

Report on the Meeting
on
WHEN INTERNAL DISPLACEMENT ENDS

sponsored by

The Brookings Institution-Johns Hopkins SAIS Project on Internal Displacement
The Georgetown University Institute for the Study of International Migration
The Global IDP Project of the Norwegian Refugee Council

24 September 2002
Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, Geneva

Introduction

A meeting on the subject of When Internal Displacement Ends was convened on 24 September 2002, co-sponsored by the Brookings Institution-Johns Hopkins SAIS (School of Advanced International Studies) Project on Internal Displacement, Georgetown University's Institute for the Study of International Migration (ISIM) and the Norwegian Refugee Council's Global IDP Project. The meeting was the second in a series of consultations exploring the issue, the first having been held in Washington, D.C. on 22 April 2002. The need for these meetings had arisen from the increasing number of requests, emanating from a range of actors engaged with internally displaced persons (IDPs), for criteria to determine when internal displacement ends. In response to these queries, the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) had requested the Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General on Internally Displaced Persons, Dr. Francis M. Deng, to provide guidance and advice on definitional issues "*indicating when generically an individual would not only become an IDP but when he/she should no longer be considered under this category.*" The Representative commissioned the Brookings-SAIS Project and ISIM to assist him in responding to this request.

Participants in the Geneva meeting, which was chaired by Dr. Deng, included representatives from UN agencies, international organizations and non-governmental organizations working with the internally displaced as well as experts from universities and research institutions (see attached List of Participants). After an overview of the issue and its importance, the question of when displacement ends was explored through a number of case studies. Different options for criteria were then outlined and discussed (see attached Agenda). The new UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Sergio Vieira De Mello, joined the meeting as luncheon speaker on his Office's role with internal displacement (see Appendix).

In advance of the meeting, the following documents were circulated to participants: a discussion paper by Erin Mooney (Brookings-SAIS Project) entitled *An IDP No More? Exploring the Issue of When Internal Displacement Ends*; a legal commentary by Professor Walter Kälin (University of Bern); the summary report of the Washington meeting; and a paper on *Criteria for Determining the End of Displacement: Options for Consideration* prepared by Susan Martin (ISIM) and Mooney (see attached).¹

¹ All documents available on the Brookings Institution – SAIS Project on Internal Displacement website: <http://www.brook.edu/fp/projects/idp.htm>

Overview of the Issue

Erin Mooney introduced the issue by explaining that there were a number of reasons why it was important to answer the question of when internal displacement ends. To begin with, decisions that internal displacement has ended inevitably lead to the termination of programs addressing IDPs' particular needs; therefore, it was critical to understand the basis on which such decisions were made and the extent to which they matched realities on the ground. Operational agencies, NGOs, donors and other governments also required accurate data on the number of IDPs in order to effectively formulate programs, policies and budgets. In addition, it was important to determine when national and international resources should shift from the needs and vulnerabilities of IDPs to community-wide rehabilitation and development. Furthermore, organizations and researchers engaged in compiling statistics needed to know when to stop counting. Most importantly, IDPs were entitled to know when the benefits as well as the restrictions and risks that their designation as an "IDP" entailed would cease.

Answering the question, therefore, was not simply an academic or theoretical exercise but could have a tremendous impact on the lives of IDPs. Mooney pointed out that, currently, decisions on when internal displacement ended were made, if at all, on an *ad hoc* and arbitrary basis, whether by governments, international organizations or donors. Moreover, the methodologies used and, consequently, the conclusions reached differed among actors dramatically, thereby impeding coordinated responses.

The issue of when displacement ends could be looked at through three different lenses. The first lens was the *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement*, which specify return or resettlement as solutions to displacement. Because resettlement could entail IDPs either settling and integrating locally, in the area to which they were displaced, or resettling in another part of the country, there effectively exist three possible in-country solutions to internal displacement: return, local integration or resettlement elsewhere. The Principles further stipulate a number of conditions that these solutions must satisfy: that they be voluntary; occur in safety and dignity; non-discrimination against IDPs in areas of return or resettlement; and that assistance be provided for IDPs' recovery of or compensation for property and possessions.

The second lens was the refugee experience. While refugee law was concerned with a specific legal status, making direct analogies difficult, the experience with refugee status cessation nonetheless could offer some important guidance. At the same time, the cessation of refugee status and the end of displacement should not be linked, as the relationship between the two was not necessarily automatic and indeed might be inversely proportional.

The third lens through which to examine the issue was through case studies. The cases examined had confirmed that there exists no systematic approach to determining when displacement ends. The deciding factors vary and include, for instance: constraints on resources to assist the displaced; interest in deflecting attention from the country by deeming the displacement situation "resolved"; or emphasis, typically for political reasons, on one particular solution, most often return, to the exclusion of the alternative solutions of local integration or resettlement. In many cases, the approaches used violated the rights of the displaced.

The Washington meeting had agreed on the importance of developing criteria for when internal displacement ends, in particular to safeguard against decisions being made arbitrarily, including being driven by government or donor pressure. As to the content of the criteria, three different possible approaches had emerged from the discussions. One approach would be to focus on the causes of internal displacement and, borrowing from the refugee analogy, evaluate the existence of "changed circumstances" from those that had compelled flight in the first place.

Cause-based criteria could include, for instance, the end of a conflict or a change in government such that a well-founded fear of persecution no longer existed. Another possible approach would emphasize solutions, or the ability of IDPs either to return or resettle voluntarily and in conditions of “safety and dignity” (which would need to be further elaborated) in order to ensure the durability and effectiveness of whichever solution was chosen. Still another approach would look for when the particular needs of IDPs, in terms of protection, assistance and reintegration, ceased to exist; when IDPs no longer required special attention and assistance distinct from other populations in need or at risk, attention and resources could shift to more community-wide transitional and development assistance. Following these different approaches, three possible sets of criteria -- cause-based, solutions-based, and needs-based -- for determining when displacement ends had been developed for consideration at the Geneva meeting (see attached Options Paper by Martin and Mooney).

Participants at the Geneva meeting concurred that the issue of when displacement ends was important to address, not only for the UN but also for governments in countries experiencing internal displacement as well as for donor countries responding to these crises. It was pointed out that in some countries, assistance and attention to IDPs ceased not because the particular needs of IDPs had been met, but because money had run out. An analytical framework was needed so as to ensure that such decisions were not simply resource-driven. Rather, it was a question of determining when resources and attention should shift from a special focus on IDPs towards more holistic approaches. Most importantly, answering the question of when internal displacement ends was critical for IDPs themselves. Continuing to be an IDP, one participant suggested, in and of itself amounted to a violation of rights. There was consensus that displacement should be brought to an end for humanitarian reasons, in particular ending the disadvantages IDPs suffered as well as ensuring that they would not be held hostage to their situation, nor deprived of special assistance prematurely, by an approach driven by the availability of resources or political imperatives. Guidelines on this issue, participants agreed, would be valuable.

Case Studies

The issue of when internal displacement ends then was examined through the lens of a number of case studies, grouped according to three different types of IDP situations: protracted crises; frozen conflicts; and post-conflict situations.

Protracted Crises

Protracted crises of internal displacement were those that had persisted unresolved for several years and which typically also entailed new and ongoing displacement. Specifically, the meeting considered the cases of Burundi, Colombia and Sierra Leone.

The case of Burundi underscored that a formal end to a conflict did not automatically mean an end to internal displacement. Notwithstanding the peace accords of 2000, a fundamental change of circumstances had not taken place in Burundi: there was no effective cease-fire, and insecurity and fighting continued in several provinces, with the result that internal displacement actually had increased. Moreover, when international pressure successfully led to the closure that same year of many of the *regroupement* camps (into which several hundred thousand civilians, mainly Hutus, had been relocated), neither the government nor the international community had made the necessary preparations for returns. Indeed, international agencies had scant information

on the conditions, even the location, of most of the formerly “regrouped” population and, due to conditions of insecurity, little access to those whose location was in fact known. Many IDPs consequently were deprived of international protection and assistance, even though significant numbers remained displaced, while those who did return home did not receive the reintegration support they required. The Burundi case therefore also revealed the importance of establishing mechanisms for monitoring the conditions of displaced persons after they left a camp situation, so as to ensure they do not simply become “out of sight, out of mind”.

Colombia was another case where the end of displacement, though officially prescribed, was very difficult, under current circumstances, to envisage in real terms. According to Colombian law, a person is considered “internally displaced” for a period of three months, with a possible three-month extension, provided that s/he has formally registered (which in fact many IDPs are unable to do). Once the officially recognized duration of displacement ended, so too did the entitlement to government assistance (which it was reported less than half of registered IDPs actually receive). Although humanitarian needs for basic assistance continued to exist, including at a critical level, assistance was terminated. Deprived of socio-economic support from either the government or the international community, most of Colombia’s IDPs became part of the urban poor and effectively disappeared from attention. Few were able to return to their areas of origin. Those who managed to do so remained caught up in the midst of armed conflict and subject to further displacement. For IDPs who relocated to other parts of the country, the scope of the conflict often interfered with a lasting and effective solution. Consequently, an increasing number of IDPs have been moving across the border to seek asylum in Panama, Venezuela and Ecuador. However, restrictions on asylum have meant that this provides a solution to few. Meanwhile, the cause of displacement, namely the conflict, has continued and the real number of IDPs has continued to increase. The case of Colombia demonstrated the difficulty of envisaging an end to displacement in situations of protracted conflict. It also underlined that national responsibility for IDPs entails not only providing protection and assistance *during* displacement, but also facilitating the creation of conditions for durable solutions for IDPs and addressing the root causes of displacement.

The case of Sierra Leone provided important insights into the limitations of applying simply cause-based criteria. After more than a decade of devastating civil war, in 2001 the government, with the assistance of the international community, adopted a Resettlement Strategy for the large-scale return of officially registered IDPs (as well as refugees and ex-combatants) and the phasing out of IDP camps. The policy specified the need for the areas of return to be “sufficiently safe to allow for the return of displaced people in safety and dignity”. By the autumn of 2002, after some 220,000 registered IDPs had been resettled under this program and many more had returned home spontaneously, officially at least, there were no longer any IDPs in the country. It was pointed out, however, that the return and resettlement process had been problematic in several respects, which called into question whether displacement really had ended in Sierra Leone. For one, only IDPs who had been officially registered for assistance in the camps were entitled to receive the resettlement assistance provided for under the government Resettlement Strategy, depriving many unrecognized IDPs of assistance to return home. Second, many IDPs did not wish to return, owing to a variety of reasons, including fears of insecurity, the lack of infrastructure in areas of return, and better economic opportunities in the areas where they had sought refuge. Although no longer officially considered IDPs, they might still be in need and therefore should not be precluded from reintegration assistance. A third and related concern was that in some cases, areas of return were prematurely or inaccurately declared “safe for resettlement”, with the result that some IDPs were resettled in unsafe areas, for instance, in areas bordering Liberia which subsequently experienced cross-border raids and abductions of

civilians as well as further displacement. In addition, IDPs had not necessarily had access to adequate information about conditions in areas of return. Inadequate resettlement packages and lack of shelter and basic services in return areas had led many “resettled” IDPs to drift back to urban areas. Overall, the resettlement program had been heavily criticized, for instance by MSF, on the grounds that it was rushed, poorly planned and “more closely resembled eviction than resettlement”.

Frozen Conflicts

The case of Georgia illustrated the challenges of bringing an end to internal displacement in situations of so-called “frozen conflicts”, characterized by an extended absence of active hostilities but where an end to the conflict nonetheless remained elusive. After upwards of a decade of being displaced, IDPs from the breakaway region of Abkhazia were still unable to return owing to continued insecurity in the area and the lack of a political settlement to the conflict. At the same time, the government had resisted providing support for the integration of IDPs into their host communities for fear of diminishing pressure for pursuing a resolution to the conflict. As a result, IDPs were effectively being held politically hostage to the goal of return. Indeed, IDPs feared that if they were to integrate in areas of displacement, even temporarily, they would lose their right to return to Abkhazia, as surveys suggest the majority of IDPs would prefer to do. Donors, however, have been eager to shift from emergency relief to more development-oriented programs in order to avoid creating long-term dependency among IDPs. In recent years, the government has taken certain steps in this direction with the adoption of the “New Approach” which has sought to improve living conditions and promote greater self-reliance among IDPs. However, the basic thrust remains one of emphasizing the right to return as the only means of bringing an end to displacement.

In the discussion, it was noted that a similar dynamic also was at play in Azerbaijan. One participant suggested that if the government did not facilitate or allow the international community to assist in facilitating local resettlement and reintegration, the international community should be prepared to take a strong stand and cease to consider such IDPs entitled to international protection and assistance. It was pointed out that in some cases, such an approach had worked to induce governments to assume greater responsibility for improving the conditions of the displaced, all the while maintaining the emphasis on the right to return. Reference also was made to the case of Cyprus, where decades after having been displaced, IDPs had more or less permanently integrated into local communities but were still counted as IDPs for political purposes, i.e., the absence of a settlement to the conflict. These situations of frozen conflict raised important questions about the appropriateness of focusing strictly on the causes of displacement as a determinant of when displacement ends.

Post-Conflict

An examination of several post-conflict situations -- the Balkans, Angola, Rwanda and Sri Lanka -- underscored that an end to conflict does not necessarily bring displacement effectively to an end.

The experience in the Balkans suggested that the question of when displacement ends depended very much on political factors beyond simply an end to the hostilities. It was pointed out that in cases such as Kosovo and Bosnia-Herzegovina, addressing the complex constitutional issues stemming from the origins of the conflicts would be key to enabling durable solutions for

the displaced. While in Kosovo, security was the main reason why IDPs were not returning and thus should be a primary concern, constitutional uncertainties were an additional and contributing factor, and one that was heavily politicized and closely linked to the question of return. As in Georgia, there existed strong political preferences for the solution of return, rather than resettlement. However, it was argued that when adequate conditions for return did not exist, IDPs should not be kept in limbo; the conditions should be created -- legal, political and socio-economic -- to enable them to integrate locally, if only temporarily, without compromising the option of return. A political commitment for such an approach with the adoption of a national action plan for facilitating both return *and* resettlement was important. Indeed, it was suggested that the criteria for when displacement ends should be the existence of key enabling conditions such as safety, resolution of property issues and socio-economic conditions so that IDPs truly have options to pursue whichever solution -- return, local integration or resettlement -- they prefer. Moreover, because these conditions, in particular the socio-economic ones, would only come about when financial institutions were involved, it was suggested that these actors should be more actively engaged in the question of when displacement ends.

The case of Angola provided an example not only of the value of developing standards for IDP return and resettlement but also of the importance of ensuring that these standards are monitored and observed. Even before the peace agreement had been signed, Norms for the Resettlement of Displaced Populations, based on the Guiding Principles, had been elaborated which set out minimum standards for resettlement including safety, access to land, education, food, potable water, shelter, clothing, medical services and sanitation. Following the cessation of hostilities in April 2002, the government announced the closure of IDP camps and transit centers and said that the return of the displaced to their areas of origin should be achieved by the end of the year. However, only ten percent of IDPs who returned to their areas of origin had done so as part of the resettlement plan formulated in accordance with the Norms; the overwhelming majority of IDPs had returned in the absence of security guarantees and without reintegration assistance. Half of the sites to which IDPs returned were insecure and in many return areas landmines were rampant. Moreover, it was reported that in many cases, IDPs had been encouraged by the government to return on the basis of false information on the conditions in areas of return.

The experience of Angola underscored that an end to displacement should not be driven by a government's timeframe, but rather when the necessary conditions for return and resettlement, specified in defined standards, existed. It also made clear that it is essential to put in place mechanisms for monitoring and supporting the creation of these conditions and respect for these standards. Having learned this lesson, OCHA was working with the government of Angola to train administrators at the municipal level on the minimum standards for resettlement set out in the Norms. It was suggested that it would also be valuable for UN monitors or human rights officers to be deployed in areas of return to monitor and, together with the government, help to address protection concerns.

In Rwanda, after the government had ordered the dismantling of camps in the Northwest and the relocation of the displaced into new villages in 1998, there were markedly differing opinions among UN officials and agencies as well as international NGOs as to whether the "villagization" process marked the end of displacement. The position of OCHA initially was that all those IDPs who had relocated to housing sites in the villages had permanently resettled and therefore should no longer be considered IDPs. However, after determining that a number of the relocation sites lacked basic infrastructure and adequate housing, OCHA introduced a slight change by using the term "newly relocated" rather than "resettled" to describe these people. For UNHCR, IDPs in

Rwanda ceased to be “people of concern” to the agency at some point within a year after their resettlement. The IASC’s Special Coordinator on Internal Displacement, however, subsequently questioned these approaches, especially as resettlement had not necessarily been voluntary and most of the IDPs who had relocated to the villages continued to suffer basic humanitarian needs. Moreover, he pointed out that it was difficult to reconcile the conclusion of UN agencies in Rwanda with the position adopted in Burundi, where people continued to be considered IDPs even though they had been resettled for several years in what were considered to be acceptable conditions. The U.S. Committee for Refugees (USCR), meanwhile, continued to count as IDPs those among the resettled population who lacked essentials such as proper shelter and land allocation for farming opportunities; later, due to difficulties in identifying and quantifying who was an IDP, USCR counted no Rwandans as internally displaced.

Comparing these various approaches, the one criterion that all actors viewed as essential for ending displacement was permanent resettlement. However, there was little or no consensus on other issues. For example, concerns raised by some organizations about the voluntary nature of the process did not appear to be given sufficient weight in decisions about whether to continue to consider relocated populations as IDPs. Some actors did take into account factors such as the fulfillment of basic humanitarian needs and access to land, but differed in their conclusions as to whether these criteria had been met. Outstanding basic humanitarian needs, it was explained, was the key reason why NRC’s Global IDP Project continued to maintain a country report on Rwanda although it did not have a specific figure for the IDP population.

The case of Rwanda therefore illustrated the significantly different approaches of agencies and organizations to the issue of when internal displacement ends. Indeed, it had been pivotal in highlighting to the UN the need for clarity and a common approach on this issue. It also demonstrated the strong role that governments could play in deciding when internal displacement ends and how international agencies might simply echo the government’s position.

Though the case of Sri Lanka was not yet formally post-conflict, it was suggested that it was timely not only for IDPs, but also for national reconciliation and as an important peace dividend, to begin to consider moving away from a situation of displacement. At the same time, it was emphasized that in the rush towards peace, care should be taken to ensure that “rights are not bargained away.” It was therefore essential that the process of ending displacement should occur in compliance with internationally recognized and measurable standards, especially in terms of protection and development. As regards protection, it was suggested that the change of circumstances required in order to apply cause-based criteria and the refugee analogy should be the creation of an environment where not only the government but also non-state actors respect international standards of human rights and humanitarian law. Protection concerns, it was pointed out, would especially be a challenge for returning minorities.

A needs-based approach also was applicable to the Sri Lankan case. In fact, a national framework for relief, rehabilitation and reconciliation as well as a task force to examine humanitarian needs and solutions had been established. It was critical for these initiatives to be guided by international humanitarian law, human rights law, the Guiding Principles, and the Sphere Minimum Standards for humanitarian assistance. Standards and guidelines for returnees had been developed in Sri Lanka which sought to identify and remove possible obstacles to return, in particular security concerns such as landmines, road conditions for access to the population, housing conditions, and access to public services and infrastructure in areas of return. It was suggested that what was really at issue in discussing when displacement ends was the need to recreate viable livelihoods for the displaced. IDPs accordingly needed to be supported in making the transition from relief to development, with this process being linked to the

development of the country as a whole. To bring together these protection and development approaches, IDPs would need to be able to recover their full entitlements and rights as well as regain means to livelihood.

UNHCR's Perspective

Given its expertise in situations of displacement, in particular its guidelines for the cessation of refugee status and its involvement in IDP situations, UNHCR was invited to comment on its approach to when internal displacement ends. UNHCR's representative began by noting that for IDPs, unlike with refugees, there was legally no need to declare an "end to displacement". Applying by analogy to IDPs the cessation clause in refugee law therefore was not necessary and would be unhelpful and undermine IDPs' rights. Nonetheless, in UNHCR's view it was critically important to consider and forge consensus on what constitutes a solution for IDPs. In this connection, agreed criteria on when displacement ends would be valuable. While UNHCR, for its own part, did not have a defined approach to the issue of when displacement ends, generally speaking it would consider internal displacement to end once IDPs were able to freely choose and attain a sustainable solution.

Solutions to displacement, UNHCR emphasized, must be voluntary. As citizens, IDPs were entitled to freedom of movement and choice of residence. Forced displacement, however, constrained the exercise of this freedom. It was only when the factors inducing forced displacement were removed and conditions for safe and dignified return were created that IDPs would truly be able to make free choices as to where to live: whether to return, to stay where they are, or to move elsewhere. To have choices also meant that exercising any of these options would not come at the expense of the enjoyment of other rights.

Having the choice to return, integrate locally, or relocate, however, was only the first step towards solutions. In the case of refugees, UNHCR had a legitimate concern for the *consequences* of return and for promoting the sustainability of return in conditions of safety, dignity and equality. Sustainable return required the assurance both of the returnees' physical and material security and a constructive relationship among returnees, the state and civil society. More concretely, this meant that returning refugees should be reintegrated into the local community, able to enjoy a normal livelihood in safety and dignity, and have equal access to protection from national authorities. These considerations would also be relevant to IDPs.

UNHCR suggested that a sustainable solution for IDPs should be measured against agreed criteria and indicators drawn from principles of human rights and humanitarian law, in particular those incorporated in the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, and on the basis of both a general assessment of the situation in the country as well as specific considerations regarding the situation of the displaced population. The general assessment should take into account factors such as the removal of the root causes of displacement, for instance the dismantling of oppressive forces in the context of a peace agreement; political developments including the holding of democratic elections; general respect for human rights; and socio-economic conditions. In short, what was required was a well functioning state, by which was meant a state with the capability and will to protect its citizens' safety and welfare. The specific assessment should take into account the profile of the displaced population, the conditions in areas of return or resettlement, including the prospects of physical safety, access to land, income-generating opportunities and access to basic services and basic living standards.

While noting that there were no fixed indicators as to what "reintegration" would entail, UNHCR suggested that its realization could best be measured by comparing IDPs' circumstances

with those of members of the local community and in particular by considering three types of integration -- legal, social and economic. Legal elements of integration would include land and property rights; freedom of movement and protection against forcible return; non-discrimination; and the ability to exercise citizenship rights. Social integration would include the right to participate fully and equally in public affairs at all levels as well as equal access to public services, including welfare, public housing and education. The economic dimension of integration would require equality of access to employment and income-generating opportunities. In all three areas of reintegration, putting in place these conditions for displaced persons would be a gradual process that would likely progress in parallel with general developments in a country such as national reconciliation processes, improvements in human rights protection, and socio-economic development.

In protracted conflict situations, it was UNHCR's view that the individual's hope to return to his/her area of origin should be balanced with not only the prospects for safe return but with the conditions in areas where IDPs were currently located. If conditions of safe return did not yet exist and could not be envisaged for the foreseeable future, but IDPs were considered to have "an acceptable level of integration" in their current location, this could be considered a durable solution and a basis for phasing out IDP-specific assistance. An IDP's right to return, whenever conditions allowed, would remain untrammelled, based on the right to freedom of movement.

Furthermore, UNHCR emphasized that the application of the cessation clause for refugees would not necessarily imply that a solution had been reached for IDPs or that protection and assistance for them should be discontinued. The cessation of refugee status, after all, simply implied that refugees from a particular country were no longer in need of international protection outside his or her country; however, once they returned, they might still require assistance for their reintegration to ensure its sustainability. IDPs' needs might be different and therefore should be separately assessed. Even with a determination that internal displacement had ended, instead of prompting a phasing out of assistance, this should lead, rather, to a shifting of resources from displacement camps or sites to places of return or relocation, where support would still be required. For determining when internal displacement ends, UNHCR would favor a mixed solutions-focused and needs-based approach for ensuring durable solutions together with a protection, or rights-based, approach.

Discussion of Possible Criteria

Susan Martin introduced the Options Paper, which, building on the Washington consultations, set out three possible sets of criteria for determining when the international community should no longer consider IDPs as such (see attached).

(i) Cause-based criteria: The first set of criteria was focused on the causes of internal displacement and, drawing on the refugee analogy, considered the existence of "changed circumstances" to signal the end of internal displacement. Because refugee law was concerned with people who were unable to enjoy the protection of their governments, the availability of national protection was the key determinant of when the international protection that refugee law affords was no longer necessary. For IDPs, the availability of national protection could likewise determine when international concern would end. More specific criteria could be constructed to address the different reasons for displacement outlined in the Guiding Principles. In the case of conflict-induced displacement, obvious indicators would be the end of hostilities and the restoration of peace. The case studies, however, had underscored that the signing of a peace agreement and a formal end to conflict did not necessarily signify the establishment of conditions

of safety and the ability of IDPs to secure national protection. Cause-based indicators therefore should evidence a sufficient change of circumstance in a situation such that the safety and security of the population could be assured. They should include, for instance, indicators measuring political changes within the country, for example, the holding of free and fair elections, restoration of the rule of law, and the protection of minority rights. Just how extensive such changes would need to be in order for the causes of displacement to be considered as addressed was an open question.

Moreover, in situations, such as Georgia or Kosovo, where displacement had occurred as a result of fundamental and seemingly intractable differences in the country regarding its borders or constitution, additional indicators other than strictly cause-based criteria might be needed. This would seem particularly important in the case of frozen conflicts, where although a cease-fire had been in place for several years, a peace agreement remained elusive. Furthermore, cause-based criteria might not be as useful in determining when displacement ends for persons displaced because of development projects or other causes which are irreversible, such that return of the affected population would be impossible.

(ii) Solutions-based criteria: A second set of criteria was focused on the possibility of solutions to displacement, whether return or resettlement in another community (either in the country of origin or in another country). The feasibility of these solutions, especially that of resettlement, did not necessarily depend upon a change in the circumstances that caused the displacement. Key guiding principles should be the voluntary nature of return or resettlement as well as its occurrence in safety and dignity. The case studies and the discussions had underlined the need for a mechanism to monitor compliance with these standards. Moreover, to be durable, a solution would require the reintegration of IDPs into the community of return or resettlement, as evidenced by non-discrimination and their ability to fully participate in the political, social and economic life of the community. Solutions might also entail restitution of or compensation for property or land lost as a result of displacement.

(iii) Needs-based criteria: A third set of possible criteria was concerned with the continuation of displacement-related needs and vulnerabilities. When IDPs ceased to have specific protection, assistance or reintegration needs related to their displacement, they would no longer need to be the subject of international assistance and protection. This would be true even though they might not have permanently resettled and might continue to have needs based on other factors such as poverty. These criteria would apply to IDPs who were able to access national assistance and protection, were not discriminated against in the exercise of their rights, and did not have unmet needs arising from their displacement. In the course of the discussions, particular emphasis was placed upon the importance to IDPs of the restoration of their livelihood, adequate shelter, and their ability to enjoy equal access to public services such as education and healthcare.

The three sets of possible criteria, Martin explained, need not be mutually exclusive and indeed include overlapping elements, which might suggest the need for an integrated approach to the issue. What was required was to consider more closely the appropriateness of each of the approaches and to think through more specifically the indicators that should be included in a “checklist” as to when internal displacement ends.

As to the overall thrust of the criteria, some participants pointed out that while it would be important to set high standards, these should not be so high that operational agencies could not implement them. It also was suggested that if the criteria were too encompassing, not only donors and financial institutions but also international agencies would shy away from the issue. Others, however, argued that precisely because the end result would be a determination that there

was no longer an international interest and obligation to assist and protect IDPs, the standards should be high and not necessarily easy to achieve. If the threshold were too low, IDPs would be endangered. In the interests of IDPs, the consensus was that the bar should be set as high as possible.

Certain criteria for the end of displacement, participants agreed, already could be found in the Guiding Principles. Solutions-based criteria of IDPs re-establishing themselves in a particular location, either through return, local integration or resettlement, were considered essential. Another criterion was that these processes should be voluntary. Still another was that they should occur in safety. A fourth criterion was that of dignity, for which the principle of non-discrimination was crucial, including in terms of ensuring IDPs' access to education, social security, health care, and income-generating opportunities -- all elements considered necessary for a solution to be durable.

The cause-based approach was considered to make an important contribution in particular in providing a starting point that an IDP would no longer be of concern to the international community once s/he was able to obtain the protection and assistance of the national government. If s/he was able to access national protection but nonetheless continued to move around, s/he should be considered an internal migrant, but not an IDP. In cases of displacement as a result of conflict, it was suggested that determining when displacement ends appeared relatively straightforward: an end to conflict should allow the protection of the national authority to become possible, as evidenced by the rule of law, including a functioning judiciary and government, though the putting into place of these conditions was not automatic and should be closely monitored and supported.

Much more complicated were situations of frozen conflicts such as Georgia and Azerbaijan. It might be that cause-based criteria, which would require an end to the conflict, set too high a standard in such situations where, by definition, there was no end to the conflict in sight. Indeed, these cases demonstrated the danger of using strictly cause-based criteria. Because the government had tied the fate of the displaced so closely to resolution of the conflict and the specific solution of return, even after more than a decade, IDPs have been impeded from taking action to promote their self-reliance and economic integration in their places of residence. Under such circumstances, many participants were of the view that it might be in the best interests of IDPs to do away with cause-based criteria, which could effectively hold IDPs as political hostages and freeze them in a situation of internal displacement and dependency. There was a strong humanitarian imperative to bring IDPs out of such a situation. To this end, it was suggested that a combination of needs-based criteria with a solutions-based approach, which allowed the options of resettlement as well as return, might be most appropriate.

Solutions-based criteria, which ensured an end to the factual situation of displacement, either through return or resettlement (locally or elsewhere in the country), were widely regarded as critically important. Indeed, as specified in the Guiding Principles, the state has a *responsibility* to create conditions to enable IDPs to pursue these solutions voluntarily as well as in safety and dignity. There was strong consensus among participants, however, that it would not be sufficient to say that displacement had ended simply because return or resettlement had taken place. In the absence of safety, basic services, infrastructure and income-generating opportunities in these areas, return or resettlement would only be temporary and therefore not a true solution. Language regarding sustainability therefore should be built into solutions-based criteria and spelled out in some detail. To be durable, it was suggested that return and resettlement should be closely linked to development. In Angola, the standards for return and resettlement set forth the elements required for durable solutions, such as safety, access to land,

education, food, potable water, housing, clothing, medical services and sanitation. These were core elements that should also be incorporated into general criteria for when displacement ends.

One concern with a solutions-based approach was that there has tended to be little information and analysis as to what happens to people once they return or resettle. Some of the case studies had underscored the need for monitoring, especially of conditions of physical safety, upon return or resettlement. Participants added that it was also important to monitor IDPs' assistance and reintegration needs. The experience of displacement, especially in protracted situations and prolonged dependency, might create long-term vulnerability such that IDPs, even after return or resettlement and initial reintegration, might experience particular challenges over the long term that would need to inform deliberations about when displacement ends. Closer attention also needed to be paid to the situation of urban displaced persons, who typically disappeared from statistics after migrating to the cities and merging in among the urban poor, but did not necessarily intend to resettle there permanently and continued to experience unique needs and vulnerabilities stemming from their displacement.

Accordingly, in addition to the emphasis on solutions, participants expressed strong interest in including needs-based criteria, according to which displacement would be considered to end when the particular needs of IDPs stemming from their displacement, and requiring special support, could be said to have ceased. Thereafter, IDPs might still have needs, but these would be of a more general nature, similar to those experienced by other members of the community, including persons who had not been displaced. The concept of "needs" should be clearly spelled out and include protection as well as assistance and rights as well as vulnerabilities. The Guiding Principles, it was pointed out, provided a useful indication of some of the most important particular assistance, protection and reintegration needs and vulnerabilities experienced by the internally displaced.

Some participants suggested that in using needs-based criteria, it would also be important to consider different degrees of displacement, in terms of the duration of displacement, and the relative level of needs and vulnerability. For example, a distinction could be made between persons who had been displaced for a period of a few months or less and those who had been displaced for several years, whom it was suggested might be less vulnerable. In the DRC, for instance, some humanitarian agencies had found that people who had been displaced for ten years were being considered the same as people who had just been displaced even though the "older" IDPs might be working and therefore in a significantly different situation from the newly displaced. A counter-example, however, had been noted during discussion of the case of Colombia, where the opposite was true: the long-term IDPs who, officially, were no longer considered IDPs or eligible for government assistance, were found to be in an even worse situation than the newly displaced. Elsewhere, there were also cases of IDPs fleeing their homes repeatedly, on a nightly basis or whenever fighting flared up in the region, but returning to their homes and fields during the day. Rather than assuming that the level of IDPs' needs were determined by the duration of displacement, needs-based criteria that measured the objective needs and vulnerabilities of the displaced would address the very different situations in which displacement occurs.

As to how to measure when IDP-specific needs would cease to exist, there was some cautioning that the needs-based criteria should not be guided by a false concept of the conditions that existed before displacement began. Emphasis, it was argued, should not be put on a "return to normalcy" because "normalcy" was something few people knew even before displacement occurred and when in most cases those affected already were extremely vulnerable. In determining when displacement ends, the emphasis should instead be on when the vulnerability

resulting from displacement, the differential vulnerability, ends. As a cautionary example, one participant pointed out that the World Bank had developed definitions for responding to development-induced displacement which essentially sought “to make people whole again” but that these were so expansive and expensive to be unrealistic for the international community to monitor and finance. In this connection, it was suggested that both the needs-based and solution-based approaches to when displacement ends would require a definition of “basic livelihood”. To support the restoration of livelihoods, the nexus between development and humanitarian relief would be critical. The key principle should be to seek to foster self-reliance at every stage. The assistance that IDPs receive should change over time according to their situation; at a certain stage, IDPs would likely need more development-focused assistance than humanitarian aid, and it accordingly might be a different international agency that would help them. Especially in protracted crises and frozen conflicts, the development regime needed to come in earlier and more strongly.

To the three sets of criteria outlined in the Options Paper, the Geneva discussions also added rights-based criteria. It was pointed out that an emphasis on human rights would enable a distancing of the discussion from an actor-driven approach (whether the actor be a government, international agency, or donor) to a more people-centered approach, focused on the needs and rights of the IDPs themselves. The right to freedom of movement, it was suggested, should be the overarching principle as it ensured IDPs the right to choose among possible solutions, rather than be held hostage to a particular solution such as return; it also provided for an understanding of the conditions that would have to be put in place in order for people to exercise this right. Solutions-based criteria, which articulated the right to return or to resettle, brought out this right most predominantly. Solutions-based and rights-based criteria, however, were not mutually exclusive. The refugee analogy had shown that people could resettle but still decide later to return home; in other words, a person did not give up the right to return because s/he chose to resettle. For IDPs, this was especially clear: as citizens of their country, they enjoyed the right to freedom of movement. They could integrate locally but still retain the right to claim property in the area of origin, because this right was not linked to whether or not a person was an IDP. Rights-based criteria therefore could provide an important means of addressing the challenges presented in situations of frozen conflicts where IDPs were held hostage to the specific solution of return and in the meantime denied the right to resettle and integrate locally.

Moreover, rights-based criteria underscored that solutions would need to entail addressing the underlying causes of displacement in order to ensure viability. In this connection, cause-based criteria for measuring an objective change of human rights circumstances also were needed. In situations such as Colombia, for example, it would be difficult to envisage an end to the conflict and concomitant displacement unless the deep social inequities at the root of the conflict were addressed. Furthermore, needs-based criteria that focus on bringing to an end the specific needs and vulnerabilities created by displacement, thereby contributing to the sustainability of solutions, would have to assert the right of returning or resettling IDPs to enjoy their social, economic and political rights on a par with the resident population.

As to the structure of the criteria, participants recommended that the typology that the meeting had used for examining different case studies -- countries in active conflict, frozen conflicts, and countries in transition -- would be a useful organizing principle, especially as different contexts would require different approaches. In protracted conflict situations, such as Colombia, there appeared to be no end to displacement: people continued to move but no solution was in sight and return or resettlement was not sustainable. On the other hand, in situations such as post-conflict Sierra Leone or in Burundi after the closure of the *regroupement*

camps, return or resettlement did not mean that displacement had ended or that the particular needs created by displacement had dissipated.

Situations of frozen conflict seemed to demand specific criteria to strike a balance between protecting the right of IDPs to return and ensuring that they are not made hostage to this goal and impeded from pursuing the alternative solution of resettlement and local integration. Views differed, however, as to whether IDPs should continue to be regarded as IDPs if they were able to find a durable solution elsewhere in the country but remained interested in return, if and when safe return became possible. Some participants argued that IDPs in this situation should still be considered IDPs because of their inability to exercise certain rights, such as the right to return, which meant that they had not really had a choice of solution. Others, however, while not disputing that people retained the right to return as a fundamental human right, questioned whether these people should still be considered IDPs, especially in cases where the conflict remained intractable and return proved impossible for decades. Still others suggested that even if IDPs settled and integrated in a place other than their area of origin, they should retain not only the right to return but also their identification as “displaced persons” as an important part of their own identity and perspective that their situation had not been resolved.

Overall, it was stressed that indicators for when displacement ends should convey and evidence responsibility, especially of states, for bringing displacement to an end in a manner respectful of the rights of the displaced.

Conclusions

At the Geneva consultations, there was broad consensus that it would be valuable to have criteria, or a checklist of indicators, to provide guidance on when internal displacement ends. This was considered especially important so as to ensure that the approach to the issue would not be driven by the interests of a particular actor or actors, such as the government concerned or donors, but based on principled and humane criteria respecting the rights of the displaced.

Of the possible approaches set out in the Options Paper, it was proposed to consolidate the three sets of criteria into two: (i) cause-based; and (ii) durable solutions, which would combine the solutions-based criteria and the needs-based criteria. However, the fact that causes could linger on indefinitely raised some concern about cause-based criteria being given the main emphasis. Instead, the focus should be on enabling solutions for IDPs through return, local integration or resettlement. There would be cases, after all, where solutions could be possible even if the causes of displacement were not fully addressed. Strong emphasis was given to the importance of ensuring that IDPs had options for solutions and could exercise these voluntarily in safety and dignity. However, for displacement to end, these solutions also needed to be sustainable. Drawing on needs-based criteria, this would require that the particular needs, risks and vulnerabilities induced by displacement be addressed, such that the differential vulnerability of displacement ends. The Geneva discussions also added rights-based criteria, which underscored the importance of the voluntary nature of solutions, offered a useful framework for defining needs, both for protection and assistance, and provided a means for resolving some of the concerns raised by applying strictly cause-based criteria.

In another important outcome, it was recommended that the different contexts of displacement according to which the case studies had been organized could also usefully be the organizing principle for the criteria. In light of the particular challenges presented in situations of frozen conflict and displacement, it was proposed that the indicators address not only when

displacement ends but also when and under what circumstances the international community should advocate for solutions other than return.

Finally, it was agreed that a valuable next step in this process of consultation would be to share these findings and a set of draft criteria with donors and international financial institutions, which would need to play an important role in supporting effective transitions from displacement.

Rapporteur: Erin Mooney*

* Special thanks are extended to Christophe Beau and Greta Zeender of the Norwegian Refugee Council's Global IDP Project for their assistance in taking notes on the discussions.

Appendix

Luncheon Discussion with Sergio Vieira de Mello, UN High Commissioner for Human Rights

The UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Sergio Vieira de Mello, joined the meeting as its luncheon guest speaker. He began by noting that the rule of law and the importance of reaffirming it would be the key theme of OHCHR during his tenure. Human rights, he stressed, were not just an ethical, political or socio-economic imperative, but first and foremost a legal obligation of states, as well as non-state actors. Three interlinked and overarching concepts -- dignity, equality and security -- would be the pillars of his approach. The High Commissioner also emphasized his interest in exploring the notion of protection and what it should mean for OHCHR. While the meaning of protection was very clear in the mandate of UNHCR, the ICRC and UNICEF, the same could not be said of OHCHR. Greater precision would have to be given to the concept of protection and the Office's role in providing it. At the same time, he would like to strengthen OHCHR's links with humanitarian agencies and lend support to their efforts.

IDPs, the High Commissioner noted, were one of his main concerns. The issue of internal displacement was closely related to the broader concern of the protection of civilians in conflict. It was also linked to poverty since those displaced by natural disasters, at least in developing countries, typically were among the poorest of society. There were also IDPs displaced by hunger, by discriminatory policies or by policies of enforced displacement. He suggested the need for a comprehensive approach and cited the 1996 conference on population movements in the Commonwealth of Independent States as a possible model. Co-sponsored by IOM, OSCE and UNHCR, the process had facilitated governments' acknowledgement of the problem and the need for international assistance in implementing a Plan of Action that included preventive measures as well as solutions.

The High Commissioner invited participants to assist him in giving greater precision to the concept of protection and what OHCHR could do, both at the conceptual level and on the ground, to translate the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement into improved protection of the rights of IDPs.

In response, participants stressed the importance of OHCHR having a field capacity and access to populations at risk, in particular through the deployment of human rights monitors. The human rights monitoring missions in Rwanda and Colombia were pointed out as examples where OHCHR had played an important protection role with regard to IDPs. A protection survey focusing on field-level responses and gaps that was being carried out jointly by the Brookings-SAIS Project on Internal Displacement and the OCHA IDP Unit would give special consideration to the role that OHCHR could play in the field. On the conceptual side, reference was made to the IASC policy paper on protection of IDPs that had grown out of a discussion between De Mello, when he served as Emergency Relief Coordinator, the RSG on IDPs, and the previous High Commissioner for Human Rights. To support implementation of this policy, the role of the Resident and Humanitarian Coordinators remained critically important.

International operational agencies, some pointed out, often found it difficult to advocate for human rights out of concern that this would jeopardize their operational activities. However, an important shift in thinking had occurred in recent years, with recognition now being given to the linkages between humanitarian work and protection. The IASC reference group on human rights and humanitarian action was one indication of this. In the field, of course, there remained significant challenges. Resident and Humanitarian Coordinators, because of political constraints,

often felt unable to take up protection issues as robustly as protection advocates would like. Moreover, human rights field operations often were structurally part of the political, rather than humanitarian, wing of the UN, which aggravated such tensions. There was a lot of engagement on the part of the humanitarian community with the mandate of the RSG on IDPs and it was suggested that OHCHR could build on that example. One obvious link with the humanitarian community could be by the special rapporteurs, such as the one on the right to food.

It was noted that discussions about the protection role of the international community often tended to be limited to the debate over humanitarian intervention, whereas the international community's responsibility in fact was far broader. Development and donor assistance, for example, could strengthen the protection responsibility of states and of the international community. It was also important to consider how to foster the protection responsibility of non-state actors, including corporate actors. Although protection was generally considered a top-down approach, a bottom-up approach of empowerment of the populations concerned also was needed. These two approaches would reinforce one another.

With regard to internal displacement, participants noted that protection remained the main gap. It was up to OHCHR to see how it could help fill that gap, given that internal displacement was fundamentally a human rights issue. After all, if human rights were respected, there would be no arbitrary displacement. Once displaced, IDPs were more vulnerable to further human rights abuses, and the restoration of human rights was essential to solutions. This comprehensive connection between human rights and displacement should concern not just the human rights officer servicing the mandate of the RSG on IDPs but should engage the entire Office. To begin with, a human rights field presence would be critical for providing IDPs protection on the ground. But protection also related to the work of human treaty bodies, country and thematic rapporteurs, and national human rights institutions with which OHCHR was working. Also relevant was OHCHR's new project on peacekeeping and human rights since peacekeeping missions could play a critical protection role for IDPs. While there had been progress recently at OHCHR in a number of these areas, there remained scope for much more to be done, both at headquarters and on the ground, to integrate the protection of IDPs into the work of the Office.

The concept of social sustainability was also considered to be important. It was suggested that while it was easy to discuss with governments the issue of economic sustainability, that of social sustainability, which included a lot of human rights issues, was another matter. Because in many IDP situations, governments were often blocking the rights of IDPs, a way needed to be found to expand the definition of social sustainability so that human rights related issues would be considered legitimate to discuss.

The High Commissioner expressed appreciation for the comments and insights offered. Field presence, he indicated, was an issue that would be examined as a matter of priority in OHCHR. He noted with interest the suggestion that OHCHR could act as a bridge between the political and humanitarian regimes. Forging closer partnerships between the special rapporteurs and humanitarian agencies also was a good idea. In addition to international law and what the Commission and treaty bodies could do to monitor and promote its implementation, he agreed that national human rights institutions were very important; indeed, there were several positive but under-reported examples of changes in governments' behavior as a result of the work of these institutions. The High Commissioner committed to work to "mainstream" the issue of IDPs throughout OHCHR. On the issue of social sustainability, he suggested that a first step would be for the World Bank, regional development banks and the IMF to accept that development and reconstruction would not be fully effective unless they integrated human rights concerns. Doing so certainly was critical to the focus of this meeting on when internal displacement ends.

MEETING ON WHEN INTERNAL DISPLACEMENT ENDS

Geneva, 24 September 2002

sponsored by

The Brookings-SAIS Project on Internal Displacement

Georgetown University – Institute for the Study of International Migration

Norwegian Refugee Council – Global IDP Project

Criteria for Determining the End of Displacement:

Options for Consideration

The purpose of this paper is to stimulate discussion of criteria for determining when the international community should no longer consider internally displaced persons (IDPs) as such. Three sets of criteria are presented to launch the discussion. These criteria are not mutually exclusive and indeed include overlapping elements.

Cause-based criteria. One way to look at the issue would be to focus on the causes of internal displacement and, drawing on the refugee analogy, consider the existence of “changed circumstances” from those that had compelled flight to signal the end of displacement. In other words, a person would cease to be an IDP when there is a change in the circumstances that originally caused the displacement. According to the UNHCR, a change in circumstances that would warrant application of the cessation clauses of the Refugee Convention must involve the complete political transformation of the refugee’s country of origin. Evidence of such transformation may include significant reforms altering the basic legal or social structure of the State, democratic elections, declarations of amnesties, repeal of oppressive laws and dismantling of former security services. The changes must be assessed over time—a minimum of 12 to 18 months. In short, improvements in a country of origin must constitute a ‘fundamental,’ ‘stable,’ ‘durable,’ and ‘effective’ change in circumstances from those that created refugees. Applying the same logic to situations of internal displacement, displacement ends (as an issue of international concern) when there are similar political changes in the IDPs’ own country. Though the refugee cessation clause focuses on persons fleeing persecution, one could construct similar criteria to address displacement from conflict, natural disasters, and other reasons outlined in the Guiding Principles as causes of internal displacement.¹

Solutions-based criteria. Internal displacement may be considered to be at an end when IDPs return to their home communities or (re)settle in another community (either in the country of origin or in another country). This is similar to the criteria in Article 1, Section C of the Refugee Convention, which states the Convention shall not apply to people who would otherwise be refugees if they voluntarily return to the country from which they previously fled, or if they acquire the nationality of another country. The end of displacement thus would occur when an IDP, having secured or being able to secure national protection, either in his or her original home community or in another location, no longer needs international protection. Following the

¹ Cause-based criteria may not be as useful in determining when displacement ends for those forced to leave their homes because of dams and other development projects that render return impossible.

refugee criteria, the return must have been undertaken voluntarily and in safety and dignity, and the IDP must also have reintegrated in the community of origin. Similarly, local integration or resettlement must be voluntary and the IDP must be able to exercise all of the rights and fulfill all of the obligations of other nationals of the new community or country. Solutions may involve compensation for loss of property—for example, for land appropriated to build dams, pipelines or other development projects. Again following the refugee analogy, the international community would have a responsibility to monitor that the returning/resettled IDPs are safe and that they have indeed reintegrated. Reintegration is a gradual process, particularly when return or resettlement occurs in countries in transition from conflict. It can be measured by full participation by former IDPs in the social, economic and political life of the community.

Needs-based criteria. This approach to the end of displacement focuses on the continued existence of IDP-specific needs and vulnerabilities. When IDPs no longer have specific protection, assistance or reintegration needs related to their displacement, the international community would no longer consider them to be of international concern (although their displacement may continue and they may continue to have needs based on poverty or disability). These criteria could apply to IDPs who are able to access the protection and assistance of their national governments, are not discriminated in the exercise of their rights or have particular unmet needs on the basis of being displaced, and therefore do not need special international assistance and protection. It could also include IDPs who are able to support themselves and their families or who have social support networks that can assist them (although they would be considered IDPs if they have protection needs). The Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement provide guidance useful in developing criteria for determining needs that are specifically related to displacement and assessing whether the specific protection, assistance and reintegration needs of IDPs have indeed been met.

This paper was prepared by Susan Martin and Erin Mooney.

MEETING ON WHEN DISPLACEMENT ENDS

Geneva, 24 September 2002

sponsored by

The Brookings-SAIS Project on Internal Displacement

Georgetown University – Institute for the Study of International Migration

Norwegian Refugee Council – Global IDP Project

AGENDA

9:00 AM Welcome and Introductions

Host: Elisabeth Rasmusson, Norwegian Refugee Council – Global IDP Project, Geneva

Chair: Francis M. Deng, Representative of the UN Secretary-General on Internally Displaced Persons

9:30 AM Findings of Previous Meeting - April 22, Washington DC

Erin Mooney, Brookings-SAIS Project on Internal Displacement

Discussion

10:15 AM Case Studies

Introduction to Case Studies

Susan Forbes Martin, Institute for the Study of International Migration, Georgetown University

Protracted Crises

Burundi

Susan Forbes Martin, Institute for the Study of International Migration, Georgetown University

Colombia

Jozef Merkx, UNHCR

Sierra Leone

Claudia McGoldrick, Norwegian Refugee Council

Discussion

11:00 AM Coffee Break

- 11:20 AM Case Studies (cont.)
- Frozen Conflicts*
 Georgia
 Maura Lynch, UN OCHA Tbilisi
- Discussion
- 11:45 AM *Post-Conflict Situations and Peace Negotiations*
- Angola
 Jamie McGoldrick, UN OCHA Response Coordination Branch
- Balkans
 Soren Jessen-Petersen, Stability Pact for Southeastern Europe
- Rwanda
 Greta Zeender, Norwegian Refugee Council
- Sri Lanka
 Jeevan Thiagaraja, Consortium of Humanitarian Agencies – Sri Lanka
- Discussion
- 1:00 PM Luncheon
 Speaker - Sergio Vieira de Mello, UN High Commissioner for Human Rights
- 2:30 PM Criteria for when displacement ends
- Comments on UNHCR's approach
 Guillermo Bettocchi, UNHCR Division of International Protection
- Discussion of criteria
- 3:30 PM Coffee Break
- 4:00 PM Discussion of Criteria (cont.)
- 5:00 PM Conclusion and Follow-up
- 5:30 PM Close of Meeting

MEETING ON WHEN DISPLACEMENT ENDS

Geneva, 24 September 2002

sponsored by

The Brookings-SAIS Project on Internal Displacement

Georgetown University – Institute for the Study of International Migration

Norwegian Refugee Council – Global IDP Project

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Marlene Alejos	OHCHR Human Rights Officer	malejos.hchr@unog.ch
Kofi Asomani	OCHA - Internal Displacement Unit Director	asomani@un.org
Christophe Beau	Norwegian Refugee Council - Global IDP Project Senior Information Officer	christophe.beau@nrc.ch
Guillermo Bettocchi	UNHCR - Department of International Protection Special Advisor	bettocch@unhcr.ch
Paul Bonard	ICRC – Central Tracing Agency and Protection Division Deputy Head	pbonard.gva@icrc.org
Marguerite Contat-Hickel	ICRC – International Organizations Division Diplomatic Adviser	mcontathickel.gva@icrc.org
Johan Cels	Commission on Human Security Liaison Officer	cels@un.org

Roberta Cohen	Brookings-SAIS Project on Internal Displacement Co-Director	Rcohen@brookings.edu
Jeff Crisp	UNHCR - Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit Head	crisp@unhcr.ch
Francis Deng	Representative of the UN Secretary-General on Internally Displaced Persons	fdeng1@jhu.edu
Steven Holtzman	World Bank Senior Social Scientist	sholtzman@worldbank.org
Soren Jessen-Petersen	Stability Pact for Southeastern Europe - Steering Committee on Refugee Matters Chair	sorenjp@attglobal.net
Allan Jury	WFP - Strategy and Policy Division Chief	allan.jury@wfp.org
Sikander Khan	UNICEF - Emergency Operations Programme Officer	sikhan@unicef.org
Eve Lester	Amnesty International Refugee Coordinator	elester@amnesty.org
Ragnhild Lund	Norwegian University of Science and Technology Trondheim - Research Group on Forced Migration	ragnhild.lund@svt.ntnu.no

Maura Lynch	UN OCHA Tbilisi Head	maura.lynch@unocha.org.ge
Claudia McGoldrick	Norwegian Refugee Council - Global IDP Project Information Officer	claudia.mcgoldrick@nrc.ch
Jamie McGoldrick	OCHA Response Coordination Branch Head of Africa I	mcgoldrickj@un.org
Carlos Maldonado	OCHA Internal Displacement Unit Senior IDP Adviser	maldonadoc@un.org
Susan F. Martin	Georgetown University - Institute for the Study of International Migration Director	martinsf@georgetown.edu
Jozef Merkx	UNHCR Senior Desk Officer for Colombia	merkx@unhcr.ch
Erin Mooney	Brookings-SAIS Project on Internal Displacement Deputy Director	emooney3@jhu.edu
Peter Neussl	OCHA Internal Displacement Unit IDP Advisor	neussl@un.org
Elisabeth Rasmusson	Norwegian Refugee Council Resident Representative	elisabeth.rasmusson@nrc.ch
Mona Rishmawi	OHCHR Senior Human Rights Adviser	mrishmawi.hchr@unog.ch

Ed Schenkenberg van Mierop	ICVA Coordinator	ed.schenkenberg@icva.ch
Jeevan Thiagarajah	Consortium of Humanitarian Agencies – Sri Lanka Executive Director	jeevant2002@yahoo.com jeevant@sri.lanka.net
Meghan Scott	OCHA Democratic Republic of Congo	meganscott624@yahoo.com
Amina Tirana	UNDP – Transition Recovery Unit Recovery Specialist	amina.tirana@undp.org
Shyla Vohra	IOM Legal Officer	svohra@iom.int
Jonas Widgren	International Centre for Migration Policy Development Director General	Jonas.Widgren@icmpd.org
Wendy Williams	IFRC Population movement adviser	wahkahnee@hotmail.com
Greta Zeender	Norwegian Refugee Council - Global IDP Project Information Officer	greta.zeender@nrc.ch