

REFUGEE LAW
INITIATIVE

SCHOOL OF
ADVANCED STUDY
UNIVERSITY
OF LONDON



Revitalising IDP research

A 'state of the art'
review

Ala Al-Mahaidi, Léa Gross and
David Cantor

rli.sas.ac.uk

REFUGEE LAW INITIATIVE

School of Advanced Study | University of London

Senate House, Malet Street, London WC1E 7HU, UK

Email: RLI@sas.ac.uk

Telephone: +44 (0)20 7862 8668

First published February 2019

ISBN 978-1-912250-22-6 (PDF edition)

Revitalising IDP research

A 'state of the art' review

Ala Al-Mahaidi, Léa Gross and David Cantor

A 'state of the art' research review based on the research workshop
*'Revitalising IDP Research: 20 Years of the UN Guiding Principles on
Internal Displacement'*

Refugee Law Initiative, London

20 July 2018

Contents

Acknowledgements	iv
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Scope of the workshop	1
1.2 Focus of the report	2
1.3 Next steps	2
2. Evaluating IDP norms	4
2.1 The Guiding Principles as soft law	4
2.2 'Sovereignty as responsibility' and 'Responsibility to Protect'	5
2.3 IDP norms under international humanitarian law	5
2.4 Domestic implementation of IDP norms	5
2.5 Obligations of non-state actors	6
2.6 Workshop discussion and research priorities	7
3. Framing internal displacement and IDP dynamics	9
3.1 Conceptualisation of 'internal displacement'	9
3.2 IDPs as a category of concern	10
3.3 IDPs and displacement drivers	10
3.4 Workshop discussion and research priorities	11
4. Urban and other non-encamped IDPs	12
4.1 General trends in urban internal displacement	12
4.2 Understanding and profiling urban IDPs	12
4.3 Case studies of urban internal displacement	13
4.4 Workshop discussion and research priorities	13
5. Regional protection of IDPs in Africa	15
5.1 Historical protection of IDPs in Africa	15
5.2 The Kampala Convention and IDP protection	15
5.3 National implementation of the Kampala Convention	16
5.4 Workshop discussion and research priorities	16
6. The relationship between internal displacement and cross-border movements	18
6.1 Normative distinction between 'IDPs' and 'refugees'	18
6.2 Patterns between internal and external displacement	18
6.3 Workshop discussion and research priorities	19
7. Environmental, disaster and development-induced displacement	21
7.1 Multidisciplinary perspectives on environmental displacement	21
7.2 Normative protection gaps for environmental IDPs	21
7.3 Resettlement and relocation of environmental IDPs	22
7.4 Particular geographic contexts: SIDS and Sub-Saharan Africa	22
7.5 Development-induced displacement	23
7.6 Workshop discussion and research priorities	23
8. Internal displacement and (access to) justice	25
8.1 Forced migration, transitional justice and reconciliation	25
8.2 Peace accords, international complaints mechanisms and insights from Colombia	25
8.3 Workshop discussion and research priorities	26
9. Internal displacement as a humanitarian challenge	28
9.1 International humanitarian responses	28
9.2 The roles of UN agencies and other international actors	28

9.3	Humanitarian access to IDP populations	29
9.4	Workshop discussion and research priorities	30
10.	Solutions, development and 'end of displacement'	31
10.1	Durable solutions to internal displacement	31
10.2	Achieving solutions through development	31
10.3	The 'end' of displacement	32
10.4	Workshop discussion and research priorities	32
11.	Other themes in IDP research	34
11.1.	Internal displacement in other regions (outside Africa)	34
11.2.	Beyond the social sciences	34
12.	Bibliography	35
	Appendix: Workshop programme	48

Acknowledgements

The Refugee Law Initiative and the editors gratefully acknowledge the useful input and comments received from many participants in the ‘Revitalising IDP Research’ workshop on which this report is based. Thanks also to Nicholas Maple and Susie Reardon-Smith for their role in note-taking on the day and in reviewing early drafts of this text.

The Refugee Law Initiative also wishes to thank Susie Reardon-Smith, Nicholas Maple, Olga Jimenez and Chloe Pieters at the School of Advanced Study, University of London, for their roles in helping to design, organise and run the workshop. The financial support of the John Coffin Trust was crucial in helping to defray some of the room hire costs on the day and is gratefully acknowledged here.

The editors also wish to give particular thanks to the members of the workshop steering group for their invaluable input on the design and methodology for the workshop, as well as for widely disseminating news of the event through their respective networks. Special thanks to Natalia Krynsky Baal (Joint IDP Profiling Service), Dr Bina Desai (Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre), Professor Elizabeth Ferris (Georgetown University), Katrine Gertz Schlundt (UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights) and Professor Walter Kälin (Bern University).

Thanks also to Cecilia Jimenez-Damary, UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Internally Displaced Persons, for her excellent opening keynote presentation and to Professor Walter Kälin for his skilful facilitating of the discussion during the final plenary session.

1. Introduction

Internal displacement due to conflict, violence, disasters and other push factors is a major feature of today’s world. Many millions of internally displaced persons (IDPs) exist in over 125 countries. High levels of poverty among IDPs bring other development and protection challenges, even as mainstreaming of IDPs in the humanitarian response has brought dividends in practice. Yet relatively little new research or thinking on internal displacement has emerged since the mid-2000s.

On 20 July 2018, a special research workshop ‘Revitalising IDP Research’ was convened in London to mark 20 years of the UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement (Guiding Principles). The event was convened by the Refugee Law Initiative (RLI), School of Advanced Study, University of London, with a view to consolidating and revitalising academic interest in IDP issues and promoting renewed research in the field.

This report outlines the themes, presentations, discussions and conclusions of the nine thematic panel sessions at that one-day workshop. In tandem, it presents a ‘state of the art’ review of research to illustrate the wider context of current literature on those themes and to substantiate the main priorities for future research identified by each of the panels. Additional areas of contemporary IDP research and the relevant literature are summarised towards the end of the report.

1.1 Scope of the workshop

The twentieth anniversary of the Guiding Principles in 2018 offers an important opportunity to reflect on internal displacement globally.¹ Although the Guiding Principles have promoted a common approach to addressing internal displacement, over 40 million IDPs reportedly remain displaced due to conflict and over 200 million were displaced by disasters in just the last ten years (IDMC 2018a). IDPs represent a major challenge for the humanitarian, development and security sectors.

However, there has been a relative paucity of new thinking and independent research on IDPs, particularly over the past ten years. The ‘Revitalising IDP Research’ workshop was convened as a forum to bring together researchers on IDP issues from both academia and practice to reflect on the current state of IDP research, the main priorities for future IDP research and ways for promoting the further development of a research community to engage with the topic of internal displacement.

The workshop centred around nine thematic panels at which a total of 35 researchers presented their new research on IDPs.² These papers presented were selected from a widely disseminated call for papers and the panels were constituted accordingly.³ The chair of each panel moderated an open discussion that addressed both the papers presented and wider issues relating to the theme of the panel. These panels form the basis for the ‘state of the art’ review presented in this report. A lunchtime session also saw four posters on IDP themes presented by early career researchers.

The nine research panels were complemented by an opening plenary session with a keynote speech by Cecilia Jimenez-Damary (UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Internally Displaced Persons) which introduced practitioner concerns into the research agenda. More generally, Ms Jimenez-Damary emphasised the strong need for greater research to ensure that IDPs and their rights, aspirations, futures and visions do not fall off international and national agendas.⁴ The workshop closed with a closing plenary session on pragmatic ‘next steps’ to building an IDP research community.⁵

1 On this point, the October 2018 issue of the *Forced Migration Review* is dedicated to 20 years of the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement.

2 See the Appendix for the workshop programme.

3 Panel- and poster-session presentation slides shared with the convenors are displayed on this RLI webpage.

4 She also drew attention to the four priority areas identified by practitioners in the *20th Anniversary of the Guiding Principles* plan of action, namely: IDP participation, national law and policy on internal displacement, data and analysis on internal displacement and addressing protracted displacement and supporting solutions.

5 See further below, section 1.3.

1.2 Focus of the report

This report represents a first step towards promoting greater engagement with IDP issues by the global research community. For each of the nine overarching panel themes identified through the initial call for papers for the workshop, the report presents:

- A concise summary of the ‘state of the art’ of relevant IDP research based on a review of the academic literature on IDPs and internal displacement, and
- A summary of the presentations delivered at the relevant panel of the ‘Revitalising IDP research’ workshop and the key research priorities identified during the panel discussion.

It is intended to be an aid for stimulating new research by academic and other researchers on IDPs and internal displacement. The focus is thus principally on research debates in academic fields rather than on the policy-oriented research produced by practitioners.

The report does not pretend to be an exhaustive review of IDP literature. A comprehensive review was outside the scope of the exercise. Moreover, it would not easily have allowed for inclusion of research presented at the workshop, some of which has not been published, or the research priorities identified by the expert participants for each of the nine themes. That is, after all, a crucial ‘added value’ of the workshop format (as opposed to a desk-based literature review).

The structure of the report reflects this decision. The following nine chapters thus directly map the nine overarching themes that were canvassed by the panels at the workshop:

- Evaluating IDP norms (Chapter 2)
- Framing internal displacement and IDP dynamics (Chapter 3)
- Urban and other non-encamped IDPs (Chapter 4)
- Regional protection of IDPs in Africa (Chapter 5)
- The relationship between internal displacement and cross-border movements (Chapter 6)
- Environmental, disaster and development-induced displacement (Chapter 7)
- Internal displacement and (access to) justice (Chapter 8)
- Internal displacement as a humanitarian challenge (Chapter 9)
- Solutions, development and ‘end of displacement’ (Chapter 10)

These chapters have benefited from input and comments received from workshop participants and other reviewers following their circulation in draft form in September 2018.

An additional chapter (Chapter 11) in this report signposts other thematic areas not covered at the workshop but where a body of research literature on IDPs exists and/or there is a priority for future research. The chapter reflects the input of the editors, as well as comments received from workshop participants and other reviewers from September 2018. It is not intended to be definitive but rather to indicate areas of research that fell outside those captured by the initial workshop call for papers.

The final chapter (Chapter 12) provides a bibliography for published sources referred to in the text.

1.3 Next steps

The final plenary session of the workshop focused on how to develop new momentum in IDP research. Following a short presentation by Dr David Cantor (RLI director) on the envisaged workshop outcomes, the session chair, Professor Walter Kälin (University of Bern) facilitated an open discussion of ‘next steps’. Alongside the production of this report, proposals were advanced for developing a network of academics and practitioners dedicated to IDP research.

Proposals for relevant network activities included:

- Sharing of research news, new publications, funding opportunities, collaboration calls, etc.
- Developing of joint proposals for research and events (including panels at other events)
- Organising own events as regular focal points for network (e.g. follow-up workshop in 2019)
- Developing an open-access peer-review journal as a focal point for new research on IDPs
- Designing/promoting teaching curricula in IDP field (on model of Refugee Law Reader)
- Working to support research capacity in countries affected by internal displacement
- Encouraging knowledge exchange between academics and practitioners in the IDP field.

A call was also made to share potential sources of funding to support such activities over time and to collect the names of other researchers in the field who might be interested in participating in the network but who were not present at the workshop.

The RLI is working towards the development of this network for promoting and building upon IDP research shared at the workshop.

2. Evaluating IDP norms

The recognition in literature of international protection norms for IDPs emerged in the early 1990s with the mandate of Francis Deng as the first UN Special Rapporteur on the rights of internally displaced persons. In one of his seminal contributions, Deng (1993) offered an overview of legal standards for the protection and assistance for IDPs in the context of the causes and consequences of internal displacement, calling for an urgent international response. Others at the time also recognised the value of consolidating existing legal principles concerning IDPs into a single text (e.g. Plender 1994). Subsequently, Deng’s (1995) landmark *Compilation and Analysis of Legal Norms* study, which underpinned the formation of the Guiding Principles, invigorated research interest concerning norms for IDP protection.

As discussed in this chapter, the research areas on IDP norms include the Guiding Principles as soft law, the notions of ‘sovereignty as responsibility’ and the ‘Responsibility to Protect’, IDP norms under international humanitarian law (IHL) and the domestic implementation of international IDP norms. The potential use by governments of IDP concepts and laws for narrow political purposes has also been raised by scholars (see, for example, Vidal López 2007).

2.1 The Guiding Principles as soft law

Following the adoption of the Guiding Principles in 1998, writers analysed the process of the instrument’s coming into being. Cohen (2004), as an insider in the development of the Guiding Principles, discusses the reservations that several governments expressed regarding the instrument’s development by international experts outside the UN system, considering the method used as an innovation in global standard setting. More recently, she examines the limitations and benefits that accrued from the use of a non-governmental process and argues that lessons can be learned for standard setting in the field of migration more broadly (Cohen 2013). The process is also described by Bagshaw (2005) as an example of how states have found more flexible ways of developing human rights standards than through formal treaties.

This has fed into a discussion about the appropriateness of a soft law approach to IDP protection. Kälin (2001) – as another insider in the development process – argues that the preparation of a treaty or General Assembly resolution in relation to IDPs would not have been a realistic option due to various complexities associated with the formation of those kinds of instruments. However, he argues that, despite their non-binding nature as soft law, the Guiding Principles are not without legal significance, as they are largely a reflection of states’ existing international legal obligations.⁶ Moreover, he suggests that, due to the instrument’s legal foundation along with the breadth of rights it contains and its wide acceptance, the Guiding Principles represent the ‘minimum international standard’ for IDP protection (Kälin 2005).

The recognition of this legal foundation and the merits of a soft law approach have been echoed by others. According to Cohen (2013: 13), one of the reasons for the success of the Guiding Principles was that it did not impose new obligations on states, but merely restates obligations that already existed under international law. Also, Orchard (2010: 281) argues that the increasing perception among states of internal displacement as an international problem has occurred ‘through the innovative use of soft law ... by a consortia of norm entrepreneurs’. He makes a case that the use of a soft law approach has contributed to the internalisation of norms in domestic legislation.

However, others consider the way forward in IDP protection to involve a more binding approach. Looking specifically at the right not to be displaced, Morel, Stavropoulou and Durieux (2012: 7) write that while most international instruments recognising this right – including the Guiding Principles – are soft law, strengthening the legal protection of this right would require, inter alia, for it to be ‘more firmly recognised by a competent, authoritative body (such as the UN General Assembly or UN Human Rights Council) in an authoritative international instrument (such as a new convention, a protocol to existing

⁶ Kälin’s (2008b) annotations to the Guiding Principles explain the legal sources, meaning and implications of each of the principles.

human rights conventions, or a resolution)’. Moreover, Cantor (2018b: 1) uses the issue of IDP returns to argue that a distinct field of IDP law is emerging with ‘intriguing implications for apparently long-settled debates about IDP protection, its relationship to refugee protection and its connection to other bodies of international law’.

2.2 ‘Sovereignty as responsibility’ and ‘Responsibility to Protect’

The emergence of the Guiding Principles challenged traditional understandings of the norm of state sovereignty. Deng (1995) coined the expression ‘sovereignty as responsibility’, asserting that sovereignty includes a government’s responsibility towards its citizens, including IDPs. Where the state is unable or unwilling to fulfil this responsibility, it should not stand in the way of international assistance. Moreover, the advent of the doctrine of the ‘Responsibility to Protect’ (R2P) – which proposes a deviation from the norm of non-intervention in certain kinds of emergencies⁷ (ICISS 2001) – saw increased academic attention on the relevance of the doctrine to the context of IDP protection.

Some have traced the historical connections between IDP protection and R2P and addressed the question of what utility the latter offers the former. Rimmer (2010a) challenges the idea that R2P inevitably leads to greater protection for displaced persons, arguing that there are both costs and benefits associated with aligning R2P with IDP protection. Also, Cohen (2010) identifies a host of problems associated with the application of R2P in this context, including, inter alia, the sidelining of the Guiding Principles. In contrast, Mooney (2010) regards R2P and IDP protection to be a good match overall, considering their differences in light of their ability to complement one another and ensure more comprehensive protection. However, more research is needed to fuel this debate. For example, according to Cohen (2010), an in-depth study of the single time when R2P was invoked – in Kenya – could offer strategies for better reconciliation between R2P and IDP protection.

2.3 IDP norms under international humanitarian law

There has also been discussion about how IDPs are protected under international humanitarian law (IHL). An early contribution in the *International Review of the Red Cross* argues for the importance of IHL for protection of IDPs when they are victims of armed conflict, suggesting also that the scrupulous application of IHL would make it possible to avoid most displacements (Lavoyer 1995). Cantor (2012) maintains that IHL does not contain a general prohibition of displacement, but rather embodies an understanding that displacement is often an inevitable fact of war. Based on this premise, he explores the ways in which conflict-related displacement is regulated by IHL and points out that not every conflict-related displacement is necessarily a breach of IHL. Jacques (2012) discusses normative gaps in IHL with regard to the protection of displaced persons, such as the inadequacy of concepts like ‘protected persons’ and the dichotomy between international and non-international armed conflicts, which, she argues, is incongruent with the realities of contemporary armed conflicts. Casalin (2018a and 2018b) examines the interplay between international humanitarian and human rights law regarding protection from internal displacement in different types of armed conflict.

2.4 Domestic implementation of IDP norms

The application of IDP norms in domestic contexts has also been explored in the literature.⁸ Ten years after the adoption of the Guiding Principles, Kälin (2008b) wrote that internal displacement continued to be seen as an essentially ‘internal affair’ in many parts of the world. He advocates for a ‘bottom up’ approach of convincing states affected by internal displacement to incorporate the General Principles

⁷ In exceptional situations of massive violence (massacre, genocide or ethnic cleansing on a large scale) ‘which so genuinely “shock the conscience of mankind” or which present a clear and present danger to international security’, this doctrine suggested that military intervention may be required (ICISS 2001: 31).

⁸ The October 2018 issue of the *Forced Migration Review* includes several articles on the domestic application of the Guiding Principles and law/policy development.

into domestic law and encouraging the development of regional normative frameworks. He also notes many cases where domestic applications of the Guiding Principles did not succeed in translating the abstract principles into concrete actions. Moreover, Kälin et al. (2010) considers specific protection issues – such as movement-related rights, the right to humanitarian assistance and the rights to food and water, to name but a few – while offering guidance on the domestic application of the Guiding Principles as they pertain to those issues.

Several studies compare practices across countries. For example, Ferris, Mooney and Stark (2011) examine government processes in 15 of the 20 countries most affected by internal displacement due to conflict, generalised violence and human rights violations; they apply a framework for an effective national response to internal displacement proposed by the Brookings Institution-University of Bern Project on Internal Displacement (2005). Some scholars, like Carr (2009) and Schrepfer (2012), explore how national laws and policies on internal displacement have evolved and expanded, with discussions on the benefits and shortcomings of different models with reference to specific cases.

Other studies give particular attention to certain contexts, such as countries in the South Caucasus (Cohen, Kälin and Mooney 2003) and South Asia (Banerjee et al., 2005). Furthermore, practical guides and tools for implementing IDP norms domestically have been developed, targeting law and policymakers (Brookings Institution-University of Bern Project on Internal Displacement 2008; Brookings Institution-LSE Project on Internal Displacement, IDMC and NRC 2013; JIPS 2018),⁹ parliamentarians (Inter-Parliamentary Union and UNHCR 2013), municipal authorities (Ibáñez and Velásquez 2008) and international human rights mechanisms and advocates. Since 2016, the Global Protection Cluster has hosted a database on countries with IDP laws and policies on internal displacement.¹⁰

A few studies provide different perspectives on the implementation of IDP norms. Ferris (2008a) argues that, while it is clear that the Guiding Principles have encouraged national action and been used for IDP advocacy, the extent to which they have prevented arbitrary displacement or contributed to sustainable solutions to displacement is less clear. Cohen (2006) states that there continues to be a lack of international institutional arrangements – including tools and structures – that are needed to prevent displacement and protect IDPs. Also, Droege (2008) argues that, even though there has been much uptake of the international treaties underpinning the Guiding Principles, the first cause of displacement in armed conflict – disrespect for IHL – continues to be prevalent, with little improvement in this area. These issues merit further research attention.

According to Orchard (2018) the recipe for the successful implementation of the Guiding Principles into national laws and policies is a mix of robust state capacity, leadership and commitment – but also effective accountability mechanisms. On the other hand, the narrow definition of the scope of the existing laws and policies or contextual limitations like renewals of conflict complicates the implementation of the Guiding Principles. The question of whether national normative frameworks contribute to reducing displacement is addressed by MacGuire (2018).

Finally, Krynsky Baal et al. (2018) argue for the role of improved data in helping the implementation of the Guiding Principles. Scholars have also long observed that IDPs themselves should be involved in the process of ‘translating international standards on IDPs into concrete legal or policy provisions at the national level’ (Wyndam 2006: 11; see also Aubin et al. 2018).

2.5 Obligations of non-state actors

Other research has also looked at the role of non-state actors. An issue of *Forced Migration Review* (Couldrey and Herson 2011) on ‘Armed Non-State Actors and Displacement’ looks at different types of non-state armed groups and efforts to bring them into frameworks of responsibility and accountability. For example, in one contribution to the special issue, Bellal, Giacca and Casey-Maslen (2011) point out

⁹ See also Chapter 10.1.

¹⁰ The global database is available on the Global Protection Cluster website. The Global Protection Cluster also provides useful tools and guidance.

that, although the Guiding Principles contain references to IHL norms that are binding on armed non-state actors, there are difficulties in ensuring compliance. They outline a number of reasons for this, such as a lack of ‘ownership’ over norms by non-state armed groups. Also, an article by Zeender (2005) addresses the legal obligations of armed non-state actors towards IDP protection under IHL, including legal gaps, and assesses the implementation of these obligations in practice. Further, it makes recommendations on how to engage armed non-state actors with IDP rights, such as the creation of guiding principles that clearly define the responsibilities of non-state actors towards IDPs.

2.6 Workshop discussion and research priorities

Many of the issues highlighted in this chapter were discussed in the panel discussion on ‘The Guiding Principles at 20: Evaluating IDP norms’, chaired by Cecilia Jimenez-Damary (UN Special Rapporteur on the human rights of IDPs). As summarised below, panellists focused particularly on the national adoption and implementation of the Guiding Principles and the role of non-state actors.

Dr Gabriel Cardona-Fox (Bologna Institute for Policy Research, Italy) presented his research on patterns of commitment to the Guiding Principles and regional mechanisms of norm diffusion. He found a steady growth in commitment to the Guiding Principles since the 1990s even among countries that, theoretically, should be less likely to comply (i.e. fragile, underdeveloped states, conflicts with a strong ethnic component and still at war) and with a great diversity of types and models of domestic laws and policies. Nevertheless, commitment has grown from countries suffering from internationalised and domestic conflict, rather than those with individualised political persecution. He also found that the number of IDPs in a country tends to increase in the lead-up to norm implementation, after which the number significantly declines (although he notes that this correlation does not necessarily indicate a causal relationship). Further, he finds clear evidence of regional clustering in the diffusion of norms, and that commitment is mainly driven by the intervention of international institutions and advocacy networks.

Ileana Nicolau (European University Institute, Italy) discussed the institutionalisation of IDP protection norms by state governments. Her research explores questions of how and why states engage with IDP protection norms, and what this indicates about their exercise of sovereignty. She explored different dimensions of norm institutionalisation, including scope of institutionalisation (i.e. the constitutive effect of the norm) and the level of institutionalisation (i.e. the prescriptive effect of the norm). The latter includes the level of formalisation of norms as well as states’ practical behaviour. Moreover, she provided a comparison of the institutionalisation processes of IDP protection norms in Colombia, Peru and Kenya, with attempts to explain the variations.

Dr Annysa Bellal (Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights, Switzerland) discussed the practices and interpretation of IDP norms by non-state armed groups. She said that the topic is not a straightforward dual analysis of perpetrator and victims: while armed groups may be agents of displacement, their own family members could also be the victims. Armed groups could also be protectors and promoters of IDP norms. Bellal pointed out that armed groups often have different interpretations of IDP norms, giving the example of the Kurdish People’s Protection Units (YPG) in northern Syria. In response to an Amnesty International (2015) report accusing the YPG of conducting forced displacement, the group claimed that the report was inconsistent with the permissibility in the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court of forced displacement for ‘imperative military reasons’. However, there is a lack of information and understanding of how armed groups interpret IDP norms.

Sarah Adamczyk (independent researcher) spoke about the role of non-state actors in upholding the norm of access to legal and civil documentation. In Syria, identity documents issued by non-state actors are generally not recognised by the state and IDPs holding them risk being perceived as affiliated with the issuing group. IDPs also face other barriers to accessing documents, such as loss or confiscation, destruction and targeting of records and gender discrimination. As a consequence, they may face barriers to movement and access to humanitarian services and education, statelessness, family separation, arrest and detention, the risk of sexual exploitation and early marriage (where age cannot be determined)

and the need to rely on fraudulent documents and bribery. This demonstrates some of the difficulties in upholding IDP norms where non-state actors exercise control.

The panel discussion gave rise to the following **research priorities**:

- The role of international law and the Guiding Principles as soft law in the development of domestic law, policy and practice on internal displacement.
- Incentives and barriers to domestic implementation of law and policy on internal displacement, and the impact of that implementation in different contexts.
- Obligations and practices of non-state actors, including both armed groups and non-armed groups.

3. Framing internal displacement and IDP dynamics

Work on the framing of internal displacement and IDP dynamics stems from the adoption of the Guiding Principles and the seminal literature that provided overviews of the causes, consequences and normative context of internal displacement (Cohen and Deng 1998a, 1998b; Deng 1993; Korn 1999). With this grounding, particular debates have emerged about how ‘internal displacement’ and ‘IDPs’ should be conceptually understood (especially in comparison to the definition of a ‘refugee’) – for instance, whether IDPs should be considered a distinct category of concern.

3.1 Conceptualisation of ‘internal displacement’

The origins of the concept of ‘internal displacement’ have been outlined by Weiss and Korn (2006). They suggest that the conceptualisation of internal displacement can be traced back to the work and interests of some refugee-focused NGOs in the 1980s. With the establishment of the mandate of the Representative of the Secretary-General on internally displaced persons in 1993, the concept of internal displacement arose because it was ‘used as an effective vehicle for articulating legal standards and mobilizing the international community’ around IDP issues (Stavropoulou 2009: 125). The eventual adoption of the Guiding Principles established a definition of IDPs as:

persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized State border (Guiding Principles, Introduction: 2).

However, the ways in which ‘internal displacement’ and ‘IDPs’ are to be conceptualised and framed are not so clearly understood. Mooney (2005b) discusses the need for conceptual clarity, describing ‘internal displacement’ as ‘a term of art’ subject to different ideas about its meaning. Importantly, she suggests, the definition of ‘IDP’ is descriptive, rather than legal, as it ‘simply describes the factual situation of a person being displaced within one’s country of habitual residence ... [and] does not connote or confer a special legal status in the same way that recognition as a “refugee” does’ (Mooney 2005b: 13; see also Wyndham 2006). Rather, as Kälin (2008a: 4) puts it: ‘the rights and guarantees to which IDPs are entitled stem from the fact that they are human beings and citizens or habitual residents of a particular state’.

Moreover, the demarcation of the concepts of ‘internal displacement’ and ‘IDPs’ from ‘refugees’ has been the subject of particular discussion. In her statement to the General Assembly in 1949, Eleanor Roosevelt explained that IDPs were omitted from the draft 1951 Refugee Convention because ‘internal refugee situations ... were separate problems of a different character, in which no question of protection of the persons concerned was involved’ (Phuong 2005a: 23). Based on a review of archival evidence, Orchard (2016) suggests that this statement represented a frame used by the United States government to forestall a wider-encompassing refugee definition and an assistance mandate for UNHCR.

Moreover, Phuong (2005a) argues that although some commentators suggest treating IDPs as the same as refugees due to their similar circumstances (e.g. Kourula 1997), the distinction between the two definitions should not be blurred, especially with the statist nature of international refugee law (and the paramount importance of the crossing of an international border). Developed countries in the North may also see IDP protection as a way to reduce migration flows northwards, which could contribute to blurring the line between both categories.

Some suggest that such conceptual arguments now lie largely in the past, with the main issues in the IDP field operational, practical and political, rather than theoretical. For instance, Beyani, Krynsky Baal and Caterina (2016: 13) stress that the main challenge in the field of IDP is ‘determining the end of displacement and therefore appropriate support for the search for durable solutions’ (see also Chapter 10 of this report). While acknowledging the importance of these concerns, other scholars suggest that developments in

the IDP field require re-engagement with conceptual questions, such as those around the relationship between IDPs and refugees (Cantor 2018a).

3.2 IDPs as a category of concern

The question also arises as to whether IDPs should be treated as a separate category of concern from other vulnerable groups. An awareness of the politicisation of this debate is necessary, with arguments for and against separating IDPs from other categories often highly politicised in practice.

Some express strong objections to the separate treatment and identification of IDPs from other 'actual and potential vulnerable groups' (Borton, Buchanan-Smith and Otto 2005: 14), while others argue that IDPs should simply be treated as victims of war (Bouchet-Saulnier 2001). According to Chemaly, Jacobsen and Krynsky Baal (2016), there are two reasons for not singling out IDPs. First, they mostly live with other people sharing a similar lifestyle. Secondly, the definition of internal displacement in the Guiding Principles does not cover all aspects when it comes to identifying who is an IDP. Another limitation of IDPs as a category of concern is that trapped populations are de facto excluded, even if they became vulnerable for similar reasons as IDPs. Black and Collyer (2014: 52) notice that in past conflicts, those in most humanitarian need were precisely those who were unable to flee the conflict and violence, rather than those who moved to become refugees or IDPs.

Mooney (2005b) suggests that the converse argument is more persuasive, as IDPs can be victims of a deliberate policy of forced displacement (particularly minority groups), pointing out the prohibition of arbitrary forced displacement under international law. She also argues that while IDPs belong to a larger group of persons in need, their unique needs and heightened vulnerabilities (including their need for a durable solution) are distinct from those of the general population and require special attention. Further, being designated as an IDP has been shown to have practical implications; for example, Brun (2003) suggests that IDP status in Sri Lanka is often regarded as essential for securing special needs for assistance and protection, although the status may also separate IDPs from other citizens and restrict their rights.

3.3 IDPs and displacement drivers

The relationship between drivers of displacement and the IDP classification is also discussed in the literature. The definition of IDPs in the Guiding Principles recognises persons forcibly displaced by 'armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters' (Guiding Principles, Introduction: 2). Accordingly, the literature on internal displacement has considered situations of armed conflict, gang violence, natural disasters, displacement resulting from development projects and state-induced forced relocations, with some research comparatively analysing IDPs' experiences in these different contexts (Cernea 2000). According to Mooney (2005b), what people uprooted in each of these contexts have in common are the core criteria of involuntary movement and not having crossed an international border.

However, as outlined by Phuong (2005a), some commentators argue that people displaced by natural disasters are not IDPs, thereby emphasising the need for an element of coercion enforced by a government or an insurgent group. Likewise, in situations of displacement from development projects, it is argued that the central questions are whether or not the state offers assistance, whether there is discrimination in relocation and whether the displacement is forced or voluntary. Accordingly, Phuong (2005a) suggests that internal displacement should be discussed and understood within a wider human rights context, focusing on pertinent questions of individual/group entitlements and state obligations. Furthermore, it may be relevant to mention that displacement drivers, in particular drought and other slow onset disasters, can also shift the movement of pastoralists from voluntary migration into forced displacement. Schrepfer and Caterina (2014: 6), based on a case study of Kenya, underline the complexity of the situation because of its multi-causality as well as broad implications due to the fact that pastoral production is part of the continent's cultural heritage and directly 'linked to the identity of the individuals and communities that practise it'.

3.4 Workshop discussion and research priorities

The panel discussion on ‘Contemporary trends: Framing internal displacement and IDP dynamics’, chaired by Professor Elizabeth Ferris (Georgetown University, United States), addressed a number of issues covered in this literature review. As summarised below, panellists focused particularly on the conceptualisation of ‘internal displacement’, particularly in contemporary contexts of civil war and criminal violence.

Dr Jeff Crisp (Chatham House, United Kingdom) outlined the ways in which ‘internal displacement’ has historically been framed. He described how the development of international refugee law became increasingly exclusionary for IDPs throughout the Cold War period; this echoes literature cited earlier which critiques the demarcation between ‘IDPs’ and ‘refugees’. Crisp noted that IDP issues gained some traction and research interest in the post-Cold War era with the birth of humanitarian intervention, although operational challenges existed. He also referred to the period since 2010 as one of ‘faltering commitment’, particularly expressing disappointment at the exclusion of IDPs from important international initiatives like the 2016 New York Declaration and the Global Compacts on Refugees and Migrants.

Adam G. Lichtenheld (University of California Berkeley, United States) discussed the strategic logic of internal displacement in civil wars. He conceptualised displacement in civil wars not as a by-product of conflict, but as a particular strategy employed by armed groups, noting that displacement has been used as a strategy in at least 60 per cent of conflicts. It was suggested that the logic underpinning this conduct is based on ‘assortative theory’, whereby forcibly displacing people is used as a way to demonstrate their loyalty and affiliation. By creating an overwhelming incentive to leave, armed groups force people to comply or deflect, making the population more ‘legible’ and easily ‘sorted’. Hence, Lichtenheld suggested a need to understand not only why people flee, but also the ‘pull factors’ of armed groups that incentivise people to move to their territories.

Dr Abbey Steele (University of Amsterdam, Netherlands) discussed her research on displacement in Colombia’s civil war, focusing on how displacement and resettlement can be characterised in that context. In particular, her research was able to generate a predicted probability of displacement based on political affiliations. This demonstrates the collective targeting of civilians based on political cleansing and that this takes place even in the context of non-ethnic civil wars. She also suggested that aggregate IDP and refugee populations are likely to be a mix of people moving from varied forms of targeting. Moreover, it was suggested that the conditions surrounding where someone seeks safety depends on the type of displacement that they have experienced.

Dr Vickie Knox (Refugee Law Initiative, United Kingdom) discussed her reconceptualisation of internal displacement caused by criminal violence in Central America. She explained how displacement in that context is increasingly caused by state actors in their repressive response to gangs, and that people’s decisions to flee are based on risks and threats. Knox suggested that people flee at all points of a continuum, with decisions depending on different levels of tolerance and resilience, and on access to economic resources and social capital. However, where people go in displacement is not predictable, as this is highly individualised and subjective; therefore, movements appear to be ostensibly random. Moreover, she finds that repeated displacements occur when people are unable to find security. The utility of typology in this context to guide policymaking was also considered.

The panel discussion gave rise to the following **research priorities**:

- The development community’s engagement with IDPs versus refugees, and the history of UNHCR engagement with IDPs.
- The relationship between types of displacement and types of armed violence, and the implications of this for research and policy.
- The dynamics of internal displacement, including considerations of the micro-politics of displacement.
- The relationship between IDPs and the ‘containment agenda’, i.e. the extent to which a focus on internal displacement reflects a desire to contain displacement problems in countries or regions of origin.

4. Urban and other non-encamped IDPs

It is estimated that more than 80 per cent of IDPs around the world live in urban environments (Brandt, Jones and Katz 2017: 1). However, the accuracy of this figure has been questioned (IDMC 2018b), especially given that IDPs in urban areas are not readily identifiable (Davies and Jacobsen 2010). Moreover, many IDPs live in small settlements or villages that are neither camps nor particularly urban.

Nevertheless, urban IDPs are thought to be 'among the poorest and most vulnerable groups in many conflict-affected countries' (Davies and Jacobsen 2010: 13) and in need of a special focus in research. As outlined in this chapter, some general trends can be discerned, such as the relationship between urban internal displacement and broader processes of rapid urbanisation occurring in the world. There have also been contributions proposing general approaches to understanding and profiling urban internal displacement situations, whereas earlier literature on this topic focused mainly on describing particular cases of urban internal displacement, such as in Senegal and Colombia.

4.1 General trends in urban internal displacement

A limited set of literature has explored general trends in urban internal displacement. Crisp, Morris and Refstie (2012) assert that displaced people are affected by and engaged in the process of rapid urbanisation that characterises the modern world. They argue that with the increasing arrival and long-term settlement of IDPs in towns and cities, these populations need to be better anticipated, understood and planned for. They especially emphasise the importance of forming new partnerships,¹¹ writing: 'Humanitarian actors can no longer liaise only with national governments; they must also develop urgently closer working relationships with mayors and municipal authorities, service providers, urban police forces, and, most importantly, the representatives of both displaced and resident communities' (Crisp, Morris and Refstie 2012: 23).

Pantuliano et al. (2012) suggest that there has been an increase in attention given to, and recognition of, the implications of rapid urbanisation in the developing world, and they discuss the link between the broader trend of urbanisation and displacement issues. Assuming displacement as a key lens on urban vulnerability, they outline the historical development of debates on urban displacement since the 1970s and assess the ramifications of urban vulnerability for humanitarian practitioners. Moreover, they contend that the humanitarian sector has not been able to galvanise on the issue or employ existing knowledge and adapt practice. A person-centred approach to improve the humanitarian response to urban displacement has been proposed by the ICRC (2018) based on four case studies of urban displacement scenarios: Baidoa in Somalia, Maiduguri in Nigeria, Mosul in Iraq and San Pedro Sula in Honduras.

4.2 Understanding and profiling urban IDPs

Schmeidl and Hedditch (2017) assert that while development responses rely on nuanced knowledge of displacement situations, existing knowledge is imprecise and lacks depth, highlighting the need for more detailed and contextual research. Their work offers a snapshot of the current understanding of internal displacement, focusing particularly on urban settings. They point to areas where there has been progress in methodology and enumeration, as well as to the persisting gaps and challenges. They also make a case for the utility of a demography lens to fill those gaps and obtain a more holistic understanding of internal displacement.

Moreover, addressing the need to have better estimates of the number of urban IDPs and understanding of their demographics, the Feinstein International Center of Tufts University, together with the IDMC, conducted urban profiling studies between 2006 and 2008 in Sudan, the Ivory Coast and Colombia (Davies and Jacobsen 2010). The researchers propose a methodology that avoids focusing too much

¹¹ This is one of the aims of The Global Alliance for Urban Crises. Various actors – humanitarian and development agencies, academic bodies, networks of municipal authorities and professional institutes representing architects, engineers and planners – are part of the Alliance.

attention only on urban IDPs, instead looking at areas where IDPs are likely to be living and comparing their situations to those of other population groups in the same areas. Based on the results of the studies, they argue ‘that urban IDPs can be profiled, that the methodology tested is feasible for doing so and that estimates of urban IDPs can be made’ (ibid: 13).

4.3 Case studies of urban internal displacement

Simultaneously, key operational partners founded the Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS), an interagency technical support service dedicated to supporting humanitarian, development and government partners to undertake collaborative data collection exercises to support solutions for internally displaced populations. Much of JIPS’ work since then has focused on urban settings and out-of-camp displaced populations, with much effort invested in developing operational guidance and tools for conducting profiling.¹² Newer approaches, combining displacement population profiles and an area-based analysis of cities are also currently undergoing further application and testing in many contexts, for example, an urban profiling exercise in the Erbil Governorate of Iraq in 2016.¹³

Earlier studies on urban internal displacement focus on particular cases. For example, Evans (2007) surveyed a particular group of IDPs from Senegal originating from a rural area along the Guinea-Bissau border and displaced into the regional capital, Ziguinchor, mostly in the first half of the 1990s. He found that IDPs use pre-existing rural-urban migration chains and social integration processes, and that their livelihoods are more restricted compared to people normally resident in the periphery of the urban reception area and those remaining in the rural home area. He also found that IDP livelihood activities are more urban-based compared to those of ordinary town folk.

A few papers explore situations of urban displacement in Colombia. Carrillo (2009) gives an overview of internal displacement and the IDP assistance system in that country. She analyses the humanitarian consequences of urban displacement, describing the challenges that IDPs face in adjusting to an urban environment and the consequent livelihood implications, pointing out that IDPs become a part of the cities’ poverty belts. Carrillo also analyses the impact of urban displacement on different actors, including government, national and international organisations, and host communities. For example, she suggests that organisations have to adapt their programmes, criteria and the aid that they provide to the specific needs of people displaced in urban areas.

Albuja and Ceballos (2010) provide a brief overview of forced displacement to urban areas in Colombia in the context of rural-urban migration. They explain that Colombia’s capital, Bogotá, hosts both the largest immigrant and IDP populations in the country and that ‘it is difficult to differentiate economic reasons for migration from those linked directly to conflict, violence and human rights violations’ (ibid: 10). They explain how this mixed flow complicates the IDP registration process and results in the emergence of informal settlements and informal land markets around Bogotá. They also note the very long time it takes for IDPs to access humanitarian aid and the necessity for long-run development support alongside humanitarian assistance for new arrivals. Finally, they note lack of clarity around responsibility-sharing towards IDP assistance between national and local governments.

4.4 Workshop discussion and research priorities

The panel discussion on ‘Urban and other non-encamped IDPs: Thinking outside the camp’ – chaired by Bethan Mathias (Refugee Law Initiative, United Kingdom) – built on the emerging literature on urban internal displacement. As summarised below, the panel addressed issues related to challenging assumptions about urban displacement and engaged with the diverse range of stakeholders at multiple

¹² Useful resources for profiling urban displacement situations are the ‘Guidance For Profiling Urban Displacement Situations: Challenges And Solutions’ and the JIPS Essential Toolkit.

¹³ See: UNHCR (2016), ‘Displacement as challenge and opportunity – Urban profile: Refugees, internally displaced persons and host community, Erbil Governorate, Kurdistan Region of Iraq’. More case studies (Somalia, Iraq, Honduras, El Salvador) are available on JIPS’ website.

levels to explore durable solutions.

Dr Angela Cotroneo and **Dr Catherine Lune Grayson** (International Committee of the Red Cross) discussed the experience of IDPs in urban settings and the challenges involved in developing an adequate humanitarian response. Looking at humanitarian responses in cities in Iraq, Nigeria, Somalia and Honduras, they noted that such responses often simply rely on translating rural plans to urban situations. Moreover, they are built on unverified assumptions, namely that IDPs in urban areas are harder to identify, better off than those in camps and have the same needs as other poor urban populations. Cotroneo and Grayson argued that these assumptions need to be tested with better data and knowledge, and that engagement needs to be improved at different levels (i.e. city, community, household and individual levels). This echoes calls to fill knowledge gaps and establish multi-level partnerships made by authors cited in this chapter's literature review.

Melissa Weihmayer (Joint IDP Profiling Service) shared experiences of the challenges and opportunities for data collection and analysis on urban displacement in cities. She outlined the following four key factors that have implications for accessing information in the urban displacement context: (1) IDP populations in dense urban environments are difficult to find, (2) urban IDPs tend to be mixed in with the urban poor in informal settlements, (3) urban IDPs are often found in heavily damaged cities where low-functioning services are rife, and (4) cities have different types of actors responsible for providing services to urban populations which can be underfunded, have limited technical capacities and be driven by different mandates than traditional humanitarian actors. Weihmayer offered solutions for adapting information-gathering processes to overcome these challenges, especially working together with local authorities and partners in order to gather evidence that is relevant, useful and trusted to enable a more holistic and collaborative response.

Patricia García Amado (Universidad de Deusto, Spain) addressed issues related to durable solutions to protracted urban internal displacement. In particular, she looked at the Ugandan context, where people have been displaced for two decades yet are not recognised as IDPs. Amado pointed out that not much research has been conducted on what integration means in the IDP context. She moved on to discuss the framework on durable solutions in the context of urban internal displacement, focusing on state accountability; she pointed out that while national state actors may be willing to provide protection, city and local authorities may not be. She also looked at the community approach adopted by UNHCR and highlighted challenges in its implementation in urban areas.

Dr Fraser Murray (University College London, United Kingdom) presented his research on livelihood strategies by non-encamped IDPs in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). He particularly discussed the dynamics of hosting IDPs at the household level, pointing out that support does not normally reach beyond the community level and that most spending goes into camps. Murray described how hosts and IDPs usually agree on a hosting arrangement, whereby hosts (who quite often have been displaced themselves) offer shelter and social capital. While there is usually no financial assistance in the agreement, IDPs can benefit from entering into social networks. This can be seen as an alternative form of humanitarianism at the local level. However, Murray notes that existing writing is dismissive of hosting, even though it has been working for a long time.

The panel discussion gave rise to the following **research priorities**:

- Multi-scale interventions for addressing urban internal displacement (i.e. city, community, household and individual levels), and how these different levels of intervention could complement each other.
- Ways of combining area-based approaches with population-based approaches for more holistic understanding of internal displacement in a city.
- The extent to which social networks provide and/or support durable solutions.
- Factors that lead to local integration in urban and non-camp areas.

5. Regional protection of IDPs in Africa

Africa is the only region to have a binding instrument addressing internal displacement. The African Union Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa (Kampala Convention), which was adopted in 2009 and entered into force on 6 December 2012, put in place state responsibilities in relation to internal displacement and protected IDP rights in Africa. While earlier studies explored the history of IDP protection in the continent, the adoption of the Kampala Convention spurred research interest in its application and IDP protection norms in the African context, as well as policy-oriented reviews that took stock of state adoption and implementation of the treaty.

5.1 Historical protection of IDPs in Africa

The earlier literature focusing on urban displacement in Africa explored the extent to which regional actors dealt with IDP protection before the Kampala Convention was adopted. Beyani (2006) highlights the historical commitment of the African Union to addressing displacement problems in Africa. Levitt (2001) examines the conflict maintenance capacities of African regional actors – including conflict prevention, management and resolution – in order to assess their institutional capacity to protect displaced persons during internal conflict. Also, Murray (2005) addresses the extent to which the Organization of African Unity, the African Union and the African Commission on Human and People’s Rights protect displaced persons and assesses the limitations in the coherence and enforcement of their obligations towards IDPs.

Leading up to the adoption of the Kampala Convention, commentators wrote about the prospects and significance of treaty’s coming into being. Beyani (2006) outlines the gap in legal arrangements for IDP protection in Africa and presents the parameters of a draft legal framework for the prospective Convention. He suggests that the steps to adopt the Convention ‘will lead to a legal landmark in this field of human rights and international humanitarian law’ and perhaps ‘inspire an international resolve to formulate and adopt such an instrument, if not for the world as a whole, then at least for regions...’ (ibid: 197). Also, Jaksa and Smith (2008) discuss various reservations to the proposed Convention and suggest a role that might be played by the African Court of Justice and Human Rights in ensuring compliance with the instrument.

5.2 The Kampala Convention and IDP protection

The adoption of the Kampala Convention in 2009 spurred further research interest. Abebe (2009) explores the normative and institutional evolution of the African regional response to internal displacement and argues for the prioritisation of institution building. In another article, he traces the preparatory work, drafting meetings, policymaking processes and underlying legal sources of the Kampala Convention, and discusses its scope and enforcement challenges (Abebe 2010). More recently, Maru (2014) demonstrates how the Kampala Convention fills a gap in international law in relation to IDP protection and contributes to normative development at the international, regional and national levels. Adeola explores how the Kampala Convention protects development-induced displaced persons (Adeola, 2017). Others examine the articulation of the right to protection from arbitrary displacement in the Convention (Stavropoulou 2010; Adeola 2018) and the limitations of the Convention in protecting IDP women (Groth 2011).

Some studies discuss the integration of international legal norms into the Kampala Convention. Kidane (2011) critically appraises how the Convention transforms the Guiding Principles into legally binding rules for the management of internal displacement in Africa, while also analysing arguments for and against according IDPs a distinctive legal status. Also, Ojeda (2010) discusses the extent to which the Kampala Convention integrates international human rights law norms and contributes to the development of international human rights law rules related to internal displacement during armed conflict, highlighting areas where the Convention goes beyond existing norms.

5.3 National implementation of the Kampala Convention

One year on from the coming into force of the Kampala Convention, a report by the African Union and Norwegian Refugee Council (2013) took stock of the progress in the ratification and implementation of the Convention by African Union member states. Focusing mainly on countries that had ratified the treaty, the report focuses on issues related to national responsibility, forced evictions, displacement due to disasters and the role of civil society organisations and IDPs themselves. Moreover, in 2016, the International Committee of the Red Cross also conducted a stocktaking exercise in 25 African countries, identifying how states could best meet their obligations towards IDPs. Several recommendations were made to states and other actors related to the prevention of displacement; planning, management and monitoring of protection and assistance activities; humanitarian assistance; IDP protection and durable solutions. Academics also addressed national implementation of the Convention (e.g. Adeola 2017).

5.4 Workshop discussion and research priorities

The African context was given particular attention in the panel session on ‘Regional protection of internally displaced persons in Africa’, chaired by Dr Vickie Knox (Refugee Law Initiative, United Kingdom). As summarised below, panellists focused on the role of the Kampala Convention, the challenges faced by litigators and the World Bank’s development approaches to internal displacement in Africa.

Romola Adeola (Centre for Human Rights, Faculty of Law, University of Pretoria, South Africa) discussed issues regarding the role of the Kampala Convention in IDP protection in Africa. First, she outlined the scope of protection of different articles in the Convention, while also pointing to some limitations. For example, she noted that the Convention does not provide guidance on the meaning of ‘arbitrary displacement’ and does not address non-state actors, but pointed to the obligations of international institutions under Article 6 as a potential future focus area. Adeola also explained that the Guiding Principles still have a role to play in Africa, but perhaps more so for states that have not ratified the Kampala Convention. Moreover, she also pointed to issues of national implementation, noting that Kenya is the only state that has encoded the Convention in national law.

Donald Deya (Pan-African Lawyers Union) presented about the litigation of IDP protection in Africa, focusing specifically on the case of the Endorois and Ogiek communities. He highlighted a number of challenges in this area, including that domestic courts are often too compromised, and issues with the implementation of judgments made at the regional tribunal level. He suggested that there is a need for more research on how other jurisdictions outside of Africa respond to these kinds of challenges and how to better frame legal arguments. He also argued that interventions by the African Union would be valuable. Finally, Deya pointed out that the African Union has designated 2019 as the ‘Year of Refugees, Returnees and Internally Displaced Persons in Africa: Towards Durable Solutions to Forced Displacement’, suggesting that this could be an opportunity to gain leverage.

Dr Sarah Deardorff Miller (Columbia University, United States) looked at development approaches to displacement in Africa, specifically the role of the World Bank. She noted that the World Bank does not set displacement apart from other issues, as it is not a protection agency, but is increasingly working on displacement. In particular, Miller spoke about the work on internal displacement done through the World Bank’s IDA18 funding programme and its implementation in target countries, including Ethiopia, Uganda and South Sudan. However, while she discussed the potential of this programme, she also mentioned some issues, for example, funds going to the main ministries rather than the local level and the alignment of projects with national development programmes.

The panel discussion gave rise to the following **research priorities**:

- The role of regional bodies and options for collaboration across the humanitarian-development nexus.
- Research supporting litigators, including about approaches in other jurisdictions and how to frame more practical and detailed arguments.

- How IDPs can be made central to policy development in Africa in the context of moving from emergency assistance to durable solutions.

6. The relationship between internal displacement and cross-border movements

The relationship between internal displacement and cross-border movements of displaced people has been subject to discussion in the literature. The normative distinction between ‘IDPs’ and ‘refugees’ has been debated, echoing the discussion in Chapter 3 about the framing of ‘IDPs’ as a distinct category of concern. As discussed below, a notable essay by Hathaway (2007a) sparked academic debate around this topic. Moreover, other research has explored particular patterns and trends that can be identified between internal and external displacement.

6.1 Normative distinction between ‘IDPs’ and ‘refugees’

There is an academic debate regarding the normative distinction between ‘IDPs’ and ‘refugees’, and whether the refugee regime should be extended to incorporate IDP protection. In earlier literature, Lee (1996) argues for a reconsideration of the requirement of crossing an international border as a prerequisite for assistance under international treaties and instruments, basing his arguments on historical, practical, juridical and human rights grounds. He proposes an additional protocol to the Refugee Convention to enhance IDP protection (Lee 2001). In contrast, Barutciski (1998: 11) argues that ‘the distinctiveness and importance of the particular problems that are addressed by the term “refugee”, as defined in international legal instruments, should not be ignored’. He suggests that an extension of international protection to IDPs may be counter-productive and ‘detrimental to the traditional asylum option that is central to refugeehood’ (ibid: 11).

The debate was reinvigorated by a pivotal essay from Hathaway (2007a), in which he questions the soundness of the scholarly shift from ‘refugee studies’ towards ‘forced migration studies’. He suggests that ‘subsuming refugee studies into the broader framework of forced migration studies may result in a failure to take account of the specificity of the refugee’s circumstances’, illustrating his argument with reference to the emergence of the ‘IDPs’ category (ibid: 349). He writes: ‘the forced migration label ... groups together two sets of persons – refugees and the internally displaced – who in fact share little other than the shared symptoms of involuntary movement’ (ibid: 359).

The essay sparked responses from other scholars. Cohen (2007: 371) emphasises the similarities between refugees and IDPs, such as ‘IDPs in conflict situations just like refugees also frequently have fled persecution and discrimination’ and many do not ‘enjoy the protection of their own government’. Adelman and McGrath (2007: 380) accuse Hathaway of ‘simplistic reductionism’ in his arguments, linking the evolution of ‘refugee studies’ into ‘forced migration studies’ with the growth in interest in internal displacement. DeWind (2007: 381) criticises Hathaway for making ‘unnecessarily pessimistic assumptions about the incompatibility between individual rights protection and the practical necessity for broader and alternative collective remedies’. In a rejoinder, Hathaway (2007b: 388) states that the responses from Cohen and Adelman and McGrath ‘profoundly misunderstood the contemporary scope of the legal definition of refugee status, as well as the way in which refugee rights accrue’.

6.2 Patterns between internal and external displacement

Some research has looked at patterns and trends that can be identified between internal displacement and cross-border displacement dynamics. For example, Moore and Shellman (2006) explore the circumstances leading some countries to produce a large number of refugees and relatively few IDPs. They develop and confirm a hypothesis suggesting that refugee flows are greater in the face of state or state-sponsored genocide or politicide than other state coercion, dissident campaigns of violence or civil wars. Also, it is argued that fewer refugees are produced, relative to IDPs, in countries surrounded by poor and authoritarian regimes, as opposed to wealthy and democratic ones. Their explanations are grounded in an analysis of the choice calculations made by individual IDPs.

Also, Ferris (2008b) looks at the relationship between internal displacement and the right to seek asylum. She argues that governments contribute to increasing internal displacement when they deny asylum on the grounds that asylum seekers can find protection elsewhere within their own country. It is suggested that the Guiding Principles could be used to determine whether an ‘internal flight alternative’ could be used in determining asylum claims. In her analysis, Ferris considers a range of issues, including the relationship between internal and external displacement, the impact of closed borders on internal displacement, refugee returns and internal displacement, the internal flight alternative and the role of UNHCR in upholding asylum and increasing its engagement with IDPs.

6.3 Workshop discussion and research priorities

Many of the issues discussed in this chapter were addressed in the panel discussion on ‘The invisible majority: Understanding the relationship between internal displacement and cross-border movements of refugees and migrants’, chaired by Elizabeth Rushing (Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre). As summarised below, panellists discussed the relationship between IDP protection and international refugee law, different drivers and causes of internal to cross-border displacement and the role of information and digital technology in the movements of displaced people.

Dr Bríd Ní Ghráinne (University of Sheffield, United Kingdom) discussed challenges in the relationship between the protection of IDPs and international refugee law. She argued that IDP protection does not, in law, undermine refugee protection, asserting that if the threshold for internal protection is able to be met, then protection can be accessed within the country and there is no need for refugee status. However, five challenges were identified: (1) the difficulties in conceptualising IDPs as a category of concern, (2) developing an appropriate framework for IDP protection while preserving the protection of refugees, (3) ensuring that IDP protection is not misinterpreted as a substitute for asylum, (4) determining the relationship between complementary protection and encampment, and (5) the implications of Article 1D of the Refugee Convention.

Chloe Sydney (Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre) spoke about what drives IDPs to cross borders and to return. She identified that multiple internal displacements eventually lead to cross-border movements in the absence of durable solutions in-country. Moreover, she spoke about a relationship between struggles experienced in a host country and the desire to return. For example, a lack of income opportunities for Iraqi refugees in Sweden resulted in an increased desire to return to Iraq; eventually, the need of financial security takes precedence over physical security, resulting in premature returns. Based on these results, Sydney pointed to the need for more focus on internal displacement to prevent refugee crises and argued that holistic, durable solutions programming should include both IDPs and returning refugees.

Dr Caroline Zickgraf (University of Liège, Belgium) discussed internal to cross-border displacement in multi-risk and slow-onset contexts. First, she highlighted that refugee and IDP research often treats the causes of displacement as separate risks. However, the isolation of displacement drivers can lead to inappropriate solutions. Secondly, she pointed out that there is an overwhelming focus on sudden-onset issues, given that most new IDPs are in displacement because of sudden-onset environmental disasters, rather than conflict. With the exception of drought, slow-onset causes are continually neglected and are often not seen as displacement issues, but, rather, drivers of economic migration. Institutions also do not see people displaced by slow-onset drivers as in need of protection.

Dr Charles Martin-Shields (German Development Institute, GDI-DIE) spoke about the role of access to information in shaping internal and cross-border migration. In particular, he looked at digitalisation in the lives of IDPs and refugees and the use of technology. His research explores why displaced people use the technology that they do, and how they use technology tools to support them during migration. For example, he explained that having a smartphone can facilitate social networks, which are essential for settling in urban areas. Further, he discussed the importance of having an understanding of how people on the move use digital tools when designing programmes to support and protect them.

The panel discussion gave rise to the following **research priorities**:

- The scale and drivers of the onward movement of IDPs across borders, and what hinders others from crossing borders.
- Obstacles experienced by returning refugees and IDPs in achieving durable solutions in their community or areas of origin.
- Untangling and understanding migration and displacement (both internal and cross-border) in multi-risk and slow-onset contexts.
- How to ensure that the protection of IDPs is not misinterpreted as a substitute for asylum.
- How IDPs and refugees use digital tools to make safe migration decisions in different urban, rural and camp environments.

7. Environmental, disaster and development-induced displacement

The scale and magnitude for forced displacement caused by environmental factors is evident; according to IDMC (2018a: 6), 61 per cent of all new displacements in 2017 were triggered by environmental disasters. Indeed, in the Guiding Principles, those displaced by ‘natural’ disasters are encompassed in the IDP definition (Guiding Principles, Introduction: 2). Accordingly, researchers have attempted to understand environmental displacement from multidisciplinary perspectives, while also addressing normative protection gaps and government policies of resettlement and relocation. They also cover both rapid-onset disasters such as those linked to geophysical hazards and slower-onset disasters such as those linked to climate change. Two geographic contexts – small island developing states (SIDS) and Sub-Saharan Africa – have particularly attracted the attention of scholars. Other studies attempt to quantify the scale of internal climate displacement (see, for example, World Bank 2018).

Moreover, while related to environmental displacement, development-induced displacement has also been a subject of research in its own right (see, for example, Satiroglu and Narae 2015).

7.1 Multidisciplinary perspectives on environmental displacement

Some literature is dedicated to understanding environmental displacement from different analytical perspectives. A book edited by McAdam (2010) presents multidisciplinary perspectives on climate change and displacement through contributions from scholars from different disciplinary backgrounds. For example, some articles give conceptual and legal analyses of the status of displaced persons while others present anthropological studies of the displacement consequences of climate change and public health perspectives. The book has been lauded for providing a ‘one-stop shop’ in understanding climate-induced displacement from different angles (Suzenski 2011). Further anthropological perspectives on climate change can be found in the book by Crate and Nuttall (2009); in particular, the chapter by Oliver-Smith (2009a) focuses on adaptation, vulnerability and resilience in climate change-induced displacement and migration from an anthropological standpoint. Several Japanese studies explore disaster displacement in relation not only to earthquakes and tsunamis but also to technological disasters (Mosneaga, Sato and Turner 2016; Yonetani 2017).

7.2 Normative protection gaps for environmental IDPs

State obligations in this context of environmental displacement are set out in the *Peninsula Principles on Climate Displacement within States* (Displacement Solutions 2013). However, analyses of protection gaps have also been a particular focus of academics. Kälin and Schrepfer (2012) explore general obligations of states regarding mitigation, adaptation and protection, and identify critical legal issues that are unaddressed. A book by McAdam (2012) provides an in-depth legal analysis, critically examining whether states have protection obligations towards those displaced by environmental factors under international refugee law, international human rights law and the international law on statelessness. A study by Zetter (2010) identifies the existence of legal, normative policy and institutional protection gaps, and recommends that national governments develop coordinated and comprehensive policies and norms, including through the adoption of the Guiding Principles. Adeola and Viljoen (2018) explore normative provision by the Kampala Convention for climate change and development-induced displacement.

Bradley and Cohen (2010) highlight a lack of clarity about the status and protection needs of those displaced by slow-onset disasters as opposed to sudden-onset disasters. However, they acknowledge that protection gaps are greater for those who cross borders than the internally displaced. Also, Koser (2008: 17) argues that while it is arguably a priority to define the rights of those displaced outside of their country due to climate change, ‘the prospect of growing numbers of people displaced internally should also be a catalyst to address gaps and implementation challenges in the normative framework

that applies to them’.

A UNHCR-organised expert roundtable on climate change and displacement in 2011 found that, while the Guiding Principles are relevant to those displaced by environmental factors within their country, there exists a legal gap for cross-border displacements (Türk and Edwards 2011; UNHCR 2011). The Nansen Initiative Agenda for Protection, adopted by States at a global intergovernmental consultation in Geneva in October 2015, addresses this gap and includes a section on ‘Addressing the Needs of Internally Displaced Persons in Disaster Contexts’ (Nansen Initiative 2015).¹⁴ However, Rubio Díaz-Leal (2017: 415) argues that we still lack normative and operational systems to address climate change, suggesting this is partly because there is no international or domestic institution responsible for climate displacement and, consequently, no accepted definition for environmental IDPs.

7.3 Resettlement and relocation of environmental IDPs

Some studies have focused on resettlement and relocation policies in relation to environmental displacement. McAdam and Ferris (2015) examine conceptual and normative issues related to relocation as well as policy challenges about how relocations are, or could be, used in practice. Ferris (2012) proposes a set of principles regarding whether and how to plan relocations for vulnerable populations, based on lessons learned from development-induced displacement made necessary by the effects of climate change. De Sherbinin et al. (2011) outline important considerations and recommendations for policymakers contemplating relocations, such as the need for national-level legal frameworks and financing mechanisms. A policy briefing by Warner et al. (2013) asserts that different policies are required for different types of mobility related to climate change – including migration, displacement and planned relocations – and to make policy recommendations. Moreover, Johnson (2012) discusses the ethics and politics of resettlement as a means of mitigating climate disaster risks.

Further, a report by Foresight (2011) reaches the conclusion that planned and well-managed migration should be considered as an adaptation strategy, as it may reduce the chance of later humanitarian emergencies and displacement. Also, a comprehensive guide from the World Bank and Global Facility for Disaster Risk and Recovery makes the case for preventive resettlement and provides guidance on planning preventive resettlement and the importance of a comprehensive resettlement plan (Correa, Ramírez and Sanahuja 2011); a complementary report provides example case studies from Latin America (Correa 2011).

In addition, guidance has been developed to set out general principles to assist States and other actors faced with the need to undertake ‘planned relocation’ (UNHCR 2015). A toolbox with concrete suggestions for States and other actors also exists (UNHCR 2017).

The challenge when it comes to designing resettlement/relocation schemes is to consider age, gender and disability. While obviously important, this is still often overlooked. Specifically regarding the question of age, based on the experiences of a group of elderly displaced people in Japan and Georgia, Mosneaga and Vanore (2016) present why this group is ‘a radically different population cohort when considering durable solutions’. For them, ‘the need for age-sensitive approaches to durable solutions emphasizes the importance of better profiling of displaced populations so that the solutions are designed to meet the specific needs and vulnerabilities of different segments of the affected populations’ (ibid: 26).

7.4 Particular geographic contexts: SIDS and Sub-Saharan Africa

A few studies have explored particular geographic contexts where environmental internal displacement is acute. For example, in relation to SIDS, Thomas and Benjamin (2017) address policies and mechanisms for addressing climate-induced migration and displacement in Caribbean and Pacific SIDS; Plewa and Koch Giese (2017) explore Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) in the

¹⁴ The Nansen Initiative concluded its work with the endorsement of the Protection Agenda. The implementation of that framework is now being pursued by its successor organisation, the Platform on Disaster Displacement (<https://disasterdisplacement.org/>).

same geographical area. Hamza, Koch and Plewa (2017: 62) also note the ‘lack of literature on disaster displacement with a focus on SIDS, and especially with a regional focus on the Caribbean’. Moreover, according to a concise article by Kelman (2008: 21), which addresses, *inter alia*, island communities’ evacuation responses to environmental threats, there is a need to ‘draw on the experience of previous environmentally induced displacement, both island and non-island’ in developing precautionary planning.

Some scholars have looked at environmental displacement in Sub-Saharan Africa. Buchenrieder, Mack and Balgah (2017) construct ‘a unique micro-level human security index’ in order to improve understanding of people internally displaced by environmental factors and the framing conditions to return or not, looking specifically at internal displacement during a natural disaster in Cameroon in 1986. A study by van der Geest and de Jeu (2008) looking at internal migration flows in northern Ghana found higher migration propensities in districts with more natural resource scarcity, but that migration did not increase in times of environmental stress in the source areas of migration because of adverse economic conditions in the prime destination area. Other case studies highlight patterns of rural-urban environmental migration within Ethiopia (Morrissey 2008) and national disaster management policies in Nigeria (Chinedu 2008).

7.5 Development-induced displacement

As alluded to earlier, issues related to development-induced displacement sometimes emerge in the literature on environmental displacement (e.g. Ferris 2012). A volume edited by Cernea (2000) offers the first multidimensional analysis comparing people resettled due to development with those displaced due to natural calamities and military conflict. However, the topic of development-induced displacement in its own right is of increasing research interest. An early contribution to this topic argues that people displaced by development projects are ‘a forgotten category’, suggesting that the IDP definition should be extended to include them (Leckie 2002).

The unique risks and consequences of development-induced displacement is explored by some scholars (e.g. De Wet 2002; Robinson 2003; McDowell 1996), including for specific groups, such as indigenous people (e.g. Gray 1996), and specific project types, such as large dams (e.g. Scudder 2005). There is a particular focus on ethical perspectives towards resettlement processes, including considerations of rights and responsibilities (Muggah 2003; Oliver-Smith 2009b; Penz 2002; Penz, Drydyk and Bose 2011; Adeola 2017). For example, some argue for the insufficiency of compensation alone in re-establishing livelihoods (Cernea and Mathur 2008) while others consider the importance of socio-economic viability and sustainability in resettlement policies (De Wet 2006).

7.6 Workshop discussion and research priorities

Some of the issues discussed in this chapter were raised in the panel session on ‘Present and future danger? Environmental and disaster displacement’, chaired by Professor Walter Kälin (Platform on Disaster Displacement). Although the workshop was focused on environmental and disaster displacement contexts, disaster-induced displacement was also alluded to. In particular, the panel discussed a human rights-based approach to studying disaster displacement, the SIDS context, technological disasters related to the environment and the relationship between environmental, development and conflict displacement.

Dr Matthew Scott (Raoul Wallenberg Institute, Sweden) presented a research initiative studying disaster displacement in the Asia Pacific region through a human rights lens. Looking at ten different countries in the region, and with a grounding in the Guiding Principles, the research explores the relevant law and the role it plays in specific situations of disaster displacement. Those situations include prevention of displacement, evacuation, protection during displacement and durable solutions. Particular consideration is given to differential impacts and capabilities based on gender, age, sex and disability.

Dr Natalie Dietrich Jones (University of the West Indies (Mona), Jamaica) discussed her research on the capacity of sovereign and non-sovereign SIDS to respond to IDPs, looking at the case of the Anglophone Caribbean. Building on the research gaps on environmental displacement in SIDS (discussed earlier in

this chapter), Dietrich Jones’ research explores the macro-level factors that limit states’ capacities to respond to natural disasters. She identified a range of internal factors that are within the state’s control and external factors that are not. Among the conclusions and recommendations made are that improved state preparedness to respond to natural disasters could improve their response to IDPs, and that states need to take a more proactive approach to IDPs by explicitly including protection references and action points in policy and legislation.

Dr Ana Mosneaga (Japan Platform, Japan) discussed the case study of the response to displacement in Fukushima after the Great East Japan Earthquake. The case was described as a ‘living example’ of evolving needs, capacities and vulnerabilities over time. Mosneaga explained that disaster-induced vulnerabilities experienced by displaced people were linked with pre-existing, structural issues, including regional inequalities, job and income insecurity, and social isolation (especially for elderly people). Some of the recommendations made regarding solutions to technological disasters are: comprehensive reforms to policy, legal and institutional frameworks to provide targeted, timely and tailored support, and greater awareness about the long-lasting and divisive impacts of technological disasters, including psychological and social consequences.

Dr Beatriz Sánchez (independent researcher, Spain) discussed the relationship between environmental, development and conflict displacement through a Colombian case study. She outlined Colombia’s three approaches regarding managing internal forced exoduses: the IDP framework for displacement from armed conflict, ‘*damnificados*’ for displacement related to environmental disasters and the lack of a specific category for displacement related to development projects. She argued that the lack of a framework for displacement from development projects – which Colombia has embraced since the early 2000s – needs to be addressed as a matter of rights protection, and that keeping the three frameworks separate would not allow for a complete understanding of why almost 15 per cent of Colombia’s population has been uprooted.

The panel discussion gave rise to the following **research priorities**:

- Conceptualising ‘internal displacement’ in disaster contexts, including when the notion of ‘IDP’ is an appropriate one, the creation of protracted situations and the applicable sets of laws and policies.
- Understanding the conflict-disaster nexus, including causalities and interlinks, effective response in law and policy and the role of non-state actors controlling areas affected by disaster.
- Understanding the internal displacement/cross-border mobility nexus in disaster contexts, including migration pathways and secondary displacement.

8. Internal displacement and (access to) justice

Access to justice for IDPs is an area of increasing academic interest. As discussed in this chapter, although studies of forced migration and transitional justice have been mostly separate, some literature has sought to draw the connections between internal displacement, transitional justice and reconciliation, including from a gendered perspective. Further, other scholarly contributions have introduced different perspectives on the question of justice, including the relevance of IDP issues in peace accords, the role of international complaints mechanisms and special procedures, and insights from country case studies.

8.1 Forced migration, transitional justice and reconciliation

To date studies of forced migration and transitional justice have been mostly detached from each other. However, an emerging body of literature is exploring the relationship between transitional justice and displacement. A paper by Rimmer (2010b) addresses the need to reconceive refugees and IDPs as transitional justice actors, and appeals to academics and practitioners to conduct research in this area. The author argues for research that could lead to innovative camp-based programmes, improved sustainability and peace-building, and ‘foreground wider issues of coherence and effectiveness for the current UN system about the prevention of forced displacement’ (ibid: 163).

Duthie (2011) also points out that displacement issues have not figured prominently in transitional justice literature or practice. He explores how transitional justice fits within the broader response to displacement, arguing that the former can – and should – address the latter, but in doing so, should also take into account and establish links with other relevant actors. In his analysis, Duthie provides examples of how displacement has been dealt with through transitional justice measures and addresses questions about the capacity of transitional justice to meaningfully engage with displaced persons and their concerns. He also considers potential tensions and opportunities for cooperation, coordination and mutual reinforcement between transitional justice measures and the work of displacement actors.

Bradley (2012) looks at links between reconciliation, forced migration and transitional justice, and how the involvement of displaced persons in transitional justice processes could have potential implications for reconciliation. She addresses the conceptual and practical challenges of reconciliation in post-conflict societies affected by large-scale displacement. Further, she also looks at how policymakers and practitioners have sought to support reconciliation between displaced populations and other actors, and suggests ways to more effectively navigate some of the associated challenges.

Moreover, Hovil (2013) explores the relationship between transitional justice and forced migration through a gender-justice dimension. Using gender as a lens, she discusses some of the causes and consequences of displacement; for example, she asserts that certain groups are particularly vulnerable to sexual violence and that gender dynamics may also play a role in generating displacement. She also addresses how displacement itself can profoundly affect gender relations. Further, Hovil discusses the overlaps between the aspirations of transitional justice and the need to resolve displacement from a gender-specific perspective.

8.2 Peace accords, international complaints mechanisms and insights from Colombia

A different perspective is offered by Andersen-Rodgers (2015), who examines whether the inclusion of IDP issues in comprehensive peace accords increases the likelihood of a peace accord’s success, as well as the IDP issues being resolved. These issues are addressed in the context of an emerging set of norms on the treatment and rights of IDPs both during and after conflict, such as around issues of restorative justice. Based on an analysis of data from the Peace Accord Matrix, the study concludes that ‘peace accords with more provisions for IDPs are more likely to be successful, but not necessarily in terms of actually resolving IDP issues’ (ibid: 44).

There has been very little attention given to how IDPs could access justice through international complaints mechanisms and special procedures. A book edited by Fitzpatrick (2001) gives an analysis of how refugees, asylum seekers and IDPs can access human rights complaints mechanisms, while also providing details of procedural requirements and the relevance of different UN treaties for forcibly displaced people. The kind of guidance and analysis offered in the book could be re-explored through fresh contributions addressing international mechanisms and procedures in the current context.

Finally, other contributions seek to glean lessons from particular contexts. For example, Rivadeneira (2009) explores the judicial protection of IDPs in Colombia and, in particular, the contributions of the Colombian Constitutional Court to addressing displacement and protecting IDPs through its jurisprudence. It is suggested that the Colombian experience gives an indication of how courts and judicial processes can contribute to effective responses to internal displacement. Also, Jacobs and Kyamusugulwa (2018) draw insights from the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) highlighting, for example, the importance of personal connections and social networks in IDPs’ access to justice.

8.3 Workshop discussion and research priorities

The panel session on ‘Internal displacement and (access to) justice’, chaired by Romola Adeola (Centre for Human Rights, Faculty of Law, University of Pretoria, South Africa) built on many of the issues discussed in this chapter. As summarised below, these included the role of the Guiding Principles in international human rights mechanisms, a transitional justice perspective on internal displacement in Colombia and issues of access to justice in the DRC.

Deborah Casalin (University of Antwerp, Belgium) discussed the role of international human rights mechanisms in reparations for internal displacement, addressing a research gap highlighted earlier in this chapter. In particular, she explained the little explicit engagement with the Guiding Principles in the significant volume of relevant case law emerging from human rights mechanisms. For example, she noted that although most decisions on mass internal displacement were made after the adoption of the Guiding Principles, more than 75 per cent do not make reference to them. It was suggested that a potential contribution of the Guiding Principles in this sphere is the focus on the rights not to be displaced and to restitution. Moreover, some potential entry points were identified, including the incorporation of the Guiding Principles into national legislation, their use as an interpretative tool and petitioners taking the initiative of using the Guiding Principles in their arguments.

Félix Torres Penagos (University of Nottingham, United Kingdom/Constitutional Court, Colombia) discussed the opportunities and risks of IDP protection from the perspective of transitional justice, drawing lessons from the Colombian context. While suggesting that the IDP field should take advantage of the opportunities offered by transitional justice, he also acknowledged that the scope for application of transitional justice is quite narrow as it only tackles those aspects prohibited by international law. Although displacement is not in itself prohibited by international law, in some cases, it is still considered an affront to international law. He also pointed to the risks of using a transitional justice framework, as it may discriminate or create a hierarchy between persons with different reasons for moving but who experience the same result of displacement; also, it may privilege some IDPs over others.

Dr Carolien Jacobs (Leiden University, Netherlands) discussed the case study of the DRC. Based largely on qualitative research carried out in the country, Jacobs explained that interventions in that context are focused on protection and basic needs, but less so on justice for IDPs, particularly in urban settings. She noted that IDPs in the city of Bukavu have difficulties in claiming their rights in a number of arenas, pointing to challenges in identifying and registering IDPs, defining boundaries between the IDP and resident or economic migrant communities and IDP security. Moreover, the research highlighted that the state is ranked very low as a justice provider for people, compared to higher rankings of the church and local chiefs. Disparities in access to justice were also noted between IDP and local populations.

The panel discussion gave rise to the following **research priorities**:

- A comprehensive approach to IDPs’ access to justice within the context of transitional justice and beyond a narrow focus on reparations.
- How the Guiding Principles could be applied through judicial mechanisms at the domestic, regional and international levels.
- How IDPs’ practical access to justice (including additional measures such as psychological support) could be ensured.

9. Internal displacement as a humanitarian challenge

Humanitarian responses to addressing internal displacement have been subject to discussion and debate in the literature. In particular, the UN’s ‘collaborative response’, which was introduced in 1999, as well as the ‘cluster-based approach’ that replaced it in 2006, have been critiqued by commentators for their potential to address IDPs’ humanitarian needs. The roles of various international humanitarian actors have also been considered, most notably the debate around UNHCR’s involvement with IDP issues. Moreover, a limited set of literature explores issues regarding humanitarian actors’ access to IDP populations and state obligations in this regard.

9.1 International humanitarian responses

Some research has explored and critiqued the international institutional systems for the humanitarian protection of IDPs, the origins of which are captured in an early publication commissioned by the UN Office of Humanitarian Affairs (Newland, Patrick and Zard 2003). Earlier critiques address the UN’s ‘collaborative response’ to internal displacement (IASC 2004). For example, Eschenbächer (2005) analyses and contextualises the collaborative response approach against trends and developments in internal displacements, making several recommendations on how to improve the response system. Some authors, like McNamara (2005) – who discuss the role of the UN Emergency Relief Coordinator and the Inter-Agency Internal Displacement Division – point to the ‘considerable progress’ that had been made by those actors in driving the collaborative response.

Others are more critical. For example, Bagshaw and Paul (2004: 3) argue that the UN’s approach was ‘largely *ad hoc* and driven more by the personalities and convictions of individuals on the ground than by the institutional, system-wide agenda’, and criticise the lack of political and financial support for IDP protection efforts on the ground. Moreover, key figures in the humanitarian community highlight the need to address the limitations of IDP protection and assistance in a *Forced Migration Review* supplement (Couldrey and Morris 2005) dedicated to internal displacement.

An independent report commissioned by the UN Emergency Relief Coordinator and Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs assesses the humanitarian system’s capacities and shortfalls at the global level, including in relation to internal displacement (Adinolfi et al. 2005). The idea of ‘inter-agency clusters’ proposed in the report paved the way for institutional reforms. The 2006 UN Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) provides a Guidance Note on the implementation of the cluster approach, which was described as ‘a mechanism that can help to address identified gaps in response and enhance the quality of humanitarian action’ (IASC 2006: 1). Ferris (2014) studies the evolution of this humanitarian reform process (including the cluster approach) between 2004–2014 and concludes that ‘international commitment to addressing internal displacement seems to be diminishing’.

A number of scholars have been critical of the approach adopted. Graves, Wheeler and Martin (2007: 1) analysed the operational consequences of the humanitarian reform initiatives and note that, while the cluster system was initially intended to address protection gaps for IDPs, it has ‘expanded too far too fast given the lack of clarity over roles and responsibilities at the field level’. Ferris (2011) also explores the evolution of the international community’s understandings of ‘protection’ – particularly the humanitarian community in the context of the cluster approach – and highlights the inconsistent ways in which protection is defined and applied. Based on this analysis, she argues that existing protection paradigms are inadequate to meet future challenges. Moreover, Ferris and Ferro-Ribeiro (2012) draw lessons from international humanitarian actors’ efforts to protect Haitians during the 2010 earthquake, with a critical perspective on the cluster approach.

9.2 The roles of UN agencies and other international actors

There has also been a discussion regarding the humanitarian protection role to be played by UNHCR with regards to IDPs. An important policy document from UNHCR (2007a) discusses the agency’s capacities

in supporting and enhancing the humanitarian response to internal displacement and presents its implementation strategy, while a complementary paper examines the legal and protection aspects of UNHCR’s role in this area (UNHCR 2007b). At the High Commissioner’s Dialogue on Protection Challenges in 2013, many participants described IDP protection as UNHCR’s core business, while the agency renewed its commitment to engage in internal displacement situations (UNHCR 2013). Moreover, Crisp (2009) provides an examination of the expansion of UNHCR’s work in accommodating for broader groups of forced migrants.

However, there have been different academic opinions regarding UNHCR’s engagement with IDP issues. Some have argued for a broader scope for UNHCR’s work. For example, Lanz (2008: 192) discusses legal, political and operational arguments ‘pointing to the inevitability of UNHCR’s IDP operations’, arguing that ‘UNHCR should act pragmatically based on humanitarian necessity, as opposed to rigid normative criteria’. Phuong (2005b: 80), who traces UNHCR’s involvement with internal displacement, maintains that the agency ‘should not be given overall responsibility for the internally displaced, but it still needs to develop a coherent policy on internal displacement in collaboration with OCHA and other agencies’.

Some literature also addresses the role and scope of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement (the Movement) and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). The Movement (2009) presents its own policy on internal displacement, while Furrer (2005: 84) discusses the scope of the mandate and operational activities of the ICRC in relation to IDPs and considers that the ICRC’s concern with IDPs arose ‘out of the fact that armed conflict represents one of the major causes of displacement’ as well as ‘the fact that displacement often results from serious violations of International Humanitarian Law’. This reflects literature noted in Chapter 2 that discusses IDP protection norms under IHL (Cantor 2012; Jacques 2012; Lavoyer 1995).

The roles of other international actors in humanitarian efforts have also been noted. For example, an early paper from the UN Children’s Fund (UNICEF) outlines some ways in which the agency could incorporate concerns related to IDP children in its work (Kunder 1998), while Kastberg (2002) discusses some of the agency’s experiences working with displaced children, including IDPs. Also, the International Organization for Migration (2017) presents its framework for addressing internal displacement, while the World Food Programme (2012) recognises its role in relation to ensuring food security for IDPs.

Further, the role of the UN Security Council in promoting humanitarian assistance for IDPs has also been considered. A review of Security Council resolutions indicates that ‘[c]oncerns associated with humanitarian access and assistance to IDPs in armed conflict are often encompassed within concerns associated with humanitarian access and assistance to civilians generally’ (Weerasinghe and Ferris 2011: 21). The study also recommends a number of considerations for the Security Council in relation to humanitarian access and assistance for IDPs.

9.3 Humanitarian access to IDP populations

Finally, the literature has explored issues related to states’ obligation to accept international humanitarian assistance for IDPs under international law. Luopajarvi (2003: 678) addresses questions of ‘whether and when the international community can provide either surrogate or complementary assistance to the internally displaced without the consent of the government concerned’. Further, a book from the IASC (2002), which gathers methods and programmes developed by humanitarians working in the field, including in internal displacement contexts, discusses negotiating access to persons under threat and ensuring the right to humanitarian assistance. The question of how operational realities ultimately shape the protection of IDPs by humanitarians, and also where limitations exist, is the subject of a recent study by Schrepfer (2018). This has also raised questions about the operational relevance of the Guiding Principles (Russell 2018).

9.4 Workshop discussion and research priorities

Issues discussed in this chapter were raised in the panel session on ‘Internal displacement as a humanitarian challenge’, chaired by Joakim Daun (Refugee Law Initiative, United Kingdom). As summarised below, the discussion included an overview of issues related to internal displacement as a humanitarian challenge, public health issues in relation to IDPs and humanitarian practice in the DRC.

Professor Elizabeth Ferris (Georgetown University, United States) gave an overview of issues related to IDPs as a humanitarian concern. She raised a number of broad questions, such as whether people who have been displaced (either internally or across borders) are always in greater need of humanitarian support over others. Echoing the debate discussed earlier in this chapter about the role of UNHCR with regards to IDPs, Ferris discussed some of the financial issues underlying UNHCR’s limited engagement with IDPs. For example, she noted that although UNHCR is working with twice as many IDPs as refugees, it is only asking for 17 per cent of its budget to be focused on IDPs. She also mentioned some potential future directions for humanitarian responses to IDPs, including a greater role for UNHCR, a new UN agency or a cluster system of existing institutions.

Professor Bayard Roberts (London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, United Kingdom) presented about issues of public health in relation to IDPs. First, Roberts presented evidence on IDP health, noting that the mortality rate of IDPs is twice that of refugees and other residents, while mental health outcomes are around 60 per cent worse for IDPs than refugees. He also discussed evidence gaps related to the effectiveness of public health interventions in humanitarian crises in low- and middle-income countries, including a limited number and slow increase in studies over time, only one study with urban IDPs, no studies considering economic methods and few studies referring to process implementation and effectiveness.

Sandrine Tiller (Médecins Sans Frontières) spoke about humanitarian practice with regard to IDPs in North Kivu, DRC. She mentioned that although non-discrimination and proportionality form a bedrock for humanitarian assistance, an analysis found that people in North Kivu were being assisted on the basis of their status (e.g. whether or not they were in an official camp) and location, rather than their need. Discrepancies were also noted in the standard of services. She partly attributed this to political considerations of the Congolese government in deciding which IDPs received more assistance and protection, and humanitarian agencies not investing in negotiating access with non-state armed actors and therefore focusing on areas secured by the government or the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the DRC. Tiller concluded by arguing that the humanitarian system is inflexible in meeting the needs of IDPs.

The panel discussion gave rise to the following **research priorities**:

- Issues related to accessing assistance and funding, including who receives access to assistance and how funding is allocated.
- Independent research/evaluations of the performance of humanitarian organisations and actors.
- The importance of negotiation skills by humanitarian actors.
- Support for universities and researchers in the Global South in addressing IDPs.

10. Solutions, development and ‘end of displacement’

A body of literature has addressed durable solutions to internal displacement, including what durable solutions are and why they are necessary for resolving situations of protracted internal displacement. With the notable exception of IDP returns, particular durable solutions for IDPs have not been dealt with in great depth in the literature. However, the value of development approaches to achieving solutions to internal displacement has also been advocated for in literature from the World Bank. Moreover, the issue of when internal displacement ‘ends’ is not clearly understood, although perspectives on this question are provided by Mooney (2001, 2003, 2005a and b) and the 2010 IASC Framework on Durable Solutions (see below).

10.1 Durable solutions to internal displacement

The IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for Internally Displaced Persons (Brookings-Bern Project on Internal Displacement 2010) was created to give clarity on the concept of a durable solution for IDPs, as well as general guidance on how to achieve it. It considers a durable solution to be achieved ‘when IDPs no longer have specific assistance and protection needs that are linked to their displacement and such persons can enjoy their human rights without discrimination resulting from their displacement’ (ibid: 5). The framework was designed to aid those working in the field – particularly international and non-governmental actors working with governments – to determine whether a durable solution has been found. More recent research (Kälin 2014; Kälin and Chapuisat 2018) further examines the notion of durable solutions, especially in the context of protracted internal displacement.

Some research has focused on solutions to protracted displacement situations, which have been described as displacement situations with ‘no solutions in sight’ (Crisp 2002). In an introductory article in a special issue of *Refugee Survey Quarterly* on protracted displacement, Zetter (2011: 1) writes that the majority of the world’s refugees and IDPs in protracted displacement have ‘little or no prospect of a durable solution to their predicament’. In a case study of displacement in Central America during the 1980s and 1990s featured in this special issue, Bradley (2011: 84) highlights the importance of, inter alia, ‘the need to address justice claims and long-term development concerns alongside the promotion of durable solutions’ and ‘the value of equitable access to support and choice among durable solutions’. Moreover, Long (2011) drew on insights from the case studies presented in the special issue to suggest a number of ‘innovative strategies’ to help international policy better match the needs of people in protracted displacement. Practitioner research also sheds light on the concept of durable solutions and the steps required to achieve them (World Bank 2017 and JIPS 2018).

While these contributions refer to durable solutions for both refugees and IDPs, there is limited research on durable solutions for IDPs in particular. However, a recent book by Cantor (2018a) focuses specifically on IDP returns and the IDP return framework. It suggests that while solutions to internal displacement are often premised on IDP returns, there are ‘attendant questions about the congruity of the IDP return framework with existing international law’, as well as limited knowledge of its implementation in practice (Cantor 2018a: 1). Wider considerations relevant to the return of IDPs have also been outlined recently by Bradley (2018).

Recent efforts led by the Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of IDPs have sought to develop an analytical framework and measures for assessing progress towards durable solutions based upon the IASC Framework definition, criteria and principles. This effort was inspired by the gap between theory and practice identified in many displacement contexts (Beyani, Krynsky Baal and Caterina 2016).

10.2 Achieving solutions through development

The role of development actors in achieving durable solutions for IDPs and an ‘end to displacement’ has also been advocated for by the World Bank. Some World Bank reports discuss the development dimensions of forced displacement and the potential role of the World Bank in contributing to durable

solutions for displaced people (including IDPs) and returnees (Christensen and Harild 2009; World Bank 2017). Christensen and Harild write: ‘From a development perspective, the question “when displacement ends” ... has to do with the barriers to and the conditions and processes that underpin durable solutions, and by implication, the development activities that are necessary to achieve such solutions’ (2009: 13). Moreover, an earlier World Bank (2004) report assesses the performance of 17 post-conflict fund grants related to IDPs and refugees, and recommends ways in which IDP and refugee needs – including their need for a durable solution – could be better addressed by such grants.

10.3 The ‘end’ of displacement

The question of ‘the end of displacement’ has been an area lacking clarity in the literature, despite the importance of understanding, for a number of reasons, when internal displacement ends, such as compiling accurate IDP statistics and determining when IDPs cease to come under the mandate of particular institutional mechanisms (Mooney 2005a). Some of the issues around this question have been outlined by Mooney (2003, 2005a), who distils guidance from the Guiding Principles, considers the issue of cessation in the refugee experience, provides case examples of when internal displacement has been or may risk being determined to have ended and offers a possible set of criteria for consideration.

Mooney (2003) points out that although the Guiding Principles stipulate that ‘displacement shall last no longer than required by the circumstances’ (Principle 6), there is no cessation clause as to the application of the Guiding Principles, given that the IDP definition is descriptive, rather than declaratory. She notes that a review of numerous cases of internal displacement reveals that there is no consistent or systematic approach to the question of when internal displacement ends, suggesting an integrated approach to understanding the end of displacement by combining criteria based on causes, solutions and needs. Elsewhere, Mooney (2005b) discusses the relevance of the question of the ‘end of displacement’ in relation to a broader argument about IDPs as a ‘category of concern’. She suggests that a shift in focus away from IDPs as a category of concern first requires the ‘distinct risks and vulnerabilities resulting from displacement’ to cease to exist (ibid: 23).

10.4 Workshop discussion and research priorities

Some of the issues raised in this chapter were discussed in the panel session on ‘Solutions, development and the “end of displacement”’, chaired by Natalia Krynsky Baal (Joint IDP Profiling Service). In particular, panellists discussed solutions to protracted internal displacement, the use of an area-based approach in relation to urban IDPs, innovative approaches to achieving solutions and measuring progress towards durable solutions.

Professor Walter Kälin (University of Bern, Switzerland) presented the findings of a recent report from OCHA on reducing protracted internal displacement as a collective outcome’ (Kälin and Chapuisat 2017). He emphasised the importance of focusing on the prevention and reduction of protracted displacement even where durable solutions are not feasible. He also outlined a number of actions, including (1) moving early towards self-sufficiency, (2) systematising and strengthening cooperation across humanitarian, development and political divides, (3) ensuring the participation of IDPs and host communities, (4) encouraging and allowing authorities to lead efforts, and (5) providing multi-year, flexible funding that transcends the humanitarian–development divide.

Liz Eyster (IDP Unit, UNHCR) spoke about the challenges of pursuing solutions on the ground, such as barriers of access to IDPs caused by regulations by government and non-state actors. Eyster also spoke about responding to internal displacement in urban areas, suggesting that while it is often claimed that urban IDPs are hard to identify, it could be that outdated modes of finding them are being used. In this context, she discussed the new ‘area-based approach’ for addressing urban displacement – where actions support people in a particular location – which she suggested is more inclusive and should be combined with a community approach.

Marina Cremonese (Danish Refugee Council, Serbia) spoke about using the Western Balkans context as a model of innovation for solutions to internal displacement. The Danish Refugee Council’s programmes in the Western Balkans are community-oriented and integrate different sectors, supporting both displaced people and host communities. There is a focus on the municipal level through financial support and direct implementation by municipal authorities with NGOs, as well as active community involvement, donor engagement and a multi-stakeholder, collective investment approach.

Khadra Elmi (Joint IDP Profiling Service) spoke about measuring progress towards durable solutions in practice, pointing out that more important than simply looking to identify an end-point to displacement is the need for data that is sound and actionable to inform short- and long-term responses. She presented work recently completed through the Durable Solutions Indicator Library and Analysis Guide project,¹⁵ a multi-stakeholder initiative led by the UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of IDPs and coordinated by JIPS. Based on a case study of profiling work being undertaken in Sudan, Elmi spoke about best practice in strengthening the evidence base to inform solutions to internal displacement and help measure progress.

The panel discussion gave rise to the following **research priorities**:

- The impact of internal displacement on host communities. One way to look at this would be to shift/broaden our understanding by investigating both populations within a ‘displacement-affected area or communities’ lens.
- How area-based approaches could be purposed most effectively and how the role of local governments can be strengthened.
- The humanitarian-development nexus and multi-stakeholder approaches, including whether joint data is actually better, the positive and negative impacts of working so closely together and how humanitarian space can be maintained.
- How best to pursue local integration and understand social cohesion, including in environments where it is socially/politically sensitive to do so.

15 For further details see the section about ‘Durable solutions to displacement’ on the JIPS website.

11. Other themes in IDP research

The nine thematic panels that made up the principal focus of the ‘Revitalising IDP Research’ workshop, while identifying a number of key areas of research on internal displacement, did not cover all areas of this field. This concluding chapter illustrates the point by identifying just a few of the other bodies of literature on distinct aspects of internal displacement. The survey of themes here is not intended to be exhaustive but simply illustrative of some additional research areas that were not directly addressed by the workshop composition and participants.

11.1. Internal displacement in other regions (outside Africa)

Africa is clearly not the only region where research on internal displacement has been conducted. For instance, within Latin America, a considerable body of literature on IDPs exists, particularly on Colombia and its dynamics of conflict and internal displacement (see, for example, Vidal López 2007; Ibáñez 2009; Ruiz Ruiz 2013; Steele 2017; Cantor 2018b). A growing body of literature also examines internal displacement in contexts of criminal violence, mostly in the North of Central America and Mexico (see, for example, Cantor 2014; Pérez 2014; Cantor and Rodríguez Serna 2017; IDMC 2018c and 2018d). Internal displacement linked to environmental factors is also starting to be addressed by the literature (Rubio Díaz-Leal 2017; World Bank 2018; Sánchez and Rubiano 2018).¹⁶ By contrast, relatively little research on internal displacement exists for other parts of the Americas.

In Europe, alongside the substantial literature of the 2000s on the Balkan conflicts and their aftermath (for a more recent study, see Ivlevs and Veliziotis 2017), a body of research is emerging on internal displacement in other conflicts such as those in Ukraine (Pikulicka-Wilczewska and Uehling 2017; Woroniecka-Krzyzanowska and Palaguta 2017; Roberts et al. 2017) and Georgia (Makhashvili et al. 2014). However, academic research on internal displacement in regions such as the Asia-Pacific appears comparatively scarce (Francis and Maguire 2015: 9). Nonetheless, publications on internal displacement do exist for this region (e.g. Chari 2003; Banerjee et al. 2005), as well as for countries such as Myanmar (Johnson et al. 2018; Ho 2018) and Sri Lanka (Senanayake 2003; Brun 2003; Saparamadu and Lall 2014; Jayatilaka and Amirthalingam 2015). Internal displacement in the Middle East is also the subject of research (for example, Siddiqui 2018), although the focus largely remains on Syrian refugees rather than IDPs.¹⁷

11.2. Beyond the social sciences

Much of the research outlined in this paper has had a legal or policy emphasis (and is written in English). Nonetheless, a wider body of published research exists on internal movement and displacement in disciplines as diverse as history, sociology, anthropology, geography, political science, medicine and psychology. Integrating these distinct perspectives and the debates to which they speak with those from the body of literature surveyed here is an important next step for the research process in this field.

¹⁶ See also the recent special issue of *Forced Migration Review* on Latin America and the Caribbean.

¹⁷ See, for example, the 2018 *Forced Migration Review* issue on Syrians in displacement.

12. Bibliography

- Abebe, AM (2009), ‘Legal and institutional dimensions of protecting and assisting internally displaced persons in Africa’, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 22(2), 155–176, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fep011>.
- Abebe, AM (2010), ‘The African Union Convention on Internally Displaced Persons: Its codification background, scope, and enforcement challenges’, *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 29(3), 28–57, <https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdq029>.
- Adelman, H and McGrath, S (2007), ‘To date or to marry: That is the question’, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 20(3), 376–380, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fem021>.
- Adeola, R (2017), ‘The legal protection of development-induced displaced persons in Africa’, *African Journal of Legal Studies*, 10(1), 91–104, <https://doi.org/10.1163/17087384-12340013>.
- Adeola, R (2018), ‘The Kampala Convention and the right not to be arbitrarily displaced in Africa’, *Forced Migration Review*, 59, 15–17, <https://www.fmreview.org/GuidingPrinciples20/adeola>.
- Adeola, R and Viljoen, F (2018), ‘Climate change, development projects and internal displacement in Africa’, *Journal of African Law*, 62(3), 335–350, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021855318000219>.
- Adinolfi, C, Bassiouni, DS, Lauritzsen, HF and Williams HR (2005), *Humanitarian response review*, UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, https://www.unicef.org/emerg/files/ocha_hrr.pdf.
- African Union and Norwegian Refugee Council (2013), *The Kampala Convention, one year on: Progress and prospects*, <http://www.refworld.org/docid/52a57dd14.html>.
- Albuja, S and Ceballos, M (2010), ‘Urban displacement and migration in Colombia’, *Forced Migration Review*, 34, 10–11, <http://www.fmreview.org/sites/fmr/files/FMRdownloads/en/urban-displacement/albuja-ceballos.pdf>.
- Amnesty International (2015), ‘We had nowhere else to go’: *Forced displacement and demolitions in northern Syria*, <https://www.amnesty.org/download/Documents/MDE2425032015ENGLISH.pdf>
- Andersen-Rodgers, DR (2015), ‘Back home again: Assessing the impact of provisions for internally displaced persons in comprehensive peace accords’, *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 34(3), 24–45, <https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdv010>.
- Aubin, L, Eyster, E and MacGuire, D (2018), ‘People-centred principles: The participation of IDPs and the Guiding Principles’, *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 30(2), 287–291, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/eey027>.
- Bagshaw, S (2005), *Developing a normative framework for the protection of internally displaced persons*, Transnational, New York.
- Bagshaw, S and Paul, D (2004), *Protect or neglect: Towards a more effective United Nations approach to the protection of IDPs*, Brookings Institution-SAIS Project on Internal Displacement and UN Office for the Coordination of Internal Affairs, Geneva, https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/protection_survey.pdf.
- Banerjee, P, Basu, S, Chaudhury, R and Das, SK (2005), *Internal displacement in South Asia: The relevance of the UN Guiding Principles*, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi.
- Barutciski, M (1998), ‘Tension between the refugee concept and IDP debate’, *Forced Migration Review*, 3, 11–14, <http://www.fmreview.org/sites/fmr/files/FMRdownloads/en/fmr-3/barutciski.pdf>.
- Bellal, A, Giacca, G and Casey-Maslen, S (2011), ‘Towards engagement, compliance and accountability’, *Forced Migration Review*, 37, 4–6, <http://www.fmreview.org/sites/fmr/files/FMRdownloads/en/non-state.pdf>.

- Beyani, C (2006), ‘Recent developments: The elaboration of a legal framework for the protection of internally displaced persons in Africa’, *Journal of African Law*, 50(2), 187–197, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021855306000155>.
- Beyani, C, Krynsky Baal, N and Caterina, M (2016) ‘Conceptual challenges and practical solutions in situations of internal displacement’, *Forced Migration Review*, 52, 39–42, <https://www.fmreview.org/sites/fmr/files/FMRdownloads/en/solutions/beyani-baal-caterina.pdf>.
- Black, R and Collyer, M (2014), ‘Populations “trapped” at times of crisis’, *Forced Migration Review*, 45, 52–56, <https://eprints.soas.ac.uk/18086/1/black-collyer.pdf>.
- Borton, J, Buchanan-Smith, M and Otto, R (2005), *Support to internally displaced persons: Learning from evaluations*, Sida, Stockholm, <https://www.oecd.org/countries/eritrea/35093445.pdf>.
- Bouchet-Saulnier, F (2001), *Using the law of war to protect the displaced: MSF activity report 2000–2001*, Médecins sans Frontières, Paris.
- Bradley, M (2011), ‘Unlocking protracted displacement: Central America’s “success story” reconsidered’, *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 30(4), 84–121, <https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdr011>.
- Bradley, M (2012), *Displacement, transitional justice and reconciliation: Assumptions, challenges and lessons*, Policy Briefing 9, Refugee Studies Centre, University of Oxford, <http://www.refworld.org/pdfid/4f993f1d2.pdf>.
- Bradley, M (2018), ‘Durable solutions and the right of return for IDPs: Evolving interpretations’, *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 30(2), 218–242, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/eey021>.
- Bradley, M and Cohen, R (2010), ‘Disasters and displacement: Gaps in protection’, *Journal of International Humanitarian Legal Studies*, 1(1), 95–142, <https://doi.org/10.1163/187815210X12766020139884>.
- Brandt, J, Jones, B and Katz, B (2017), *What makes displacement different today?*, Brookings Institution, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/metropolitan-revolution/2017/09/13/what-makes-displacement-different-today/>.
- Brookings Institution-London School of Economics Project on Internal Displacement, Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC) and Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) (2013), *National instruments on internal displacement: A guide to their development*, NRC and Brookings Institution, Geneva.
- Brookings Institution-University of Bern Project on Internal Displacement (2005), *Addressing internal displacement: A framework for national responsibility*, https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/04_national_responsibility_framework_Eng.pdf.
- Brookings Institution-University of Bern Project on Internal Displacement (2008), *Protecting internally displaced persons: A manual for law and policy makers*, https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/10_internal_displacement_manual.pdf.
- Brookings Institution-University of Bern Project on Internal Displacement (2010), *IASC framework on durable solutions for internally displaced persons*, <http://www.unhcr.org/50f94cd49.pdf>.
- Brun, C (2003), ‘Local citizens or internally displaced persons? Dilemmas of long term displacement in Sri Lanka’, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 16(4), 376–397, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/16.4.376>.
- Buchenrieder, G, Mack, C and Balgah, AR (2017), ‘Human security and the relocation of internally displaced environmental refugees in Cameroon’, *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 36(3), 20–47, <https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdx005>.
- Cantor, DJ (2012), ‘Does IHL prohibit the forced displacement of civilians during war?’, *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 24(4), 840–846, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/ees053>.
- Cantor, DJ (2014), ‘The new wave: forced displacement caused by organized crime in Central America and Mexico’, *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 33(3), 34–68, <https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdu008>.

- Cantor, DJ (2018a), *Returns of internally displaced persons during armed conflict: International law and its application in Colombia*, Brill-Nijhoff, Leiden.
- Cantor, DJ (2018b), “‘The IDP in international law’? Developments, debates, prospects’, *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 30(2), 191–217, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/eey031>.
- Cantor, DJ and Rodríguez Serna, N (2017), *The new refugees: Crime and forced displacement in Latin America*, Institute of Latin American Studies, London.
- Carr, S (2009), ‘From theory to practice: National and regional application of the Guiding Principles’, *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 21(1), 34–47, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/een038>.
- Carrillo, AC (2009), ‘Internal displacement in Colombia: Humanitarian, economic and social consequences in urban settings and current challenges’, *International Review of the Red Cross*, 91(875), 527–546, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1816383109990427>.
- Casalin, D (2018a), ‘A green light turning red? The potential influence of human rights on developing customary legal protection against conflict-driven displacement’, *Human Rights & International Legal Discourse*, 12(1), 62–78.
- Casalin, D (2018b), ‘Prohibitions on arbitrary displacement in international humanitarian law and human rights: A time and a place for everything’ in De Hert, P, Smis, S and Holvoet, M (eds), *Convergences and divergences between international human rights, international humanitarian, and international criminal law*, Intersentia, Cambridge, 253–257.
- Cernea, MM (ed.) (2000), *Risks and reconstruction: Experiences of resettlers and refugees*, World Bank, Washington D.C.
- Cernea, MM and Mathur, HM (eds) (2008), *Can compensation prevent impoverishment? Reforming resettlement through investments and benefits-sharing*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Chari, PR (2003), ‘Refugees, migrants and internally displaced persons in South Asia: An overview’ in Chari, PR, Joseph, M and Suba Chandran, D, *Missing boundaries: Refugees, migrants, stateless and internally displaced persons in South Asia*, Manohar Publishers, New Delhi, 17–38.
- Chemaly, W, Jacobsen, K and Krynsky Baal, N (2016), *Forced displacement, go figure! Shaking the box of profiling IDP situations*, Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS) and The Feinstein International Center, <http://fic.tufts.edu/assets/2016-08-Forced-Displacement-WEB.pdf>.
- Chinedu, UO (2008), ‘Internal displacement in Nigeria’, *Forced Migration Review*, 31, 37, <http://www.fmreview.org/sites/fmr/files/FMRdownloads/en/climatechange/chinedu.pdf>.
- Christensen, A and Harild, N (2009), *Forced displacement: The development challenge*, World Bank, Washington D.C., http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTSOCIALDEVELOPMENT/Resources/244362-1164107274725/3182370-1164201144397/Forced_Displacement.pdf.
- Cohen, R (2004), ‘The Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement: An innovation in international standard setting’, *Global Governance*, 10, 459–480, <http://www.refworld.org/pdfid/4c51531f2.pdf>.
- Cohen, R (2006), ‘Developing an international system for internally displaced persons’, *International Studies Perspectives*, 7(2), 87–101, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1528-3585.2006.00233.x>.
- Cohen, R (2007), ‘Response to Hathaway’, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 20(3), 370–376, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fem020>.
- Cohen, R (2010), ‘Reconciling R2P with IDP protection’ in Davies, SE and Glanville, L (eds), *Protecting the displaced: Deepening the responsibility to protect*, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, Leiden, 35–58.
- Cohen, R (2013), *Lessons learned from the development of the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement*, Institute for the Study of International Migration, https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Lessons_Learned_GPs_Cohen_Oct2013.pdf.

- Cohen, R and Deng, F (1998a), *Masses in flight: The global crisis of internal displacement*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington D.C.
- Cohen, R and Deng, F (eds) (1998b), *The forsaken people: Case studies of the internally displaced*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington D.C.
- Cohen, R, Kälin, W and Mooney, E (eds) (2003), *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement and the law of the South Caucasus*, American Society of International Law, Washington D.C.
- Correa, E (ed.) (2011), *Preventive resettlement of populations at risk of disaster: Experiences from Latin America*, World Bank, http://www.gfdrr.org/sites/gfdrr/files/publication/preventive_resettlement_LAC_experiencesDS150.pdf.
- Correa, E, Ramírez, F and Sanahuja, H (2011), *Populations at risk of disaster: A resettlement guide*, World Bank, <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/612501468045040748/pdf/653550WP0Box360settlement0guide0150.pdf>.
- Couldrey, M and Herson, M (eds) (2011), 'Armed non-state actors and displacement', *Forced Migration Review*, 37, <http://www.fmreview.org/sites/fmr/files/FMRdownloads/en/non-state.pdf>.
- Couldrey, M and Morris, T (eds) (2005), 'Protecting and assisting the internally displaced: The way forward', *Forced Migration Review* (supplement), <http://www.fmreview.org/sites/fmr/files/FMRdownloads/en/FMRpdfs/FMR24/IDP%20Supplement/full.pdf>.
- Crate, SA and Nuttall, M (eds) (2009), *Anthropology and climate change: From encounters to actions*, Routledge, Oxon.
- Crisp, J (2002), *No solutions in sight: The problem of protracted refugee situations in Africa*, Working Paper No. 68, Center for Comparative Immigration Studies, University of California, https://ccis.ucsd.edu/_files/wp68.pdf.
- Crisp, J (2009), 'Refugee, persons of concern, and people on the move: The broadening boundaries of UNHCR', *Refugee*, 26(1), 73–76, <https://refugee.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/refuge/article/view/30611/28121>.
- Crisp, J, Morris, T and Refstie, H (2012), 'Displacement in urban areas: New challenges, new partnerships', *Disasters*, 36(s1), 23–42, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7717.2012.01284.x>.
- Davies, A and Jacobsen, K (2010), 'Profiling urban IDPs', *Forced Migration Review*, 34, 13–15, <http://www.fmreview.org/sites/fmr/files/FMRdownloads/en/urban-displacement/davies-jacobsen.pdf>.
- De Sherbinin, A, Castro, M, Gemenne, F, Cernea, MM, Adamo, S, Fearnside, PM, Krieger, G, Lahmani, S, Oliver-Smith, A, Pankhurst, A, Scudder, T, Singer, B, Tan, Y, Wannier, G, Boncour, P, Ehrhart, C, Hugo, G, Pandey, B and Shi, G (2011), 'Preparing for resettlement associated with climate change', *Science*, 28(344), 456–457, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1208821>.
- De Wet, C (2002), 'Improving outcomes in development-induced displacement and resettlement projects', *Forced Migration Review*, 12, 6–9, <http://www.fmreview.org/sites/fmr/files/FMRdownloads/en/development-induced-displacement.pdf>.
- De Wet, C (ed.) (2006), *Development-induced displacement: Problems, policies, and people*, Berghahn Books, Providence.
- Deng, F (1993), *Protecting the dispossessed: A challenge for the international community*, The Brookings Institution, Washington D.C.
- Deng, F (1995), *Internally displaced persons: Compilation and analysis of legal norms*. Report of the Representative of the Secretary-General, Francis M. Deng, submitted pursuant to Commission on Human Rights resolution 1995/57, E/CN.4/1996/52/Add.2, <http://undocs.org/E/CN.4/1996/52/Add.2>.
- DeWind, J (2007), 'Response to Hathaway', *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 20(3), 381–385, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fem022>.

- Displacement Solutions (2013), *The Peninsula Principles on Climate Displacement within states*, <http://displacementsolutions.org/wp-content/uploads/FINAL-Peninsula-Principles-FINAL.pdf>.
- Droege, C (2008), ‘Developments in the legal protection of IDPs’, *Forced Migration Review*, GP10, 8–9, <http://www.refworld.org/pdfid/4c6cf2372.pdf>.
- Duthie, R (2011), ‘Transitional justice and displacement’, *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, 5(2), 241–261, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijtj/ijr009>.
- Eschenbächer, J (2005), ‘The global internal displacement crisis: Recent developments and perspectives for an improved international response’, *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 24(3), 49–60, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdi052>.
- Evans, M (2007), ‘“The suffering is too great”: Urban internally displaced persons in the Casamance conflict, Senegal’, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 20(1), 60–85, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fel026>.
- Ferris, E (2008a), ‘Assessing the impact of the Principles: An unfinished task’, *Forced Migration Review*, GP10, 10–11, <http://www.refworld.org/pdfid/4c6cf2372.pdf>.
- Ferris, E (2008b), ‘Internal displacement and the right to seek asylum’, *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 27(3), 76–92, <https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdn046>.
- Ferris, E (2011), *The politics of protection: The limits of humanitarian action*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington D.C.
- Ferris, E (2012), *Protection and planned relocations in the context of climate change*, UNHCR, <http://www.refworld.org/docid/5023774e2.html>.
- Ferris, E (2014), *Ten years after humanitarian reform: How have IDPs fared?*, Brookings Institution, <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Introduction-to-final-report-IDP-Study-FINAL.pdf>.
- Ferris, E and Ferro-Ribeiro, S (2012), ‘Protecting people in cities: The disturbing case of Haiti’, *Disasters*, 36(1), S43–S63, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7717.2012.01285.x>.
- Ferris, E, Mooney, E and Stark, C (2011), *From responsibility to response: Assessing national approaches to internal displacement*, Brookings Institution-London School of Economic Project on Internal Displacement, <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/From-Responsibility-to-Response-Nov-2011.pdf>.
- Fitzpatrick, JM (2001), *Human rights protection for refugees, asylum-seekers, and internally displaced persons: A guide to international mechanisms and procedures*, Brill-Nijhoff, Leiden.
- Foresight (2011), *Migration and global environmental change: Future challenges and opportunities*, https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/287717/11-1116-migration-and-global-environmental-change.pdf.
- Francis, A and Maguire, R (2016), *Protection of refugees and displaced persons in the Asia Pacific region*, Routledge, Oxon.
- Furrer, M (2005), ‘The mandate of the International Committee of the Red Cross for the protection of internally displaced persons’, *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 24(3), 84–95, <https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdi055>.
- Graves, S, Wheeler, V and Martin, E (2007), *Lost in translation: Managing coordination and leadership reform in the humanitarian system*, Policy Brief 27, Humanitarian Policy Group, Overseas Development Institute, <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/315.pdf>.
- Gray, A (1996), ‘Indigenous resistance to involuntary relocation’, in McDowell, C (ed), *Understanding impoverishment: The consequences of development induced displacement*, Berghahn Books, Oxford, 99–122.

- Groth, L (2011), ‘Engendering protection: An analysis of the 2009 Kampala Convention and its provisions for internally displaced women’, *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 23(2), 221–251, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/eer002>.
- Hamza, M, Koch, I and Plewa, M (2017), ‘Disaster-induced displacement in the Caribbean and the Pacific’, *Forced Migration Review*, 56, 62–64, <http://www.fmreview.org/sites/fmr/files/FMRdownloads/en/latinamerica-caribbean/hamza-koch-plewa.pdf>.
- Hathaway, J (2007a), ‘Forced migration studies: Could we agree just to “date”?’’, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 20(3), 349–369, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fem019>.
- Hathaway, J (2007b), ‘Rejoinder’, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 20(3), 385–390, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fem034>.
- Ho, EL (2018), ‘Interfaces and the politics of humanitarianism: Kachin internal displacement at the China–Myanmar border’, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 31(3), 407–425, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fey017>.
- Hovil, L (2013), *The nexus between displacement and transitional justice: A gender-justice dimension*, International Center for Transitional Justice and Brookings Institution-LSE Project on Internal Displacement, <http://ictj.org/sites/default/files/ICTJ-Research-Brief-Displacement-Gender-Hovil.pdf>.
- Ibáñez, AM and Velásquez, A (2008), *Public policies to assist internally displaced persons: The role of municipal authorities*, Brookings Institution-University of Bern Project on Internal Displacement, https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/1203_colombia_ibanez.pdf.
- Ibáñez, AM (2009), *El desplazamiento forzoso en Colombia: un camino sin retorno hacia la pobreza*, Universidad de Los Andes, Bogotá.
- Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) (2002), *Growing the sheltering tree: Protecting right through humanitarian action*, UN Inter-Agency Standing Committee, Geneva.
- Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) (2004), *Implementing the collaborative response to situations of internal displacement: Guidance for UN humanitarian and/or resident coordinators and country teams*, UN Inter-Agency Standing Committee, Geneva.
- Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) (2006), *IASC guidance note on using the cluster approach to strengthen the humanitarian response*, <http://www.refworld.org/docid/460a8ccc2.html>.
- Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC) (2018a), *GRID 2018: Global report on internal displacement*, <http://www.internal-displacement.org/global-report/grid2018/downloads/2018-GRID.pdf>.
- Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC) (2018b), *Urban myths? Debunking claims about displacement in cities*, <http://internal-displacement.org/expert-opinion/urban-myths-debunking-claims-about-displacement-in-cities>.
- Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC) (2018c), *Thematic report: An atomised crisis – Reframing displacement caused by crime and violence in El Salvador*, <https://reliefweb.int/report/el-salvador/thematic-report-atomised-crisis-reframing-displacement-caused-crime-and-violence>.
- Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC) (2018d), *Thematic report: Cause or consequence? Reframing violence and displacement in Guatemala*, <http://www.internal-displacement.org/sites/default/files/inline-files/201809-guatemala-cause-or-consequence-en.pdf>.
- International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) (2001), *The responsibility to protect: Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty*, <http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/ICISS%20Report.pdf>.
- International Committee of the Red Cross (2016), *Translating the Kampala Convention into practice: A stocktaking exercise*, <https://shop.icrc.org/translating-the-kampala-convention-into-practice-2648.html>.

- International Committee of the Red Cross ICRC (2018), *Displaced in cities: Experiencing and responding to urban internal displacement*, <https://www.icrc.org/en/publication/4344-displaced-cities-experiencing-and-responding-urban-internal-displacement-outside>.
- International Organization for Migration (2017), *IOM framework for addressing internal displacement*, https://www.iom.int/sites/default/files/press_release/file/170829_IDP_Framework_LowRes.pdf.
- International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement (2009), *Movement policy on internal displacement: Resolution No. 5 of the 2009 Council of Delegates*, <https://www.icrc.org/eng/assets/files/publications/icrc-002-1124.pdf>.
- Inter-Parliamentary Union and United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2013), *Handbook for parliamentarians No. 20–2013: Internal displacement: Responsibility and action*, Inter-Parliamentary Union, Geneva, <http://www.refworld.org/docid/528b1a444.html>.
- Ivlevs, A and Veliziotis, M (2018), ‘Beyond conflict: Long-term labour market integration of internally displaced persons in post-socialist countries’, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 105, 131–146, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.12.003>.
- Jacobs, C and Kyamusugulwa, PM (2018), ‘Everyday justice for the internally displaced in a context of fragility: The case of the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)’, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 31(2), 179–196, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fex025>.
- Jacques, M (2012), *Armed conflict and displacement: The protection of refugees and displaced persons under international humanitarian law*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Jaksa, B and Smith, J (2008), ‘Africa: From voluntary principles to binding standards’, *Forced Migration Review*, GP10, 18–19, <http://www.fmreview.org/sites/fmr/files/FMRdownloads/en/GuidingPrinciples10/jaksa-smith.pdf>.
- Jayatilaka, D and Amirthalingam, K (2015), *The impact of displacement on dowries in Sri Lanka*, Brookings Institution-LSE Project on Internal Displacement, <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/The-Impact-of-Displacement-on-Dowries-in-Sri-Lanka-Feb-2015.pdf>.
- Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS) (2018), *Durable solutions analysis guide: Tool to measure progress towards durable solutions for IDPs*, <http://www.jips.org/files/1412>.
- Johnson, CA (2012), ‘Governing climate displacement: The ethics and politics of human resettlement’, *Symposium on Climate Change, Discourse and Democracy*, 21(2), 308–328, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2012.651905>.
- Johnson, T, von Meding, J, Gajendran, T and Forino, G (2018), ‘Disaster vulnerability of displaced people in Rakhine state, Myanmar’ in Asgary A (ed.), *Resettlement challenges for displaced populations and refugees*, Springer, Cham, 81–91.
- Kälin, W (2001), *How hard is soft law? The Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement and the need for a normative framework*, Brookings Institution-CUNY Project on Internal Displacement, <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/20011219.pdf>.
- Kälin, W (2005), ‘The Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement as international minimum standard and protection tool’, *The Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 24(3), 27–36, <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/85213381.pdf>.
- Kälin, W (2008a), *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement: Annotations*, 2nd edition, Brookings Institution and The American Society of International Law, https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/spring_guiding_principles.pdf.
- Kälin, W (2008b), ‘The future of the Guiding Principles’, *Forced Migration Review*, GP10, 38–39, <http://www.refworld.org/pdfid/4c6cf2372.pdf>.

- Kälin, W (2014), 'The Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement and the search for a universal framework of protection for internally displaced persons' in Chetail, V and Bauloz C (eds), *Research handbook on international law and migration*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, 612–633.
- Kälin, W and Chapuisat, HE (2017), Breaking the impasse: Reducing protracted internal displacement as a collective outcome, UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, <https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/Breaking-the-impasse.pdf>.
- Kälin, W and Chapuisat, HE (2018), 'Guiding Principle 28: The unfulfilled promise to end protracted internal displacement', *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 30(2), 243–268, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/eey030>.
- Kälin, W and Schrepfer, N (2012), Protecting people across borders in the context of climate change: Normative gaps and possible approaches, UNHCR, <http://www.unhcr.org/4f33f1729.pdf>.
- Kälin, W, Williams, RC, Koser, K and Solomon, A (eds) (2010), *Incorporating the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement into domestic law: Issues and challenges*, American Society of International Law, Washington D.C.
- Kastberg, N (2002), 'Strengthening the response to displaced children', *Forced Migration Review*, 15, 4–6, <https://www.unicef.org/emerg/files/responsetodisplacedchildren.pdf>.
- Kelman, I (2008), 'Island evacuation', *Forced Migration Review*, 31, 20–21, <http://www.fmreview.org/sites/fmr/files/FMRdownloads/en/climatechange/kelman.pdf>.
- Kidane, W (2011), 'Managing forced displacement by law in Africa: The role of the new African Union IDPs Convention', *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law*, 44(1), 1–85, <https://www.vanderbilt.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/78/kidane-cr.pdf>.
- Korn, DA (1999), *Exodus within borders: An introduction to the crisis of internal displacement*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington D.C.
- Koser, K (2008), 'Gaps in IDP protection', *Forced Migration Review*, 31, 17, <http://www.fmreview.org/sites/fmr/files/FMRdownloads/en/climatechange/koser.pdf>.
- Kourula, P (1997), *Broadening the edges: Refugee definition and international protection revisited*, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, Leiden.
- Krynsky Baal, N, Kivelä, L, and Weihmayer, M (2018), 'Improving IDP data to help implement the Guiding Principles', *Forced Migration Review*, 59, 21–23, <https://www.fmreview.org/GuidingPrinciples20/krynskybaal-kivela-weihmayer>.
- Kunder, J (1998), *The needs of internally displaced women and children: Guiding principles and considerations*, UNICEF, <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/2E33B9CFFB3B8F7BC1256C7C004EFCAA-UNICEF.pdf>.
- Lanz, D (2008), 'Subversion or reinvention? Dilemmas and debates in the context of UNHCR's increasing involvement with IDPs', *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 21(2), 192–209, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fen014>.
- Lavoyer, J (1995), 'Refugees and internally displaced persons – International humanitarian law and the role of the ICRC', *International Review of the Red Cross*, 35, 162–180, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020860400090586>.
- Leckie, S (2002), 'Towards a right to security of place', *Forced Migration Review*, 12, 20–21, <http://www.fmreview.org/sites/fmr/files/FMRdownloads/en/development-induced-displacement.pdf>.
- Lee, LT (1996), 'Internally displaced persons and refugees: Toward a legal synthesis?', *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 9(1), 27–42, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/9.1.27>.
- Lee, LT (2001), 'The Refugee Convention and internally displaced persons', *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 13(3), 363–366, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/13.3.363>.

- Levitt, J (2001), ‘Conflict prevention, management, and resolution: Africa — Regional strategies for the prevention of displacement and protection of displaced persons: The cases of the OAU, ECOWAS, SADC, and IGAD’, *Duke Journal of Comparative and International Law*, 11, 39–79, <https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/djCIL/vol11/iss1/3>.
- Long, K (2011), *Permanent crises?: Unlocking the protracted displacement of refugees and internally displaced persons*, Refugee Studies Centre, University of Oxford, <https://www.rsc.ox.ac.uk/files/files-1/pb-unlocking-protracted-displacement-2011.pdf>.
- Luopajarvi, K (2003), ‘Is there an obligation on states to accept international humanitarian assistance to internally displaced persons under international law?’, *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 15(4), 678–714, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/15.4.678>.
- MacGuire, D (2018), ‘The relationship between national normative frameworks on internal displacement and the reduction of displacement’, *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 30(2), 269–286.
- Makhashvili, N, Chikovani, I, McKee, M, Bisson, J, Patel, V and Roberts, B (2014), ‘Mental disorders and their association with disability among internally displaced persons and returnees in Georgia’, *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 27(5), 509–518, <https://doi.org/10.1002/jts.21949>.
- Maru, MT (2014), *The Kampala Convention and its contributions to international law: Legal analyses and interpretations of the African Union Convention on the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons*, Eleven International Publishing, The Hague.
- McAdam, J (ed.) (2010), *Climate change and displacement: Multidisciplinary perspectives*, Hart Publishing, Oxford.
- McAdam, J (2012), *Climate change, forced migration and international law*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- McAdam, J and Ferris, E (2015), ‘Planned relocations in the context of climate change: Unpacking the legal and conceptual issues’, *Cambridge Journal of International and Comparative Law*, 4(1), 137–166, https://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/groups_committees/loss_and_damage_executive_committee/application/pdf/mcadam_and_ferris.pdf.
- McDowell, C (ed.) (1996), *Understanding impoverishment: The consequences of development-induced displacement*, Berghahn Books, Providence.
- McNamara, D (2005), ‘The mandate of the Emergency Relief Coordinator and the role of OCHA’s Interagency Internal Displacement Division’, *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 24(3), 61–70, <https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdi053>.
- Mooney, E (2001), ‘Principles of Protection for Internally Displaced Persons’, *International Migration*, 38 (6), 81–101.
- Mooney, E (2003), ‘Bringing the end into sight for internally displaced persons’, *Forced Migration Review*, 17, 4–7, <http://repository.forcedmigration.org/pdf/?pid=fmo:4820>.
- Mooney, E (2005a), *An IDP no more?: Exploring the issue of when internal displacement ends*, Brookings Institution-CUNY Project on Internal Displacement and Institute for the Study of Forced Migration, Georgetown University, https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/ends_background_paper.pdf.
- Mooney, E (2005b), ‘The concept of internal displacement and the case for internally displaced persons as a category of concern’, *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 24(3), 9–26, <https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdi049>.
- Mooney, E (2010), ‘Something old, something new, something borrowed ... something blue? The protection potential of a marriage of concepts between R2P and IDP protection’ in Davies, SE and Glanville, L (eds), *Protecting the displaced: Deepening the responsibility to protect*, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, Leiden, 59–84.

- Moore, WH and Shellman, SM (2006), 'Refugee or internally displaced person? To where should one flee?', *Comparative Political Studies*, 39(5), 599–622, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414005276457>.
- Morel, M, Stavropoulou, M and Durieux, J (2012), 'The history and status of the right not to be displaced', *Forced Migration Review*, 41, 5–7, <http://www.fmreview.org/sites/fmr/files/FMRdownloads/en/preventing/morel-et-al.pdf>.
- Morrissey, J (2008), 'Rural-urban migration in Ethiopia', *Forced Migration Review*, 31, 28–29, <http://www.fmreview.org/sites/fmr/files/FMRdownloads/en/climatechange/morrissey.pdf>.
- Mosneaga, A and Vanore, M (2016), 'An age-sensitive approach to durable solutions', *Forced Migration Review*, 52, 22–26, <https://www.fmreview.org/solutions/mosneaga-vanore>.
- Mosneaga, A, Sato, A and Turner, N (2016) *Fukushima Global Communication Programme final report*, United Nations University, http://collections.unu.edu/eserv/UNU:5758/FGC_Final_Report_EN.pdf.
- Muggah, R (2003), 'A tale of two solitudes: Comparing conflict and development-induced displacement and involuntary resettlement', *International Migration*, 41(5), 5–31, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0020-7985.2003.00259.x>.
- Murray, R (2005), 'Refugees and internally displaced persons and human rights: The African system', *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 24(2), 56–66, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdi026>.
- Nansen Initiative (2015), *Agenda for the protection of cross-border displaced persons in the context of disasters and climate change*, www.nanseninitiative.org.
- Newland, K, Patrick, E and Zard, M (2003), *No refuge: The challenge of internal displacement*, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, Geneva.
- Ojeda, S (2010), 'The Kampala Convention on Internally Displaced Persons: Some international humanitarian law aspects', *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 29(3), 58–66, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdq028>.
- Oliver-Smith, A (2009a), 'Climate change and population displacement: Disasters and diasporas in the twenty-first century', in Crate, SA and Nuttall, M (eds), *Anthropology and climate change: From encounters to actions*, Routledge, Oxon, 116–136.
- Oliver-Smith, A (ed.) (2009b), *Development and dispossession: The crisis of forced displacement and resettlement*, School for Advanced Research Press, Santa Fe.
- Orchard, P (2010), 'Protection of internally displaced persons: Soft law as a norm-generating mechanism', *Review of International Studies*, 36(2), 281–303, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40783200>.
- Orchard, P (2016), 'The contested origins of internal displacement', *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 28(2), 210–233, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/eew031>.
- Orchard, P (2018), *Protecting the internally displaced: Rhetoric and reality*, Routledge, Oxon.
- Pantuliano, S, Metcalfe, V, Haysom, S and Davey, E (2012), 'Urban vulnerability and displacement: A review of current issues', *Disasters*, 36(s1), 1–22, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7717.2012.01282.x>.
- Penz, P (2002), 'Development, displacement and ethics', *Forced Migration Review*, 12, 4–5, <http://www.fmreview.org/sites/fmr/files/FMRdownloads/en/development-induced-displacement.pdf>.
- Penz, P, Drydyk, J and Bose, PS (2011), *Displacement by development: Ethics, rights and responsibilities*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Pérez, B (2014), 'El tema del desplazamiento interno en la agenda pública: una comparación de su situación en México y Colombia', *El Cotidiano*, 183, 7–16, <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=32529943002>.
- Phuong, C (2005a), *The international protection of internally displaced persons*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- Phuong, C (2005b), ‘The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons’, *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 24(3), 71–83, <https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdi054>.
- Pikulicka-Wilczewska, A and Uehling, G (eds) (2017), *Migration and the Ukraine crisis: A two-country perspective*, E-International Relations, Bristol, <http://www.e-ir.info/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/Migration-and-the-Ukraine-Crisis-E-IR.pdf>.
- Plender, R (1994), ‘The legal basis of international jurisdiction to act with regard to the internally displaced’, *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 6(3), 345–361, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/6.3.345>.
- Plewa, MP and Koch Giese, I (2017), ‘Disaster-induced displacement: The case of small island developing states in the Pacific and the Caribbean’, Lunds Universitet, Lund, <https://lup.lub.lu.se/student-papers/search/publication/8922401>.
- Rimmer, SH (2010a), *New issues in refugee research: Refugees, internally displaced persons and the ‘responsibility to protect’*, Research Paper No. 185, UNHCR, <http://www.unhcr.org/research/working/4b97b0909/refugees-internally-displaced-persons-responsibility-protect-dr-susan-harris.html>.
- Rimmer, SH (2010b), ‘Reconceiving refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs) as transitional justice actors’, *Contemporary Readings in Law and Justice*, 2(2), 163–180, <https://www.cceol.com/search/article-detail?id=156230>.
- Rivadeneira, RA (2009), *Judicial protection of internally displaced persons: The Colombian experience*, Brookings Institution-University of Bern Project on Internal Displacement, https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/11_judicial_protection_arango.pdf.
- Roberts, B, Makhshvili, N, Javakhishvili, J, Karachevskyy, A, Kharchenko, N, Shpiker, M and Richardson, E (2017), ‘Mental health care utilisation among internally displaced persons in Ukraine: results from a nation-wide survey’, *Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences*, 28(1), 1–12, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2045796017000385>.
- Robinson, WC (2003), *Risks and rights: The causes, consequences and challenges of development-induced displacement: Report*, Brookings Institution-SAIS Project on Internal Displacement, <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/didreport.pdf>.
- Rubio Díaz-Leal, L (2017), *Desplazamiento Ambiental: Experiencia Global, realidad mexicana*, Tres Picos Servicios Editoriales, México D.F. (An English version is available on pp. 404–494 of the book.)
- Ruiz Ruiz, NY (2013), *El desplazamiento forzado en Colombia: población, territorio y violencia*, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Bogotá.
- Russell, S (2018), ‘The operational relevance of the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement’, *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 30(2), 307–309, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/eey022>.
- Sánchez, BE, and Rubiano, S (2018), *Territorios en transformación, derechos en movimiento*, Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá.
- Saparamadu, C and Lall, A (2014), *Resettlement of conflict-induced IDPs in northern Sri Lanka: Political economy of state policy and practice*, SLRC Working Paper 10, ODI, London. <https://securelivelife.org/wp-content/uploads/Resettlement-of-conflict-induced-IDPs-in-northern-Sri-Lanka.pdf>.
- Satiroglu, I, and Narae, C (2015), *Development-induced displacement and resettlement: New perspectives on persisting problems*, Routledge Studies in Development, Displacement and Resettlement, Routledge, New York.
- Schmeidl, S and Hedditch, K (2017), ‘Changing patterns of internal displacement: The art of figure skating’ in Hugo, G, Abbasi-Shavazi, MJ and Kraly, EP (eds), *Demography of refugee and forced Migration*, Springer Publishing, New York, 177–199, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-67147-5_9.

- Schrepfer, N (2012), 'Addressing internal displacement through national laws and policies: A plea for a promising means of protection', *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 24(4), 667–691, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/ees048>.
- Schrepfer, N (2018), 'Protection in practice: Protecting IDPs in today's armed conflicts', *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 30(2), 292–306, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/eey033>.
- Schrepfer, N and Caterina, M (2014), *On the margin: Kenya's pastoralists. From displacement to solutions, a conceptual study on the internal displacement of pastoralists*, Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre, Geneva, <http://www.internal-displacement.org/sites/default/files/publications/documents/201403-af-kenya-on-the-margin-en.pdf>.
- Scudder, T (2005), *The future of large dams: Dealing with social, environmental, institutional and political costs*, Earthscan, London.
- Senanayake, R (2003), 'Managing the internally displaced in Sri Lanka' in Chari, PR, Joseph, M and Suba Chandran, D, *Missing boundaries: Refugees, migrants, stateless and internally displaced persons in South Asia*, Manohar Publishers, New Delhi, 181–192.
- Siddiqui, N (2018), 'Balancing the rights of displaced, returning and remaining populations: Learning from Iraq', *Forced Migration Review*, 57, 64–65, <https://www.fmreview.org/syria2018/siddiqui>.
- Stavropoulou, M (2009), 'Internal displacement: Conceptualization and its consequences. By Thomas G. Weiss and David A. Korn', *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 22(1), 125–126, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fep003>.
- Stavropoulou, M (2010), 'The Kampala Convention and protection from arbitrary displacement', *Forced Migration Review*, 36, 62–63, <http://www.fmreview.org/sites/fmr/files/FMRdownloads/en/DRCongo/62-63.pdf>.
- Steele, A (2017), *Democracy and displacement in Colombia's civil war*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca.
- Suzenski, DA (2011), 'Review of climate change and displacement: Multidisciplinary perspectives', *New Global Studies*, 5(1), 1–5, <https://doi.org/10.2202/1940-0004.1133>.
- Thomas, A and Benjamin, L (2017), 'Policies and mechanisms to address climate-induced migration and displacement in Pacific and Caribbean small island developing states', *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management*, 10(1), 86–104, <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCCSM-03-2017-0055>.
- Türk, V and Edwards, A (2011), 'Introductory note to the Bellagio summary of deliberations on climate change and displacement', *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 23(3), 558–560, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/eer019>.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2007a), *Policy framework and implementation strategy for UNHCR's role in support of an enhanced humanitarian response to situations of internal displacement*, <http://www.un.org/ruleoflaw/files/4693775c2.pdf>.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2007b), *The protection of internally displaced persons and the role of UNHCR*, <http://www.refworld.org/docid/45ddc5c04.html>.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2011), 'Summary of deliberations on climate change and displacement', *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 23(3), 561–574, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/eer020>.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2013), *High Commissioner's dialogue on protection challenges, 2013: Protecting the internally displaced*, <http://www.unhcr.org/pages/5214d99c6.html>.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2015), *Guidance on protecting people from disasters and environmental change through planned relocation (Guidance on planned relocation)*, <http://www.refworld.org/docid/596f15284.html>.

- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2017), *A toolbox: Planning relocations to protect people from disasters and environmental change*, <http://www.refworld.org/docid/596f15774.html>.
- Van der Geest, K and de Jeu, R (2008), ‘Ghana’, *Forced Migration Review*, 31, 16, <http://www.fmreview.org/sites/fmr/files/FMRdownloads/en/climatechange/vandergeest-dejeu.pdf>.
- Vidal López, R (2007), *Derecho global y desplazamiento interno: creación, uso y desaparición del desplazamiento forzado por la violencia en el derecho contemporáneo*, Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Bogotá.
- Warner, K, Afifi, T, Kälin, W, Leckie, S, Ferris, E, Martin, SF and Wrathall, D (2013), *Changing climate, moving people: Framing migration, displacement and planned relocation*, Policy Brief No. 8, United Nations University, https://i.unu.edu/media/migration.unu.edu/publication/229/Policybrief_8_web.pdf.
- Weerasinghe, S and Ferris, E (2011), *Security Council, internal displacement and protection: Recommendations for strengthening action through resolutions*, Brookings Institution-LSE Project on Internal Displacement, https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Security_Council_ID_Protection.pdf.
- Weiss, TG and Korn, DA (2006), *Internal displacement: Conceptualization and its consequences*, Routledge, London.
- World Bank (2004), *Within and beyond borders: An independent review of post-conflict fund support to refugees and internally displaced persons*, Paper No. 17, World Bank Social Development Papers, http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTCPR/214578-1111996036679/20482458/WP17_Web.pdf.
- World Bank (2017), *Forcibly displaced: Toward a development approach supporting refugees, the internally displaced, and their hosts*, <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/25016>.
- World Bank (2018), *Groundswell: Preparing for internal climate migration*, https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/29461/WBG_ClimateChange_Final.pdf.
- World Food Programme (2012), *WFP humanitarian protection policy*, WFP/EB.1/2012/5-B/Rev.1, <https://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/eb/wfpdoc061670.pdf>.
- Woroniecka-Krzyzanowska, D, and Palaguta, N (2017), ‘Internally displaced persons and elections under military conflict in Ukraine’, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 30(1), 27–46, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/few021>.
- Wyndham, J (2006), ‘A developing trend: Laws and policies on internal displacement’, *Human rights brief*, 14, 7–12, <https://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/hrbrief/vol14/iss1/2/>.
- Yonetani, M (2017), ‘Recovery postponed: The long-term plight of people displaced by the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake, tsunami and nuclear radiation disaster’, *The Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre IDMC*, <http://www.internal-displacement.org/publications/recovery-postponed-the-long-term-plight-of-people-displaced-by-the-2011-great-east>.
- Zeender, G (2005), ‘Engaging armed non-state actors on internally displaced persons protection’, *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 24(3), 96–111, <https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdi056>.
- Zetter, R (2010), *Protecting environmentally displaced people: Developing the capacity of legal and normative frameworks*, Refugee Studies Centre, University of Oxford, <http://www.unhcr.org/4d00eb889.pdf>.
- Zetter, R (2011), ‘Unlocking the protracted displacement of refugees and internally displaced persons: An overview’, *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 30(4), 1–13, <https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdr015>.

Appendix: Workshop programme

Revitalising IDP Research: 20 Years of the UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement

20 July 2018

Senate House, University of London

About us:

The Refugee Law Initiative is the only academic centre in the UK to concentrate specifically on international refugee law. As a national focal point for leading and promoting research in this field, the Refugee Law Initiative works to integrate the shared interests of refugee law scholars and practitioners, stimulate collaboration between academics and non-academics, and achieve policy impact at the national and international level. Visit <https://rli.sas.ac.uk>

Founded in 1994, the School of Advanced Study at the University of London is the only institution in the UK that is nationally funded to promote and facilitate research in the humanities. It performs a vital role as a driving force for knowledge sharing across the humanities in the UK and beyond, and receives special funding for this purpose from Research England.

Key to Panel Sessions:

Stream 1 Law, norms and justice

Stream 2 Displacement and response dynamics

Stream 3 Future problems and solutions

0900–0930 *Registration*

0930–0945 *Opening and Workshop Methodology – Plenary Session*

- *Dr David James Cantor* (Refugee Law Initiative)

0945–1015 *Keynote: Introducing the Issues – Plenary Session*

- ‘Framing Policy-Relevant Research on IDPs: the GP20 Process’
Cecilia Jimenez-Damary (UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of IDPs)

1015–1200 *Breakout Session I*

Stream 1: The Guiding Principles at 20: Evaluating IDP Norms

Chair: *Cecilia Jimenez-Damary* (UN Special Rapporteur)

- ‘Patterns of Commitment with the Guiding Principles and Regional Mechanisms of Norm Diffusion’ – *Dr Gabriel Cardona-Fox* (Johns Hopkins University, Italy)
- ‘Internal Displacement Norms: Reassessing Practice and Interpretation by Non-State Armed Groups’ – *Dr Annyssa Bellal* (Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights, Switzerland)
- ‘Doing Better in Protecting the Internally Displaced: The Tension between State Instruments and Practices’ – *Ileana Nicolau* (European University Institute, Italy)
- ‘Identity Crisis: Access and Barriers to Legal and Civil Documentation for Internally Displaced Persons and the Role of Non-State Actors’ – *Sarah Adamczyk* (independent researcher)

Stream 2: Contemporary Trends: Framing Internal Displacement and IDP Dynamics

Chair: *Professor Elizabeth Ferris* (Georgetown University, USA)

- 'Framing the issue of Internal Displacement: A Historical Perspective' – *Dr Jeff Crisp* (Chatham House, UK)
- 'The Strategic Logic of Internal Displacement in Civil Wars' – *Adam G. Lichtenheld* (University of California Berkeley, USA)
- 'Reconceptualising Internal Displacement caused by Criminal Violence in Central America' – *Dr Vickie Knox* (Refugee Law Initiative, UK)
- 'Democracy and Displacement in Colombia's Civil War' – *Dr Abbey Steele* (University of Amsterdam, Netherlands)

Stream 3: Urban and other Non-Encamped IDPs: Thinking outside the Camp

Chair: *Bethan Mathias* (Refugee Law Initiative, UK)

- 'The Experience of IDPs in Urban Settings and the Challenges to Develop an Adequate Humanitarian Response' – *Dr Angela Cotroneo* and *Dr Catherine Lune Grayson* (ICRC)
- 'Towards a Holistic Framework on Internal Displacement in Cities' – *Melissa Weihmayer* (JIPS)
- 'The Missing Link: The Relational Dimension of Durable Solutions to Protracted Urban Internal Displacement' – *Patricia García Amado* (Universidad de Deusto, Spain)
- 'Livelihood Strategies by Non-Encamped IDPs in the Democratic Republic of Congo' – *Dr Fraser Murray* (University College London, UK)

1200–1300 *Lunch and Poster Session*

Poster presentations will be displayed and discussed during this working lunch, including:

- 'Addressing Internal Displacement through National Application of the Guiding Principles' – *Naziye Dirikgil* (Aberystwyth University, UK)
- 'The Law of IDP Returns' – *Ben Hudson* (Lincoln University, UK)
- 'Redefining Protection Intervention in Humanitarian Aid for IDPs through External Factors: A Case Study of Niger and Pakistan' – *Valerie Svobodova* (UNHCR, Niger)
- 'Learning from Experiences of Internal Displacement in Iraq: Implementation of Innovative Crisis-Response Solutions by RNVDO' – *Aleksandra K. Wiśniewska* (University of Oxford, UK)

1300–1445 *Breakout Session II*

Stream 1: Regional Protection of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa

Chair: *Dr Vickie Knox* (Refugee Law Initiative, UK)

- 'The Legal Protection of IDPs in Africa: The Kampala Convention' – *Romola Adeola* (University of Pretoria, South Africa)
- 'Litigating IDP Protection in Africa: The Case of the Endorois and Ogiek Communities' – *Donald Deya* (Pan-African Lawyers Union)
- 'Climate Change Displacement and the Protection of Indigenous Peoples in Africa' – *Jegede Ademola Oluborode* (University of Venda, South Africa)

- ‘The World Bank, Development Approaches and IDPs in East Africa’ – *Dr Sarah Deardorff Miller* (Columbia University, USA)
- Stream 2: The Invisible Majority: Understanding the Relationship between Internal Displacement and Cross-border Movements of Refugees and Migrants
- Chair: *Elizabeth Rushing* (IDMC)
- ‘Drivers and Tipping Points for Internal Displacement, Cross-border Movements and Returns: New Findings from Syria and Iraq’ – *Chloe Sydney* (IDMC)
 - ‘Root Causes of Forced Displacement and the Role of Access to Information in Shaping Internal and Cross-border Migration’ – *Dr Charles Martin-Schiels* (German Development Institute, GDI-DIE)
 - ‘Challenges in the Relationship between the Protection of Internally Displaced Persons and International Refugee Law’ – *Dr Bríd Ní Ghráinne* (University of Sheffield, UK)
 - ‘Internal to Cross-border Displacement in Multi-Risk and Slow-Onset Contexts’ – *Dr Caroline Zickgraf* (University of Liège, Belgium)
- Stream 3: Present and Future Danger? Environmental and Disaster Displacement
- Chair: *Professor Walter Kälin* (Platform on Disaster Displacement)
- ‘A Human Rights-Based Approach to Disaster Displacement in Asia Pacific: Preliminary Insights from a Ten-Country Research Initiative’ – *Dr Matthew Scott* (Raoul Wallenberg Institute, Sweden)
 - ‘Assessing Sovereign and Non-Sovereign Small Island Developing States’ Capacity to Respond to Internally Displaced Populations: The Case of the Anglophone Caribbean’ – *Dr Natalie Dietrich Jones* (University of the West Indies (Mona), Jamaica)
 - ‘Displacement and Technological Disasters: Fukushima as a “Living Example”’ – *Dr Ana Mosneaga* (Japan Platform, Japan)
 - ‘Re-evaluating the Relationship between Disaster and Conflict Displacement: A Colombian Case Study’ – *Dr Beatriz Sánchez* (independent researcher, Spain)
- 1445–1515 *Coffee*
- 1515–1700 *Breakout Session III*
- Stream 1: Internal Displacement and (Access to) Justice
- Chair: *Romola Adeola* (University of Pretoria, South Africa)
- ‘Hand in Hand or at Arm’s Length? The Displacement Reparations Case Law of International Human Rights Mechanisms, Twenty Years after the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement’ – *Deborah Casalin* (University of Antwerp, Belgium)
 - ‘IDPs from the Perspective of Transitional Justice: Opportunities, Risks and Lessons from Colombia’ – *Félix Torres Penagos* (University of Nottingham, UK / Constitutional Court, Colombia)
 - ‘Justice and Security for Internally Displaced Persons in the DRC: The Case of Bukavu in the DRC’ – *Dr Carolien Jacobs* (Leiden University, Netherlands)
- Stream 2: Internal Displacement as a Humanitarian Challenge
- Chair: *Joakim Daun* (Refugee Law Initiative, UK)

- ‘IDPs as a Humanitarian Concern’ – *Professor Elizabeth Ferris* (Georgetown University, USA)
- ‘IDPs and Public Health’ – *Professor Bayard Roberts* (London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK)
- ‘Be Near a Road: Humanitarian Practice and Displaced Persons in North Kivu’ – *Sandrine Tiller* (Médecins Sans Frontières) [with Sean Healy]
- ‘Redefining Protection Intervention in Humanitarian Aid for IDPs through External Factors: A Case Study of Niger and Pakistan’ – *Valerie Svobodova* (UNHCR, Niger)

Stream 3: Solutions, Development and the ‘End of Displacement’

Chair: *Natalia Krynsky Baal* (JIPS)

- ‘Breaking the Impasse: Reducing Protracted Internal Displacement as a Collective Outcome’ – *Professor Walter Kälin* (University of Bern, Switzerland)
- ‘The Challenges of Pursuing Solutions on the Ground’ – *Liz Eyster* (IDP Unit, UNHCR)
- ‘Innovation for Solutions’ – *Kathrine Starup* (Danish Refugee Council, Denmark)
- ‘Measuring Progress towards Durable Solutions’ – *Khadra Elmi* (JIPS)

1700–1800 *Closing Review and Next Steps – Plenary Session*

- Discussion: research gaps and opportunities, developing a network and future research links
Professor Walter Kälin (University of Bern, Switzerland)

