

entry point for addressing both urgent and protracted IDP situations is through the inclusion of displaced populations in the diagnostic and strategy development work.

For the World Bank Group, IDPs as a distinct population group are of concern when they have specific vulnerabilities which affect their ability to seize economic opportunities available to other nationals and which often result in a poverty trap. When

For development actors to be able to engage effectively, it will be important for the Panel to clarify some issues. This section outlines some of these points.

(a) Draw on the lessons of development approaches

Governments are at the center of the IDP situations and will remain the key actors in promoting and achieving solutions. This can limit the reach of actors like the World Bank when governments are the main culprits or enablers of displacement or in contexts where there is little political will to recognize/address displacement. However, development assistance has also been used effectively to advance agendas (e.g. climate change and gender equality) in ways that stress shared benefits and allow governments to lead the national response. When feasible, such an approach not only strengthens national ownership and sustainability, but also helps minimize the establishment of parallel systems and dependency.

The World Bank has gained valuable experience on the inclusion of marginalized groups – experience that in many cases can be applied to displacement situations. In many instances, stand-alone operations focused exclusively on the displaced may not be the most appropriate or effective way to support displacement-affected populations. Exploring where internally displaced are excluded from benefitting from development assistance and supporting measures to overcome hindrances can be a powerful way to increase international assistance for IDPs – even if not labelled as IDP projects. Using an exclusion lens may in certain instances help overcome reluctance to address displacement with development finances.

Addressing complex exclusion and marginalization situations has also taught development actors the value of multi-sectoral approaches. Working with governments to address the needs of internally displaced and their hosts – whether in the early onset, during or after displacement places it in a good position to take a holistic approach at both operational and policy levels. Long standing relationships with line ministries that are involved in what are areas of intervention of importance to IDPs, returnees and hosts (including jobs, financial inclusion, agriculture, housing, schools, healthcare, social cohesion etc.) can be leveraged to ensure that these populations are thought into sectoral policies and interventions.

We would advocate for further building evidence on what works so as to inform policy recommendations, develop sound interventions, enable effective synergies between humanitarian and development actors and move the dialogue forward on solutions. Operational lessons learned stemming from urbanization, marginalization and refugee situations can be extracted and used for IDP situations. This could include responses and delivery mechanisms that have been able to deliver results, ranging from extending existing social safety net programs to employment-policy changes that allow the displaced to use their skills and to boost the

actors across the humanitarian, development, security and political spheres use their comparative advantages to analyze and respond to the challenges posed by the causes and consequences of internal displacement.

It is important to define “solutions” in a manner that reflects realities on the ground and that can be operationalized. Internal displacement is often protracted with a large number of those affected having been IDPs for years, if not over generations. The UN Guiding Principles and the IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for IDPs identify three ways to achieve durable solutions: (a) voluntary and sustainable reintegration at the place of origin (return and reintegration); (b) sustainable local integration in areas where IDPs take refuge (local integration); and (c) voluntary and sustainable integration in another part of the country (settlement elsewhere in the country). These are linked to considerable ambiguity. For example, in the case of urbanized IDPs who are not able or willing to return to rural areas, when does one cease to be an IDP? The criteria

Internal displacement can be caused by several factors: violence, conflict, and persecution; natural disasters; large-scale projects; and increasingly climate change. In an initial phase, most people will need life-saving assistance which may be similar – hence the temptation to aggregate all groups. But progress towards solutions will in most cases closely depend on the cause of internal displacement – violence, conflict, and persecution will often be far more political than other causes, complicating both national and international responses.

We would advocate for keeping the different type of IDP separate, including in statistical / counting efforts. Aggregating categories would blur the lines, which in turn would make it more difficult to provide medium-term support focused on solutions in an adequate and coordinated manner. Incidentally, the different categories would also result in large increases in numbers, which may feed into xenophobic and discriminatory anxieties and narratives. This will not necessarily be an easy exercise as there are affected populations where such distinction will be difficult (e.g. Somalia and Afghanistan).

(d) Harmonize definitions and counting methodologies

Aggregate estimates of IDP numbers are based on national definitions and hence not directly comparable. What it means to be an IDP varies significantly across countries.² Some governments carry out periodic registration exercises and IDPs are identified individuals with specific rights, entitlements, and/or obligations deriving from their situation. In other contexts, IDP numbers mainly refer to broad estimates of the number of people who have been forced to leave their residences, with no clear identification of specific individuals. For example, there is no consensus on how far a person must flee in order to be considered internally displaced, the definition of internal displacement for nomadic populations, or whether children born to IDPs in displacement are themselves counted as IDPs. In addition, the crafting of a definition for IDPs and its application in a particular context may be influenced by political factors: for example, in some contexts it may be politically expedient to recognize only IDPs displaced by some parties to the conflict or IDPs of particular ethnicities, while in others, governments continue designating people as IDPs in order to create leverage in territorial negotiations.

Uncertainty on numbers is exacerbated by methodological challenges. There are significant practical challenges associated with the collection of data on IDPs, especially in conflict-affected and inaccessible areas. These issues can lead to both over- and under-reporting of IDPs, and comparing or aggregating data across displacement situations may be misleading. Furthermore, the direct link between estimates of displaced populations and humanitarian assistance can lead to over-reporting of IDP numbers.

Aggregate numbers hide some fundamental variations across situations that impact what an adequate response should look like. As a way to designate a group of people who share key socio-economic characteristics, the term IDP is not particularly instructive: it aggregates situations that have little in common, from people surviving in the midst of ongoing violence in Syria to people who have been rebuilding their lives in the slums of Bogota for over a generation. These people may have more in common with people living near them than with each other. In fact, the stock of IDPs can be roughly broken down into three groups – people living in the midst of conflict (e.g., Syria); people fleeing part of their countries to stable regions and still in a situation of flux (e.g., Northeast Nigeria); and people who have been settled as IDPs in stable environments for years or decades (e.g.,

² See Technical Report on the Statistics of Internally Displaced Persons, Chapter 3 (<https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3859598/9316015/KS-GQ-18-003-EN-N.pdf/2f5996ce-c15f-42a2-b659-ed1b843a596e>)

among some of the largest producers (and hosts) of internal displacement. In combination, this aims to increase the amount of international assistance supporting IDPs and their hosts.

Additional instruments may be considered to support private sector investment in areas with high concentrations of IDPs. This will be especially needed if these are lagging or far-away regions which were not attractive to start with.