatly helped members to remain in the village.”

In the Horn of Africa, multi-sectoral interventions have helped to build communities’ resilience to climatic shocks and increase social cohesion.

### Return on investment: anticipatory action

There is increasing recognition of the role of anticipatory action in preventing displacement and limiting its impact on lives and livelihoods. Unconditional cash assistance is one of the key tools for anticipatory action, helping communities to meet what they deem their most urgent upcoming needs before disasters strike. Cash transfers are one-off, short-term measures, but they contribute to the resilience of communities affected by displacement, for example by covering the cost of evacuation and the transport of assets to safer areas.

Anticipatory action is still a growing area of intervention and there is much progress to be made, but the work of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) in Mongolia stands out as a particularly promising example.

IFRC implemented a forecast-based financing project to release humanitarian funds to assist nomadic herders in the lead up to an extreme weather phenomenon known as the dzud. The dzud occurs when drought is followed by a harsh winter, causing significant livestock losses, economic strain and food insecurity, which in turn may trigger displacement. The project developed a dzud risk map to serve as an early warning tool, and early action protocols were agreed through a consultative approach, with a community-led risk assessment to understand the dzud’s impacts and how best to address them.

When the threshold for early action is met, nomadic herders are provided with unconditional cash transfers and animal care kits to help them cope with the shock and prevent livestock deaths. Financing was activated in 2017-2018 and 2019-2020 to the benefit of 3,000 herder households. Measuring the project’s success in reducing displacement is a challenge because only limited data is available, but it provides a concrete example of anticipatory action that addresses the known drivers of displacement before it occurs.

---
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Sounding the alarm: national early warning mechanisms

There is global recognition of the value of early warning mechanisms in saving lives, livelihoods and reducing the damage that natural hazards cause. They also allow people to take measures to protect their homes and other assets, which has the potential to reduce the impact of displacement if it occurs.²²⁰ By some estimates even 24 hours’ advanced warning can reduce damage by 30 per cent.²²¹ The World Meteorological Organization’s Early Warnings for All initiative is intended to ensure that early warning systems protect everyone on the planet from extreme hazards by 2027, which would greatly reduce the impact of disasters and climate change and allow people to recover sooner.²²²

At the national level, the Philippines – one of the countries most affected by disasters in the world with typhoons, storms, floods, landslides and earthquakes a common occurrence – is active in managing disaster risk. Its PHANARE early warning system serves as the basis for pre-emptive evacuations, a “positive” form of displacement when well managed and brief in nature.²²³ As typhoon Rai approached in 2021 the system provided advanced modelling to support critical information needs to aid rapid response.²²⁴ This enabled the government to make swift evacuation decisions, suspend work and school, confine ferries and cargo vessels to port and ground domestic flights.

The country’s investments in early warning, early action and mitigation measures also reduced the average duration of displacement. Around 95 per cent of the people Rai displaced in the most affected area of Western Visayas were able to return within three weeks.²²⁵ This is in sharp contrast to the aftermath of typhoon Haiyan, a similar-sized storm that struck in 2013, when it took more than a year for many IDPs to return to their homes.²²⁶

Cuba, which is hit by hurricanes and other severe storms that cause significant losses and damage every year, offers another example of good early warning practices and a lesson in resilience. All Cubans are taught what to do when hurricanes approach from an early age. Disaster preparedness, prevention and response are part of the national curriculum, and people of all ages take part in drills, simulation exercises and other training.

The island’s civil defence system and meteorological institute are pillars of its DRM system, and every individual has a role to play at the community level as a storm approaches. Schools and hospitals are converted into shelters and transport is quickly organised. As a result, most of the displacement recorded is in the form of pre-emptive evacuations.²²⁷ These examples highlight how a culture of early warning, which promotes a culture of community behaviour, and investments in technological and institutional resources can lead to swift pre-emptive action before a disaster strikes.

A culture of early warning, which promotes informed community behaviour, and investments in technological and institutional resources can lead to swift pre-emptive action before a disaster strikes, including evacuations. This form of displacement still comes at a considerable cost to those affected, but it saves lives and hastens recovery.²²⁸

Regional institutions: a springboard for displacement risk reduction?

East Africa

The Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) has two early warning and alert systems. It established the Conflict Early Warning and Response Mechanism (CEWARN) more than 20 years ago and operates the Climate Prediction and Applications Centre (ICPAC), which oversees DRR and DRM.²²⁹ Tools and best practices on resilience, some of which focus on internal displacement, are also shared on IGAD’s resilience portal.²³⁰

CEWARN collects data and monitors conflict risks in the region. It publishes scenarios and conflict profiles that cover both internal and cross-border displacement as a key impact of violence.²³¹ ICPAC’s East Africa Hazards Watch dashboard provides a one-stop shop for alerts on natural hazards, many of which have the potential to trigger displacement.²³² Exposure data based on available population figures can be overlain to show how many people live in areas at risk.²³³ ICPAC is also planning to introduce specific displacement early warnings into its dashboard.²³⁴

With support from PDD and the German Development Cooperation Agency (GIZ), IGAD has also developed flood and cyclone displacement risk profiles and decision-making models that consider the hazards’ implications for human mobility and formulated a methodology for modelling displacement patterns associated with slow-onset events such as drought.²³⁵

South-east Asia

The Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance on Disaster Management (AHA Centre) established by the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), is an inter-governmental initiative that facilitates cooperation and coordination on disaster management and emergency responses among the body’s ten member states and with the UN and international organisations.²³⁶ Through its activities, platforms and tools the centre aims to reduce loss of life and damage to property by identifying hazards and risks and increasing warning times.

The centre works closely with ASEAN member states’ national disaster management organisations (NDMOs) to ensure that hazards are effectively monitored so they can anticipate when a disaster will strike and organise evacuations accordingly. The data the centre collects on the impacts of disasters, including displacement, is useful in analysing how to mobilise resources in a timely and efficient way to support NDMOs’ evacuation efforts.

These two examples show how regional institutions can support countries in identifying and reducing displacement risk through better data, early warning and alerts that give residents and authorities precious time to prepare. Quality data collected by institutions such as the AHA Centre gives them an edge in data analytics, while the internet of regional bodies such as IGAD in statistical models positions them in the growing field of displacement-focused predictive analysis.

No going back: planned relocations in disaster settings

In some circumstances the level of disaster risk is so high that the difficult decision to relocate whole communities is taken. Planned relocations are a sensitive and controversial topic, and preventive relocations in particular are under-researched because they have only recently been undertaken at scale.²³⁶ Planned relocations save lives and resources and often give a head start to recovery, but they come at a cost. People leave behind property, social networks, jobs, ancestral land, traditional cultures and livelihoods.²³⁷ The financial costs of implementation can run into millions for a just few dozen people.²³⁸ For these reasons they are considered a measure of last resort.²³⁹

Planned relocations save lives and resources and often give a head start to recovery, but they come at a cost.
Some countries have crafted their own legal and operational frameworks to support the sensitive and dignified relocation of at-risk communities. Preventive relocations to address climate change impacts are ongoing in Fiji and remain an “enormous” task for the government.245, 246 There are no global standards to define a successful relocation, but Fiji has made progress.247 A systematic review of literature on relocations conducted in the country since 1970 and reported on until September 2020 found 15 cases, of which nine were completed.247

The government has used relocations to prevent and respond to damages and losses caused by storms, sea-level rise, floods, coastal erosion and landslides.248 It is also aware of the human cost of doing so, and that it involves much more than “pulling out 30 or 40 houses and moving them further upfield”.245 In four out of five relocation cases analysed in more detail in the literature review, involving 77 households and another 150 individuals, comparable livelihood opportunities were provided in relocation sites and the national government and/or the communities were involved at different stages.248 Outcomes have been mixed, but efforts were made to consider relocation beyond housing.247

Elsewhere, small communities such as the indigenous Caçaara people of Enseada da Baleia in São Paulo state, Brazil, managed relocation themselves.249 From the mid-2000s, the community advocated for their right to stay and then to leave after coastal erosion made life unsustainable.244 The state authorities gave them permission to move to a nearby location after a lengthy process in which the community and authorities agreed on a protocol to ensure future relocations would consider cultural preferences and sensitivities.246 The community rebuilt through collective mobilisation of regional networks, receiving free labour and funds, and are now re-establishing their way of life.246

Relocation is a complex undertaking which goes beyond housing to include issues of social cohesion, ancestral belonging and traditional livelihoods. The three examples above show how communities and authorities are responding to the challenge, considering the different needs of each community and their microcosm of productive activities and social connections.

Growing expectations: emerging risk analysis and forecasting systems

As global recognition of the need for better preparedness for and prevention of displacement continues to grow, too do expectations that risk analyses and forecasting will predict where the next displacement event will occur, reduce its risk, implement early action and limit its impact. The UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR) has analysed the risk of economic losses as a result of disasters risks in its Global Assessment Report (GAR) since 2011.247 This does not, however, include evidence and analysis of the risk of disaster displacement, a problem which hinders the effective reduction of both displacement risk and disaster risk.

With support from the Nansen Initiative, IDMC began exploring this topic in 2014, conducting a study on the internal displacement of pastoralists in northern Kenya.250 The study sought to understand the drivers, patterns, push factors and causes of prolonged displacement of pastoralists affected by the multi-dimensional impacts of climate change and recurring disasters. This was followed by the publication of a joint report in the lead up to the World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in Sendai, Japan.250

The purpose of the publication was to raise awareness about displacement risk, what could happen, who is at risk and where they are located. For the first iteration of the model, IDMC explored a deterministic approach, examining how displacement had occurred over past decades as the basis for looking ahead. The approach, however, had several limitations. Looking at historical displacement helps to explain the past, but it does not necessarily provide a good guide to the future.

IDMC endeavoured to generate probabilistic risk information to quantify expected displacement based on annual averages and the effect of disaster events of different return periods, such as the expected number of people displaced based on a 100-year return period flooding event scenario. This culminated in the publication of the first global displacement risk model in 2017, which built on the risk analysis developed by UNDRR using a wide range of hazard scenarios, their likelihood and their potential to cause housing damage, the latter serving as a proxy for medium to long-term displacement.
Results showed that 14 million people on average could be displaced globally in any given year. This estimate only takes into account displacement linked with cyclical winds, storm surges, riverine floods, earthquakes and tsunamis, leaving out the effects of other disasters and the impacts of climate change.

This global model was intended to raise awareness of displacement as an issue to prepare for and address pre-emptively, rather than respond to after it occurs. It highlights the need for, and the feasibility of, prevention in the hope of informing investments and policies. Since its release, IDMC, along with its partners – CIMA Research Foundation, Weather and Climate Risks, ETH Zurich and the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research – has made significant progress in enhancing and fine-tuning the model for sudden-onset hazards. One particular area of improvement has been its resolution, allowing a more detailed assessment of vulnerability.

Understanding vulnerability is essential in determining the severity of impacts, because it encompasses people’s exposure to hazards and their level of susceptibility. As such, it is important to analyse how the different factors that affect vulnerability change over space and time, and to delve into the economic, social, environmental and governance elements that influence disaster risk.

In parallel, IDMC has been collaborating with the University of Valencia in Spain to advance the efforts to estimate the risk of drought displacement. This research explores the application of causal models for Somalia to better understand and address the challenges posed by this type of displacement.263 The World Bank has also published its two-part Groundswell report, which includes projections and analysis of internal climate migration. The first part was published in 2018, covering Sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia and Latin America; and the second in 2021, covering three additional regions: East Asia and the Pacific, North Africa, and Eastern Europe and Central Asia.264 The report uses a novel modelling approach to help understand the scale, trajectory and spatial patterns of future climate migration within countries, illuminating the relative importance of push factors in locations of origin and pull factors in destination locations over larger geographic areas.

Modeling the attractiveness of locations in terms of economic or demographic characteristics, expressed as an agglomeration effect and influenced by environmental conditions, fits with existing theory. The model does not focus on individual reasons for migration, but it provides compelling information on patterns and trends to inform policy dialogue and action.

To enable comparisons between countries and regions, selected global datasets and scenario pathways, including spatially and temporally consistent sectoral impact datasets, were used as model inputs.

Efforts have also been made to understand the risk of becoming displaced in countries dealing with governance crises and where fragility on several parameters, such as ongoing conflict and violence against civilians, is high and aggravated by the impacts of climate change and environmental degradation. The Danish Refugee Council has developed the Foresight model, a machine-learning tool initially created in cooperation with IBM, to predict both internal and cross-border displacement at the national level one to three years into the future.265

The model currently covers 26 countries, and more than half of the forecasts produced have been less than 10 per cent off the actual displacement level for the coming year. It aggregates data from 18 sources, including IDMC’s own displacement data, and contains 120 indicators related to violence, governance, the economy, the environment and socio-demographics.

Despite the promising advances discussed, the number of internal displacements and IDPs shows no sign of decreasing.266 Certainly global data coverage has improved, but so have state capacities to act on early warnings and disaster preparedness, as shown in this chapter. Some countries are able to pre-emptively evacuate large numbers of people, whose movements count as internal displacements and some of whom remain in counts long after the disaster has passed, either for lack of updated information or because it is impossible for them to return or integrate elsewhere.

The number of people exposed to disasters has also increased with climate change, sea-level rise and population growth in at-risk areas, these being but a few of the many factors behind the trend.267 Climate change has also increased the frequency and severity of hazards, which has compounding and cascading effects, including internal displacement.268

The global number of IDPs has grown steadily since 2016, but this doesn’t mean that preparedness, prevention and early warning have failed.269 Lives, livelihoods and assets have been safeguarded and some displacement has undoubtedly been averted. It is only through increased investment in these areas that we can hope to turn the tide in terms of internal displacement figures in the future.
Chapter V:

Data on internal displacement

There are places in the country that we have visited and ... six months later they are depopulated.

Academic researcher interviewed in San Salvador. IDMC, September 2018

As gang violence grew in the Northern Triangle of Central America in the 1990s, so did the number of people displaced by criminal groups. Regularly updated government data about these displacements is still hard to come by even today, but the needs and conditions of the region’s IDPs had to be documented as IDMC expanded the scope of our monitoring to include criminal and structural forms of violence there. This monitoring has relied extensively on data from researchers, universities, NGOs and other civil society organisations ever since.

"Structural violence identifies "social mechanisms, state institutions and cultural norms or practices that prevent people from meeting their basic needs." IDMC, An atomised crisis: Reframing displacement caused by crime and violence in El Salvador, September 2018"
**Displacement data initiatives**

Country-led initiatives to collect quality data on internal displacement are essential for the design of tailored policies, responses and solutions for affected communities. They can take many forms and meet different purposes that inform their focus, granularity, coverage and scope. Such data is often produced by humanitarain stakeholders, whether governmental or otherwise, who try to rapidly assess the needs of the people they intend to assist and monitor the impact of their work.

In other cases, disaster management agencies or other entities collect information on housing damage or destruction to inform reconstruction plans and other post-disaster support, also giving an indication of the number of people who lost their homes in an event. Some countries have invested in the production of official statistics on IDPs, integrating specific questions in their national censuses and household surveys.

This multitude of data sources has recently benefited from collective efforts to try to standardise information on internal displacement at the international level for more efficiency, interoperability and overall improved quality. JIPS was created in 2004, is a data collection and analysis system established at the country level in agreement with authorities. It provides data on the number, needs and vulnerabilities of people on the move, including IDPs and returnees. DTM has been active in 121 countries since its inception and is currently tracking internal displacement linked with conflict, disasters and other emergencies in 24 countries. The data informs not only humanitarian operations, but also policy and research on migration and displacement, and IDMC’s annual estimates.

Other thematic initiatives have helped to raise the visibility of specific aspects of displacement and improve the granularity of knowledge of particular situations or groups of affected people. PDD, which focuses on estimating the number of IDPs and research on migration and displacement, and IDMC’s annual estimates.

**Country-led initiatives to collect quality data on internal displacement are essential for the design of tailored policies, responses and solutions for affected communities.**

Within the multilateral aid system, IOM has played a central role as a provider of data, information and research on internal displacement, alongside its programmatic interventions. Its Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM), introduced in 2004, is a data collection and analysis system established at the country level in agreement with authorities. It provides data on the number, needs and vulnerabilities of people on the move, including IDPs and returnees. DTM has been active in 121 countries since its inception and is currently tracking internal displacement linked with conflict, disasters and other emergencies in 24 countries. The data informs not only humanitarian operations, but also policy and research on migration and displacement, and IDMC’s annual estimates.

Other thematic initiatives have helped to raise the visibility of specific aspects of displacement and improve the granularity of knowledge of particular situations or groups of affected people. PDD, which was established in 2016 as a state-led initiative to follow up on the Nansen Initiative, has done much to increase attention to disaster and climate displacement. The International Data Alliance for Children on the Move (IDAC), launched in 2020, advocates for more age-disaggregated data on IDPs and specific research and analysis on displaced children. Global data producing organisations such as DTM/REACH have also made their primary data collection exercises even more comprehensive, granular and harmonised with international standards. International efforts to improve internal displacement data have accelerated in the past couple of years with initiatives that include the creation of the Global Data Centre on Forced Displacement by UNHCR and the World Bank, the Inter-Agency Data for Solutions to Internal Displacement (ISID) Taskforce to the United Nations Special Advisor on Solutions to Internal Displacement, efforts by UNDP to produce data on development solutions for the assessment of the production of a new Periodic Global Report on the State of Solutions to Internal Displacement (PROGRESS) by IOM’s Global Data Institute (GDI) and Georgetown University’s institute for the study of international migration.

The Humanitarian Data Exchange (HDX) has helped to bring together different sources of data on internal displacement and humanitarian crises more broadly. Managed by OCHA’s Centre for Humanitarian Data, it provides a central online platform for organisations to publish their own data and access that of other entities for analyses.

Knowledge of the scale, impacts, drivers and risk of internal displacement in 2023 is undoubtedly much better than it was in 1998, allowing practitioners, policymakers and investors to make more informed decisions. Significant gaps remain at all levels, however, and it is crucial that data comes to solutions. The efforts discussed above are indicative of the far-reaching impacts of internal displacement and its relevance to a broad range of stakeholders at the global level, but they also represent a challenge when it comes to coordination and information sharing. This challenge is ongoing and must remain a priority to ensure the limited resources, investment and attention to the topic are used wisely.

Quality data on internal displacement requires systematic collection, rigorous verification and a harmonised approach to support interoperability of data and systems. It also requires comprehensive geographical coverage, disaggregation by age, sex and region. The reports, published by the National Drought and Displacement Monitoring Centre (NDM), bring together data and information on displacement conditions, including priority needs, safety concerns and school attendance rates for displaced children.

**Capturing and harmonising displacement data**

Quality data on internal displacement requires systematic collection, rigorous verification and a harmonised approach to support interoperability of data and systems. It also requires comprehensive geographical coverage, disaggregation by age, sex and region. The reports, published by the National Drought and Displacement Monitoring Centre (NDM), bring together data and information on displacement conditions, including priority needs, safety concerns and school attendance rates for displaced children.

Despite repeated recognition of the need for more and better-quality data, many gaps and inconsistencies remain.

Located on the Pacific Ring of Fire and in East Asia’s typhoon belt, the Philippines is one of the countries most affected by disaster displacement globally. The recurrence of storms and other weather-related hazards has prompted authorities to strengthen their monitoring systems to produce more actionable data to inform policy and programming in DRR and development solutions. The efforts of the Disaster Response Operations Monitoring and
Information Centre (DROMIC) serve as a good example of how such data enables a more comprehensive understanding of displacement trends.

DROMIC’s data can be used to run time-series analyses and understand displacement and return trends over time. When plotted on maps, it reveals the geographical footprint of disaster displacement and identifies hotspots. This information is useful in organising timely humanitarian assistance in the aftermath of a disaster and informing future decisions on resource mobilisation and preparations for similar events.

Disaggregating data further by sex, age and disability status would help authorities to better understand IDPs’ social and economic vulnerabilities. DROMIC’s efforts to monitor disaster displacement systematically over space and time are significant, particularly as they are strongly aligned with the Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction. They represent a model that other countries with similar levels of disaster displacement risk could replicate and adapt.

The registry provides a dataset on IDPs, which is accessible through an online dashboard. The data is disaggregated by location, age, sex, ethnicity, disability status and sexual orientation, and captures repeated displacements and other forms of abuse or victimisation of the same individual. The registry is the result of a substantial investment by the government and requires ongoing resources to maintain, which may be out of reach for some countries.

Registration is voluntary and relies on IDPs identifying themselves, which may result in under-registration and underestimation of their number. A survey of people displaced in 2022 found that around half had not registered for reasons including safety concerns, lack of knowledge about the registration process or belief that it would bring no benefit.

The rich dataset is still able to inform Colombia’s policy and programming to respond to conflict displacement, and monitor progress of its efforts to address IDPs’ specific vulnerabilities across different locations and population groups through a dedicated index in collaboration with the National Statistics Office (DANE). The data has also been used to help identify the most vulnerable households and provide them with support through the social protection system.

Data-informed policymaking: Colombia’s victims law and registry

Addressing protracted displacement associated with Colombia’s conflict has required the adoption of dedicated laws to support victims, governance and the administrative structures necessary to effectively implement the measures stipulated, and a robust data system to inform these efforts. The Victims Law of 2011 (Law 1448) paved the way for an articulated response at the local and national level by establishing the Victims Unit, the Land Restitution Unit and the National Protection Unit. It also created a National Registry of Victims (RUV).

The registry provides a dataset on IDPs, which is accessible through an online dashboard. The data is disaggregated by location, age, sex, ethnicity, disability status and sexual orientation, and captures repeated displacements and other forms of abuse or victimisation of the same individual. The registry is the result of a substantial investment by the government and requires ongoing resources to maintain, which may be out of reach for some countries.

Registration is voluntary and relies on IDPs identifying themselves, which may result in under-registration and underestimation of their number. A survey of people displaced in 2022 found that around half had not registered for reasons including safety concerns, lack of knowledge about the registration process or belief that it would bring no benefit.

The rich dataset is still able to inform Colombia’s policy and programming to respond to conflict displacement, and monitor progress of its efforts to address IDPs’ specific vulnerabilities across different locations and population groups through a dedicated index in collaboration with the National Statistics Office (DANE). The data has also been used to help identify the most vulnerable households and provide them with support through the social protection system.
Spotlight: The evolution of IDMC’s internal displacement database

Displacement risk analyses and models, durable solutions, inclusive protection and assistance for IDPs and tailored policies all have one thing in common: they need quality data to be effective. Data on internal displacement has improved significantly in the 25 years since the adoption of the Guiding Principles and establishment of IDMC, then known as the Global IDP Project. Its main objective at the outset was to monitor and document conflict displacement worldwide through a database, which was created in 1999, and raise global awareness of the issue. Despite IDPs outnumbering refugees in the early 2000s, they received significantly less attention in terms of assistance, protection and international media coverage.289

UN General Assembly resolution 52/130 of 1998 recognised the need for “a more comprehensive and coherent system of collecting data on the situation of internally displaced persons” and a number of subsequent resolutions over the years have reaffirmed the relevance of IDMC’s role as the provider of such a system through its Global Internal Displacement Database.288 The evolution of internal displacement data is closely intertwined with the global framework in which we operate.

By the end of 2001, the Global IDP Project’s online IDP Database covered all ongoing situations of internal displacement associated with conflict and violence globally, spanning 47 countries across all continents (see figure 3). The Guiding Principles were used as an analytical tool to regularly update country profiles, which covered all phases of displacement and helped assess national and international responses.290 By that time, the database had compiled more than 4,000 documents from more than 700 sources.287 IDMC has since refined its conflict and violence typology to the point where conflict data is now aggregated at the country level to provide a comprehensive overview of the triggers of displacement in each conflict-affected country.

IDMC has continuously improved its monitoring methodology through extensive research, data management, analysis and validation in collaboration with organisations such as UNHCR and IOM. Monitoring internal displacement, however, comes with a wide array of challenges, mostly linked to the lack of visibility and understanding of the phenomenon. IDMC’s global figures on conflict and disaster displacement rely on data from primary and secondary sources, but availability varies considerably.

Efforts are made to obtain not only quantitative data on possible increases and decreases in the number of IDPs and movements, but also more specific information such as data disaggregated by sex and age and the number of IDPs with disabilities. This information is key to inform targeted and effective responses to IDPs’ protection and assistance needs.

In 2009, IDMC addressed the global data gap on disaster displacement by publishing a report that had two primary objectives: to estimate the extent of the phenomenon in 2008, particularly related to weather and climate-related hazards, and to propose a methodology to monitor disaster-related displacement on an ongoing basis. Building on this, IDMC has committed to a long-term role in the global monitoring and analysis of disaster displacement, including providing annual global estimates of its scale.291

IDMC has expanded its monitoring efforts over the years by revising its methodology, providing estimates of the number of IDPs displaced by slow-onset hazards such as droughts since 2017. Disaster data is currently disaggregated at the event level, offering detailed information on specific events and the types of hazards involved. Coverage has increased from 80 countries in 2008 to 148 in 2022. The number of events to trigger displacement has also increased significantly from 185 in 2008 to reach 2,300 in 2022 (see figure 4).

Figure 3: Evolution of the number of IDPs displaced by conflict and countries covered from 2009 to 2022.

Figure 4: Number of disaster events and countries covered by IDMC’s monitoring from 2008 to 2022.
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Documenting the duration of displacement and sustainability of returns

Documenting the duration of displacement is a challenging aspect of monitoring. A recent innovation in Ukraine after Russia’s invasion in February 2022 has made the process easier, however, with IDPs now able to register and cancel their status through a mobile app called Diia.294 Registrants are provided with a certificate of their status as an IDP and can apply for a monthly allowance for themselves and their dependents. They can also extend the duration of the targeted assistance payments.296

There were a number of challenges during the rollout, which the Ministry of Digital Transformation and the Ministry of Social Policy have gradually addressed. Regular surveys have helped to identify users’ difficulties, and a hotline was established to provide support.296 This data provides a partial picture of the dynamics of displacement in the country, including the duration of physical displacement and geographical dimensions, albeit with some gaps and limitations. Not everyone registers their displaced status for a number of reasons, meaning the figures are an underestimate, and many still have displacement-related needs when they return to their places of origin.

Inclusion errors can also be a challenge when registration and monitoring are linked to assistance, and it is unclear how this is being captured or addressed in Ukraine. A further missing element in many situations is an analysis of the shifting impacts of displacement as it becomes prolonged, which would help to better understand how IDPs’ needs and vulnerability evolve over time. Addressing this gap requires further research and investment.

Blind spots: data disaggregation

The disaggregation of displacement data, including by sex, age and disability status, is a key component of quality information, but the IDI reveals that 26 of the 46 countries analysed in 2022 did not disaggregate their data by sex and age either for disaster or conflict displacement. Only Ethiopia and Mozambique registered the maximum score of 1 for sex and age disaggregation for both types of displacement. Other forms of disaggregation, by disability status or ethnicity for example, are extremely rare. These gaps hinder targeted programming and policies, because one-size-fits-all approaches leave people with specific needs behind.297

Mozambique achieved a full score for the IDI’s data indicator, which assesses whether governments publish or endorse data on disaster and conflict displacement and its quality, for the last two years that the assessment was completed (2021 and 2023).295 IOM publishes disaster displacement data in collaboration with the National Institute for Disaster Management (INGD) and other humanitarian agencies. Data for tropical storm Freddy was disaggregated by sex, age and vulnerabilities, including the proportion of people with disabilities, pregnant and lactating women and unaccompanied minors.299

INGD also publishes data on conflict displacement in Cabo Delgado.600 INGD does not publish raw datasets or a dashboard for conflict displacement, but its data is disaggregated by sex, age, province of origin, district and province of displacement and type of accommodation.600 IOM data has additional disaggregation layers by factors of potential vulnerability such as pregnancy and lactation, and the sex and age of heads of household.602

Another good practice comes from the US Census Bureau and its household pulse survey. Started in 2020 to assess the socioeconomic impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic, the survey now includes questions on disaster displacement, its duration, type of trigger and the extent of damage to personal property and possessions.303 The data is disaggregated by age, sex, gender, sexual orientation, origin, race, education level, marital status, disability status, household size, presence of minors, employment status, household income, military duty and reported basic needs.304 Data is collected at the state level and for main cities at the metro level and then aggregated at the national level.305 Less disaggregation is possible through the interactive data visualisation tool.306

Mind the gap: civil society and internal displacement monitoring

In countries where official data on internal displacement is not systematically recorded and updated, non-governmental stakeholders can help to fill the data gap. The Mexican Commission for the Defence and Promotion of Human Rights (CMDPDH) has been monitoring stocks and flows for displacement triggered by violence since 2014 in the absence of systematic government data.307 Despite its limited resources, CMDPDH provides a partial picture of the dynamics of displacement in the country, including the duration of physical displacement and geographical dimensions, albeit with some gaps and limitations. Not everyone registers their displaced status for a number of reasons, meaning the figures are an underestimate, and many still have displacement-related needs when they return to their places of origin.

Inclusion errors can also be a challenge when registration and monitoring are linked to assistance, and it is unclear how this is being captured or addressed in Ukraine. A further missing element in many situations is an analysis of the shifting impacts of displacement as it becomes prolonged, which would help to better understand how IDPs’ needs and vulnerability evolve over time. Addressing this gap requires further research and investment.

One-size-fits-all approaches leave people with specific needs behind.

For a full list of sub-indicators that feed the IDI data indicator score, please refer to annex B.
into IDPs’ living conditions and rights status, including during the pandemic.314 The data also informs their advocacy and referral of IDPs to relevant services.295

When systematic collection of data and information on internal displacement does not take place, civil society organisations can provide indicative but still essential estimates of its national scale. They can also add nuance to what is known about the needs and challenges of IDPs and the communities they live in, and put their information and data to immediate use in shaping their advocacy and assistance efforts.

### Persisting data gaps: what remains to be achieved

The IDI’s data indicator for 2023 shows that data gaps are still evident. Among the 44 countries hosting IDPs displaced by conflict at the end of 2022, ten did not have data published or endorsed by the government for the year or any annual update.296 This was the case in Guatemala and Türkiye making it difficult to establish how many people were still displaced from previous conflict events, some of which date back decades. In Honduras and Mexico, the lack of recent and systematically updated government data hinders full understanding of how new episodes of conflict and violence affect the number of IDPs.297

There are fewer data gaps on disaster displacement, but some still exist. Of the 46 countries analysed for the IDI, all but one had full or partial displacement data published or endorsed by the government for their main disaster events.298 Government data on main disaster events for five countries exists but is not disaggregated by location, limiting its potential use for response and prevention. Another key challenge is the lack of monitoring over time. Little data is available beyond the immediate months following a disaster.

The IDI’s data indicator focuses on the basic criteria for quality data on IDPs: whether it provides good coverage of the main internal displacement situations in the country, whether it is disaggregated at the sub-national level and by sex and age, and whether it is updated at least annually. Many other types of data are needed, however, to inform better policies, support and solutions.

Inconsistent definitions and methods, lack of disaggregation and limited coverage of socioeconomic data, including data on host communities, have been flagged as some of the most pressing gaps to fill.299

### Inconsistent definitions and methods, lack of disaggregation and limited coverage of socioeconomic data, including data on host communities, have been flagged as some of the most pressing gaps to fill.

Inconsistent definitions and methods, lack of disaggregation and limited coverage of socioeconomic data, including data on host communities, have been flagged as some of the most pressing gaps to fill.319

Contributions such as the Technical Report on Statistics of Internally Displaced Persons, published by the EU and UN in 2018, provide clear recommendations on how to address the ongoing challenges inherent in the production, use and analysis of internal displacement data.320 A systemic approach that incorporates common standards and improves cooperation, coordination and data interoperability is vital if governments and other stakeholders are to fully understand, prevent and address the phenomenon through better policymaking, planning and risk reduction.322

Others, however, correspond to the use of such data and overall “data literacy” for programme design and funding allocation, and for humanitarian responses and longer-term development projects to support durable solutions.323

### Availability of displacement data in 46 IDI countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict data published or endorsed by government</th>
<th>Available for 2022</th>
<th>Not available for 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disaster data published or endorsed by government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 6: Number of countries assessed in the IDI 2023 (n=46) with data on internal displacement published or endorsed by the government for 2022
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Conclusion

This year’s 25th anniversary of the Guiding Principles and IDMC’s founding provides an opportunity to assess the progress made in preventing, addressing and resolving internal displacement. Many countries now include the issue, whether triggered by conflict, violence, disasters or climate change, in their national policy and legal frameworks. Information is more widely available on the scale, patterns and impacts of displacement and on affected people’s needs. Assessments of the risk of future displacement are also becoming more precise and allow for better preparedness.

The phenomenon continues to increase, however, reaching an all-time high at the end of 2022 when 711 million people were living in internal displacement in more 150 countries and territories.

Countries dealing with displacement face myriad challenges that can vary greatly from one situation to the next, but the following areas stand out as being particularly important and, in most cases, universal.

Political will and action

The primary responsibility for addressing internal displacement rests with national authorities. Their engagement is needed at all levels, from legal and policy frameworks to monitoring, assistance, recovery and solutions. The growing number of laws, policies, strategies and plans is a clear indication of commitment from many governments, but evidence of their effective implementation is scarce.

Action plans should be accompanied by adequate financial, technical and human resources, which in many countries dealing with internal displacement and other competing priorities are in high demand. The international community’s increased attention and commitment is an encouraging sign that support for these governments should follow, including through funding for prevention, preparedness, response and solutions.

Towards more inclusive, localised and comprehensive support

Some of the most effective interventions are community-led approaches that centre the voices of IDPs and their hosts. Participatory and inclusive projects are able to provide highly contextualised support tailored to the diverse needs of each community and specific groups. They also tend to address the issue more comprehensively than blanket approaches.

The less visible impacts of displacement, on psychosocial wellbeing, livelihoods and social cohesion for example, are often a priority for those affected and vital for the pursuit of durable solutions, but they are rarely prioritised. Projects with substantial community engagement and empowerment, multi-year investments and multi-stakeholder support deliver better results and are more sustainable over time.

From emergency response to investments in solutions

The past 25 years have demonstrated that relying mostly on emergency responses to address internal displacement is neither efficient nor sustainable. Life-saving assistance is indispensable, but even if it is sustained it overlooks essential ingredients of solutions – such as livelihood opportunities, education, psychosocial support and social cohesion. Without the means to rebuild their lives, IDPs remain dependent on external support, unable to contribute fully to society, exercise their rights or enjoy their lives.

Countries able to integrate displacement into longer-term plans through development and climate-adaptation investments, preventive measures and anticipatory and early-warning action may not only avoid the human and financial costs inherent in humanitarian crises. They also stand to benefit from increased economic activity and stability.

Increased knowledge for informed action

With so many variables to take into account, and the diversity of internal displacement situations in virtually every country around the world, the need for quality data and evidence to inform tailored support and solutions is beyond question. Collecting such information is costly and time-consuming, however, and countries dealing with internal displacement often have limited resources to do so.

Ensuring that the data collected by various stakeholders from the local to the global level is made available, accessible and interoperable is key. There have been many positive developments in data sharing and harmonisation over the past few years, and several agencies now offer evidence on the scale, triggers, drivers, impacts and risk of displacement for decision makers to act upon.

More granular and inclusive data to design and monitor effective interventions is also needed, as is transparent publication to enable other stakeholders to use it. Increased collaboration at the national and international level has already done much to accelerate results.

This report recognises the important achievements made to date, but it also shows that more needs to be done to prevent displacement and achieve durable solutions for IDPs. Identifying key focus areas to do so, there is both urgency and optimism. Addressing them requires coordinated and comprehensive support and engagement from a vast array of stakeholders at all levels, across the humanitarian, peace and development sectors, intergovernmental bodies, NGOs, donors, the private sector, and governments themselves.

No single policy, plan, entity or programme will resolve internal displacement. It requires a multi-layer, multi-sector and multi-stakeholder response that is meaningfully informed by the preferences and aspirations of IDPs themselves. Thanks to the UN Secretary General’s High-Level Panel on Internal Displacement the phenomenon has been generating more interest globally. Evidence of what works is also available, providing hope that the ever-growing number of IDPs will at last begin to decline.
Annex A: How to read the IDI and its results

The Internal Displacement Index (IDI), like all composite indices, is an entry point into a complex phenomenon that results from a combination of factors. It does not give the full picture of internal displacement’s drivers and impacts, nor does it go into the depth needed to design tailored actions at the country or local level. It provides a snapshot of information that directs its users towards areas they should further investigate.

The IDI points to recent investments in policies, data or other resources to address internal displacement. It identifies contextual drivers that increase or decrease the likelihood of future crises and reveals improvement or degradation in current ones. It combines indicators on national policies and capacities, as well as contextual drivers and impacts, all of which feed into the internal displacement cycle (see figure 7).

The IDI values are based on data from 2022. It is important to keep in mind that the values of most indicators do not evolve significantly from one year to the next. Changes such as the positive impacts of new policies and investments in overall welfare and security may only become visible in the IDI over a longer period of time.

Cross-country comparisons should be interpreted carefully, because differences between two countries for which the IDI value is close can be caused by a lack of more precise, accurate or updated data. Improvements in IDI values can be a result of improved data availability, rather than a change in the situation itself.

More details on the IDI methodology are included in annex B of this report.
### Table 1: Internal Displacement Index

The table below presents the overall IDI scores for each country based on the situation in 2022, 2020 and 2019. The results for the three categories - impact, context, and policies and capacities – that make up the overall scores are presented in tables 2 to 4. Higher scores show a better overall situation in the country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbajan</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>0.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>0.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>0.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>0.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>0.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>0.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>0.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>0.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>0.541</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>0.655</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>0.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>0.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>0.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>0.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>0.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>0.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>Yemen, Rep.</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>0.571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Impact index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbajan</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>0.953</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>0.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>0.970</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>0.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>0.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>0.970</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>0.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.655</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>0.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>0.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>0.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>0.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>Yemen, Rep.</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>0.541</td>
<td>0.641</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Context index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>0.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>0.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>0.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>0.501</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>0.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>0.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>0.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.501</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>0.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>0.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td>0.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>0.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>0.530</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>0.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>0.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>0.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>0.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>0.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>0.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>0.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>0.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>Yemen, Rep.</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>0.317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: Policies and capacities index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>0.967</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>0.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>0.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>0.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>0.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>0.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>Yemen, Rep.</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex B: Methodological note

This report presents the third iteration of the IDI. It applies a methodology that was developed by IDMC through broad consultation with technical experts and published in March 2019 to 46 countries. In this latest iteration, the severity indicator - one of three that make up the impact index - was not included. This is because of revision to the underlying methodology used to produce the severity assessments, which had not been finalised at the time of publication. A new indicator was also introduced to replace the environmental sustainability measure in the context index. Sourced from the World Risk Index (WRI), it reports populations’ exposure to natural hazards. The indicator was updated because exposure to natural hazards was deemed to better capture factors that drive disaster displacement. Another reason for the change was that the WRI allows for comparisons across countries and time with more than ten years of timeseries data available. This was not possible with the data available for the environmental sustainability indicator. Scores for the exposure indicator tend to be considerably higher overall compared with its predecessor.

Time-series data from the WRI has been used to update the scores for the 2020 and 2019 IDI, reported in annex A. The introduction of the new exposure indicator justifies the updates to the IDI scores for 2020 compared with those originally published. As the severity indicator is included in IDI scores for 2019 and 2020 but not for 2022, direct comparison of impact index scores and overall IDI scores across the three years are not possible.

The conceptual framework of the IDI highlights the links between contextual drivers and aggravating factors of displacement. These include socio-economic development, population’s exposure to natural hazards, security and stability, the impacts of displacement and the actions governments and their partners take to prevent and respond to the issue. The IDI is applied only to countries affected by both conflict and disaster displacement.

Results for each country were obtained through extensive review of publicly available policies, humanitarian response plans, reports and datasets. The sources used for each indicator are listed later in this methodological annex.

The value for each indicator was established on the basis of information IDMC was able to access in time for the publication of this report. For this edition specifically, values reflect the situation in the country as of the end of 2022. The IDI is intended to be updated regularly.

Selection of indicators

The IDI builds on existing data sources and indicators on internal displacement and related areas. As data availability and quality improves over the years, the methodology will be further refined.

The indicators that form the IDI were selected based on their relevance and on the availability of quality data across countries and over time.

For the IDI to be comparable across countries, it uses information available at the international level in a standardised format. Databases from multilateral organisations and international data initiatives are best suited for this purpose. For this reason, a number of composite indicators from well-established international data sets or indexes are used.

The IDI brings together indicators on the impacts of internal displacement, on the socioeconomic and political context, along with natural hazards, and on national policies and capacities to prevent and address internal displacement. These indicators are grouped into three categories.

Impact indicators

When an event such as a natural hazard or conflict heightens people’s pre-existing vulnerabilities, displacement may occur. Its impacts vary depending on the number of people affected, the duration of their displacement and other factors. The IDI measures these impacts through the relative scale of displacement and estimates of the economic impact of the crisis.

Scale of displacement

IDMC measures the scale of internal displacement based on the number of new displacements associated with conflicts and disasters and the number of people living in displacement as a result of conflict. These figures are published every year by IDMC in the Global Report on Internal Displacement and available on its Global Internal Displacement Database (GIDD). The figures used in this report are those for 2022.

The number of people living in displacement as a result of conflict is reported by IDMC as a stock figure, taken at 31 December of each year. It indicates the number of IDPs on that date and includes people displaced from all periods, from a few days up to several decades ago. The current methodology does not include people living in displacement as a result of disasters in the scale indicator. It might, however, be considered in future iterations of the IDI.

The number of IDPs is expressed as a percentage of the country’s population and normalised to arrive at a value between 0 and 1. As for all indicators, 1 is the best-case scenario and 0 the worst-case scenario.

The aspirational value is for 0 per cent of a country’s population to be internally displaced. The highest proportion ever recorded was in 2014, when 37.4 per cent of Syria’s population were IDPs. Based on this record, a value of 40 per cent of a country’s population living in internal displacement is used for normalisation, assuming that the number of IDPs should represent between 0 and 40 per cent of the population for all countries.

| Country’s value | 0-40 |
| New displacements indicator | 0-45 |

The number of new displacements accounts for every movement a person has had to make because of a crisis. One IDP can be forced to move several times, each of which is documented as a separate displacement. This figure is reported by IDMC as the total number of internal displacements recorded from 1 January to 31 December each year. It is available for both conflict and disasters.

The numbers of new conflict and disaster displacements for each country are added up and applied to the country’s population, before being normalised to arrive at a value between 0 and 1.

The aspirational value is 0 for countries with no new displacements recorded for the year in question. The highest level recorded by IDMC was in 2022, when the number of new displacements in Ukraine represented 44.4 per cent of its population. Based on this record, a value of 45 is used for normalisation, assuming that the number of new displacements should represent between 0 and 45 per cent of the population for all countries.

| Country’s value | 0-45 |
| New displacements indicator | 0-45 |
Final values for the scale of displacement indicator are expressed between 0 and 1 as the arithmetic average of the IDPs indicator and the new displacement indicator. In the case of a country where these values are respectively 0.8 and 0.3, the scale of displacement indicator would be:

\[ \frac{0.8 + 0.3}{2} = 0.55 \]

It should be noted that in the case of disasters, pre-emptive evacuations are included in the number of new displacements. Pre-emptive evacuations are a lifesaving measure that illustrate a government’s capacity to address disasters but also the result of the population’s exposure and vulnerability to natural hazards. Countries with large-scale pre-emptive evacuations might have a significantly increased number of internal displacements, which in turn lowers the indicator’s score.

Another caveat is that in cases where countries have recently invested in improving their data collection or otherwise increased the number of recorded displacements or IDPs because of additional engagement or resources, the increased figures affect the indicator negatively.

**Economic impacts**

IDMC published an original methodology in 2019 to estimate the economic impacts of internal displacement. It uses publicly available information on the cost of meeting IDPs’ needs for shelter, security, primary healthcare and temporary education, as well as estimates of their lost income. Most of this information comes from the humanitarian response plans and humanitarian needs overview published by OCHA and from the World Bank’s databases.

The methodology assesses these costs and losses per IDP for a year of displacement. The average across all countries assessed in 2022 was $360 per IDP. This average is multiplied by the number of IDPs in each country to estimate the total economic impact at the country level.

For Afghanistan, Burkin’a Faso, Burundi, the Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, DRC, Ethiopia, Iraq, Libya, Mali, Myanmar, Nigeria, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Ukraine and Yemen, country-specific information was available to estimate a more precise cost per IDP. This cost was used instead of the average value of $360.

The total economic impact estimated for each country is expressed as a percentage of its GDP. The percentage of GDP is then normalised to arrive at a value between 0 and 1.

The aspirational value is 0, for countries where internal displacement has no economic impact. The highest estimate made by IDMC is 31 per cent of Syria’s GDP for 2022. Based on this record, an economic impact representing 35 per cent of GDP is used for normalisation, assuming that values should range between 0 and 35 for all countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country’s value - 35</th>
<th>Economic impacts indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Context indicators**

Research by IDMC and that of others has shown that the level of internal displacement in a country is correlated with environmental factors, socioeconomic development and security. Investments in DRR and preparedness, inclusive and sustainable development and peace and stability can limit its likelihood, scale and impacts. The IDI accounts for this factor using three indicators for populations’ exposure to natural hazards, socioeconomic development and security and political stability.

All three are composite indices produced by internationally recognised institutions.

**Exposure to natural hazards**

WRI is published annually by Bündnis Entwicklung Hilft and the Institute for International Law of Peace and Armed Conflict (IFHV). The WRI indicator used for the IDI is “exposure”. Exposure in the WRI is defined as “the extent to which populations in hazard-prone areas are exposed to and burdened by the impacts of extreme natural events or the negative consequences of climate change.”

The indicator covers the frequency and intensity of natural hazards including earthquakes, tsunamis, coastal and riverine floods, storm winds, droughts and sea-level rise. Landslides, heatwaves and cold snaps are not included. The 2022 WRI covered 193 countries.

**Socioeconomic development**

UNDP’s annual Human Development Index (HDI) brings together indicators on income, health and education. It provides a more comprehensive measure of socioeconomic development than any single indicator and serves as the socioeconomic development indicator for the IDI.

**Security and political stability**

The World Bank publishes information on political stability and the absence of violence in 200 countries as part of its research for its Worldwide Governance Indicators. Using data from external sources, including academia, civil society and multilateral organisations, the index measures perceptions of the likelihood of political instability and/or politically-motivated violence, including terrorism. It is updated annually. The political stability and absence of violence index of the Worldwide Governance Indicators is used for the computation of the IDI.

**Policies and capacities indicators**

Indicators on policies and capacities represent a government’s commitments, resources, plans and strategies to prevent internal displacement and reduce its negative consequences. The IDI measures these institutional efforts by considering a government’s publication or use of quality data and the existence and implementation of comprehensive policies on the phenomenon.

**Data on internal displacement**

A government’s publication of data on IDPs is an indication of its commitment and ability to address the issue in a transparent and coordinated way. When governments are unable to collect and publish this information themselves, they can endorse and use data produced by other institutions such as the IOM’s DTM. This indicator is intended to assess whether a government acknowledges internal displacement as an issue that requires data in order for it to be resolved and either publishes or endorses data on the number of IDPs.

1. This indicator is rated by IDMC between 0 and 1 based on a checklist of 10 requirements with equal weight. Each element is scored as either 1 for “yes”, 0.5 for “partially” or 0 for “no”.

2. The government publishes or endorses data on the number of people internally displaced by disasters.

3. Data on the number of people internally displaced by disasters is disaggregated by gender.

4. Data on the number of people internally displaced by disasters is disaggregated by age.

5. Data on the number of people internally displaced by disasters is updated at least annually.

6. The government publishes or endorses data on the number of people internally displaced by conflict or violence.

7. The government publishes or endorses data on the number of people internally displaced by conflict or violence.

8. Data on the number of people internally displaced by conflict or violence is disaggregated by location.

9. Data on the number of people internally displaced by conflict or violence is disaggregated by gender.

10. Data on the number of people internally displaced by conflict or violence is disaggregated by age.

11. Data on the number of people internally displaced by conflict or violence is updated at least annually.

**National policies**

Another indication of a government’s commitment to address internal displacement is the existence of dedicated policies, frameworks, strategies or plans. Best efforts are made to include key policies and laws on internal displacement, particularly newer ones, to inform the scoring of the policy index, but it is not possible, nor is it the aim of the desk review, to
gather all policies that mention internal displacement, evacuations, relocation and/or resettlement. Nor does the IDI consider local policies for tackling internal displacement, despite recognizing their importance. Only national frameworks are considered, because the score is provided at the national level. Frameworks related to displacement triggered by technological disasters or development projects were also not assessed.

This indicator is rated by IDMC based on the checklist of requirements below. The first requirement is scored between 0 and 1, and the remaining four as 0.5 for inclusion of disasters or conflict and 1.0 for inclusion of both.

1. Existence of a dedicated national policy on internal displacement or clear inclusion of internal displacement in broader policies, including national development plans or DRR strategies

2. Inclusion of internal displacement associated with both disasters and conflict or violence in these policies

3. Inclusion of measures to prevent new internal displacements related to both conflict and disasters in these policies

4. Inclusion of measures to ensure durable solutions for IDPs related to both conflict and disasters in these policies

5. Inclusion of measures to mitigate the negative consequences of internal displacement related to both conflict and disasters on other groups, including communities of refuge and origin.

Implementation capacity

National policies on internal displacement are not always accompanied by the necessary resources for implementation. This point is measured by the third indicator on implementation capacity.

Implementation capacity is rated by IDMC between 0 and 1 based on the following checklist of requirements with equal weight:

1. A dedicated public entity is in charge of dealing with internal displacement at the national level

2. Public funds are allocated to the implementation of national policies on internal displacement

3. IDPs can access support from the government or other aid providers

Computing the IDI

The IDI’s three indices - impacts, context, and policies and capacities - are allocated equal weight in its calculation.

Impact index

The impact index is made up of two values: the scale of displacement and its estimated economic impact. Both are expressed between 0 and 1 as explained above.

Values for the two indicators are given equal weight and aggregated using an arithmetic average:

\[
\text{Scale of displacement + economic impact} / 2 = \text{impact index}
\]

Context index

The context index is made up of three values: exposure to natural hazards, socioeconomic development, and security and political stability.

The IDI’s exposure indicator is based on the WDR, the socioeconomic development indicator on the HDI and the security and political stability indicator on the World Bank’s political stability and absence of violence index.

Policies and capacities index

The policies and capacities index is made up of three indicators on the publication or use of quality data on IDPs, the existence of comprehensive national policies on internal displacement and the existence of means to implement them.

Values for these three indicators are given equal weight and aggregated using an arithmetic average:

\[
\text{Data value + policy value + implementation value} / 3 = \text{policies and capacities index}
\]

Aggregating the three indices

The values of the impact, context, and policies and capacities indices are averaged into the IDI using arithmetic mean and equal weight:

\[
\text{Impacts index + context index + policies and capacities index} / 3 = \text{IDI}
\]

Annex C: Report limitations

- Countries mentioned are examples of specific practices, policies or data systems. The report is intended to showcase a variety of examples, good practices and challenges from around the world. Limited space means it was not possible to include all relevant examples for each chapter. Some countries or stakeholders could have featured in virtually all sections. Efforts were made to give a global overview with practices from different regions and stakeholders, including low, middle and high-income countries as per the World Bank’s classification.

- The report was limited to a desk review of secondary sources, relying on publicly available information on laws, policies and interventions, and their design and implementation status. All efforts have been made to identify the most up-to-date information for each example and to accurately characterise the key features, but errors and data gaps may exist.

- As an overview of 25 years of progress and developments related to internal displacement, the report does not cover all possible topics or latest developments. There is, for example, no specific section on funding, or of displacement triggered by development projects. These are either covered in other publications from IDMC, such as Global Report on Internal Displacement 2016, or represent potential future avenues for research and analysis.
Internal Displacement Index in 2023

Average IDI values

- 0.35 - 0.65
- 0.65 - 0.70
- 0.70 - 0.75
- 0.75 - 0.80
- 0.80 - 0.85

Countries not included in the index

The boundaries and the names shown and the designations used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by IDMC.
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