THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

SAUL/ZILKHA ROOM

AFRICA'S GREAT LAKES REGION: A DEVELOPMENT RESPONSE TO FORCED DISPLACEMENT

Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, April 21, 2015

PARTICIPANTS:

Moderator:

ELIZABETH FERRIS
Senior Fellow and Co-Director
Brookings-LSE Project on Internal Displacement

Panel:

CORDELIA CHESNUTT
Displacement Specialist
World Bank Group

JOANNA DE BARRY
Senior Social Development Specialist
World Bank Group

STACEY WHITE
Independent Humanitarian Policy Expert

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. FERRIS: Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to Brookings. MY name is Beth Ferris. I'm a senior fellow here and co-director of the Brookings-LSE Project on Internal Displacement.

We're here this afternoon to talk about displacement in the Great Lakes region, a region which has had displacement for many years, both refugees, IDPs, returnees, layers of protracted displacement, newly displaced people. Sometimes the feeling of how is this going to end, what possibilities are there for resolving displacement.

So, we're delighted, together with the World Bank, to host this session where we'll hear from three different people; different aspects of displacement in the region. I want to point out that we may be making Brookings history in terms of the gender composition of this panel (Laughter). This is not typical of this institution but certainly --

SPEAKER: (Laughter) Yay.

MS. FERRIS: -- certainly glad to see. And we're going to begin with Stacey White. Stacey is an independent humanitarian expert who has worked with a lot of different organizations on different issues over the years. Most recently, she worked with us at Brookings in writing a study on the Democratic Republic of Congo and long-term displacement there.

This was part of a series we did, looking at how IDPs are faring 10 years after humanitarian reform, and we did case studies on DRC as well as Colombia and Somalia. And we found in those studies that the important role that development actors play, and the need to engage development actors, particularly when you're talking about long-term displacement.

So, we were thrilled to see this initiative and new study from the World Bank on displacement and the Great Lakes, which looks not only at DRC, but a number of countries in the region, from Burundi to Tanzania and so on. So, following Stacey's presentation on IDPs in DRC, we'll turn to the World Bank and we'll begin with Jo DeBuse Barry, who has a PhD in anthropology, has worked with Save the Children and other organizations, and has been at the World Bank for 10 years.

She'll then be followed by Cordelia Chesnutt, whose specialty is displacement at the World Bank, and she talk both about the study and the work that the World Bank is doing, as well as about the World Bank's engagement with displacement generally. And you know, certainly it's something that we've been watching very closely over the years, and I'm delighted to see the World Bank taking this issue seriously.

So, each of the panelists will talk for about 10, 15 minutes, and then we'll turn to Q&A. So, welcome, Stacey. We'll start with you.

MS. DE BARRY: All right. You'll cut me off I go over.

MS. FERRIS: I will cut you off, yes.

MS. DE BARRY: I just want to thank Brookings and the World Bank Global Program on Forced Displacement for organizing this event. I'm really happy to be sitting next to World Bank staff talking about internal displacement. I think it's a great, great move forward.

As Beth pointed out, I'm an independent humanitarian consultant who studies all sorts of systems and policies within the humanitarian context. I was able to luckily go to Congo in August of last year. I hadn't been there in about 20 years, so I'll say from the outset, that I am not a DRC expert per se, but what I do have is a very long-term perspective. I lived and worked on internal displacement issues in the Great Lakes

region about 20 years ago, and then was asked by Brookings to go back and see, you know, if anything had changed. So, that was a really interesting endeavor.

Under the auspices of the study, I did go to the Congo. I was in Kinshasa and Goma. I spoke to about a hundred different stakeholders; about 60 of them were IDPs themselves, to really look at the protection and assistance conditions of IDPs, and whether they had gotten any better in the last decade.

Now, specific to the particular study with Brookings, was a look at the 2005 humanitarian reforms and elements of those was things like, you know, reinforcement of the humanitarian coordinator role, introduction of the cluster system, establishment of pooled funding. So, that was the central part of my study, which you might have seen at the front door there.

I will talk much less about that today, because what was equally important in my findings was this; that the humanitarian action is only one part of a much larger architecture required to address the needs of vulnerable people in protracted displacement.

Additional to any humanitarian action is the need for explicit and accompanying political and development strategies to protect and assist IDPs. There was someone -- we went after our study, and were in Geneva and New York and here in Washington, and we were presenting our findings, and there was one colleague who said, you know, once someone's been displaced for you know, three months, it's no longer a humanitarian issue, it's a development issue. And I would strongly agree with that statement.

So, I'll organize my thoughts as follows. First, I'm just going to summarize the situation in DRC currently, because it's going on for so long. If you're like

me, you sort of dip in and out of it, and I'll just sort of give you the latest of what's happening there.

Then, I'll offer some thoughts about what some of the tricky challenges have been for both humanitarians and development actors. And finally, I'll suggest some areas in which the international community might want to look in moving forward. So today, in DRC, you basically have persistent conflict and displacement. You have between 20 and 40 armed groups still active in the country, despite multiple peace agreements over the years, including the African Union's Peace Security and Cooperation Framework for DRC and the region, which was the latest one signed in February of 2013, which my colleagues have mentioned in their report in a broader way.

There was a lot of optimism generated by the defeat of the M23 rebel group at the end of 2013, in conjunction with MONUSCO's force intervention brigade, but that euphoria has given way to a much more realistic view that this is not going to be easy in the Congo, and one defeat is not going to define the future of the country. There are more rebel groups to disarm, most notably the FTLR, which is the most threatening armed group in DRC, and the FTLR had a deadline, actually, of January 2nd, 2015 to completely disarm. It did not.

At the same time, you have real worries of increased violence and the forced closure of camps with the upcoming November, 2016 elections. Already things are destabilized in the country.

And what you have with that is an underlying push on the part of the government for a camp exit strategy. So, in this context, you have an estimated 2.7 million IDPs in DRC, which is overwhelmingly the majority of IDPs in the region. It's about the fourth or fifth largest IDP population in the world.

According to the most recent strategic plan that the UN released at the end of 2014 for 2015, they estimate that 75 percent of these IDPs are in a situation of prolonged displacement, which they define as over 6 months, and 25 percent have been displaced for less than 6 months. These IDPs are in 59 camps in North Kivu. Those are the only camps in the country.

These IDPs receive the greatest visibility and easy accessibility, although the large majority, they say between 70 and 80 percent of IDPs live with host families. But the fact of the matter is, and what I found when I went in August is no one has any idea how these IDPs living with host families are getting on, or how these host families are getting on. No real assessments have ever been done in all of the years that the international community has been engaged in the country.

In addition, you have a government that has really never taken a leadership role in dealing with IDPs. There's no national IDP policy in place. Yes, they did ratify the Kampala Convention in the summer of last year, which is a positive step, but they've also signed other agreements that include protection and assistance elements for IDPs, and nothing has really changed. So, cynics sort of really wonder whether these national level actions are going to have any sort of impact on the ground, especially in the east, where there's only limited authority of the government anyway.

In terms of the international response, you have an integrated United Nations mission there for nearly 15 years. MONUSCO's the largest peacekeeping mission in the world, with some 22,000 uniformed personnel. It has been ineffectual in neutralizing armed groups. Of course, there was you know, the success of defeating the M23, but since then, hopes for the forced intervention brigade have kind of fallen apart, and in fact, there's been a rift between the Congolese government and MONUSCO, and

the latest intervention on the part of the Congolese troops was taken unilaterally against FDLR without any support from MONUSCO. So, that's not encouraging.

And further to that, you have a breakdown really, of the United Nations leadership in the country. You have the deputy special representative for rule of law and operations in Eastern Congo who just left the country for another post. You have Martin Kobler, who is the head of MONUSCO who brought a lot of energy and a lot of hope to the MONUSCO mission, who is going to be leaving soon.

And you also have the deputy special representative, and he was also the humanitarian coordinator and the resident coordinator, Mustafo Sumari, who is also going to be leaving. So, the leadership is going to completely change, which with the elections coming up is not really perfect timing.

So, what do you have? You have sustained international humanitarian engagement. That's basically what the international humanitarian community has done for nearly 20 years now. The total investment over the last 10 years is $5.5 billion, but there's been no progress beyond the narrowest of humanitarian objectives. Basically, they -- you know, any efforts to actually get IDP's not -- I mean, people not to be displaced because of the violence, nothing has happened, and any efforts towards durable solutions have also been you know, unsuccessful.

So, what do I see as the key challenges? I mean, basically, IDPs and their -- numbers and their vulnerability have persisted, and what has been impossible to achieve during all the years of sustained humanitarian engagement is a real transition towards durable solutions, either through return, local integration or resettlement in other parts of the country.

As a result, humanitarians find themselves in a no man's land, neither

operating in a traditional emergency, nor moving towards a more transitional setting. And you have organizations like MSF who have pulled out of the camps, because it's not an emergency context for them, and they would like someone else to take over.

At the same time, the development actors don't consider it to be a development context, because in fact, there's still conflict going on, so no one is filling the vacuum. Year after year, if you look through all of the different humanitarian action plans for the last 10 years, you know, they do the same thing. It's basically: alleviate human suffering and save lives, and it never really goes beyond that.

There's a general malaise amongst humanitarians about what to do next, and a lack of vision and funding about what kinds of activities are best suited to assist IDPs in this situation of chronic insecurity. There was little interest when I was there -- I would say no interest on the part of traditional donors in a more diversified portfolio, which would actually give money for emergency activities, and at the same time, set aside some money for transitional activities or activities that could build the autonomy of IDPs who are going to be living in this chronic situation. So, that was a little bit disheartening.

At the same time, actors acknowledge that very little is known about IDPs, despite almost 20 years of assistance, making it even more difficult to determine how to help them. How am I doing on time?

MS. FERRIS: About three minutes.

MS. WHITE: Okay, cool. The other issue is that the few discussions that have taken place with the government about return, they center almost entirely on return, so they don't want to talk about local integration. They don't want to talk about resettlement, and there's a very strong national resistance to local integration.

But in fact, the camp coordination management sort of work -- it's not a cluster, but it's a working group in Kivu, recently did a survey where they registered all of the IDPs living in the camps of Goma, and over half of the people wanted to integrate locally outside of Goma, and about half, 47 percent wanted to return.

So, you really need to look at that seriously as international community in terms of a real, viable option that people want, and that would involve an urban planning of Goma, which has doubled in size over the last several years, and is really turning into this sort of patchwork of shanty towns and slums, and you know, it needs adequate infrastructure, also social services, et cetera.

So, that's something really, where a partnership between humanitarians and development actors could build something that -- you know, there's an actual vision there. So, the task at hand in DRC is to explore what to do when nothing changes. It's clear that the current approach is doing nothing beyond maintaining the status quo, and may arguably be diminishing the resilience of populations over time.

So, I would recommend a diversified two pronged approach that would improve the protection and assistance of IDPs over the long-term, but also, be agile and responsive enough to address the inevitable shocks and the new displacements that will inevitably occur, especially with the elections coming up.

You know, all of this requires a bit of a paradigm shift, one that brings the issue of displacement more squarely in the operating arenas of development actors, but also, politicians who need to take responsibility for new displacements that continue to occur. Two of the main areas where I think humanitarian development partnerships could help to lay some groundwork for durable solutions are a development plan for Goma, which I mentioned, and also, some really sustained and thoughtful help with

regard to land disputes. And I will end it there.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you very much, although you painted a quite depressing picture (Laughter) in terms of humanitarian efforts to respond to this situation. But let's turn now to development actors, and see what the World Banks has to say about this situation within the Great Lakes generally. Please, Jo.

MS. DE BARRY: Thank you. Well, we were very delighted when your report came out, because it paralleled and reinforced many of the messages that we have been putting together over the last year, and are brought together in these reports, for which there are copies, I hope, at the back, available.

So, it seemed to dovetail nicely, which is why we proposed this event here today. We too, believe very strongly that a development response is needed to the challenges of forced displacement, not just in the DRC, but in the greater Great Lakes region more generally, and we say that as a development agency who we are trying to convince to engage in this topic.

So, why do we think that a development response is needed? Many of the rationales, many of the justifications for a development response are very much echoed in what you've just said. First of all, this is 3.3 million people affected, most of whom are living in abject poverty. We know that some people survive and do well out of the experience of forced displacement, but that for the majority, that is an impoverishing experience.

And as a development agency whose goal is to eliminate poverty, we know that we can't achieve that goal unless we work with those who have been forcibly displaced. So, if we want to achieve our vision of ending poverty, displacement is a topic that we just have to take on, because that is such an impoverishing experience.

Secondly, the poverty impacts of displacement are compounded, because displaced people often end up in the poorest parts of the country and put additional strain and constrain the opportunities for development in those parts of the country and for the country as a whole. So, there's a kind of double whammy of the poverty impacts of displacement.

Thirdly, we think a development response is needed, because as you said, much of the forced displacement in the Great Lakes region is now, very sadly protracted. We have refugees, for example, in Zambia and Tanzania who have been forcibly displaced and unable to return home for more than 40 years now. And very soon, after the emergency phase is over and more and more as you go into a protracted displacement situation, the needs of the forcibly displaced are developmental.

They are not just about emergency care and protection. They are around things like how to have access to land, how to cultivate, how to have a sustainable livelihood, how to get children back into education, how to have mainstream access to service provision, how to have voice in representation and how to be included in government planning. And these issues, these needs, we think are well -- development agencies are well placed to address.

And exactly as you've said, maintaining humanitarian assistance in a long-term protracted displacement situation is extremely expensive, and development responses could alleviate some of that expense and free up some of the humanitarian resources that could then be redeployed into where they're really needed, where it is a very cute, saving lives, protection situation.

We also know from existing work on forced displacement that a development response is more likely to foster the self reliance of displaced people. It

encourages them to be active participants in their local communities and making contributions to local and national economies. And it encourages displaced people to be innovative and to bring and build upon the skills that they might have had before they were displaced.

I was very struck when I was in Zambia recently, that until there were refugees in the hosting community, there had been no rice production. Refugee -- that was a skill that refugees brought with them, and had actually benefited the local hosting area because they had been encouraged to use that skill and to cultivate swamps somewhere, teaching the Zambians how to do that, as well.

And we also believe that self reliance -- these responses where people are not dependent on humanitarian assistance, where people are enabled to take initiative and to pursue innovation, actually can contribute to durable solutions in the long-term. So, people who are self reliant in the meantime may be better equipped to go home, or they may be better equipped to integrate as in when a durable solution is available.

So, very clearly, we think there's a case to be made that there is a need for a development response to force displacement globally, and particularly in the Great Lakes region. So, what are we doing about that? And the first thing, like I said, we've done, is to put this report together, which we intended as a stock taking of what is the extent of displacement, what are the causes of displacement, what are some of the main development needs for IDPs, returnees, refugees and host communities, and what are some of the opportunities to engage on those needs? So, that's the first thing we've done.

And then, following on from that, we think there needs to be a two

pronged approach to bring a development response to forced displacement. The first prong is political engagement and policy engagement. One of the things we do say in the report is that we think that this region is actually comparatively well set up for there to be a strong policy response in the region that encourages a development approach.

Maybe you would have another opinion on that, but there are existing institutions like the African Union, the National Conference of the Great Lakes region; that there is the UN special representative and the U.S. Special Envoy; that there is the Peace and Security Cooperation framework for the DRC does put in place some frameworks within which political and policy debates around displacement could take place. And we argue in the report that we need to maximize the opportunities and work with them.

The second thing we are going to do is that we are actually launching a new project for refugees, IDPs, returnees and host communities in the Great Lakes region. It's a hundred million dollar project. It's going to be covering Tanzania, Zambia and DRC.

As you know, when the World Bank has a project, we lend to a government and the government implements that project. So, what we can achieve through this modality is maybe in some -- the first time, to encourage our partner governments to extend their services and their development responses to displaced people.

Cordelia's going to talk a bit more about what that project is going to look like in the DRC -- some of the preliminary ideas that we have for the design of that project. But just to close, I'll give you an example of what we think we're going to do in Tanzania, which I think really strongly illustrates the difference between a development

response and a continuing humanitarian response.

So, as many of you know, there have been a large number of refugees from Burundi and Tanzania. Many of them came in 1972, and they have been in refugee settlements now for 40 years. Those refugee settlements are physically quite isolated. They are really, really far away and not very well connected to neighboring towns and communities.

And those settlements have been pretty much administered through a humanitarian response for the last 40 years. They have been, from a government point of view, under the responsibility of the Department of Refugees and the Ministry of Home Affairs, who has very much had a humanitarian mandate. But pretty much, all service delivery in the settlements has been outsourced, either to UNHCR or to UNHCR implementing partners.

Now, that has done well by people. That has ensured that for 40 years, they have had access to health and education. But what's happened is that all the funding, all the planning for the settlements, all the needs assessment, all the design of what goes on in those settlements happens very much in parallel from what the government is doing in terms of its mainstream service provision.

The government of Tanzania has recently offered citizenship to 200,000 of these long-term refugees. They will no longer be refugees. They will become what they're calling new citizens of Tanzania.

And what we're proposing to do in the project is to use some of the financing so that the government can extend its mainstream service provisions through local authorities, through district authorities, local governments, through regional authorities into those settlements. Each district or authority in Tanzania is required to put

in place what they call a general planning scheme, a GPS.

At the moment, the GPSs do not include those settlements. They do not include the planning needs for those 200,000 people. We'd like to see that change. We'd like to see the settlements included in those plans, and then, we'd like to offer some resources to local authorities to carry out those development plans, which will hopefully benefit the former refugees, as well.

We're also proposing to do some work around increasing more stable to land for the former refugees, and we will also propose that local government systems, like representative councils, local wards, local district authorities, all those structures are extended into the settlements, so that the former refugees are fully much part of local governance systems.

So, that's the difference in approach. It's encouraging the government to extend their services into an area where it just hasn't reached for a very long time. There is a really good opportunity to do that in Tanzania, because the framework has been set. It's harder to do that in places like DRC, which is why more hybrid models that look at a kind of transition to a humanitarian development response are needed. But I'll hand it over to Cordelia to talk about some of those.

MS. CHESNUTT: Thanks, Jo.

So, I'm here today. I work for the global program on forced displacement, which is a small, catalytic program within the World Bank that seeks to improve the way that development actors address the issue of forced displacement. And actually, we have positive news. This is progressing quite well. Today, I'm here to talk to you about what we're doing in DRC in the World Bank, but we can also talk about more global experiences later, if you have questions.

I'm going to organize my thoughts a little bit around some of the conclusions that Stacey had in her paper, because they tally quite well with the findings that we had when we recently went on mission in DRC. The three conclusions that I'm going to draw on particularly are her findings that there are key differences between those IDPs who wish to stay in their areas of displacement and those who wish to return; that there are significant differences between IDPs in urban and rural communities, and then finally, that a lot of IDPs rest with host communities, and we need to tailor our approaches accordingly.

But just a little bit of background. In late February and early March, I traveled with a team of specialists to DRC -- to eastern DRC, Goma, but also to Kinshasa, to survey the labeled land. Actually, I traveled with Maritza Tovo, who is the task team leader of the DRC element of our regional program. We're happy to have her here today. She can answer any specific questions on the project later, if I don't know the answers to those.

But we traveled first to Goma, this team of five, and then, we split into two groups, where the first group went north to Bunia and Dungu, and Martiza and I went south to Bukavu and Kalami, and we also did some field work in Monono and Sangha, among other places. So, our engagement in eastern DRC, it builds on what the bank is already doing in the area.

Maritza is actually leading another World Bank project known as the Eastern Recovery Project. The objectives of this existing project are to improve access to social and economic infrastructure, develop social cohesion and stimulate improved livelihoods. This overall approach is quite integrated into the I4S, which I think Stacey alluded to before the government Starek program.

We seek to coordinate with partners as much as possible throughout this project. And the strategic corridors for implementation of the project are actually selected in collaboration with MONUSCO and also Starek. But when we're talking about the DRC aspect of this regional project that Jo just introduced, we're going to be having a similar approach, because we can build on the existing work that the bank is doing through this Eastern Recovery project, because we already had a displacement sensitive approach. What does that mean? That means that we're targeting areas that have high degrees of population movement, communities that have a certain degree of return and communities that have high numbers of displaced populations.

But what are the particular elements that we're looking at now in designing the DRC element of the regional program? There are two particular elements that we've identified so far. The first is a focus on livelihoods, and secondly, we're looking at access to services.

So, why are we looking at livelihoods? Well, first of all, it would be a way of garnering immediate access to employment, but secondly, it could also be in support of durable solutions. Like Stacey mentioned, this is often a development issue. We have a protracted situation of displacement, and livelihoods are often the first thing needed to transition from the humanitarian to the development appropriate.

We'll also be looking at labor intensive public works as a way to provide immediate income to displaced populations, host communities and returnees, and as a way of contributing to overall infrastructure improvements, which are very much needed. A large element of this is rehabilitating roads in the area, and anyone who's traveled in DRC knows that that's very much required.

The second main element is going to be on socio economic services,

and the idea behind this is to maybe facilitate return, but also, support the IDPs in their areas of displacement. This could also be a way of encouraging social cohesion for both the IDPs and their hosts. And the way that we're going to do this is by using a project mechanism that many of you will be familiar with, namely CDD or Community Driven Development, where communities identify their needs themselves and actively participate in the implementation of subprojects.

These subprojects -- that could be schools or markets, for example, could make return communities more livable, and they could also bring people together for a common goal. In addition to all of this, we're looking at how we might train communities in conflict management to help them become more resilient to the drivers of conflict and to develop their social capital.

So, now that I've mentioned to you a little bit about what we're thinking of this new project, I want to try and tie it up with what Stacey highlighted in her paper. Some of her ideas really tally quite well with the findings that we had in our mission, and I think the first one was the differences between those IDPs who want to stay in their host communities, and those who wish to return.

I think Stacey mentioned there was a survey that has shown that a majority of people actually wanted to reside in their areas of displacement. Service tend to -- they disagree. Sometimes they say they want to return. Sometimes they stay they want to stay, but in reality, most people stay, whether they want to or not.

A lot of people have sentimental attachments to their areas of return. They want to go back, but in the end, they end up staying. Goma has doubled in size over the last 10 years. Why is that? Maybe it's access to electricity. Maybe it's access to livelihoods. All we know is that people do tend to stay, and therefore, we can't just look

at return, we have to look at areas of displacement, as well.

So, how do we in our project, tailor to this finding? Well, in terms of our livelihoods approach, we take this into account by looking at those people who want to return. If they engage in livelihoods, they might be able to accumulate cash for later investments in their areas of return, but we also have to remember that land can be an issue. It's a political issue, and it can be a restriction on how much returning IBPs might be able to invest in their areas.

For those who prefer to stay in their areas of displacement, accumulated cash could be a way of buying agricultural inputs, and it could also be a way of investing in small businesses. The second key conclusion from Stacey's paper that I'd like to highlight is the differences between rural and urban IDPs, and their needs most likely will vary.

An IDP who lives in Goma is very likely to have different needs than an IDP in a rural setting, such as in Sangha, where we visited. And our project is going to try and tailor to these differences, in that in urban areas, we're going to have labor market studies that can suggest the type of training that's needed in those areas, other types of support, such as micro finance, and hopefully, we'll be able to do these kinds of studies alongside the labor intensive public works that we're also employing. In the rural areas, we're going to be undertaking a value chain development approach through selected strategic corridors in order to complement the existing road project.

And the final, third conclusion that I wanted to draw attention to from Stacey's paper was the one on inclusivity or on host communities more generally, how we can not only focus on IDPs, but that we need to think of host communities. And I think this is really a key difference where the fact that we're coming in as development

actors makes a difference.

Our projects will have to think about those host communities who have been generous enough to allow the IDPs to settle there. As we know, about 80 percent of IDPs in DRC rest with host communities, but only 20 percent, more or less, live in camps. We also know that most humanitarian assistance has been focusing on camps and not on host communities, so maybe this is an area where development actors can make a difference.

This is also a way that our project is going to be looking to be as inclusive as possible. As I said, we're going to be trying to include IDPs in host communities, but also, returnees and other people who are affected by displacement.

Investments in social and economic infrastructure will include both IDPs and host communities as beneficiaries, and we're also going to be paying specific attention to vulnerable groups such as widows, elderly, orphans and certain ethnic groups that might be marginalized otherwise. The way I see it, in complementarity to all the work that's going on from both humanitarian or development actors, what are the challenges that persist in designing displacement projects in the area?

Well firstly, we could say, how do we design a project to make sure that we sufficiently include displaced populations and their needs. But on the other hand, how do we avoid over privileging the displaced people? This is quite a significant challenge, and it requires a multi-faceted approach, but we have a couple of ideas.

Regarding how you make sure that you sufficiently include IDPs and other populations, while in terms of the strategic corridors that we mentioned under the project, we're going to be selecting these on the basis of specific criteria, such is what is the proportion of displacement affected populations in the area. But we're also looking at

sustainability. What's the security in the area? What is the economic potential? How can investments contribute to stabilization overall? I think these are important questions, because we don't want to just be investing in areas for the sake of it and see that we fail at the end of the day.

And on the question of over privileging IDPs, while we seek to counter that by making sure that host communities have just as much access to the benefits of the program as the IDPs themselves. So, I think this overall draws attention to the need for humanitarian and development actors to work together, and I'd be happy to answer to any questions, whether it be about eastern DRC, or globally from the perspective of the World Bank. Thank you.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you. Thanks to all three of you for your substantive comments and for your discipline in keeping to a relatively short amount of time on very complex issues.

Before we open it up for general questions, let me just throw out a few questions for each of you. And I'll start with you, Stacey. One of your conclusions in your report was the impact of this protracted humanitarian response on humanitarian agencies themselves. I mean, to what extent is the fact that humanitarians have been working in DRC for decades -- how does that affect their ability to respond to new emergencies?

MS. WHITE: Yeah, that was -- I sort of glossed over the humanitarian element of what's going on, and it's very complex, and there is a lot of good work being done in an extremely difficult environment.

But it is true that when I was there in August, there was concern that basically, the humanitarian community had kind of caught and stuck in a status quo.

Here is our caseload near Goma. That's easy to get to. And new displacements, smaller displacements, smaller shocks are happening all of the time, and that in fact, many of these are happening outside of the radar of the humanitarian community altogether, or they're happening in assessments to determine what sort of needs these people require, are taking a very long time to actually happen, and then there's no follow up.

And that's a little bit related to a cluster system, which is really based on collaboration and everybody coming to a decision together. And so, it does create a little bit of a bottleneck for one particular NGO to just go out there and say, you know, we're going to go see what's going on.

So yeah, they have lost a little bit that agility, and I think that's just a question of you know, the agencies have been there for a very, very long time. There's nothing really new happening. Donors aren't sort of wanting to do anything new, but at the same time, they're giving less and less money every year, so it's a little bit of a depressing environment in which to work, especially in Congo, where even in the best circumstances, the humanitarian community has never been able to cover the needs of the many, many people affected by the conflict.

MS. FERRIS: Thanks. And Jo, it's just wonderful to hear you two talk about displacement as the development issue, because I don't think that's completely widespread in the development community, at least not yet, although we're working on it.

Jo, I was struck by one of the real contributions I think development actors bring as their relationship with governments and the ability to work with governments rather than to bypass or substitute -- and I don't know, one of my former interns just finished her PhD dissertation on UNHRC as a surrogate state in Tanzania; the way in which refugees turn to UNHRC, rather than the government. And perhaps an,

you know, unintended consequence of these decades of humanitarian action.

But what advice would you give to humanitarians in working with governments to make the transition to development a little easier?

MS. DE BARRY: It's very tricky. I saw exactly that kind of -- not for lack of good motives, but UNHCR have been the people that former refugees go to. And it's going to be a painful transition. You know, one of the things that's going to have to happen in Tanzania with the loss of the refugee status is the loss of that kind of protection and of being directly under the mandate of UNHCR.

Any government service provision that there's been in the settlements to date has been heavily subsidized by UNHCR, so they will pay stipends for government health workers. They will pay stipends for government teachers. They will -- they built the houses in which the government, Ministry of Home Affairs camp superintendents live, all of which again, done with the best possible intention.

But that is going to be painful, because when we work with government, we cannot, through our financing, say it's okay to continue paying this government health worker five times the salary that another health worker has when they're not working with refugees. That is the painful transition of integration in terms of what you're integrating people into is as good or as bad service delivery than anybody else has.

So, I don't think we can do it straight away, to answer your question. The advice is that we are going to have to kind of phase this out, but it's going to have to be a lot of involved actors agreeing on the same process, that UNHCR is phasing out; that the refugee mandate is no longer applicable; that these people are citizens, and therefore, they move into mainstream service provision as any other citizen. But we all have to be speaking -- saying the same thing, and we have to put in place the very careful steps that

no one gets hurt in that process, I think.

MS. FERRIS: And finally, Cordelia, it's wonderful to hear about how the bank is taking displacement seriously and seeing it as a development issue. What advice would you give for other development actors to being to see it in this way? Too often, you know, you talk to a development agency, and they say refugee, IDP, that's humanitarian. That's not our job. I mean, how do you break that kind of silo?

MS. CHESNUTT: Well, I'd say there are two main issues that seem to have recurred and have been effective in the bank. First of all, the bank responds to analytical conclusions, particularly if they're economic. So, we can do a study where we can demonstrate that a country will benefit economically if they integrate their IDPs, their refugees, their returnees, then we might be able to convince our country teams in the bank, but also, the governments even, if they see a financial difference.

But secondly, I think it's also just about how you approach the issue. Displacement overall is a very political topic, and I think this is one of the reasons why the bank has been nervous about addressing the issue in the past. But increasingly, we've seen the bank be more interested in engaging with the UN, which has allowed us to have a space to engage with UNHCR, which really has the mandate to deal with refugees.

And for that reason, we've done this joint approach doing analytical studies, particularly in Africa, where for the last few years, we've had joint visits by Ban Ki-Moon and Jim Kim in the (Inaudible) the Great Lakes and the Horn; political announcements that have allowed us to work within our organizations in a more coordinated manner.

That's then been followed up by analytical studies like our own, which have particular recommendations, and then, they've been able to guide the operations.

So, I think if we're able to base our work on hired, documented sort of analytical facts, as much as that can be done within our field. But also, just recognizing it's a political topic, but if we want to address these twin goals that we have within the bank about eradicating poverty and boosting shared prosperity, we have to include the most vulnerable groups, and that will be inherently political, but we can do it in a joint coordinated manner.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you. Thank you very much. We now have time for some questions. We have people standing by with microphones who can -- and please, if you can introduce yourself and --

SPEAKER: Good afternoon. My name is (Inaudible). I am teaching courses on refugees and IDPs at the School of Conflict Analysis and Resolution. So basically, my focus is conflict induced displacement, although I have also worked at the World Bank for 31 years, and I left.

And only after I left the World Bank do I appreciate the role of the World Bank development organization, and more so now in addressing displacement, which is a recent phenomena for the World Bank's strategic goals. And I like your approach that yes, fighting poverty with passion is the goal of the World Bank, and how can you do that unless you address the plight of the people who are displaced.

And so, there's a large, large part of the world's population, the people who are displaced, and we cannot address their poverty. We cannot eliminate unless we address that group. So, I'm very excited to hear of the World Bank's approach towards internal displacement.

My research has focused on Cashmere's displacement. Due to militancy, a quarter of a million people were displaced. And what I would like to know, since you said that although this afternoon we are looking at the Great Lakes approach,

but you offered that you will also provide answers for the global addressing of the displacement.

What I would like to know is, what is the development organization's role when it comes to addressing internal displacement in the disputed territories? And disputed territories are many. And there's a large part of the population of displaced persons.

And as you know, we are looking into the clash of civilizations, and I expect that there will be more disputed territories. Cashmere is not the only one. We have (Inaudible) and maybe Crimea. And I know that World Bank tends to be a little bit political in addressing displacement. How do you see the role of development organizations in the disputed territories?

MS. FERRIS: I'm going to give you just a minute to think about that while we take another question. One and two?

MS. AMSTEAD: Thanks. My name's Rhonda Amstead, and I'm a career consultant for Be the Change Careers which works with international development and not profit job seekers and social entrepreneurs.

My question -- and I'm very interested in the transition from humanitarian to development. And so, I was just wondering if any of you might be able to talk a little bit about some unique success cases or some things that have been very innovative, or maybe not, but just have been successful in transitioning from aid recipients to economic players and self reliance.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you. And third right here?

SPEAKER: Yeah, good afternoon. My name is John (Inaudible), former refugee from Burundi. And I wanted to ask in reference to -- a lot of the work you're

going to do is really wonderful. Do you intend to use some of the efforts in preventing conflict?

Because coming from that area, I've seen that prevention can do a lot more than humanitarian stuff. And this is political. I know that the organizations yet don't want to get into political. But the root causes of these problems is political, and so, I want to know if you can tell me any steps that you want to take to make sure that these millions of people are no longer in these conditions, because I lived it. I know how bad it is, so I would like to see what you can do.

The other question is, for the refugees who just acquired citizenship of Tanzania, I work some of the (Inaudible) here, and they have been denied most basic human rights. So, I want to know what you're going to do in terms of kind of catching up to the Tanzanian citizens in terms of education, health -- basic stuff for them to catch up with the rest of society. Thank you.

MS. FERRIS: Okay. We'll take another round, but let's start with these questions on the role of development organizations in disputed territories, success cases and their relief to development transition, role in conflict prevention and the question specifically of rights of Burundians and Tanzania compared to Tanzanians. I don't think any of those are for you, Stacey, but (Laughter) --

MS. WHITE: I was hoping the success story might be (Laughter).

MS. DE BARRY: Maybe I'll talk about the disputed territories. I mean, you know, what do you do when your partner, as our partner is at the World Bank, is a government who is an agent of causing forced displacement. It inevitably constrains your conversation. (Laughter) But that is not to say we don't try.

The degree to which we try is determined by a lot of things, in terms of

how willing the government is to have that conversation with us, how willing senior management in the World Bank is prepared to back a politically sensitive conversation, and how much of an opportunity there is, actually, for a development response in that time and place, and whether there is a window that isn't just a humanitarian need.

And you know, I worked on Azerbaijan for many years, with the IDPs from the Nagorno-Karabakh displacement, and you know, by anyone's kind of stretch of the imagination, what the government was doing towards their own IDPs was entirely politically motivated, and was not exactly (Laughter) -- was not exactly a fine example of a development response. And it was very tough to have that conversation when, yeah, the main kind of actor in why these IDPs are not being integrated, and why these IDPs are stagnating for so long is the government policy itself.

But by having a partnership with the government, you have a negotiation. You really do have a negotiation, and you're not going to entirely be successful. There will be kind of lines that have to be drawn in that. But I think we did manage to move things along, and partly, because of the unique relationship you get with governments by working at the World Bank, as you well know from your own experience, you are sometimes better placed for that negotiation, and sometimes, worse placed for that negotiation. And you have to recognize when you are worse placed, and leave it up to the people who are better placed.

But it is possible. I mean, people are trying at the moment in Ukraine, people are trying in Georgia, and we continue to try in Azerbaijan. We haven't gone into Cashmere as of yet, because I know --

(Audio dropout)

MS. CHESNUTT: To add to that, I would just say forced displacement is

still a relatively new issue for the bank. The global program of forced displacement was established back in 2009, but even before that, the bank had done a few things on displacement, in addition to the Azerbaijan project that Jo led. We also have had projects in Sri Lanka and (Inaudible) program in eastern DRC and a few other places.

But I think it's still yet to be seen, what the successful projects have been, and it's up to organizations like the IEG, the Independent Evaluation Group, to document that moving forward. But you know, even Azerbaijan that Jo just mentioned, that's one of the countries that I highlight as quite successful in terms of what we were able to do, because that's one of the cases where a bit of economic analysis or a bit of analytical reporting was able to be part of these discussions and perhaps, influence policy considerations in the country.

But we're still building the case. At least we're getting to the point where people want to have the discussion and see how we can tailor existing bank portfolios and even design new programs.

MS. FERRIS: Any responses to the questions on Burundi and Burundians in Tanzania? Questions of rights, conflict prevention?

MS. DE BARRY: Yeah. I'd love to talk to you more about your ideas about what could be done. I think one of the really biggest challenges I see for that situation is land rights, because as refugees, they've actually had, as you know, protected access to land and have been able to cultivate.

Now, they are no longer refugees, they won't have that protect access. They will, in some ways be more vulnerable than they were before. So, what I think we have to ensure is that when you remove the protection that comes from refugee status that people don't kind of drop down in their status; that there is -- there are measures in

place. And I think that's going to be tricky to make sure that the kind of very dedicated focus that that group of people have had from UNHCR and the protection that they've had, which is now going to be removed, because they're no longer refugees; that that doesn't leave them actually even more exposed. So it will be good to talk more afterwards.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you. I have another round then? This woman -- we'll stay in the front for this round. Then we'll come to the back.

EMMA: Hi. My name is Emma. I have a question for Stacey on one of the proposed solutions that you were discussing about land disputes. I was wondering what kind of framework would this look like; how the Maji Maji would fit in as actors in this framework? And if you think there's any like real chance in like action on the part of the Congolese government to try and really implement something on frameworks for land disputes.

MS. FERRIS: The gentleman right in front?

MR. BOYCE: Hi. Michael Boyce from Refugees International. Thank you all very much for the presentation, and certainly, in my recent visits to the Congo, I talked with aid organizations and actors who are very eagerly awaiting this World Bank program and funding, so I really appreciate all the effort that you've put in to make that happen and look forward to seeing the results.

Just one question about that. Some of the donors that I've met with who have worked on the Congo for a long time have sometimes expressed a challenge between -- on how to strike a balance between building the capacity of the Congolese state, building the capacity of ministries and departments both at the national or regional level so that they can deliver programs in a sustainable way, versus actually just you

know, providing money and making sure that programs actually get completed on the ground; that schools actually get expanded, that doctors actually get paid.

And so, I wonder, as you are thinking about how to program this big pot of money, how are you going to try and prioritize and balance those different concerns? Thanks.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you. Let's take another one or two over here.

MS. ROSE: Hi. Madeline Rose from Mercy Corps. Just want to -- huge thanks to Brookings for kind of issuing this sort of reflective assessment and to the report itself. It's been hugely helpful.

Just one note, kind of, of optimism so that donors weren't that interested in advocacy. I think since this report came out, we've already seen you know, better responsiveness from the U.S. government, from the UK government and others about piloting some more exploratory approaches to bridge this relief to development divide. So, huge thanks, Elizabeth and Brookings to your leadership in kind of commissioning the report, and it has already yielded some tangible exploration.

But I just want to kind of go back to that -- Stacey, I'm curious about the interviews you may have had on the ground between the sort of humanitarian incentives around live saving assistance.

And this is something that we're having on the advocacy side, a lot of conversations about M&E reform and indicators and what does -- what do humanitarian incentives look like in a world where most responses are protracted. So, I'm curious if any of your conversations you've had in the last few months since writing the paper about what does -- how do we reform the incentive structure to solve problems and take a stabilization lens to investments, as opposed to just that immediate life saving incentive

always be there.

MS. FERRIS: Okay, it looks like you've got a few questions this time, Stacey (Laughter). You have land disputes, the question of -- you might want to comment as well, on the balance between building capacity of states and actually delivering services, and then the question of humanitarian incentives and --

MS. WHITE: I'm going to actually throw a question at you guys at the end of trying to answer some of these, if you don't mind.

MS. FERRIS: That's very -- yep.

MS. WHITE: So, with regard to land disputes, I really don't know. UN Habitat with UNDP and WFP and FAO were doing some you know, small pilot projects were you know, they were really hand holding and like bringing these people back and trying to help, and in many instances, you know, there are people who are party to the conflict in some way, shape or form who are actually taking the lands over, and in those situations, it's nearly impossible to negotiate or mediate any sort of you know, land agreement.

So, in terms of a framework, I mean, and this goes a little bit to what our colleague from Burundi had mentioned. I mean, I think it might be good that these -- you know, this peace and security framework for the Great Lakes region -- I mean, there were all these annexes in that framework that was signed in February, 2013, that included elements of return.

But the political people who put that together never spoke to the humanitarians or the development actors about you know, the modalities for actually doing that. So, I think some of these things need to actually be on the front end of these political negotiations in terms of preventing displacement, and then hopefully, that will

help to sort of make them -- pressure them to do a framework at the end. That's really the only answer I have.

But I do think that this issue of really pressuring politicians who are around the table to talk to humanitarians, may actually happen, when you have heavier hitters like the World Bank who are interested in this issue. Because I mean, up until now, you know, traditional donors have not really been that interested, and that goes a little bit to your question.

I spoke to many donors when I was Congo, who were like, no, no, capacity building, no way. That's just a complete -- you know, I mean, I even spoke about, you know, well about what national NGOs? I mean, it doesn't seem like they're being included at all. And many donors would simply say, it's a complete waste of our time.

There's no accountability for financing, and even doing training for that. You know, you'd think over 20 years that you might have a little bit set aside to sort of try to capacitate the national civil society. So, I thought that was a little bit interesting.

Humanitarian incentives. I mean, there were some interesting things going on. In fact, World Vision and Mercy Corps and Search for Common Ground had this Do More Good network where they were trying to look at you know, what are the patterns of displacement? What are the coping strategies? A lot of these people in Congo, and this is a little bit my question for you guys -- have learned to use mobility as a coping mechanism.

So, they go from rural to urban and they're still displaced. So you know, there was a fixing exercise that IOM did where they sort of came to a camp, closed it off, counted all of the IDPs, and you know, 82 percent of the IDPs who were supposed to be

there, weren't there. So, they said, well 82 percent of them have gone home.

Well no, I don't think it works like that in Congo, and Congo people are moving around all the time, and they're going to continue to do so, even with you know, major money coming in from the World Bank. So, I guess my question to you guys is, well, what will be your measurement of success in that way? Because they might just continue to move around, because they've been doing it now for a very long time.

So, back to humanitarian incentives. I mean, I just feel like humanitarians were trying to sort of be innovative, trying to look at ways of doing something that's less traditional in terms of humanitarian inputs. But I just feel like there was no support on the part of donors, and budgets were, you know, just decreasing all of the time.

And the time that I went, WFP had just announced that you know, they were only going to be feeding you know, 34 percent of the people in camps that they'd been feeding before. So really, the humanitarian incentive was very much aligned with more and more restricted budgets, which is a really, you know, cynical way of looking at it, but that's how I saw it when I was there in August.

MS. FERRIS: Would you like to comment?

MS. CHESNUTT: Maybe I'll turn to Mauritzia on the challenges of investing in capacity building versus delivering.

(Discussion off the record)

SPEAKER: Okay, thank you. In terms of the challenge and balancing, the capacity building versus the service delivery, it is that we, of course, have to confront all the time. As the World Bank, we have to work with governments. So in a way, we don't have a choice. We have to try to do it.

In the case of DRC, we have been lucky, actually, because we have an implementing agency which is government that can deliver. And it is really an exception. It hasn't always been that way. It's the social fund of the IRC. We have worked with him now for seven years. We are satisfied about their fiduciary operations, meaning that we don't think they steal, which is very important in Congo (Laughter).

And actually, they have even put in prison an account and they were stealing. So, they are really an example. And they collaborate with local civil society. This is another issue that you were mentioning. This is something that struck me when working in eastern DRC. You talk to the humanitarian community, and it's only foreigners. And you go to the coordinated meetings, and there are no local agencies.

And so, why aren't you -- there seems to be a little bit of a snobbish attitude, like the local NGOs are not good enough for us. You know, we are the ones doing the real work. And our implementing agency is government, and they basically only work with local NGOs, not because they discriminate, but because they have competitive biddings, and the local NGOs are way cheaper. So, they simply win the tendering.

So, it can be done, to work with government agencies and build their capacity. In the end, we want things to be sustainable. The government agency will be there. The humanitarians, hopefully, will leave, and so we want to build their capacity. It takes a long time.

In this case, we were lucky. We had a project with them for seven years. At the beginning, it was very painful. By now, they really learned how to do it, and I just pray to God that the director does not retire before me. That's all (Laughter).

MS. FERRIS: Thank you. Let's take some questions from the back.

(Simultaneous discussion)

MS. CHESNUTT: Could I add just to the question -- answer?

MS. FERRIS: Okay.

MS. CHESNUTT: Answer the question. So, what Stacey just mentioned about IDPs moving around -- because that's something we thought about ourselves. And if you look at a map of displacement of DRC and it's six months old, you can more or less throw it out, because three months later, it will be completely different.

Basically, the way we're going to look at that is by doing area based development, meaning that we're not just helping the IDPs, but also, the host communities, and selecting these on the basis of criteria that, you know, as many displaced people as possible -- economically, how do we support the areas, and in consultation with partners who are saying these are the areas that you can really make a difference in.

And when we were talking with UNHCR and other agencies on the ground, one of the ideas they came up with was to say, why don't you support the peripheral areas around the major urban centers. Because so much money is going into Goma, Bukababu and other areas, but these towns and cities are expanding. So, maybe there is economic activity going on around these areas that you can connect the rural and the villages themselves. So, those are a few of the ideas that we have.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you. Let's turn to the back. Paula Lynch and the person over here.

MS. LYNCH: Hello. Thank you very much, Beth. This is a really interesting group and a good conversation. I'm Paula Lynch. I head a multi sector Office of Policy Analysis at the State Department working on foreign assistance resources.

I've worked for, I guess more -- 30 years in humanitarian assistance, and 15 of them looking at relief to development transitions. But last fall, I had an opportunity to switch and look at conflict minerals in the DRC, and travel out there. And I was amazed at how deeply I got into something that had absolutely nothing to do with humanitarian assistance in the DRC, which surprised me, because we've all talked for so long about how conflict minerals are so deeply entrenched in the conflict that has produced a lot of the displacement.

So, I wondered if those of you that have been working on this recently from the humanitarian end have had discussions with those that are working on the conflict minerals, because it seems to me that there are some places where there could be some good overlap. Especially the mention of the value chain and working along strategic corridors -- I think there's certainly a lot of evidence that there is a lot of economic activity around the mines.

There is a lot of work that needs to be done on the responsible minerals trade, and is being worked on by a group that has banded together that includes not only local civil society, local private sector, local government, but also, donors and international organizations. It's quite impressive.

And so, I just wanted to ask that question, and then also, comment on what makes relief to development work better. The one thing I've noticed that works is when humanitarians and developers sit together before they've done their planning and talk about what the goals are for what they need to accomplish, and then, figure out what they can learn from the other, because there are always things on the humanitarian agenda that are not on the development agenda, and vice versa. So that's my quick answer on that one (Laughter).

MS. FERRIS: Thank you very much. I have a hand over here in the back. Yes?

SPEAKER: Thank you very much. I thank the speakers and the study. My name is Franklin Mutahakana with the World Bank, Uganda country office.

Mine will be really comments. And two comments. The first one is on the issue of the response. I think it is key that this is divided into two, because they are the short-term immediate actions that need to be taken in terms of addressing the immediate challenges that the IDPs face. But it is also then looking at the medium to long-term actions in terms of what are the systematic efforts to address the development issues. And then, following on what she just mentioned, the issue of addressing the root causes of the conflicts, because actually that is a key aspect.

Now, my second comment is actually to the team, to indicate that Uganda had a similar problem in the northern part of the country. We had the war for about what, 20 years, in the north, and then, there was a marginalized area in the north, northeast. Efforts have been taken -- very strong efforts.

Okay, the war in the north has ended, but a lot of efforts have been taken in terms of reintegrating that community back into the country in terms of the development agenda of the country. So, I would invite the team to get some time and study what has gone on in those areas.

The government specifically took an affirmative action in terms of allocating specific resources to ensure that they bring up this particular area to the same pace of development as the rest of the country, having lost the 20 years. But also, the bank has been very strategic in terms of supporting the area.

We are currently negotiating -- I think we are negotiating tomorrow, about

one, a program -- a third phase program to address that specific area. So there are some lessons that could be learned from there, and actually, there is a lot of success, when you look at what is currently going on, and what was happening at the time, and the whole aspect of reintegrating IDPs with the relationship they have with the host communities.

You'd be most welcome, if you want to -- I'm not too sure much has been written about it, but it would be an interesting thing for the team to look at it and see how they can get parallels and some similarities with the DRC cases. Thank you very much.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you very much. Let's have this person right here.

SPEAKER: (Inaudible) -- Research for Common Ground. And I have just one comment and one question. First, I just wanted to underline the importance of land and the recognition of land as a conflict driver. I think for Burundi and Rwanda, it's been understood for a long time, but for DRC, it was sort of cynically viewed as the solution to the land problem in the region, as compared to recognizing the conflicts that are existing and that are, perhaps, more difficult to solve because so much hasn't been invested in the infrastructure and the mediation structures, et cetera.

And then, I don't know if it's a question or a musing or what, but talking about the political aspect, and also the prevention aspect. And we've talked a lot about DRC, but with the Burundi elections coming up and the growing insecurity, there's discussions of preparations for possibly 60,000 refugees coming into Rwanda.

Obviously, the DRC elections and a lot of questions around what might happen there with the third mandate or not a third mandate. Do you have any recommendations, just for the sector in general, around prevention of displacement and what political pressures might be placed?

And then also, in the planning for displacement, how some of the recommendations you're making might be taken into account from the beginning, as compared to after people are displaced, and then it has to be adjusted. Thank you.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you very much. And let's take a couple more, because we're sort of running out of time. Maybe these two right here. Uh-huh. Monica?

MS. MOYU: Hi. I'm Monica Moyu, a fellow at the American Society of International Law.

I just had a question about, are there any particular changes that you might want to see in, say, international humanitarian law or in refugee law that you think might facilitate the development based efforts.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you. And the person next to you?

MS. KENNY: Goodness. The pressure of closing up the question. I'm going to ask you a quick question. Sorry. Oh, my name is Erin Kenny. A quick question about the -- within the report for Stacey, it outlines three Congo wars, and I think I just might be totally ignorant about the history and the trajectory of Congo.

But I've also seen it described as post-conflict, and you described this kind of systemic insecurity and violence throughout the region. Can you speak to maybe the decision to describe it as a third war, and how that is characterized?

MS. FERRIS: We have a number of questions. Conflict minerals, the situation in Northern Uganda, recommendations for prevention, given some of the political developments coming up, implications for refugee or international humanitarian law, and whether Congo is post conflict or third war? I'll throw it out to you. Feel free to jump in. The first one who answers gets to pick which questions (Laughter) you respond to.

MS. DE BARRY: Hello, I'll jump in.

MS. FERRIS: Oh, yes.

MS. DE BARRY: (Laughter) We have an invitation to Uganda, which is always a good thing. Thank you very much.

You know, I think we say in the report that Uganda is -- this is another reason why we think there are lots of opportunities to bring a development response to displacement in the Great Lakes, because there are already some very good examples in the region, that the different governments and the different countries can learn from.

And so certainly, what Uganda has done, both in legal framework, the Refugee Act, which really goes as far as it's possible to go to offer self-reliance and local integration where it's possible, is a model. And then, the -- you know, the projects that have been done that see displacement as part of a broader problem of marginalized areas.

I actually lived in an IDP camp in Northern Uganda for a year and a half, and there was a young man that I knew there very well. And after being in that IDP camp, there was a period of peace and prosperity, and people did well. And then, the LRA came along, and everybody from -- who had been in the camp went back into the camp and then ran away to Soroti, which was the local town.

But during that experience of displacement, this young boy, even from a very young age, had been absolutely obsessed with cattle, and really had a love of cattle and trading. And whilst he was displaced in Soroti, the town, he -- whilst he was in an IDP, got to meet a lot of meat traders and really understood in a real way, the kind of value chain of what he'd seen one part of when he was trading his cattle up in the village.

And he got to meet these butchers and meat traders, and he learned a

lot about the industry, so that when he was able to finally go back home, and when peace came, he became a very, very successful meat trader. He now owns about three or four lorries that he loads up with cattle, and he trades across the border to South Sudan.

And for me, he's quite a kind of what is possible from a forced displacement experience. But forced displacement can expose you to new opportunities, new connections, to new insights that you can build on. And as a development agency, it's not to say -- I mean, it comes back to your mobility question.

The self reliance doesn't depend on being in a place. Durable solutions don't necessarily have to be about a place. They're about equipping people to maximize the opportunities to mitigate the danger and the terrible things that can happen during displacement, but also, to recognize that moving around and being exposed to new things can be an opportunity, and that's what we need to look for in the displacement experience and build upon and facilitate.

And I think Uganda has some really wonderful stories of people who have come through those terrible losses and suffering, and are actually now playing amazing contributions to their local economies. So, lots and lots and lots to learn from Uganda.

Just on the land question -- I think the land question is all tied up, actually, with prevention of displacement. You know, there are a lot of -- the bank does a lot of work on land administration in the Great Lakes region. We do work on land reform, and often, the land issues of the displaced are not included in those land reform processes.

So, if you had a land reform process in a country that was inclusive of marginalized people that enabled safe and secure access to land, that might prevent

displacement in the first place, because there's less room for grievances over land. It also allows you to restore land rights more quickly, when displacement is over, because everybody knows who owns what land, and that land has been owned on an equal and fair basis.

So, I do think land reform is an absolutely massively important agenda for this part of the world, and would play not only a kind of restitution role after displacement, but potentially, could play a prevention of displacement in the first place.

MS. CHESNUTT: If I may add a few answers to some of the questions. I mean, just on Uganda, to complement what Jo is saying, the way that Uganda allows refugees to work is really one of the best or one of the only political frameworks that exist globally. When we're trying in the Global Program on Forced Displacement in the bank to say, what are the good practices we have, that's one of the few ones, because it is very difficult politically for governments, and we should recognize particularly those governments who face economic challenges for their own citizens. It's hard to allow those some benefits to refugees.

In terms of recommendations on how to prevent these things from occurring, or to ensure that humanitarian and development actors work more closely together, I think this really has to start from the beginning. The more we speak with UN actors and with NGOs on the ground, the more they say to us, you should be here from day one.

And I think in the Middle East right now, the bank has been doing a lot of work on impact assessments, trying to do some studies on what are the economic effects of displaced people in these areas, but also, to try and have an idea of what's the baseline right now?

If we're going to go back a couple of years from now to do some work in Syria, or in another country, if we see that Burundi might escalate into conflict a year or two from now, what's the information we can gather right now? And humanitarians have the access to the data that development actors don't have, but the development actors might have economic and analytical resources that the humanitarian actors don't have. So, that trade off is quite important.

In terms of the laws, from my vantage point in discussions with partners, I don't think we need that many more laws. It's more about implementation of the laws. Most of the countries we're looking at in the Great Lakes, if you have a look at our study, we have a section on the regional institutions. Almost all of the institutions have signed up to the treaties, but you know, implementation is always hard.

The refugee convention is the basis, but then, we also have the Kampala convention, which is for DRC, even more important, because it's about IDPs. So, domestication of these conventions, and how do we support them on the ground, I think is even more important.

And then I'd invite Mauritzia, perhaps, to add a few comments on the DRC on the minerals or any other ideas you might have.

SPEAKER: We actually did meet with people working on mineral issues, but I really don't focus on that. I met for example, with the Association of (Inaudible) Miners. But the way we are choosing our strategic corridors don't really look at artisan -- well, mining, in general.

They are chosen basically with -- on the one hand, a criteria linked to stabilization. And so, are they secure enough to work, but not too secure to work in there, would make no difference in terms of stabilization. We are looking, of course, at

the displacement in population movements, but we also have a very important economic criteria, because we want to work where it is possible to make an economic difference.

Therefore, we are choosing corridors that have an outlet on a major market. And normally, we are choosing where there is already a main road that is either already rehabilitated or in the process of being rehabilitated. And then, we will focus on the feeder roads. But we are basically focusing on value chain -- agriculture or value chain development. And so, we are really not paying too much attention to the mineral part. I'm sorry (Laughter).

(Audio drop out)

SPEAKER: Yeah, it's just -- it's a very, very complex area, and we have colleagues working on it. So, I can try to follow, but it's -- you know, my little head can't handle it all, basically (Laughter).

MS. FERRIS: -- and Stacey, and tell us about the war in Congo.

MS. WHITE: Well, I just wanted to just compliment what Cordelia said about the laws. I mean, I do think there are a lot of countries now, including in Africa who have domesticated the Kampala Convention, or countries like Kenya who actually haven't ratified -- signed or ratified the Kampala Convention, but have a pretty robust domestic IDP law. But it is all about the implementation of that from the national level. I mean, that's really what every country, not just in Africa, but across the world, is really grappling with.

And then with regard to the Congo wars, I mean, that's sort of how it is described in literature. I think this post conflict idea is a little bit propaganda by MONUSCO after M23, because they really wanted to be seen as having done something, and they wanted to keep their funding up, et cetera. But everyone on the ground --

I mean, the peace is real in certain pockets, since the end of 2013. But I think until you have a disarmament of FDLR, and until you get past the November, 2016 elections, I would not characterize Congo as a post conflict situation.

MS. FERRIS: Does anybody have something cheerful to end this session? (Laughter)

MS. WHITE: No, but I did want to add (Laughter) -- I did want to add one little bit. And every time we have this conversation, we start talking about the transition from relief to development. And I would just say in my experience, I don't really see it that way.

I would be very worried to see all of the actors in DRC, for instance, applauding sort of the presence of the World Bank and these programs, and sort of thinking (claps), all right, it's a development phase. And it's never going to be like that in the Great Lakes. There are going to be very small pockets where people are able to a little bit get some livelihoods, maybe return, maybe locally integrate, and then, there are going to be shocks and displacements in other areas.

So, it's not really this transition. It's more these two things happening at the same time, and both of the actors learning to work in new ways that complement one another, and allow people who are living in chronic insecurity to be better able to mitigate some of the negative consequences of that.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you. Thank you for that positive reflection, and thank you, too, for the World Bank for all your work on displacement.

MS. WHITE: That's great.

MS. FERRIS: I think it's wonderful, and we look forward to seeing this in other regions and other places in the world. Please join me in thanking our panelists.

(Applause)

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2016