

Seminar/Workshop on Return, Resettlement and Reintegration of IDPs in Colombia*

Bogota, Colombia
December 3, 2003

Finding Durable Solutions for IDPs: Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement and International Experiences of Voluntary Return, Resettlement and Reintegration

*This seminar was organized by the Colombian government through the Social Solidarity Network and UNHCR with the collaboration of USAID, UNDP, IOM and other international agencies.

**Statement by Gimena Sanchez-Garzoli, Senior Research Analyst
The Brookings-SAIS
Project on Internal Displacement**

Introduction

It is an honor for me to be with you today to examine the search for durable solutions for internally displaced persons in Colombia. My presentation is divided into three parts. First, I will review what the *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement* state concerning return, resettlement and reintegration of IDPs. Then I will focus on the key themes that need to be addressed when developing a return, resettlement and reintegration plan based on these *Principles*. In doing so I will draw upon several tools developed at the international level that help integrate the standards found in the *Principles* into these processes. Third, I will explore how the key themes underlying the *Principles* can be supported with practical steps and provide examples that have been recommended or implemented in displacement situations in other countries. In particular, I will briefly discuss the Angolan experience before moving to my concluding remarks.

The Guiding Principles and Return, Resettlement and Reintegration¹

The *Guiding Principles* are the first international standards developed for internally displaced persons. These 30 *Principles*, which are based on international humanitarian law, human rights law and refugee law by analogy, set forth the rights of the internally displaced and the obligations of governments and non-state actors toward these populations. They cover all phases of displacement: protection from arbitrary displacement, protection and assistance during displacement, and during return or resettlement and reintegration. Since most of you are familiar with the *Principles* in general, I will focus my remarks on section V, which relates to the topic of this seminar.

Section V of the *Principles* addresses return, resettlement and reintegration. *Principle 28* emphasizes the right of internally displaced persons to return voluntarily and in safety

and dignity to their homes or to resettle voluntarily in another part of the country. In other words, internally displaced persons have options – they can choose to return to their home areas or resettle in another part of the country. The *Principles* emphasize that it is the responsibility of the national authorities to establish conditions enabling this, in particular to ensure secure environment in the areas of return or resettlement. Also, authorities must facilitate the reintegration of the displaced, and ensure that return or resettlement processes include their full participation.

Principle 29 (1) reiterates the notion of non-discrimination that is found throughout the *Principles*. Returned or resettled internally displaced persons should not be discriminated against and they have the right to participate in public affairs and to access public services. Emphasis is also given to the full participation of the internally displaced in the planning and management of their returns or resettlement. This is quite important because the involvement of the displaced will help make their returns or resettlement more sustainable.

Principle 29 (2) states that: “Competent authorities have the duty and responsibility to assist returned and/or resettled internally displaced persons to recover, to the extent possible, their property and possessions which they left behind or were dispossessed of upon their displacement. When recovery of such property and possessions is not possible, competent authorities shall provide or assist these persons in obtaining appropriate compensation or another form of just reparation.” Lastly, *Principle 30* provides a role for international organizations and others in the return or resettlement phase of displacement and specifies that the authorities shall grant and facilitate access by these organizations.

It should be noted that throughout the *Principles* special attention is paid to the protection and assistance needs of vulnerable groups such as women, children, the elderly and disabled. For example, the *Principles* call for the participation of women in the planning and distribution of relief supplies, prohibit sexual violence and the recruitment of minors into hostilities, and stress the need for family reunification. Of particular relevance to the Americas, the *Principles* also refer to the right of women to obtain personal identity and other documents on an equal basis as men².

Key Themes that Need to Be Addressed When Developing a Return, Resettlement and Reintegration Plan for IDPs³

To develop a return, resettlement and reintegration plan for IDPs that incorporates the standards found in the *Guiding Principles*, mechanisms must be put into place that address the following key themes: voluntary return in conditions of safety and dignity, joint participation and management in return or resettlement, non-discrimination and equality of participation and access, recovery of property and compensation; and access by humanitarian organizations.

Voluntary Return in Conditions of Safety and Dignity

The first theme is that of voluntary return in conditions of safety and dignity. It is important to explain what is meant by the terms “voluntary,” “safety” and “dignity.” Voluntary means that the decision to return to one’s place of origin must be a free choice made by the displaced person. It should be noted that “this requirement is more than a matter of principle”⁴ since a voluntary return is more likely to be lasting and sustainable.

It is essential that IDPs are not pressured to return to areas where the security conditions are not conducive to return. One of the most tragic cases of forced return took place in Rwanda in April 1995. In this country, the government forcibly closed IDP camps but the displaced refused to leave because the security conditions in the areas of return were not safe and there were few resources available for their protection and assistance. The government had legitimate reasons for wanting to close the camps and to normalize the situation. However, the forcible closure of the camps and excessive use of force by the military in order to do so led to the deaths of some 4,000 to 8,000 persons⁵.

There are several conditions to meet for an effective return in “conditions of safety and dignity.” These are legal safety, physical security, material security and ensuring that IDPs are treated with “dignity.” Legal safety can include amnesties, public assurances of personal safety, integrity, and freedom from fear of persecution or arbitrary punishment on return. Physical security takes into account protection from armed attacks and landmines. Material security means access to land, property, a means of livelihood and access to education for IDP children. The concept of dignity is “less self-evident than safety”⁶ and refers to being treated with respect and acceptance including a full restoration of rights. In practice, this means that returning IDPs should not be mistreated in any way, that they should return unconditionally and spontaneously at their own pace, and that their families are not arbitrarily separated during the return process.

Concerning physical security, it is critical to underscore the importance of protection not only during the actual return or resettlement process but also in the areas of return or resettlement. The experience of return in Tajikistan from 1993 to 1996 was studied by the Co-Director of the Brookings-SAIS Project Roberta Cohen⁷. She found that the experience serves as an example of how safe and successful returns can be achieved when protection and human rights duties are assigned to international field staff in return areas. Even though a ceasefire was signed, the areas to which IDPs were returning remained volatile. To address this, UNHCR deployed experienced field staff in the return areas who monitored return conditions, interceded with authorities when abuses took place, and helped returnees reclaim their homes. Since IDPs distrusted the authorities, they felt more confident reporting violations to UNHCR, who then accompanied the displaced to the offices of local governmental authorities to ensure that the complaints of abuses were effectively addressed. UNHCR’s presence and impartial intervention on behalf of IDPs helped discourage further communal violence and build confidence within the displaced community about remaining in the return areas.

A lack of adequate protection can greatly undermine return processes and lead to recurrent displacement. A recent example of this can be found in Afghanistan⁸. In May 2003, it was reported that 40% of the 2 million returnees were crowding into Afghan

cities such as Herat and Kabul because they could not find sufficient security or work. Meanwhile, Afghan IDPs were becoming internally displaced for a second or third time due to insecurity. Tens of thousands of ethnic Pashtuns refrained from returning to home areas for fear of retribution.

During his last visit to Colombia, the Representative of the UN Secretary-General on Internally Displaced Persons, Francis Deng, recommended⁹ that international presence be increased in areas of potential and actual return or resettlement so as to allow for objective assessments of the extent to which the requisite conditions of safety and sustainability exist. Also, that increased international presence should serve as a supplement to an enhanced presence of governmental institutions in areas of return. Deng also noted that “alternatives to return, specifically resettlement, need to be more actively pursued”¹⁰ by officials. He further recommended¹¹ that international non-governmental organizations such as Peace Brigades International (PBI) and national organizations that accompany internally displaced persons be consulted and their participation in return and resettlement processes be facilitated. Through their presence and activities in areas of return or resettlement, these organizations can help authorities and international agencies provide protection to IDPs.

Landmines¹² are another danger that can slow return or resettlement. In Mozambique, for example, landmines are reported to have killed some 10,000 IDPs during the return and resettlement process. In order to avoid such tragedies from re-occurring, it is essential that mine clearance programs and mine awareness campaigns be integrated into return and resettlement programs.

Joint Participation and Management of Return or Resettlement by the IDPs Themselves

Second, the participation of IDPs in the planning and management of return and resettlement helps to ensure that the return, resettlement and reintegration processes take place in a voluntary and dignified manner. It also helps to ensure that these processes are sustainable. The *Handbook for Applying the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement*¹³ gives some practical steps that can be taken to ensure that IDPs are integrated into the return or resettlement process in a non-discriminatory manner. Authorities can, for instance:

-“Assist representatives of IDP communities to assess conditions in potential areas of return or resettlement by supporting visits and by visiting areas of potential return or resettlement to independently assess conditions.

-Convene consultations with leaders of displaced groups prior to return and resettlement, ensuring the participation of women and all important segments of the displaced community to determine that return or resettlement is voluntary.”

Non-Discrimination and Equality of Participation and Access

Third, it is important that return and resettlement processes for IDPs take place in a non-discriminatory manner and that among the displaced there is equality of participation and access. IDPs are often vulnerable to discrimination solely on account of being IDPs. Mechanisms need to be put into place so that when IDPs return, resettle or reintegrate they are not treated as “enemies” or, alternatively, favored in a manner that creates resentment with the local or host population. It is also important that upon return they are not discriminated against when accessing public services such as education and health services or when they involve themselves in public affairs. Furthermore, efforts should be made to ensure that IDPs from ethnic minority groups such as the indigenous and Afro-descendants are not discriminated against in areas of return, resettlement and reintegration. A return, resettlement and reintegration program in Colombia, for example, should take into consideration the laws that grant ethnic minorities specific cultural and territorial rights¹⁴.

In the former Yugoslavia¹⁵, the insertion of a “positive conditionality” into the return program helped minority IDPs return to their former communities. In this case, although the right to return was guaranteed in the Dayton Peace Accords many minorities were not willing to go back to their home areas because the majority ethnic group had been resettled in these areas. In order to increase acceptance of minority IDPs, municipalities had to agree to respect the human rights of minority IDPs and guarantee their security in order to receive international assistance such as the rehabilitation of housing, schools and health facilities and income generating programs. This “positive conditionality” helped encourage IDPs to return and fostered better relations between the ethnic groups. Effective return and resettlement programs for IDPs can benefit local communities and prevent further conflict.

In addition to ensuring equity between the displaced and host communities, it is important that return programs do not generate resentment among the displaced. In the case of Sri Lanka¹⁶, the Government created a policy whereby each returned or resettled IDP family would receive financial assistance upon return to their own land or land granted to them by the authorities. In order for the displaced to receive this assistance they had to earn less than a certain income. As a result, many IDPs do not qualify for the assistance, thus generating a non-uniform distribution of benefits that has created problems among returning IDP populations.

Based on the Sri Lankan experience, the Consortium of Humanitarian Agencies (CHA)¹⁷ offers several recommendations on how to improve the return and resettlement process for IDPs in Sri Lanka which provide “lessons learned” for the Colombian context. CHA suggests supporting dialogue and mediation and reconciliation efforts between returning IDPs and local residents in an effort to reduce conflict between communities. It suggests that a coordinating body containing representatives of all relevant actors (the government, non-government sector, IDPs, military, etc.) be established at the district level so as to increase accountability of the process. If the process is “owned” by all the actors who have a stake in a mutually beneficial outcome, it is likely to take place more smoothly. CHA further recommends that assistance should be given uniformly to IDPs regardless of how long persons have been displaced and also that the displaced be fully informed of the

criteria for receiving assistance. Moreover, CHA points out the need to establish forums between the authorities and the media so that the general public is given an accurate picture of the return or resettlement process, which can thereby help to prevent conflict among communities.

Recovery of Property and Compensation

The fourth concept is one that often presents many complex challenges throughout the world but is vital to ensuring that further violence and tensions do not take place. The concept of “recovery of property and compensation” for the internally displaced is a multidimensional concept that focuses on the recovery of property occupied before displacement, as well as the property acquired during displacement. The first point is that the return of personal property is of crucial importance for a dignified return. Second, that access to land is crucial for sustainability, especially for rural IDPs whose livelihood is dependent upon access to land. It has been found that when IDPs are unable to access land in order to sustain themselves they are likely to remain dependent on assistance.

The issue of land ownership, possession of land and compensation are matters that need to be addressed with great care. One problem that frequently arises is that property left behind by IDPs is occupied by others, including IDPs. Given that such scenarios can lead to conflict, it is important that local authorities deal with property disputes in a neutral, fair matter that also takes into account the needs and rights of the secondary occupiers. It is found that utilization of local conflict resolution techniques to address such circumstances is usually best.

With regard to compensation, it is important to note that it was the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights’ decision on Nicaragua in 1984 that helped guide approaches to returns of IDPs and influenced the development of the *Guiding Principles* on this point. The Commission ruled that compensation should be awarded to the Miskito Indians for the damage done to their property during displacement¹⁸.

The question of how to properly compensate IDPs given limited resources formed part of the debate of a seminar held in Lima in April 2003 that brought together leaders of IDP organizations from throughout the Americas. At this seminar, Peruvian IDP leaders pointed out that in their view “compensation” is more than a monetary concept. For these IDPs, compensation is a multi-faceted concept that is tied to justice, acknowledgement by the warring parties of the violations committed that led to their displacement, a recognition that many remained displaced, and a process of reconciliation that will allow them to reinsert themselves into the society in a manner that allows them to fully exercise their rights as citizens. Significantly, on November 21, President Toledo apologized on behalf of the Peruvian Government “for the deaths, disappearances and internal displacements” that took place in Peru from 1980 to 2000.¹⁹

Access by Humanitarian Organizations

Fifth, it is also important to ensure that IDPs have access to humanitarian organizations and other appropriate actors such as development agencies and that there is free passage of assistance in support of return, resettlement and reintegration.

Preparing for Return and Resettlement in Colombia

While conditions may not be ripe in parts of Colombia for voluntary return in safety and dignity to take place it is important to think of how return should be addressed so that when the time comes it can be done in a manner that incorporates the standards found in the *Principles* and the lessons learned from IDP returns around the world. The five themes I just presented to you have been explored in other situations of displacement throughout the world. My explanation of these themes draws upon several practical tools that were developed to assist persons working on behalf of IDPs. These are the *Handbook for Applying the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement* (which is being distributed at this meeting), the Norwegian Refugee Council's *Module on Return, Resettlement and Reintegration* and the *Manual on Field Practice in Internal Displacement*.

Another tool developed by the Sri Lankan NGO the Consortium for Humanitarian Agencies with the support of the Brookings-SAIS Project is a *Practitioner's Kit*, based on the *Principles*, designed to serve as a practical guide for all involved in the return process. Although the situations in Sri Lanka and Colombia differ, the thinking that is taking place within Sri Lanka on how to best manage the return, resettlement and reintegration of IDPs will be useful for the Colombian context. As you may know, the issue of return, resettlement and reintegration of IDPs is currently a high priority in the country of Sri Lanka. In February 2002, the Government of Sri Lanka and the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) signed a ceasefire as a first step toward a peace process that could bring an end to the twenty year old conflict. During this conflict more than 750,000 persons became internally displaced and since February more than 300,000 have returned home²⁰.

Angola's Norms on Resettlement

I will now turn to the experience of return, resettlement and reintegration that is currently taking place in Angola. In April 2002 a ceasefire agreement was signed between the Government of Angola and the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA), ending 27 years of civil war. The challenge then became one of how to address the return, resettlement and reintegration of 4 million internally displaced persons. Between April 2002 and June 2003, over 2 million persons returned to their places of origin²¹. Prior to the ceasefire, the Angolan Government developed "Norms on the Resettlement and Return of Displaced Populations"²² based on the *Guiding Principles*, which have served to guide all the actors working toward durable solutions to internal displacement in this country. These Norms set up a "Subgroup on IDPs and Refugees" that includes representatives of the Government agencies, NGOs and humanitarian agencies to carry out the return and resettlement of IDPs. This Subgroup must identify land for returned or resettled IDPs, ensure the return or resettlement sites are secure by coordinating with the security and defense authorities, and ensure that return and

resettlement is voluntary by securing agreements with those representing IDPs and the host communities, as well as involving IDPs in the planning and management of their relocation. According to the Norms, Governmental authorities must be present at the return or resettlement sites and they must coordinate with the UN country team when assessing the viability of resettlement areas²³.

Recently, the Stanley Foundation and Strategic Humanitarian Action and Research (SHARE)²⁴ brought together representatives of the Angolan government, donors, international organizations and Angolan civil society to discuss how they could best meet the challenges Angola is facing as it moves from a severe humanitarian emergency to development. On the issue of return, reintegration and rehabilitation of IDPs, refugees and ex-combatants, conference participants found that it is important to continue emergency assistance at the same time as plans for development go forward. Also that in order to deal with protection problems, it is important that IDPs are granted identification documents and that a properly functioning justice system is put into place to monitor and protect persons from abuse.

The Angolan experience points to another key theme that needs to be considered when seeking durable solutions to situations of internal displacement which is the transition from relief to development. In order to achieve full and sustainable integration of the displaced in the areas of return, resettlement and reintegration it is recommended that programs are linked to an overall development program. Governmental officials and humanitarian agencies must work together with NGOs, donors, and development agencies to ensure that internally displaced persons fully make the transition back into civil society.

One question that is often asked in these scenarios is “when does displacement end?” This is a question that the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) has turned to the Representative of the Secretary-General for advice and guidance. On his behalf, the Brookings-SAIS Project in partnership with Georgetown University has been exploring this issue through research and a series of consultations with international agencies, non-governmental organizations and research to develop criteria as to when internal displacement ends. The question has been looked at through the lens of the Guiding Principles, the refugee experience by analogy and implication, and country cases of internal displacement. The Project under the leadership of Erin Mooney²⁵ has examined the issue through different sets of possible criteria in search of answer to this question. These include caused-based criteria, solutions-based criteria and needs-based criteria. It has been found that the act of return or resettlement of persons alone is not sufficient to fully end displacement. Conditions must be put in place to ensure the voluntariness and sustainability of these solutions, as part of an integrated approach that ensures that IDPs have options and that their particular needs and vulnerabilities arising from displacement are addressed.

The Brookings-SAIS Project and Georgetown University recently guest edited an issue of the *Forced Migration Review* on this subject²⁶. Included in this issue is an article by Amelia Fernandez and Roberto Vidal Lopez²⁷, Professors from Javeriana University who

explored the question of “when does displacement end?” in the context of Colombia. They point out that Law 387 of 1997 is restrictive when it comes to determining IDP status and deciding that a person should no longer be considered an IDP after three months of having registered. The law does not take into account the various obstacles IDPs face when trying to register, the IDPs who are excluded from the register, or the fact that those IDPs who are able to register require long-term assistance that goes beyond a three month period. It is important that the cessation of IDP status in Colombia is not done in an arbitrary manner but that it take into account whether or not the person has fully recovered from displacement and is once again a secure and self-sustaining productive citizen in Colombian society. The Government should accordingly consider formally extending protection and assistance to IDPs beyond the three month period specified by the Law to a period that reflects the needs and situation of the displaced.

Conclusion

Ultimately, durable solutions to situations of internal displacement are linked to addressing the root causes of the conflict and displacement. As Francis Deng, has pointed out²⁸, internal displacement is often a symptom of deeply rooted national problems. It is by addressing the root causes of conflict through political means and the promotion of justice, security and equality for all citizens that displacement is fully addressed. Although confronting displacement poses many challenges, it can be viewed positively as an opportunity to address injustices and plant the seeds for peace and national reconciliation. In order to address the causes of displacement it is important that all sectors of the society including the Government, international agencies, donors, non-governmental organizations, civil society and internally displaced persons be active participants in the process.

In closing, I would like to encourage you to familiarize yourselves with the standards for return, resettlement and reintegration of IDPs found in the *Principles* and to find ways to utilize them in your efforts to find durable solution for Colombia’s internally displaced.

¹ This section of the statement draws upon the following items: “Introduction to the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement,” by Roberta Cohen in *Kurdish Exodus: From internal Displacement to Diaspora*, edited by Mohammed Ahmed and Michael Gunter, Ahmed Foundation, September 2001 and statement by Gimena Sanchez-Garzoli titled “International Seminar: Experiences of Displaced Populations in Colombia, Guatemala, El Salvador and Peru,” March 2003.

² See *Internal Displacement in the Americas: Some Distinctive Features*, by Roberta Cohen and Gimena Sanchez-Garzoli, Occasional Paper, Brookings-CUNY Project on Internal Displacement, May 2001, pp. 5-6.

³ This section of the statement draws upon the following items: *Practitioner’s Kit for Return, Resettlement, Rehabilitation and Development: An Agenda for a Call for Action*, by Consortium of Humanitarian Agencies, Sri Lanka, Forthcoming 2004; *Training Module on the Guiding Principles Four: Return, Resettlement and Reintegration*, by the Norwegian Refugee Council, available from www.idpproject.org; “The Role of Protection in ending displacement,” by Roberta Cohen, *When Does Displacement End?*, *Forced Migration Review*, 17 (May 2003), pp. 21-24, available from www.fmreview.org; *The Handbook for Applying the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement*, by Susan Forbes Martin, The Brookings Institution Project on Internal Displacement and United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), 2000; *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement: Annotations*, by Walter Kaelin, the American Society of International Law and the Brookings Institution Project on Internal Displacement, Washington, DC, 2000; *Masses in Flight: The Global Crisis of Internal Displacement*, by Roberta Cohen and Francis M. Deng, Brookings Institution Press, Washington, DC, 1998; *Manual on Field Practice in Internal Displacement*, Inter-Agency Standing Committee Policy Paper Series No. 1, UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), 1999; “Durable Solutions for the Internally Displaced Kurds of Iraq: Legal and Practical Considerations,” by David Fisher, Forthcoming 2004 and *Growing the Sheltering Tree: Protecting Rights Through Humanitarian Action: Programmes and Practices Gathered from the Field*, Inter-Agency

-
- Standing Committee, 2002. Copies of items authored by the Brookings-SAIS Project on Internal Displacement are available by contacting gsanchez@brookings.edu
- ⁴ *Practitioner's Kit for Return, Resettlement, Rehabilitation and Development: An Agenda for a Call for Action*, by Consortium of Humanitarian Agencies, Sri Lanka, Forthcoming 2004, p. 6.
- ⁵ *Masses in Flight: The Global Crisis of Internal Displacement*, by Roberta Cohen and Francis M. Deng, Brookings Institution Press, Washington, DC, 1998, p. 287.
- ⁶ *Training Module on the Guiding Principles Four: Return, Resettlement and Reintegration*, by the Norwegian Refugee Council, p. 6.
- ⁷ "The Role of Protection in ending displacement," by Roberta Cohen, *When Does Displacement End?*, *Forced Migration Review*, 17 (May 2003), p. 21.
- ⁸ *Ibid.* p. 22.
- ⁹ *Profiles in Displacement: Follow Up Mission to Colombia*, by Francis M. Deng, Report of the Representative of the Secretary-General, United Nations Commission on Human Rights, UN Doc. E/CN.4/2000/83/Add.1, January 11, 2000, p. 30-31.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.* p. 31
- ¹¹ *Statement prepared for the International Seminar on the Evaluation of the Pastrana Government's Policy on Human Rights: Agenda to Overcome the Human Rights Crisis in Colombia*, by Francis M. Deng, September 7, 2000. Available from <http://www.brookings.edu/fp/projects/idp/idp.htm>
- ¹² *Masses in Flight: The Global Crisis of Internal Displacement*, by Roberta Cohen and Francis M. Deng, Brookings Institution Press, Washington, DC, 1998, p. 289.
- ¹³ *The Handbook for Applying the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement*, by Susan Forbes Martin, The Brookings Institution Project on Internal Displacement and United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), 2000, p. 59.
- ¹⁴ Interview with Marino Cordoba, Director of International Affairs, Association for Displaced Afro-Colombians (Afrodes), November 23, 2003.
- ¹⁵ *Manual on Field Practice in Internal Displacement*, Inter-Agency Standing Committee Policy Paper Series No. 1, UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), 1999, p. 74.
- ¹⁶ *Practitioner's Kit for Return, Resettlement, Rehabilitation and Development: An Agenda for a Call for Action*, by Consortium of Humanitarian Agencies, Sri Lanka, Forthcoming 2004, p. 34.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 34-35.
- ¹⁸ See *Internal Displacement in the Americas: Some Distinctive Features*, by Roberta Cohen and Gimena Sanchez-Garzoli, Occasional Paper, Brookings-CUNY Project on Internal Displacement, May 2001.
- ¹⁹ Email from Diana Avila, Project Counseling Service (PCS)- Peru, November 26, 2003 and "Toledo Apologizes to Peruvians for Era of Political Violence," *Agence France Presse*, November 22, 2003.
- ²⁰ *Practitioner's Kit for Return, Resettlement, Rehabilitation and Development: An Agenda for a Call for Action*, by Consortium of Humanitarian Agencies, Sri Lanka, Forthcoming 2004, p. 1.
- ²¹ See *Profile on Internal Displacement in Angola*, Norwegian Refugee Council's Global IDP Project, September 2003.
- ²² Government of Angola, *Decree of the Norms on the Resettlement of Internally Displaced Populations*, January 5, 2001, available from www.idproject.org
- ²³ For more information on Angola's Norms on the Resettlement and Return of Displaced Populations, see *Profiles in Displacement: Angola*, by Francis M. Deng, Report of the Representative of the Secretary-General, United Nations Commission on Human Rights, UN Doc. E/CN.4/2001/5/Add.5, January 25, 2001.
- ²⁴ "Strengthening the UN-Angolan Partnership," Summary of Geneva Meeting, by the Stanley Foundation and Strategic Humanitarian Action and Research (SHARE), October 2003, available from http://hrp.stanleyfoundation.org/p5_angola/index.html More information on this report can also be viewed in the 5 November 2003 IDP News Alert, by Gimena Sanchez-Garzoli, posted on Norwegian Refugee Council's Global IDP Database, www.idproject.org
- ²⁵ "Bringing the end into sight for internally displaced persons," by Erin Mooney in "When does displacement end?," *Forced Migration Review*, 17 (May 2003), pp. 4-6.
- ²⁶ See "When does displacement end?," *Forced Migration Review*, 17 (May 2003), available from www.fmreview.org
- ²⁷ "Colombia: the end of displacement or the end of attention?," by Amelia Fernandez and Roberto Vidal in "When does displacement end?," *Forced Migration Review*, 17 (May 2003), pp. 28-29.
- ²⁸ *Profiles in Displacement: Follow Up Mission to Colombia*, by Francis M. Deng, Report of the Representative of the Secretary-General, United Nations Commission on Human Rights, UN Doc. E/CN.4/2000/83/Add.1, January 11, 2000, p.31 and *Statement Concerning the Proposal for a Law on Internal Displacement in Peru*, by Francis M. Deng, Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General on Internally Displaced Persons, July 4, 2003.