

Technical Report on Statistics of Internally Displaced Persons

CURRENT PRACTICE AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR IMPROVEMENT

March 2018



Technical Report on Statistics of Internally Displaced Persons

**CURRENT PRACTICE AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR IMPROVEMENT**

March 2018

Manuscript completed in July 2018

Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use that might be made of the following information.

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2018

© European Union and the United Nations, 2018

Reuse is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

The reuse policy of European Commission documents is regulated by Decision 2011/833/EU (OJ L 330, 14.12.2011, p. 39).

Copyright for the cover picture: Natalia Krynsky Baal

For any use or reproduction of photos or other material that is not under the EU copyright, permission must be sought directly from the copyright holders.

For more information, please consult: <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/about/policies/copyright>

The opinions expressed herein are those of the author(s) only and should not be considered as representative of the official position of the European Commission or the United Nations. Neither the European Union institutions and the United Nations and bodies nor any person acting on their behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained herein

Theme: Population and social statistics

Collection: Manuals and guidelines

Print	ISBN 978-92-79-80773-2	2363-197X	doi:10.2785/414331	KS-GQ-18-003-EN-C
PDF	ISBN 978-92-79-80774-9	2315-0815	doi:10.2785/665226	KS-GQ-18-003-EN-N

Acknowledgements

The **Technical Report on Statistics of Internally Displaced Persons** is developed by the IDP sub-group of the Expert Group on Refugee and Internally Displaced Persons Statistics (EGRIS) from national governments, and regional and international organisations led by the Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS). The report is developed in close cooperation between experts from governments and international organisations, ensuring the representation of a wide array of perspectives.

The following representatives of countries and territories have contributed to the work:

Zabiha Asgar, State Statistical Committee of the Republic of Azerbaijan, Zlatan Hadžić from the Agency for Statistics of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Oscar Ivan Rico Valencia, Victims' Unit of the Government of Colombia, Kô Fié Didier Laurent Kra from Institut National de la Statistique, Cote d'Ivoire, Avni Kastrati from Kosovo Agency of Statistics, Gohdar Mohamed and Serwan Mohamed from Kurdistan Region Statistics Office, Iraq, Vebjørn Aalandslid, Vibeke Oestreich Nielsen, Live Margrethe Rognerud, Per Schønning, Hans Viggo Sæbø from Statistics Norway, Lourdines Dela Cruz and Editha R. Orcilla from Philippine Statistics Authority, Mohamed Moalim and Dahir Mohamed Noor from Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs and Disaster Management, Somalia, Helen Laetitia Namirembe-Nviiri from Uganda Bureau of Statistics and Vadym Pishcheiko, State Statistics Service of Ukraine.

From international organisations, the following persons have taken part in the work:

Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC): Adrián Calvo-Valderrama, Justin Ginnetti, Luisa Meneghetti and Elizabeth Rushing, Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS): Natalia Krynsky Baal, Mihaela Darii Sposato, Corina Demottaz, Laura Kivelä, Hanna Mark and Dag Roll-Hansen, Office of the Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of IDPs: Martina Caterina, United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR): Daniel Macguire, Petra Nahmias, Kimberly Roberson and Aina Helen Sætre, World Bank: Xavier Devictor, Zara Sarzin, Caroline Sergeant, Emi Suzuki and Paolo Verme.

All the above mentioned organisations have made substantial contributions through their staff members. Financial contributions have been made available by European Free Trade Association (EFTA), Eurostat, JIPS, Statistics Norway, UNHCR and the World Bank.

Contents

Acknowledgements	3
Contents	5
List of Boxes, Figures and Tables	7
Acronyms	8
1. Introduction	9
A. Background	10
B. Rationale and scope	11
C. Linkages to the International Recommendations on Refugee Statistics	11
D. Report outline	12
2. The legal and policy framework	13
A. The legal and policy frameworks for protecting IDPs	13
1. International framework	13
2. Regional instruments	14
3. National laws and policies	14
4. Guiding Principles' definition of IDPs	15
B. Elements of the definition of IDPs in the Guiding Principles	15
1. Forced or obliged to flee or leave	15
2. Homes or places of habitual residence	16
3. As a result of or in order to avoid	17
4. Causes	17
5. Internationally recognised borders not crossed	19
6. Other issues not explicitly mentioned in the Guiding Principles	19
C. Durable solutions and the end of internal displacement	20
D. Conclusion	21
3. Defining IDPs for the purpose of statistical measurement	23
A. From a legal() to statistical definition	23
B. Measurements and specifications	25
C. Deviations from technical definition in current practices	26
D. Conclusion	28
4. Collecting numbers on IDPs: considerations and sources	29
A. Why are numbers useful?	29
B. Importance of data quality	29
1. Preparations	30
2. Quality aspects to consider when planning data collection	30
3. Aiming for continuous improvements	32

C.	Comparing the main sources of IDP data	33
D.	Challenges with collecting IDP numbers	41
1.	Stocks and flows	41
2.	Individual versus household-level	44
3.	Compiling data for international comparisons	44
E.	Conclusion	45
5.	Collecting IDP characteristics: challenges and applications	47
A.	Why are IDP characteristics useful?	47
B.	Identifying IDPs in official statistics	47
C.	Characteristics for measuring durable solutions	48
1.	SDGs in characteristics determination	50
D.	Capacities of data sources	51
E.	Comparative analysis	57
1.	Linking different sources to improve information	57
F.	Conclusion	58
6.	Coordination systems at national and international levels	59
A.	Why are coordination systems important?	59
B.	Coordination of IDP statistics between national stakeholders	59
1.	What does statistical coordination cover?	59
2.	Coordination of statistics generated through national and international IDP response	60
3.	Coordination through statistical strategies and systems	61
C.	Coordination on the regional and global level	64
D.	Conclusion	66
7.	Recommendations towards a statistical framework on IDPs	67
A.	Regarding definitions and specifications	67
1.	IDPs	67
2.	IDP-related populations()	68
B.	Regarding quality standards and specifications	69
1.	General data quality	69
2.	Data sources	70
3.	Assessing durable solutions	72
C.	Coordination	73
D.	The way forward	74

List of Boxes, Figures and Tables

Box 3.1 Statistical definition of an IDP in Azerbaijan	26
Box 3.2 Somalia: IDP statistics based on data collected for operational humanitarian purposes	27
Box 3.3 KRI: Inclusion and exclusion in the IDP registration system for the purpose of assistance provision	28
Box 4.1 Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics	31
Box 4.2 Côte d'Ivoire: Use of surveys	34
Box 4.3 Kosovo: Combining multiple data sources for comprehensive analysis	35
Box 4.4 Colombia: Use of registration	36
Box 4.5 IDP registration in Ukraine and Bosnia and Herzegovina	39
Box 5.1 Colombia: The Effective Enjoyment of Rights Framework	50
Box 5.2 SDGs disaggregated by displacement status in Somalia	51
Box 5.3 Bosnia and Herzegovina: Choice of characteristics to measure	56
Box 5.4 Colombia: Combining data from surveys and administrative records	58
Box 5.5 Kosovo: Housing, land, and property compensation register	58
Box 6.1 Iraq and KRI: Mixed methods and mixed agencies	62
Box 6.2 Colombia, Azerbaijan, and Bosnia and Herzegovina: Focal points inside and outside of NSSs	63
Box 6.3 Somalia: Enhancing statistical coordination to improve response to displacement	64
Box 6.4 Côte d'Ivoire: Coordination of IDP response, but not of IDP statistics	64
Figure 5.1 IASC criteria: Proposed process for identifying context specific core indicators	49
Figure 7.1 Inflows, outflows and stocks from IDP statistics	69
Figure 7.2 Statistical categories to be included in official IDP statistics	70
Table 4.1 Key quality considerations and implications in IDP statistics	32
Table 4.2 Examples of direct IDP-related questions/questionnaires from the 2010-round of censuses	38
Table 4.3 Summary sheet of the main displacement-related sources	42
Table 5.1 SDG Indicators recommended to be disaggregated by displacement/migration	52
Table 5.2 Overview of which data sources can provide a comparative analysis with the non-displaced population on durable solutions elements	56

Acronyms

CRVS	Civil Registration and Vital Statistics
DDPR	Database of Displaced Persons in Bosnia and Herzegovina
DRC	Danish Refugee Council
DTM	Displacement Tracking Matrix
EGRIS	Expert Group on Refugee and IDP Statistics
GSBPM	Generic Statistical Business Process Model
IASC	Inter-Agency Standing Committee
IDMC	Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
IHL	International Humanitarian Law
IHRL	International Human Rights Law
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
IRRS	International Recommendations on Refugee Statistics
JIPS	Joint IDP Profiling Service
KAS	Kosovo Agency on Statistics
KRI	The Kurdistan Region of Iraq
KRSO	Kurdistan Region Statistics Office
MCR	Kosovo's Ministry for Communities and Return
MODM	Iraq's Ministry of Displacement and Migration
MOH&DM	Somalia's Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs and Disaster Management
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NSDS	National Strategies for Development of Statistics
NSO	National Statistical Office
NSS	National Statistical System
OCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
RAMON	The Reference and Management of Nomenclatures
RNI	National Information Network of Colombia's Victims' Unit
RUV	Colombia Registro Único de Víctimas
SCRM	Serbian Commissariat for Refugees and Migration
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
UN	United Nations
UNHCR	United Nations Refugee Agency
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNSC	United Nations Statistical Commission
UNSD	United Nations Statistical Division

1

Introduction

Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) account for the greatest share of displaced populations globally. In order to aptly inform related responses, accurate and practical data and statistics on IDPs are necessary. Yet to date, and despite the particular conceptual and measurement challenges IDP statistics encounter, guidance on how to best produce IDP statistics remains scarce. There is therefore a need to develop standards for comparable and quality official IDP data and statistics. As a first step, the Expert Group on Refugee and IDP Statistics (EGRIS), has worked on this Technical Report on IDP Statistics to take stock of current practice and make recommendations for a way forward.

IDP data are especially helpful for providing a yardstick from which the situation of IDP populations can be monitored and the achievements of related policies and programmes can be measured. As such, the need for available and quality statistics on displacement is a stated imperative for monitoring and implementing a number of international agendas and agreements. These include the:

- 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and its commitment to leave no one behind, including IDPs;
- Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030;⁽¹⁾
- United Nations (UN) Framework Convention on Climate Change Paris Agreement;⁽²⁾
- Nansen Initiative's protection agenda for people displaced across borders by disasters;⁽³⁾
- Agenda for Humanity;⁽⁴⁾
- Valletta Summit action plan;⁽⁵⁾ and
- New Urban Agenda.⁽⁶⁾

Quality and sound statistics on displacement are also needed for monitoring progress towards the UN Secretary General's ambitious targets of: (i) Reducing new and protracted internal displacement by at least 50 per cent come 2030;⁽⁷⁾ (ii) Providing evidence to inform the two-year negotiations on the Global Compacts for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration and the Global Compact on Sharing Responsibility for Refugees, scheduled for adoption by the UN General Assembly in 2018; and (iii) Supporting the UN's International Forum for Migration Statistics⁽⁸⁾. For all of these, available and comprehensive displacement data are imperative and even though many international initiatives and partners relate to the development of IDP statistics, the ultimate responsibility will always rest with the national governments.

This introductory chapter aims to provide context for this Technical Report on Statistics of IDPs and to introduce the rationale and scope of the report itself. It will briefly present background information, identify key linkages between this Report and other efforts, including the International Recommendations on Refugee Statistics (IRRS), and provide a summary of the Report's structure and the process through which it was developed.

(1) http://www.unisdr.org/files/43291_sendaiframeworkfordrren.pdf

(2) http://unfccc.int/files/essential_background/convention/application/pdf/english_paris_agreement.pdf

(3) <https://nanseninitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/PROTECTION-AGENDA-VOLUME-1.pdf>

(4) <http://www.agendaforhumanity.org/>

(5) <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/meetings/international-summit/2015/11/11-12/>

(6) <http://habitat3.org/wp-content/uploads/NUA-English.pdf>

(7) UN General Assembly, A/70/709: One Humanity: Shared Responsibility, 2016, paragraphs 81-84, available at: goo.gl/PfB8IG

(8) The first of which occurred in Paris on 15-16 January, 2018.

A. Background

Following discussions at the 46th session of the United Nations Statistical Commission (UNSC) in 2015 concerning a paper on refugee and IDP statistics,⁽⁹⁾ the UNSC requested a conference of experts to be organised to look more deeply into the matter. Based on the outcome of this conference, a technical report was submitted to the UNSC recommending that a handbook on official refugee statistics be developed.⁽¹⁰⁾ Further discussions at the 47th session in 2016 resulted in a second decision to establish an international Expert Group on Refugee and IDP Statistics (EGRIS), comprised of participants from national authorities and statistical organisations as well as other technical experts. Notably, the UNSC requested that the group include IDPs in addition to refugees within the scope of its work. A sub-group was therefore established to work on the development of the Technical Report on IDP statistics, resulting in this current document.

The EGRIS is co-chaired by Statistics Norway, Eurostat and the United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR). UNSC tasked EGRIS with producing the following two documents for the 49th UNSC session in 2018:⁽¹¹⁾

1. International Recommendations on Refugee Statistics (IRRS)
2. A Technical Report on Statistics of IDPs

This technical report has thus been developed by the EGRIS sub-group on IDP statistics. The sub-group members include government bodies and international agencies responsible for IDP statistics, as well as representatives from the following national/regional statistical offices: Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Kurdistan Region of Iraq (KRI), Kosovo, Philippines, Somalia, Uganda, and Ukraine. These countries/regions represent those that agreed to be part of the IDP sub-group and formally participated in at least one face-to-face meeting following broad invitations put out to all countries during and after the 47th session of the UNSC in 2016. Together, they also represent a strong variety of regions and types of displacement situations.

Led by the Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS) and co-chaired by Statistics Norway and the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC), the sub-group also benefits from input from technical experts from United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR), the Office of the Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of IDPs, and the World Bank.

The Technical Report was developed through a collaborative process among all group members including three face-to-face meetings, numerous electronic correspondences and video conferences, and multiple drafting processes. The meetings and discussions were used to find consensus on an outline, the essential content of the report, and key recommendations. While the co-chairs and UNHCR drafted the chapters, all country representatives provided country case studies and reviewed several rounds of drafts. This resulting report should therefore be considered a joint effort by all members listed above.

The final draft of the Technical Report was submitted for global consultations, facilitated by the UN Statistical Division (UNSD). The consultation took place from the 10th of November to the 10th of December 2017. The draft report was submitted for consultations in conjunction with a draft report of the IRRS and national statistical authorities around the world were encouraged to review and provide comments. Circulating the draft reports to appropriate officials in their country for further review and comments was additionally encouraged. Input received through the global consultations were incorporated in January 2018 for submission to the 49th UNSC session in March 2018.

⁽⁹⁾ Report of Statistics Norway and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees on statistics on refugees and internally displaced persons, E/CN.3/2015/9.

⁽¹⁰⁾ For more info and documentation see: <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/expert-group-on-refugee-statistics/home>

⁽¹¹⁾ Terms of Reference for the EGRIS: <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/1001617/7723880/terms-of-reference-refugee-statistics.pdf>

B. Rationale and scope

The inclusion of IDPs into the scope of the EGRIS' work is a unique opportunity to advance discussions on the quality of statistics on internal displacement—especially statistics that are nationally owned—and it follows that this report's overall goal is to improve official statistics on IDPs. It is trusted that this report will also contribute to strengthening evidence-based public policy and national response to displacement in the long term by:

- increasing recognition and/or visibility of internal displacement;
- improving comparability of statistics about IDPs vis-à-vis the host population and the general population at the national level, as well as with other groups at the international level, and supporting analyses of the impact of displacement;
- systematising analyses of vulnerability data related to the experience of displacement and better targeting of populations in need of humanitarian and development interventions in response;
- supporting the inclusion of internal displacement in local and national development plans and reporting on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Due to its mandate, this report is restricted to a stock-take of the current state of official IDP statistics. It is not intended to provide comprehensive normative guidance on the production of IDP-related statistics, though the challenges and considerations that arise when capturing these statistics are discussed. It also discusses which coordination mechanisms are requisite when producing IDP statistics and concludes by providing preliminary recommendations towards developing a statistical framework on IDPs.

As opposed to assistance-related operational data on IDPs, this report remains primarily concerned with official statistics—though there are some situations in which the two are hard to distinguish from one another. For the purposes of this report, official statistics refer to those that respect the *10 Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics* adopted by the UN General Assembly in 2014 (see Chapter 4 for more details). Based on findings from the initial stock-taking process, this report seeks to provide recommendations on how to improve the quality and availability of IDP statistics for the consideration of the UNSC's 49th session in 2018.

C. Linkages to the International Recommendations on Refugee Statistics

Although a separate product, this report should be read in conjunction with the IRRS, also developed by the EGRIS. The link between these two documents is important. This is not only because of key similarities between the populations concerned, but also because aligning the statistical recommendations they contain is necessary for producing interoperable statistics on different displaced populations in order to inform comprehensive policy and response. Hence, the linkages between the IRRS and this report were supported by coordinated efforts among members of the EGRIS. Though different in terms of objectives and scope, both reports follow a similar structure and strive to harmonise concepts and definitions to the extent possible. When relevant, linkages to specific parts of the IRRS are identified here. Likewise, this report makes references to the Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration⁽¹²⁾ and other broadly endorsed technical guidelines on statistical standards and definitions.

⁽¹²⁾ UN Statistics Division, Department of Economic and Social Affairs (1998).

D. Report outline

This report's structure covers all main elements of a statistical framework, while syncing as much as possible with the IRRS. Chapters are as follows:

- *Chapter 2. The legal and policy framework* will summarise the current international and regional frameworks relevant for protecting and identifying IDPs. It will review pertinent laws and policies and touch upon challenges with and deviations from commonly used IDP definitions.
- *Chapter 3. Defining IDPs for the purpose of statistical measurement* will elaborate upon the key criteria and measurements relevant for operationalising the definition of IDPs, and will utilise examples from partner countries to highlight current approaches.
- *Chapter 4. Collecting numbers on IDPs: considerations and sources* will detail issues related to data quality and will outline the main types of data sources employed when collecting IDP figures at the national level. It too will apply examples from partner countries to highlight the pros and cons of different approaches and to help illuminate factors to consider when selecting a data source.
- *Chapter 5. Collecting IDP characteristics: challenges and applications* will focus on plausible methods for collecting IDP characteristics in official statistics, which are critical for providing more layered understandings of the displacement event itself, appropriate responses, and the potential pathways to durable solutions. Examples from various countries are also provided to highlight relevant challenges and successes.
- *Chapter 6. Coordination systems at national and international levels* will address effective coordination approaches between different stakeholders while underlining the importance of good coordination in the production of IDP statistics.
- *Chapter 7. Recommendations towards a statistical framework on IDPs* consolidates recommendations based on analysis in preceding chapters.

Throughout this report, case examples from different countries and references to existing practices are presented. The intention is to present a range of differing practices in order to provide a multi-layered understanding of the challenges and potential ways forward when it comes to aligning production of IDP statistics. The case studies included are based on contributions from the EGRIS partner countries. It was decided not to include case studies from countries not taking part in the EGRIS IDP sub-group. While these studies are not an exhaustive list of existing practices, nor are they necessarily a representation of the most common practices in the production of IDP statistics, they do provide dynamic representations from differing contexts, phases in the displacement crises, and regions of the world.

2

The legal and policy framework

Because the normative legal and policy frameworks for protecting IDPs serve as the basis for IDP statistics, this chapter will recapitulate these frameworks. Specifically, this chapter will describe international and regional standards, as well as national laws and policies; the elements of the commonly used definition for IDPs and departures from that definition; and highlight how existing frameworks can be difficult to concretely operationalise.

A. The legal and policy frameworks for protecting IDPs

1. International framework

Internal displacement describes the situation of persons who have been forced to leave or abandon their homes, and who have vulnerabilities associated with their displacement that require particular assistance and protection.⁽¹³⁾ The Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement sets forth 30 principles that are based on international human rights law (IHRL), international humanitarian law (IHL), and refugee law by analogy.⁽¹⁴⁾ They cover the broad range of IDP assistance and protection needs required during displacement, during return, and during resettlement or reintegration. They also cover protections against arbitrary displacement.

Although the Guiding Principles do not explicitly refer to the need to collect data on IDPs, the interpretation of the Guiding Principles in the Annotations makes clear that there is an implied need for states to identify individuals and groups in need due to displacement. Data collection is also implied in the operationalisation of the definition of IDPs offered by the Guiding Principles, including information on age and gender.

The Guiding Principles do not seek to create a privileged category of persons or to establish a separate legal status for the internally displaced. Rather, they are based on the principle that IDPs have rights and obligations that should be accounted for and they underscore the importance of recognising the particular situations and needs of IDPs. Although not a legally binding document, the Principles reflect and are consistent with IHRL, IHL, and refugee law by analogy, which are binding.⁽¹⁵⁾ Since they were first presented to the Commission on Human Rights in 1998, the Guiding Principles have been accorded almost universal recognition as the normative departure point for dealing with internal displacement.⁽¹⁶⁾

⁽¹³⁾ E/CN.4/1993/35, 21 January 1993, Commission on Human Rights, Forty-ninth session, Chapter 33, available at: <https://goo.gl/uBDWXL>

⁽¹⁴⁾ E/CN.4/1998/53/Add.2, 11 February 1998, UN Commission on Human Rights, Report of the Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Francis M. Deng, submitted pursuant to Commission resolution 1997/39. Addendum: Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, available at: <https://goo.gl/GJU2Sz>

⁽¹⁵⁾ Inter-Agency Standing Committee, "Protection of Internally Displaced Persons (IASC Policy Paper)", December 1999, available at: <https://goo.gl/iHcwzj>

⁽¹⁶⁾ A/RES/60/1, 2005, World Summit Outcome document, paragraph 132, available at: <https://goo.gl/i7wLoF>, as well as, for example, A/RES/62/153(2007), paragraph 10, available at: <https://goo.gl/2PGDA6>, and A/HRC/RES/6/32 (2007), paragraph 5, available at: <https://goo.gl/dXtAWH>

2. Regional instruments

The most significant normative advance with respect to internal displacement since the Guiding Principles were established is the legally binding African Union Convention on the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa (hereafter the Kampala Convention).⁽¹⁷⁾ The Guiding Principles are directly incorporated in many of the Kampala Convention's core provisions, such as the definition of IDPs. However, whereas the Guiding Principles merely reflect pre-existing norms of IHRL and IHL, the Kampala Convention moves beyond the Guiding Principles to advance international norms on internal displacement.⁽¹⁸⁾ Among the advances found in the Kampala Convention is the extension of responsibilities for IDP protection beyond states to the African Union, international organisations, humanitarian agencies, civil society, and non-state actors (including armed groups). The Kampala Convention also makes explicit a range of human rights violations that can cause internal displacement such as gender-based violence and other harmful practices or inhumane treatment.

The Kampala Convention was preceded by the 2006 Pact on Security, Stability and Development in the Great Lakes Region of Africa, which comprised the Protection and Assistance to Internally Displaced Persons and the Protocol on the Property Rights of Returning Persons. The Pact served as impetus for the initiative by the African Union to draft the Kampala Convention by including protocol obliging signatory states to enact national legislation to incorporate the Guiding Principles in their legal frameworks;⁽¹⁹⁾ it exemplifies how regional bodies advised the incorporation of the Guiding Principles into national legislation. The Organization of American States and the Council of Europe, who have also called upon their member states to use the Guiding Principles and incorporate them into their domestic laws and policies, are two additional examples of regional bodies working to incorporate the Principles.⁽²⁰⁾

The need for data collection on IDPs is explicitly described in regional level instruments. The Great Lakes Protocol highlights that member states must assess the needs of IDPs and assist with registration as necessary. It also requires that in specific situations member states establish databases for the registration of IDPs.⁽²¹⁾ The Kampala Convention contains a similar provision and imposes an obligation on states to assess or facilitate the assessment of the needs and vulnerabilities of IDPs and those of their host community, in cooperation with international organisations and agencies.⁽²²⁾ The Kampala Convention also requires state parties, in collaboration with international organisations, humanitarian agencies, or civil society organisations, to create and maintain an up-to-date register of all IDPs.⁽²³⁾

3. National laws and policies

Another sign of international acceptance of the Guiding Principles has been the proposal, adoption, and implementation of numerous laws, policies and decrees addressing internal displacement in all regions of the world—either explicitly based upon or in a manner consistent with the Guiding Principles.⁽²⁴⁾

The legal use of the Guiding Principles is visible in the adoption of national laws and policies that expressly refer to them, but also through court rulings such as the Constitutional Court of Colombia's decision T-025 of 2004, which formally incorporated them into the country's legal framework.⁽²⁵⁾ The German Government has additionally taken the official position that "the Guiding Principles can now be considered to be international customary law,"⁽²⁶⁾ and in its 2008 national policy, the Iraqi Government stated that the Guiding Principles had become part of international

⁽¹⁷⁾ Adopted by the African Union (AU) Heads of State Special Summit in Kampala, Uganda, on 23 October 2009, and entered into force on 6 December 2012, and as of 15 June 2017 signed by 40 countries and ratified by 27 countries, available at: <https://goo.gl/BrdqYX>

⁽¹⁸⁾ Asplet M. and Bradley M., "Strengthened Protection for Internally Displaced Persons in Africa: the Kampala Convention comes into force", 6 December 2012, available at: <https://goo.gl/FTY6kD>

⁽¹⁹⁾ 30 November 2006, International Conference of the Great Lakes Region, "Protocol on the Protection and Assistance to Internally Displaced Persons". Article 6.3, available at: <https://goo.gl/FQUvP3>

⁽²⁰⁾ OEA/Ser.P/AG/doc.5232/11, Resolution 2667, (June 2011), <http://goo.gl/eQzC1q>; and Council of Europe Recommendation 6 (2006) of the Committee of Ministers to member states on internally displaced persons, available at: <https://goo.gl/W29Xxn>

⁽²¹⁾ 30 November 2006, International Conference of the Great Lakes Region, "Protocol on the Protection and Assistance to Internally Displaced Persons". Article 6.3, available at: <https://goo.gl/FQUvP3>

⁽²²⁾ Kampala Convention, Article 5(5), available at: <https://goo.gl/BrdqYX>

⁽²³⁾ Kampala Convention, Article 13(1), available at: <https://goo.gl/BrdqYX>

⁽²⁴⁾ See the IDP law and policy database at: <http://www.internal-displacement.org/law-and-policy>. Examples include Uganda's "National policy for internally displaced persons, 2004", Kenya's "Prevention, Protection and Assistance to IDPs and Affected Communities Act, 2012" and Yemen's "National Policy for Addressing Internal Displacement, 2013".

⁽²⁵⁾ Brookings Institution, "The Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement: Judicial Incorporation and Subsequent Application in Colombia", 2009, available at: <https://goo.gl/sh8CiM>

⁽²⁶⁾ A/HRC/13/21, January 2010, Report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on the human rights of internally displaced persons, Walter Kälin, p. 5, available at: <https://goo.gl/nQLgJJ>

law,⁽²⁷⁾ indicating a viewpoint that the Principles should be guidelines for rules and regulations adopted at the national level.

4. Guiding Principles' definition of IDPs

The definition of IDPs found in the Guiding Principles and mirrored in regional and national frameworks is not a legal definition. Rather, it is a descriptive definition used to identify the category of persons of concern.⁽²⁸⁾ Its aim was not to assign IDPs a particular legal status which could be granted (and eventually revoked). Doing so would raise issues of status determination, increase risks of excluding IDPs from benefits or not legally recognizing *de facto* IDPs, increase risks of any ensuing discrimination, and could lead to difficulties in determining the end of status. Instead, the Guiding Principles' definition serves to bring visibility and to provide a framework for protecting the rights of IDPs. As this definition has been widely endorsed and implemented into many national and regional normative documents, it is the most appropriate starting point for developing a framework for statistics on internal displacement.

The Guiding Principles states that IDPs are “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 generalised violence, violations of human rights, or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognised state border.”⁽²⁹⁾

This notion of an IDP is based on two components: 1) that the movement is coerced or involuntary (to distinguish from economic and other voluntary migrants), and 2) that the movement stays within internationally recognised state borders (to distinguish from refugees). While there is broad international agreement about a definition that includes these two core components, interpretations of the definition and practical translations varies from state-to-state.

Departures from the internationally accepted definition are acceptable when they broaden the definition, but can become problematic when they narrow it. A law or policy may focus on a specific cause, a specific group within the overall displaced population, or a specific phase of displacement, but the state and other entities still have responsibilities to assist and protect all IDPs under the terms of the Guiding Principles. Thus, any applied national instrument should not allow for discrimination against or inequitable treatment of others. As stated within the Guiding Principles, instruments should be applied “without discrimination of any kind such as race, colour, sex, language, religion or belief, political or other opinion, national, ethnic or social origin, legal or social status, age, disability, property, birth or on any other similar criteria.”⁽³⁰⁾ Thus the elements of the IDP definition in the Guiding Principles should be considered to be the minimum requisite.⁽³¹⁾

B. Elements of the definition of IDPs in the Guiding Principles

1. Forced or obliged to flee or leave

The forced or obliged nature of a movement distinguishes persons that have a “coercive or otherwise involuntary character of movement” from those “who move voluntarily from one place to another solely in order to improve

⁽²⁷⁾ July 2008, Government of Iraq, national policy on internal displacement, available at: <http://goo.gl/aAGi71>

⁽²⁸⁾ E/CN.4/1993/35, 21 January 1993, Guiding Principles Annotations. Commission on Human Rights, Forty-ninth session, Chapter 33), available at: <https://goo.gl/uBDWXL>

⁽²⁹⁾ UN Commission on Human Rights, Report of the Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Francis M. Deng, submitted pursuant to Commission resolution 1997/39. Addendum: Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, 11 February 1998, E/CN.4/1998/53/Add.2, pg. 5.

⁽³⁰⁾ Guiding Principle 4(1), available at: <https://goo.gl/GJU2Sz>

⁽³¹⁾ The Guiding Principles paragraph 4 states “These Guiding Principles should be disseminated and *applied* as widely as possible.” See also p. 12 of “Protecting Internally Displaced Persons: a manual for law and policymakers” (October 2008), available at: <https://goo.gl/3xy7w5>

their economic circumstances.”⁽³²⁾ Thus the Annotations to the Guiding Principles clarifies that being forced or obliged to flee is synonymous with a lack of voluntariness.

International criminal and humanitarian law suggest that force, or lack of voluntariness, is measured in certain circumstances by the lack of personal consent of an individual within the context of the surrounding circumstances.⁽³³⁾ A lack of voluntariness or obliged movement, particularly when it comes to manmade or natural disasters, could also be measured objectively. The inclusion of both subjective and objective elements as part of the analysis of what constitutes “force” highlights why both are relevant for assessing causes of displacement.

It is important to note that the element of force or obligation makes no reference to the lawful or unlawful nature of a movement, indicating that lawful and unlawful movements are included in the definition. Persons who are lawfully displaced, such as evacuees, evictees or otherwise relocated persons may be counted as IDPs.

2. Homes or places of habitual residence

This element of the definition is important in clarifying that an IDP need not be a citizen of the country concerned—habitual residency is enough. Habitual residency is determined on both an objective basis (presence over a certain period of time) and a subjective one (the “intention of remaining,” or *animus manendi*), though the definition found in the Guiding Principles does not provide a test for either basis. Legal arguments continue over the need for the subjective element to prove habitual residence.

Hence, non-citizens and foreigners may also qualify as IDPs. Displaced stateless persons who have their habitual residence in the country concerned and former refugees who have returned to their country of origin but are unable to find a durable solution qualify as well.⁽³⁴⁾

Some national frameworks explicitly include specific categories of persons in their IDP definition, such as returning refugees. Afghanistan’s IDP policy, for instance, includes “returnees (returning refugees and migrants deported back to Afghanistan) who are unable to settle in their homes and/or places of origin.”⁽³⁵⁾ Other national laws restrict the definition to specific groups, such as citizens, despite the broad nature of the Guiding Principles’ reference to persons and groups of persons. For example, the IDP definitions in Georgia⁽³⁶⁾ and Ukraine⁽³⁷⁾ do not refer to persons or groups of persons. Rather, they are limited to citizens and a few other select groups. Both definitions restrict IDPs to citizens of their respective countries, though the Georgia IDP law states that a stateless person with resident status in Georgia may also qualify as an IDP;⁽³⁸⁾ the IDP law in Ukraine⁽³⁹⁾ was amended to include foreigners and stateless people who are entitled to permanent residence.⁽⁴⁰⁾

Habitual residence also raises a question of whether pastoralists and nomads fall within the IDP definition. The fact that pastoralists can become internally displaced is reflected in the particular obligation set out in Principle 9 of the Guiding Principles, which articulates that states are under a particular obligation to protect against the displacement of indigenous peoples, minorities, peasants, pastoralists and other groups with a special dependency on and attachment to their lands. For example, the Government of Colombia recognizes indigenous communities to be victims of the conflict and includes the right for reparation of the territorial rights of the indigenous groups.⁽⁴¹⁾ It is

⁽³²⁾ Kälin W., “Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement- Annotations”, Studies in Transnational Legal Policy, No. 32 published by The American Society of International Law and The Brookings Institution Project on Internal Displacement, 2000, p. 4, available at: <https://goo.gl/BGoiYp>

⁽³³⁾ For a summary of case law from the ICTY on the ‘forcible’ element of forcible displacement from Article 17 of Protocol II to the Geneva Conventions, see Vincent Chetail’s summary in the chapter on “The Transfer and Deportation of Civilians” in “The Geneva Conventions: A Commentary” by A. Clapham, P. Gaeta and M. Sassoli, eds, Oxford University Press, 2015, pp. 1190-1191, available at: <https://goo.gl/nVVd91>

⁽³⁴⁾ Brookings-Bern, “Protecting Internally Displaced Persons: a manual for law and policymakers”, October 2008, available at: <https://goo.gl/3xy7w5>, pp. 12-13.

⁽³⁵⁾ 2013, “National Policy of the Islamic republic of Afghanistan on Internal Displacement”, Article 3(1), available at: <https://goo.gl/KERMW9>

⁽³⁶⁾ 2014, “Law of Georgia on Internally Displaced Persons – Persecuted from the Occupied Territories of Georgia”, Article 6(1), available at: <https://goo.gl/13XAjb>

⁽³⁷⁾ 2014, “Law of Ukraine on ensuring of rights and freedoms of internally displaced persons”, available at: <https://goo.gl/7Tv1TP>

⁽³⁸⁾ 2014, “Law of Georgia on Internally Displaced Persons – Persecuted from the Occupied Territories of Georgia”, Article 6(1), available at: <https://goo.gl/13XAjb>

⁽³⁹⁾ 2014, “Law of Ukraine on ensuring of rights and freedoms of internally displaced persons”, Article 1, available at: <https://goo.gl/7Tv1TP>

⁽⁴⁰⁾ 2015, “Law № 921-VIII”, available at: <https://goo.gl/6sYuX6>

⁽⁴¹⁾ Article 8, Presidential Decree 4633 of 2011.

also reflected in the Great Lakes Protocol on IDPs⁽⁴²⁾ and the Kampala Convention.⁽⁴³⁾ One approach, supported by the UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of IDPs and IDMC,⁽⁴⁴⁾ describes displacement for a pastoralist as a process whereby a habitual living space on which their pastoral way of life is dependent becomes inaccessible.⁽⁴⁵⁾

3. As a result of or in order to avoid

This element of the definition acknowledges that people can become internally displaced in anticipation of coercive factors, hazardous events, or life-threatening circumstances compelling them to move. These circumstances include emergency and mandatory evacuations or resettlement away from areas deemed to be unsafe or uninhabitable. Similar to the element of force, this anticipatory flight analysis is more difficult to assess in practice due to the fact that the causal event has not yet taken place. Additionally, when the preemptive movements are linked to slow-onset disaster situations (explained in detail below), the element of compulsion may be even more difficult to demonstrate. Often, those movements are better characterised by forms of adaptive migration.⁽⁴⁶⁾

4. Causes

The Guiding Principles list a number of different causes of internal displacement. The listed causes, however, are not exhaustive and while some national laws and policies expand upon or specify causes of displacement for specific contexts, others narrow them down. For example, Azerbaijan's Law on the Status of Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons⁽⁴⁷⁾ restricts the causes for internal displacement to military aggression, natural disaster, or technological disaster. Likewise, both the Peruvian Law Concerning the Internally Displaced⁽⁴⁸⁾ and the Colombian Law on Internal Displacement⁽⁴⁹⁾ does not include natural or human-made disasters as a cause in their definitions of internal displacement.

The explicitly mentioned causes within the Guiding Principles are:

a. Armed conflict

Armed conflict is a precondition to the applicability of IHL in addition to IHRL. While IHL distinguishes between international and non-international armed conflict, either form can cause internal displacement. IHL violations—such as attacks against and ill-treatment of civilians, destruction of property, sexual violence, and restricted access to health care and other essential services—are some of the main causes triggering displacement.⁽⁵⁰⁾ IHL rules protecting IDPs and preventing internal displacement are found mainly in Geneva Convention IV and Additional Protocols I and II, as well as in customary international law.

b. Situations of generalised violence

This category encompasses disturbances which are below the threshold of an armed conflict. It includes widespread criminal, ethnic, political, and inter-communal violence. Examples include the post-election violence in Kenya in 2007-08 and generalised violence related to gang-activity, like in Honduras.

⁽⁴²⁾ 30 November 2006, International Conference of the Great Lakes Region, "Protocol on the Protection and Assistance to Internally Displaced Persons", Article 4(1)c, available at: <https://goo.gl/FQUvP3>

⁽⁴³⁾ Kampala Convention, Article 5(5) and 11(5), available at: <https://goo.gl/BrdqYX>

⁽⁴⁴⁾ IDMC-NRC-Nansen Initiative, "On the margin: Kenya's pastoralists - From displacement to solutions, a conceptual study on the internal displacement of pastoralists", March 2014, available at: <https://goo.gl/k3k47Z> See pp. 20-31 for the definition of internally displaced pastoralists and its analysis.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ The adapted notion of an IDP replaces the term 'place' with 'living space' in order to embrace the socio-economic environment of pastoralists who, given their mobility, do not necessarily have a home or habitual place of residence in the legal sense implied in the Guiding Principles. Academics in human geography suggest that 'place is a tool of sociality' and therefore also applies to nomads: 'rather the opposite to or disruptive of place, mobility is an inherent part of how some places are defined and operate.' See Agnew J. in Agnew J. and Livingstone D., "Handbook of Geographical Knowledge", 2011, "Chapter 23: Space and Place", p. 25.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ DSWD, IOM, IDMC and SAS, "The evolving picture of displacement in the wake of Typhoon Haiyan an evidence based overview", May 2014, available at: <https://goo.gl/rGMqYB>

⁽⁴⁷⁾ May 1999, Law No. 668-1Q.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ April 2004, Law No. 28223.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ 1997, Law 287.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ ICRC Advisory Service on International Humanitarian Law, "Internally Displaced Persons and International Humanitarian Law - Factsheet", March 2010, available at: <https://goo.gl/euTnGC>

c. Human rights violations

Human rights violations are common causes of displacement. These violations may include violations of general international human rights covenants, specific international human rights treaties, or national human rights provisions.

For example, the Colombian Victims' Law defines "victims" as persons that individually or collectively have suffered harm due to violations of IHL or IHRL, as part of the internal armed conflict.⁽⁵¹⁾ These violations include land abandonment or dispossession, terrorist attacks, threats, crimes against sexual liberty and integrity, forced disappearance, homicide, land mines, and kidnapping. According to the Colombian Single Victims' Registry, one in ten victims of internal displacement are also registered as having experienced more human right violations, with threat and homicide of relatives being the most common.⁽⁵²⁾

The issue of displacement caused by land acquisition and forced internal resettlement due to large scale development projects⁽⁵³⁾ and forced eviction requires particular attention. Even though the issue is not mentioned specifically in the definition of IDPs in the introduction to the Guiding Principles, displacement by large-scale development projects not justified by compelling and overriding public interests is described as a form of arbitrary displacement under Guiding Principle 6, and is considered a type of human rights violation. The Great Lakes Protocol includes displacement from large scale development projects in a separate but adjacent clause to the IDP definition.⁽⁵⁴⁾ Similarly, the Kampala Convention has a specific article on "Displacement Induced by Projects"⁽⁵⁵⁾ that describes the steps a state must take to avoid forced displacement of persons during development, based on the UN Basic Principles and Guidelines on Development-Based Evictions and Displacement.⁽⁵⁶⁾

Furthermore, some national instruments explicitly consider IDPs to include those forcibly evicted. An example is Afghanistan's policy which defines IDPs as "Persons or groups of persons who are displaced as a result of a development project and who have not received an adequate housing and/or land alternative or appropriate compensation allowing them to restore their lives in a sustainable manner."⁽⁵⁷⁾

d. Natural or human-made disasters

Widely accepted definitions of the term "disaster" acknowledge that a disaster is something that results from a combination of pre-existing vulnerabilities and exposure to hazard(s), which may be "natural" (e.g. earthquakes, storms, and heavy rainfall), "human-made" (e.g. industrial accidents), or a combination of both (e.g. floods in poorly drained urban areas or landslides on deforested hillsides). In all but the most extreme cases, it is primarily a person's vulnerability to such hazards and their lack of capacity to prevent or cope that creates a disaster, rather than the hazard itself.⁽⁵⁸⁾ Conflict or violence might also be considered a "human-made" hazard, though it is often referred to as a separate issue, or as part of a complex emergency situation. Nevertheless, usually people who are vulnerable to conflict and violence are also vulnerable to other types of hazards. In reality, displacement is often multi-causal.

As defined in the terminology used for disaster risk reduction,⁽⁵⁹⁾ "A sudden-onset disaster is one triggered by a hazardous event that emerges quickly or unexpectedly. Sudden-onset disasters could be associated with, e.g. earthquake, volcanic eruption, flash flood, chemical explosion, critical infrastructure failure." Resulting displacement is usually relatively straightforward to identify in the face of acute threats or the resulting impacts of such hazards, including emergency evacuations to remove people from immediately dangerous areas.

A slow-onset disaster is defined as one that emerges gradually over time. Slow-onset disasters could be associated with e.g. drought, desertification, rise in sea-level, or epidemic disease. Displacement is more complicated to identify

⁽⁵¹⁾ Article 3, Law 1448 of 2011.

⁽⁵²⁾ Figures by Victims' Unit, July 1st 2017. See more figures at: <https://rni.unidadvictimas.gov.co/RUV>

⁽⁵³⁾ Large-scale development projects not justified by compelling and overriding public interests is one of the forms of arbitrary displacement prohibited under Guiding Principle 6.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ 30 November 2006, International Conference of the Great Lakes Region, "Protocol on the Protection and Assistance to Internally Displaced Persons", Article 1(5). "Internally Displaced Persons also mean 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 large scale development projects..."; available at: <https://goo.gl/FQUvP3>

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Kampala Convention, Article 10, available at: <https://goo.gl/BrdqYX>

⁽⁵⁶⁾ A/HRC/4/18, "Basic Principles and guidelines on development based evictions and displacement", available at: <https://goo.gl/d1Mhp4>

⁽⁵⁷⁾ 2013, "National Policy of the Islamic republic of Afghanistan on Internal Displacement", Article 3(1)b, available at: <https://goo.gl/KERMW9>

⁽⁵⁸⁾ See UNISDR terminology at: <https://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/terminology>

⁽⁵⁹⁾ Ibid.

in such contexts as population movements exist over a continuum between voluntary and forced movements, which parallel evolutions of the situation over time.

5. Internationally recognised borders not crossed

The second core component of the IDP definition requires that an internationally recognised state border (a formulation deliberately chosen to guide the definition in the case of contested territories) has not been crossed. This element is crucial as it highlights the difference between an IDP and a refugee, which has critical implications for the provision of assistance and protection.

This component of remaining within state borders is to be understood in a broad sense. It can be the place where the displaced person finds refuge or simply stops in their migratory path. Yet it also is met if, for example, a displaced person has to transit through a neighbouring state in order to gain access to a safer part of their own country. Seeking refuge abroad and then returning (voluntarily or involuntarily) to their own country without being able to go back to their home or place of habitual residence due to reasons outlined in Paragraph 2 of the Guiding Principles and without having a durable solution (referred to in the 1951 Refugee Convention as failing to “re-establish” oneself) still may qualify as internal displacement. Venturing to another part of one’s country voluntarily and then finding oneself unable to return home because of events that make return impossible or unreasonable qualifies, as well.⁽⁶⁰⁾ In this sense, relevant normative frameworks in some countries simply require that the displaced person is within the territory of the country (e.g. Azerbaijan⁽⁶¹⁾ or Bosnia and Herzegovina⁽⁶²⁾) or living somewhere else in the country (e.g. Nepal⁽⁶³⁾).

The concepts of returning refugees and IDPs are thus not mutually exclusive, and under certain circumstances, an individual can be both a returning refugee and an IDP. The 1951 Refugee Convention refers to returning refugees under article 1C(4), where it indicates that a person ceases to be a refugee when he has voluntarily re-established himself in the country which he or she left, or outside in which he or she remained, owing to fear of persecution. Prior to “re-establishment” (a concept that includes length of stay and the commitment to staying, and is not necessarily linked to a return to the place of origin), however, an individual could be both a returning refugee and IDP.⁽⁶⁴⁾

6. Other issues not explicitly mentioned in the Guiding Principles

a. Duration and timing of displacement

The Guiding Principles contain no specifications related to the length of time a person must be displaced in order to meet IDP criteria. Even a brief preemptive voluntary evacuation may qualify. However, brief evacuations may not generate particular needs or human rights concerns if the displacement is requisite, prepared for, and safely executed especially with due attention to the specific needs of vulnerable populations and if homes and livelihoods are not significantly disrupted. Likewise, someone does not cease to be displaced after a set period of time. Many IDPs will remain IDPs for decades and even for generations (see Section ‘D’ on durable solutions and end of displacement).

In some cases, national instruments identify a specific timeframe within which displacement should occur in order for IDPs to qualify as such. For example, the Law on Refugees from Bosnia and Herzegovina and Displaced Persons in Bosnia and Herzegovina⁽⁶⁵⁾ states: “A displaced person is a citizen of Bosnia and Herzegovina, residing within Bosnia and Herzegovina, who has been expelled from his/her habitual residence as the consequence of the conflict, or left her/his habitual residence, after 30 April 1991.”

⁽⁶⁰⁾ Kälin W., “Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement: Annotations”, 2nd ed., Studies in Transnational Legal Policy 38 (American Society of International Law and Brookings Institution), 2008, pp. 3-4, available at: <https://goo.gl/UUSD4g>

⁽⁶¹⁾ 1999, “Law of the Republic of Azerbaijan on Status of Refugees and Forcibly Displaced Persons (Persons Displaced Within the Country)”, Article 1, available at: <https://goo.gl/T62ciK>

⁽⁶²⁾ 1999, “Law on Refugees from Bosnia and Herzegovina and Displaced Persons in Bosnia and Herzegovina”, Article 4, available at: <https://goo.gl/rPiJpe>

⁽⁶³⁾ 2007, “Nepal National Policy on Internally Displaced Persons 2063/2007”, Article 3(a), available at: <https://goo.gl/i68FU2>

⁽⁶⁴⁾ UNHCR, “The Cessation Clauses: Guidelines on Their Application”, 26 April 1999, para. 21., available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3c06138c4.html>

⁽⁶⁵⁾ 1999, “Law on Refugees from Bosnia and Herzegovina and Displaced Persons in Bosnia and Herzegovina”, Article 4, available at: <https://goo.gl/rPiJpe>

b. Children of IDPs

The definition of IDPs in the Guiding Principles does not state whether children are considered IDPs when they are born to internally displaced parents after the displacement event itself. A strict-level interpretation suggests that children born into displacement are not IDPs, since they themselves were not forced or obliged to flee. Yet from a human rights perspective, there are strong arguments which advocate that children of IDPs should benefit from the same rights and assistance of their parents, depending on the context. However, this does not automatically mean they should be considered IDPs. While state normative practice generally tends to either not specify or not include children of IDPs in the definition, there are some exceptions.⁽⁶⁶⁾

c. Distance from home/place of habitual residence

The definition in the Guiding Principles does not specify the distance that an individual need to be displaced from their home or habitual residence in order to be recognised as an IDP. Displacement may include situations where people are rendered homeless but remain close to their original dwellings, whether due to personal choice or a lack of means or freedom to access shelter and assistance elsewhere. In many situations, displaced people may temporarily return to or regularly visit their homes.

d. Location

People displaced within their country's official borders should be considered IDPs irrespective of their location, including if they are in territory controlled by insurgent, dissident, or occupying forces. That said, some national instruments limit which geographical locations may constitute an IDP's place of origin. For example, the 1996 Law of Georgia on Forcibly Displaced Persons-Persecuted Persons stipulated that a person had to come from one of a number of clearly defined occupied areas in order for them to qualify as an IDP. This issue was addressed when the law was reformed in 2014.

Moreover, IDPs live in a variety of circumstances, including in camps, informal settlements, with host families, and in independently rented or purchased accommodation. It is important that this variety is considered in order to decrease the risk of oversight, neglect, and discrimination between different groups of IDPs.

C. Durable solutions and the end of internal displacement

While the IDP definition in the Guiding Principles is well-established and helps explain when an individual or community becomes displaced, it provides little insight into the issue of when displacement ends. Principles 28-30 address the issue of durable solutions for IDPs. IDPs have the right to choose freely between return to their former homes or habitual places of residence, local integration in areas where they take refuge, or settlement elsewhere in the country. Competent authorities are responsible for creating the conditions that allow displaced persons to rebuild their lives in any one of these locations. No one option is preferable to another.

The Inter-Agency Standing Committee's (IASC) Framework on Durable Solutions for IDPs aims to provide clarity on the concept of a durable solution and provides general guidance on how durable solutions are achieved and supported.⁽⁶⁷⁾ Like the Guiding Principles, the IASC Framework stresses that IDPs must be free to make a voluntary and informed choice on which settlement option they prefer, and this choice must be able to be pursued with safety and dignity. The IASC Framework states that a durable solution is achieved when "IDPs no longer have any specific assistance and protection needs that are linked to their displacement and can enjoy their human rights without discrimination on account of their displacement."⁽⁶⁸⁾ Its definition takes the position that the end of

⁽⁶⁶⁾ 2014 "Law of Georgia on Internally Displaced Persons – Persecuted from the Occupied Territories of Georgia", Article 6(2): "An underage person is entitled to an IDP status if one or both of the parents have and/or had IDP status, only based on the consent from parent(s) or his/her other legal representative.", available at: <https://goo.gl/13XAjb>

⁽⁶⁷⁾ Inter-Agency Standing Committee "Framework on Durable Solutions for internally displaced persons", April 2010, available at: <https://goo.gl/BydBcf>

⁽⁶⁸⁾ *Ibid.*, pg. 6.

displacement is determined not by the location of the displaced person, but rather by their level of access to their human rights.

How this definition should be operationalised, however, is not laid out in the framework. In many cases, even once a displacement may appear to have physically ended, people can continue to suffer related consequences. These consequences can include lack of access to adequate housing, to basic services, to security, to livelihoods opportunities, and to one's ability to recover personal assets. For this reason, considering the sustainability conditions and prospects when assessing end of displacement is necessary. A mere physical return to the place of habitual residence, long-term presence in a place of refuge, or relocation to a new settlement location at the end of a physical displacement in statistical records does not indicate that displacement-related concerns have been attended to, and risks that people may become displaced again remain.

Accordingly, the IASC Framework proposes eight criteria that should be considered to help determine if durable solutions are achieved for IDPs based on their fundamental human rights. These eight criteria include:

1. Safety and security;
2. Adequate standard of living;
3. Access to livelihoods;
4. Restoration of housing, land and property;
5. Access to documentation;
6. Family reunification;
7. Participation in public affairs; and
8. Access to effective remedies and justice.

Yet when it comes to assessing end of displacement in practicality, there is limited global use of the IASC Framework. While some states have included the IASC's criteria into their policy frameworks,⁽⁶⁹⁾ to date, none have gone so far as to include them in law. Instead, many different instruments currently attempt to measure the end of displacement, highlighting the difficulties states have in operationalising durable solutions. Creating policies to help coordinate solutions for displaced persons is another method that states such as Sri Lanka⁽⁷⁰⁾ and Zimbabwe have applied. Though efforts are currently under way to provide indicators in measuring progress towards a solution,⁽⁷¹⁾ state practice will continue to vary widely until there is a common understanding of what end of displacement entails.

D. Conclusion

There is widespread, international acceptance of the IDP definition described in the preamble to the Guiding Principles. It is thus a useful starting point for determining who an IDP is for statistical purposes. In particular, two elements of the IDP definition—that of forced movement and movement within internationally recognised state borders—are required elements. However, despite the broad agreement on the definition, applying the definition in practice can vary from state to state, and even less agreement exists on when an IDP should stop being counted as displaced. Most states do not follow the definition and framework proposed by the IASC. In this context, variations in state practice are widespread, making international comparability difficult. In the following chapters, this report will unpack how these frameworks currently are applied for statistical purposes, highlighting in vivo successes and challenges. It will conclude with recommendations for how countries can better align their practices, with a goal of minimizing future variation in worldwide IDP statistics.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ The Government of Zimbabwe's Framework for the Resettlement of Internally Displaced Persons, for example, is based on the IASC Framework for Durable Solutions, in addition to incorporating the three Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement related to solutions. The Zimbabwe Framework for the Resettlement of Internally Displaced Persons, http://www.internal-displacement.org/static_content/law-and-policy/zimbabwe/Framework_for_Resettlement_IDPs_Zimbabwe_EN.pdf

⁽⁷⁰⁾ Sri Lanka National Policy on Durable Solutions for Conflict-affected Displacement, <http://resettlementmin.gov.lk/site/images/stories/pdf/final%20policy.pdf>

⁽⁷¹⁾ <http://www.jips.org/en/profiling/durable-solutions>

3

Defining IDPs for the purpose of statistical measurement

As outlined in Chapter 2, national and regional instruments largely follow the same IDP definition as the UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement. However, interpretations of this definition and its practical applications for policy implementation and programming often vary, specifically in relation to interpretations on the end of displacement. This results in a range of practices when it comes to capturing internal displacement statistics. As the UNSC requested that this report focus on aligning the production of IDP statistics, this chapter aims to outline what baseline criteria should be considered when attempting to define IDPs for the purpose of statistical measurement. These criteria are based on the core definitions outlined in legal and policy frameworks, and recommendations on these will be further elaborated in Chapter 7. Through examples, the second part of Chapter 3 will illustrate how different countries have effectively managed to establish statistical definitions, and discusses reasons why definitions may differ cross-nationally.

A. From a legal⁽⁷²⁾ to statistical definition

The UN Guiding Principles' definition of IDPs, elaborated upon in Chapter 2, entails a set of core elements which are relevant for statistically defining an IDP. Combining these core elements also ensures sufficient distinction between internal displacement and other population movements within the borders of a country. Based on the Guiding Principles' definition and the components highlighted in the Annotations, *two criteria are necessary for a person to be statistically counted as an IDP*:

- **Forced nature of the movement from place of habitual residence:** By definition, an IDP is a person who was forcefully displaced from their place of habitual residence at some point. That is, he or she was obliged to leave the place where he or she resided or considered home as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of one of the outlined causing events (i.e. armed conflict, generalised violence, violations of human rights, or natural or man-made disasters).⁽⁷³⁾ A person can be considered an IDP as long as they were at direct risk of experiencing the causing event, regardless of whether or not they experienced the event itself. In order to distinguish between displacement and other types of population movements within a country, it is important in statistical measurement to differentiate between the reason for leaving one's place of habitual residence,⁽⁷⁴⁾ and the reason for choosing one's current place of residence. For example, a person may have been forced to flee their place of habitual residence in order to avoid the effects of generalised violence, but may have chosen to settle in their current place of residence for economic reasons. In this case, the forced displacement from their home/ place of habitual residence is the defining factor for considering this person an IDP, regardless of possible further movements that may have occurred for reasons separate from the causing event itself.
- **Currently within the internationally recognised borders of the country:** An IDP should be found within the internationally recognised state borders of the country in which the displacement took place. Persons having crossed a border and later having returned to the country within which they were displaced, can be counted as IDPs in certain cases, however, this should not be an automatic assumption. For returning refugees,

⁽⁷²⁾ Although not legally binding, when generally referring to 'the legal definition' of internal displacement, this report refers to the UN Guiding Principles' definition of internal displacement as the most commonly used and overarching one.

⁽⁷³⁾ Please refer to Chapter 2 for further details.

⁽⁷⁴⁾ See Chapter 2, p. 15 for definition of place of habitual residence.

for example, this requires an assessment of whether or not they have been able to “re-establish” themselves.⁽⁷⁵⁾ Returning refugees and other persons returning from abroad after displacement should still be considered as IDPs if they have not found a durable solution to their displacement. All persons having returned from abroad and being displaced after their return, should be counted in IDP statistics. It is notable that the IRRS also includes persons returning from international protection as a statistical category, however as the different causing events constituting internal displacement is broader than that applied in the 1951 Refugee Convention, establishing statistical categories that are mutually exclusive, yet inclusive of the full IDP-definition, will be challenging.⁽⁷⁶⁾ In addition, for the purpose of statistical measurement, *other clarifying criteria are relevant to differentiate IDPs from other population groups:*

- **Residency:** An IDP should have his/her home or place of habitual residence/place of usual residence in the place where the causing event occurred. Thus, a person may become an IDP in a country of which they are not a national.⁽⁷⁷⁾ For statistical measurement the concept of ‘place of usual residence’ can be adopted from the Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration, which may be the same or different as a person’s legal residence. The indication of this is primarily based on the person’s subjective statement.⁽⁷⁸⁾
- **Presence and timing:** IDPs are demarcated by having their place of habitual residence at the location within the country where the causing event or the threat of the causing event took place. This location should be their place of habitual residence *at the time of* this causing event, as well. People may become IDPs during a causing event or in response to it (e.g. not being able to return to or no longer having access to their place of habitual residence or habitual living space).⁽⁷⁹⁾ This means that a person can become an IDP as a result of a causing event upon their return to their place of residence even if they were not physically present at the time when it occurred. Additionally, the time spent away from the place of habitual residence does not have a clearly defined minimum length.
- **Physical movement:** As a consequence of or in order to avoid the impact of the causing event, IDPs are forced to physically flee or leave their place of habitual residence. Thus, simply experiencing harm or loss of property alone does not constitute the grounds for a person to be counted as an IDP. Yet how far a person has to move in order to be counted as an IDP is not specified in the Guiding Principles, and would thus imply not to have a minimum length.

A person should no longer be included in IDP statistics following any *one* of the following conditions:

- **Death:** Deaths in the IDP population would lead to reductions of numbers of IDPs in statistics.
- **Leaving country of displacement:** If an IDP crosses an internationally recognised border of the country within which they have been displaced, they should no longer be included in the IDP statistics in that country. This emigration can take place with the intention to seek asylum in another country,⁽⁸⁰⁾ or to establish a place of habitual residence in another country for other reasons, such as economic migration or family reunification.
- **Securing a durable solution:** As outlined in Chapter 2, according to the IASC Framework, displacement ends when IDPs have secured a durable solution to their displacement (i.e. return and reintegration, local integration or resettlement elsewhere in the country *in a sustainable manner*). In essence, this entails that IDPs are not discriminated against and are not facing any specific protection or assistance needs in relation to their displacement, after which they should no longer be counted as IDPs for statistical purposes. There is little guidance in existing definitions on how to define that a durable solution is reached, except from the IASC Framework.

As the definition of an IDP is linked to a person’s physical movement, considering a household or another group as a unit of measurement may result in either over or underestimations of the total amount of IDPs.⁽⁸¹⁾ It also makes sex disaggregation and gender analyses impossible. Hence, for the purpose of statistical measurement, IDPs should be counted at the individual level as opposed to households or other groups of persons.

⁽⁷⁵⁾ See Chapter 2, page 16.

⁽⁷⁶⁾ See Chapter 7 for recommendations on potential ways forward for statistical categories.

⁽⁷⁷⁾ As outlined in Chapter 2, this may include foreigners who typically live in a place from which they were displaced, stateless persons and returning refugees.

⁽⁷⁸⁾ See Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration, Revision 1 (1998). UN Statistics Division, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, page 9, paragraph 33.

⁽⁷⁹⁾ See Chapter 2, pages 15-16 for more.

⁽⁸⁰⁾ NB: The list of causing effects of displacement causing internal displacement differs from those of the 1951 Refugee Convention constituting a cause of flight for a refugee (persecution, war or violence), and hence not all IDPs that subsequently flee the country within which they were displaced will be considered refugees in international refugee statistics (see Handbook on Refugee Statistics, Chapter 3).

⁽⁸¹⁾ See more about unit of measurement and producing numbers of IDPs in Chapter 4 of this report.

Following a similar logic, for the purpose of statistics, children of IDPs who were born after the displacement occurred should not be included in the overall count of IDPs. This is in spite of the fact that many children of IDPs are impacted by or exposed to vulnerabilities directly related to their family's displacement. Indeed, many countries' practice to include children of IDPs among those eligible for IDP-related assistance reflects an awareness of the risks and vulnerabilities children of IDPs often do experience. Azerbaijan, for instance, includes all children with IDP fathers in its count (see Box 3.1). Yet in order to achieve consistency across different contexts, an additional statistical category is likely needed to differentiate between IDPs and descendants of IDPs born after displacement. The practice allows for more flexibility. With two categories, the strict term of those who were forced to flee and those who are directly dependent can be presented separately for international comparison, and combined when needed in those countries where children of IDPs are included legally as IDPs.

B. Measurements and specifications

Displacement is challenging to systematically operationalise for the purpose of official statistics because many of the concepts that are key to measuring it have not yet been standardised in statistical practice. Principle 9 of the *UN Fundamental Principles on Official Statistics*⁽⁸²⁾ says that the use "of international concepts, classifications and methods promotes the consistency and efficiency of statistical systems at all official levels." In other words, it is important that technical documentation and metadata⁽⁸³⁾ are in place to ensure transparency of what is measured or included in the statistics produced and disseminated.

An important precondition for achieving comparable quality statistics is the use of clear and unambiguous statistical concepts and definitions. For many of the terms and concepts often used in official statistics, established definitions already exist and are available in international and national metadata databases.⁽⁸⁴⁾ Terms related to migration statistics are also included, many of which are taken from the International Recommendations on Migration Statistics. In addition, the IRRS specifies additional terms which also might be useful in an IDP context. However, because IDP statistics have not been part of a guidance on official statistics thus far, additional definitions and concepts need to be developed for this purpose. This report is a first step towards providing international guidance on how to define some of the IDP specific elements. As further discussed below, 'durable solutions' is an example of an IDP-relevant term still in need of a statistical definition.

An important factor in collecting comparable IDP statistics is the use of unified units of measurement. As mentioned above, in the IDP context, the Guiding Principles' definition refers to 'persons or groups of persons,' but for the purpose of effectively employing the above-outlined criteria in statistical measurement, IDPs should ideally be counted at the individual level. However, due to differing data sources and purposes for which statistics on IDPs are collected, practice of data collection varies as further outlined below and in Chapter 4.

Displacement-related figures and statistics are most commonly produced as "stocks" or "flows." A stock is a static measure, which aims to capture how many people meet certain criteria in a given country or location at a particular point in time, also called a reference date. An IDP stock therefore refers to the total number of individuals that match an established definition of internally displaced in a determined location and at a specific moment in time. A person belongs to this population when she or he meets the defined criteria at a precise reference date, regardless of when he or she acquired said characteristics. Hence, the total number of IDPs at any given time is described as the stock.

In contrast, a flow is a dynamic measure. It captures how many people meet certain criteria within a particular time period (as opposed to a specific reference date), and whose status as a member of the population in question changes as a result. Flows have a directional component—they can be counted as inflows (persons entering the population of interest) and outflows (persons leaving the population of interest). The difference between inflows and outflows is called a net-flow, and this can have a positive (more inflows than outflows) or negative (less inflows than outflows) value. A clear example of a flow is the number of new IDPs identified between two specific dates following a displacement event (i.e. the event that triggered the displacement, such as an earthquake, flash flood, or a violent attack).

⁽⁸²⁾ See Chapter 4, Box 4.1 for more detail on these principles.

⁽⁸³⁾ Metadata is information about the data, e.g. definitions and classifications, mode of collection, methods used for processing etc.

⁽⁸⁴⁾ See for example the Reference and Management of Nomenclatures (RAMON) database compiled by Eurostat which provides a broad set of definitions developed by the UN, OECD and Eurostat among others: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/ramon/index.cfm?TargetUrl=DSP_PUB_WELC

Box 3.1 Statistical definition of an IDP in Azerbaijan

The State Statistical Committee of Azerbaijan produces statistics on IDPs in accordance with the law “On Status of Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons”.⁽⁶⁵⁾ The law establishes a definition for the term IDP at an individual level for those who were forced to flee their places of usual residence due to the qualifying reasons outlined within it. In addition, the following persons are considered IDPs for statistical purposes: citizens whose permanent residence falls within a region affected by an event the law defines as a reason for internal displacement; children who hold an identity card from Azerbaijan, whose father received an ‘IDP’ status, and whose parents’ permanent residence registration falls within an affected region; and persons with the identity card of Azerbaijan who have lost their parents, of whom both had an IDP status. In Azerbaijan’s statistics, an IDP loses their status if they return to the previous place of residence or are provided with another place of residence in the same region, free of charge.

As a report to UNSC noted: “The production of statistics on [displaced people] requires a clear distinction between stocks and flows.”⁽⁶⁶⁾ Confusion of stock and flow data is common and can lead to significant counting problems that result in an inaccurate assessment of displacement within a country. It is therefore crucial to understand the differences between these types of data, and how they can be interpreted and used. For example, a flow of new displacements following a specific displacement event can give an approximation of the magnitude of this event, and the impact it had on a specific population in a specific location. Conversely, a stock provides the number of people who were forced to leave or flee their habitual place of residence and consequently become displaced persons, without a specific determination on the duration of their situation as such. Because flows are provided for specific reporting periods, they can reflect multiple waves of population movements, and thus do not provide the total number of IDPs. Rather, they capture if the number is increasing or decreasing. In Chapter 4, the specific challenges that arise from employing stocks and flows in displacement-related statistics are detailed.

It should be noted that concepts and definitions are only one part of metadata specifications. It is outside the scope of this document to specify all aspects of metadata in detail as it includes issues around sampling techniques, data source, accuracy of information and confidentiality. However, many of these issues are discussed more broadly in Chapters 4 and 5 of this document.

C. Deviations from technical definition in current practices

Of the few National Statistical Offices (NSOs) or National Statistical Systems (NSSs) that currently produce and publish statistics on internal displacement, notable variation in the definition of who constitutes an IDP is evident. There are a number of reasons why definitions can vary.

1. **Different motivations for collecting IDP data:** In the majority of contexts, many of the statistics collected on IDPs are gathered for operational purposes (e.g. for providing humanitarian assistance), and are not defined as official statistics. Collecting statistics on IDPs for operational purposes can simplify how IDPs are defined, often because a lower level of accuracy can be tolerated for operational use, or the definitions can include more targeted vulnerability criteria.⁽⁶⁷⁾ In addition, operational data is often collected by different actors with various needs located in different geographical areas. This can lead to variations in the definitions and technical specifications used to target IDPs and allocate resources. An example of how Somalia worked to overcome this challenge is given in Box 3.2.
2. **No international statistical recommendations exist:** This leads to many countries using statistical definitions that can deviate from the Guiding Principles’ or national legal definitions for the purposes of technical convenience. While this is often acceptable from a practical perspective, this weakens

⁽⁶⁵⁾ The law of the Republic of Azerbaijan “On status of refugees and internally displaced (persons displaced within the country) persons”, 21 May 1999, <http://www.refugees-idps-committee.gov.az/en/laws/2.html>

⁽⁶⁶⁾ UN, Report of Statistics Norway, the Turkish Statistical Institute, Eurostat and UNHCR on progress in the work on statistics on refugees and internally displaced persons, 2016, paragraph 13, available at: goo.gl/9FplOz

⁽⁶⁷⁾ For example, limiting operational IDP statistics to only those who were displaced within a certain period of time, or demonstrate specific humanitarian needs.

comparability of IDP statistics across countries. Provision of clear metadata on how these statistics are produced would be a minimum requirement for understanding the extent to which the data can be used comparatively.

3. **Internal displacement contexts vary:** Due to the fact that internal displacement takes place in a wide range of contexts including highly volatile conflict situations or insecure regions of otherwise stable countries, following both small and large-scale natural disasters (see Chapter 2 for more), there are a range of operational realities in which data on IDPs is collected leading to various deviations from the technical definition. Different operational realities indicate a need for different methodologies to be pursued which often implies deviation from the technical definition determined by the approach selected and quality considerations involved (see Chapter 4 and 5 for more on methods/sources and data quality principles).
4. **Units of measurement vary:** Examining the whole household as one unit as opposed to individual-level data collection is a common example of this and is in line with the rationale that data collection is often focused on enabling the provision of assistance to IDP households. From a measurement perspective, however, this can result in the erroneous inclusion of certain persons that were not directly displaced, such as members of extended family residing with IDPs or children of IDPs born after the displacement event. As discussed above, the most common example of this are children of IDPs not yet born at the time of displacement. This is the case in Bosnia and Herzegovina where, once the household is registered with an IDP status, children of IDPs are also included in the registry and considered to be IDPs. In Colombia, for the provision of adequate response to protracted IDP households, the Government targets humanitarian assistance using a needs-based assessment of the household. A household is considered an “IDP household” if at least one of its members is registered as internally displaced. Even though the assistance is targeted to IDPs, the assessment looks at every individual in order to decide whether the household is in the need of aid.

Box 3.2 Somalia: IDP statistics based on data collected for operational humanitarian purposes

Prior to 2015, virtually all statistics on IDPs in the urban area of Mogadishu were based on data collected by humanitarian actors. This meant that data collected on IDPs were exclusively focused on populations residing in so-called IDP settlements, where IDPs were known to concentrate. As a result, all persons residing in these areas were automatically included into IDP statistics. In 2015-16, however, a profiling exercise was undertaken in collaboration with local authorities, national authorities, and humanitarian actors which altered this practice. In the new profiling approach, IDPs were singled out from other population groups living in settlement areas through analyses of migration histories. The profiling revealed that approximately 85 percent of these populations were actual IDPs, while the rest represented members of the local urban population, Somali economic migrants, returned refugees, and refugees and migrants from other countries. From a resource perspective, this profiling approach helped to obtain more accurate information on the settlement areas where the most vulnerable and in-need-of-assistance populations were expected to live, regardless of their displacement history. The profiling did not, however, aim to produce comprehensive figures on IDPs in the whole city: though it was known that a large amount of the population in the city had been displaced at some point in the past. Rather than aiming to cover the total of this population, the process concentrated on obtaining more targeted information about the settlement areas where the most vulnerable and in-need-of-assistance populations were expected to live.

5. **Technical challenges in identifying IDPs for the purpose of statistical analysis:** For example, in urban settings where IDPs often mix with other population groups, singling them out often necessitates specific techniques that may require substantial resources. In many contexts, such as in Ukraine and Colombia, this issue is overcome by relying on IDPs to voluntarily come forward and register themselves. Those who may meet criteria to be IDPs but who do not identify as such, who want to stay unrecognised, or who do not perceive any benefit from registering may choose to not do so and are thus excluded from statistics.

Another identification challenge arises when analysing a person’s migration history and reasons for movement. This may result in somewhat laxer criterion compared to legal definitions. In Côte d’Ivoire, for example, the official definition of an IDP includes all the different causal events outlined in the Guiding Principles and the Kampala Convention, specifically mentioning armed conflict and land disputes. However, when statistics on IDPs were collected in Côte d’Ivoire during the 2014 Population and Household Census, the questionnaire only included war and armed conflict as causes of displacement, leaving out land disputes, which is known to be a major cause of displacement (also see Table 4.2 in Chapter 4). This was done because these data were largely intended to measure the impact of the recent armed-conflict related crises, as well as for the ease of operationalising the questions in a large-scale data collection exercise; it did so by capturing displacement history at the individual-level for each household member born prior to 2002.

While defining the beginning of displacement is relatively straightforward at the conceptual level, and exclusion from IDP statistics due to death or emigration is also clear, measuring the point when an IDP is no longer to be considered an IDP is complex. The IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for IDPs provides a definition of a durable solution, and global-level work is under way to standardise the practice to measure overall progress towards durable solutions.⁽⁸⁸⁾ However, guidelines on how the different elements of durable solutions should be measured in a simple and clear manner currently do not exist. In many contexts, there is also a lack of knowledge regarding all the components that comprise a durable solution, resulting in simplified interpretations of end of displacement. An example of this is only linking the achievement of a durable solution to the return to place of habitual residence. Thus, differing practices are employed in different contexts for operationalising end of displacement for the purpose of statistical measurement. These vary from detailed analyses of IDPs' individual situations in Colombia (see Box 5.1) to countries where rough time limits are employed, most often due to assistance-related reasons.

In many contexts, this challenge is overcome by tying the legal and/or statistical definition of internal displacement to a certain event. For example, in KRI, a person is included in IDP statistics if he or she originates from an area where a displacement-causing event has been officially identified. The end of displacement is similarly linked to an official assessment of this event having subsided (see Box 3.3 for more details). In other contexts, end of displacement is considered to be linked to physical movement. In Côte d'Ivoire, IDPs are no longer considered to be IDPs if they have returned to their place of habitual residence, or they have indicated a willingness to integrate into their current place of residence.

Many of these challenges, or reasons for deviation from the technical definition, will hopefully be addressed through the development of a standardized statistical framework, combined with knowledge sharing and training in countries and regions with limited capacity in the production of these statistics.

Box 3.3 KRI: Inclusion and exclusion in the IDP registration system for the purpose of assistance provision

In Iraq, IDP status is linked to the location of displacement. The Federal Government recognises a person or a family as an IDP when a person or the head of a household comes forward to register themselves/their family after being displaced by armed conflict or disasters. This is called self-registration and is done so that legal documents can be issued and assistance can be provided. Yet when the Government declares an end to a conflict or a disaster, the registered person(s) becomes un-entitled to specific assistance-related to displacement.

Other registrations for IDPs are run both by the authorities in KRI, hosting numbers of displaced persons from different parts of Iraq, and international organisations. Each register serves its own purpose (e.g. providing overall figures on IDPs in the Kurdistan Region, provision of food assistance, etc.), but tend to use the same IDP definition so the registers are comparable between each other.

D. Conclusion

Various practices for translating the definition of an IDP into a statistically measurable unit exist due to differences in officially recognised definitions, as well as different practical, technical and conceptual challenges encountered across settings. Though statistics in many contexts depart from the comprehensive definition of IDPs established in the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, important commonalities and a need for improved practice in this area exist, and developing a unified statistical framework for this population remains feasible. Doing so would help provide clarity on conceptual challenges across many contexts and allow for better comparability of data.

In the next chapters, this report will further outline current practices in the area of official IDP statistics, including typical data collection methods and ways of characterizing data. In Chapter 7, the report recommends a pragmatic approach for establishing an international statistical framework for measuring internal displacement.

⁽⁸⁸⁾ Under the leadership of the Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of IDPs and in collaboration with a Technical Steering Committee consisting of a broad group humanitarian, development and peace-building actors, JIPS is implementing a project to operationalise the IASC Framework into measurable indicators, tools and methodologies to measure progress towards durable solutions to internal displacement. For more information, please visit: <http://www.jips.org/en/profiling/durable-solutions/measuring-progress-towards-solutions>

4

Collecting numbers on IDPs: considerations and sources

This chapter will discuss the quality of data and what are important considerations when collecting and processing them for the purpose of official statistics. Further, the different data sources available for collecting and analysing IDP numbers, and their IDP-specific advantages and limitations will be presented. Data on IDPs are collected by countries, international organisations and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) through administrative sources, surveys, censuses and other, often operational methods, and some of them end up being included in official IDP statistics. In order to illustrate the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to IDP number collection, and also in order to highlight key considerations, specific examples from different countries will be elaborated on.

A. Why are numbers useful?

As discussed in Chapter 1, national governments need accurate quantitative information on internal displacement in order to uphold their sovereign responsibility to protect their citizens. Beyond this fundamental obligation, statistics on internal displacement are needed for assistance provision and for development planning: large displaced populations need to be accounted for, and a failure to do so can lead to long-term instability and impede development gains.

However, in order for statistics to be useful, datasets on IDPs, refugees, asylum-seekers, and migrants need at minimum to be aligned, interoperable, and based on systematically applied and complementary definitions, standards, and methods. It is therefore requisite that coherence exists among concepts and methodologies, data collection instruments, and data analysis tools. Through this, in-depth understanding of displacement under its many different, highly specific forms is rendered plausible.

B. Importance of data quality

Data need to be of sufficient quality in order to be used as a basis for decision-making. The international statistical community has therefore developed a framework for quality statistics via the United Nations' *10 Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics*⁽⁸⁹⁾ (see Box 4.1). This framework or a similar one,⁽⁹⁰⁾ should be employed in the production of all official statistics.

In addition to establishing standards through quality frameworks, implementing statistical acts at the national level is key when it comes to sound data production and effective corresponding legislation and practice. Specifications around the rights and obligations of the bodies that comprise the NSSs, the scope of NSSs, and the procedures used

⁽⁸⁹⁾ UN Fundamental Principles of Statistics (last endorsed in 2014), <https://unstats.un.org/unsd/dnss/gp/fundprinciples.aspx>

⁽⁹⁰⁾ A few examples: European Statistics Code of Practice (adopted in 2011), <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/quality/european-statistics-code-of-practice>; African Charter on Statistics (adopted in 2009), <https://www.au.int/web/en/treaties/african-charter-statistics>; Code of good practice in statistics for Latin America and the Caribbean (Adopted in 2011), <http://repositorio.cepal.org/handle/11362/16423>; ASEAN Community Statistical System (ACSS) Code of Practice (Adapted in 2012), <http://www.asean.org/wp-content/uploads/images/resources/Statistics/2014/Code%20of%20Practice-ADOPTED-CLEAN.pdf>

for developing, producing, and disseminating official statistics are typically laid out in these acts. Such specifications are imperative when it comes to data quality. The rights and safeguards provided to data respondents (particularly as they concern respondent confidentiality)⁽⁹¹⁾ are also critical elements typically incorporated into statistical acts.

Additionally, many guidelines⁽⁹²⁾ and tools exist for assessing and measuring the quality of data collected and disseminated. These guidelines should also be followed when processing and disseminating official statistics on IDPs.

Many countries and regions might, however, not have the necessary skills and capacity to follow international recommendations. In these cases, cooperation between actors and knowledge sharing with relevant staff/experts is important.

1. Preparations

Working from a model like a generic statistical business process model⁽⁹³⁾ (GSBPM) during data preparations is a highly beneficial approach. GSBPMs can help ensure that all the key stages of statistical production are included, from the identification of needs to the dissemination of the data. They assist with the planning and organising of the work throughout and improve the likelihood that all sufficient groundwork is completed in advance of field operations.

Even without employing a GSBPM, efficient general preparatory efforts are those that focus on ensuring that data collection is timely, accurate, and complete; that stakeholders are broadly included; and that regular quality assurance and follow-up is implemented. Efficient planning also seeks to assess what information the data should provide and strives to find good ways to measure such information. Involving different stakeholders and data users in decisions on what should and should not be included is also important here, as is the choice and design of the approach used for data collection (e.g. survey, register, etc.).

2. Quality aspects to consider when planning data collection

As stated in Principle 5 of the *Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics*, official data can be drawn from all types of sources. However, it is the responsibility of the statistical agency to account for critical aspects like quality, timeliness, cost, and respondent burden when choosing a source. Thus, even though there are many different types of valid sources, there is always a need to assess them according to specified criteria. Though such criteria differ from context-to-context, important aspects to consider are laid out here (see Box 4.1).

⁽⁹¹⁾ A generic law for official statistics has been developed by the UN, for reference: https://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/stats/publications/2016/ECESTAT20163_web.pdf

⁽⁹²⁾ Many handbooks, guidelines and training manuals can be found here: <https://unstats.un.org/Unsd/demographic/standmeth/handbooks/default.htm>

⁽⁹³⁾ https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/cros/content/gsbpm-generic-statistical-business-process-model-theme_en

Box 4.1 Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics

Principle 1. Official statistics provide an indispensable element in the information system of a democratic society, serving the Government, the economy and the public with data about the economic, demographic, social and environmental situation. To this end, official statistics that meet the test of practical utility are to be compiled and made available on an impartial basis by official statistical agencies to honour citizens' entitlement to public information.

Principle 2. To retain trust in official statistics, the statistical agencies need to decide according to strictly professional considerations, including scientific principles and professional ethics, on the methods and procedures for the collection, processing, storage and presentation of statistical data.

Principle 3. To facilitate a correct interpretation of the data, the statistical agencies are to present information according to scientific standards on the sources, methods and procedures of the statistics.

Principle 4. The statistical agencies are entitled to comment on erroneous interpretation and misuse of statistics.

Principle 5. Data for statistical purposes may be drawn from all types of sources, be they statistical surveys or administrative records. Statistical agencies are to choose the source with regard to quality, timeliness, costs and the burden on respondents.

Principle 6. Individual data collected by statistical agencies for statistical compilation, whether they refer to natural or legal persons, are to be strictly confidential and used exclusively for statistical purposes.

Principle 7. The laws, regulations and measures under which the statistical systems operate are to be made public.

Principle 8. Coordination among statistical agencies within countries is essential to achieve consistency and efficiency in the statistical system.

Principle 9. The use by statistical agencies in each country of international concepts, classifications and methods promotes the consistency and efficiency of statistical systems at all official levels.

Principle 10. Bilateral and multilateral cooperation in statistics contributes to the improvement of systems of official statistics in all countries.

*Resolution adopted by the Economic and Social Council,
on the recommendation of the Statistical Commission
46th plenary meeting
24 July 2013*

Bearing in mind that different tools can be used for different purposes is also relevant when determining the design of the data collection tool; combining different options often improves results. Further, how questions are asked usually has a strong impact on what responses they elicit. Accessibility (a language the respondent understands), neutrality, clarity, and avoiding double questions (for example, by using 'and') are all key considerations for well-formulated questions. Assessing the questions properly using cognitive testing and pilots with small samples before widely implementing them is also very important for quality data.⁽⁹⁴⁾ All of these quality considerations have specific implications in IDP contexts, as summarised in Table 4.1.

⁽⁹⁴⁾ For more information on questionnaire design and testing, see for example Dillman, Smyth and Christian (2014): Internet, Phone, Mail and Mixed-Mode Surveys. For data collection in displacement contexts, please refer to the JIPS Essential Toolkit (JET): <http://jet.jips.org/>

Table 4.1 Key quality considerations and implications in IDP statistics

Quality Aspect	IDP-Specific Challenges
Confidentiality	Information on IDPs can be particularly sensitive in countries or regions where displacement is related to conflict or political unrest. If made publically available, or if treated without thorough safety precautions, sensitive information can expose IDPs to further vulnerabilities or danger. See also IRRS on confidentiality.
Coverage	Covering the whole IDP population is important, but can be a challenge, especially in situations where there is limited or no access for data collectors due to security or other reasons. Although it is always encouraged that data cover the population as broadly as possible (either through full count or a representative sample), safety for IDPs and data collectors must also be prioritised.
Representativity	It can often be a challenge to ensure that data is representative of the total IDP population, including certain sub-groups therein such as women, ethnic or religious minorities etc. Limitations to access is often the main barrier, but IDPs may also be excluded systematically because of difficulty of identifying IDPs living among the general population, or they may be living in housing or areas that are not included in official sampling frames.
Timeliness	In many contexts, the IDP population changes rapidly for a variety of reasons (e.g. new displacement, further movements of IDPs). The data are therefore quickly outdated, and thus a fast, yet quality-assured dissemination of statistics is particularly important.
Periodicity	The quality of the data on the flow of the IDP population will depend on how often the data are collected and published compared to the mobility of the population; the more often data are collected, the more accurately actual flows can be assessed.
Comparability	In order for data to be comparable over contexts and time, the same definitions and sampling frames need to be used. In many IDP contexts, this is not happening because different organisations have been involved in data collection and overall standards have not yet been defined.
Impartiality	It is key for official statistics that collection, processing and dissemination be carried out systematically based on an objective process free from political influence. This could be difficult in an IDP context if the displacement situation is highly political. In these cases, it is especially important that the whole process is well documented, including metadata.
Transparency	This relates to impartiality, as it is simpler to gain credibility with a well-documented process that is made easily available to the general public. While this tradition of transparency exists in official statistics more generally, it has not been as prevalent in the production of IDP statistics, yet would be valuable for increasing trust in the data and its results.

3. Aiming for continuous improvements

No statistical system is perfect. Even though statistics ought to be comparable over time and hence should change as little as possible, the process of statistics generation should be continuously improved. This is especially relevant for refining work processes and making them more efficient. Continuous improvement in statistics generation is made possible when system errors can be identified and work processes adjusted. An important prerequisite for this is a culture where discussing or documenting mistakes is allowed if not appreciated.

Systematic assessment and improvement of processes and operational controls can be carried out using quality assurance frameworks. Several generic frameworks exist. The UN's National Quality Assessment Framework⁽⁹⁵⁾ is a particularly influential one, relevant to the assessment of SDG indicator data. Several regions have also developed similar frameworks, including Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa, and South-East Asia.⁽⁹⁶⁾

⁽⁹⁵⁾ UN National Quality Assurance Framework (Endorsed in 2012), <https://unstats.un.org/unsd/dnss/QualityNQAF/nqaf.aspx>. See also: IMF Data Quality Assessment Framework (last development from 2013), <http://dsbb.imf.org/pages/dqrs/DQAF.aspx> and the UN Statistics Quality Assurance Framework (DRAFT 2017), <https://unstats.un.org/unsd/statcom/48th-session/documents/BG-4j-QAF-E.pdf>

⁽⁹⁶⁾ European Quality Assurance Framework, <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/64157/4392716/ESS-QAF-V1-2final.pdf/bbf5970c-1adf-46c8-afc3-58ce177a0646> Code of good practice in statistics for Latin America and the Caribbean (2011): <http://statinja.gov.jm/StrategicManagerial/CGP.pdf> African Charter on Statistics (2009): http://www.paris21.org/sites/default/files/AU-English_African_Charter-web.pdf ASEAN Community Statistical System (ASS) Code of Practice (2012): <http://www.asean.org/storage/images/resources/Statistics/2014/Code%20of%20Practice-ADOPTED-CLEAN.pdf>

Quality is also assured through interaction with external stakeholders. When statistics and the methodologies used are shared openly, opportunity is created to receive feedback on what is produced and how it is produced. Providing and presenting statistics on IDPs themselves, informing them about findings and therefore giving them a chance to apply the information to their own lives is important here, as well. Through stakeholder involvement, statistics can be improved to make them more relevant to both IDPs and policy makers. This is an instituted approach in some countries, but could be improved in others.

C. Comparing the main sources of IDP data

Sources of IDP data can vary significantly from one country or context to another. For the purpose of official statistics, the main data sources include population censuses, listings, sample surveys, and administrative registers. Population movement tracking systems, big data, and qualitative sources are also relevant to capturing IDP data, however they are less often used for the production of official statistics. Each of these individual approaches comes with its own set of strengths and challenges, specifically as it relates to capturing IDP numbers.

The IRRS describes the key data sources (regional, national, and international) and their advantages and limitations in detail (see Chapter 4 in the IRRS). This will not be repeated here. Instead, a short overview of each source and country examples are provided below. Where relevant, general reference to other international recommendations and general quality considerations are discussed. At the end of this section, a table is presented which gives an overview of the advantages and limitations of each data source for production of IDP statistics (Table 4.3). In the same table, each source's coverage is specified as well as whether it can be used for stock and flow measures.

When it comes to data sources for IDP statistics, an important distinction exists between data that are collected through anonymised questionnaires (e.g. censuses and surveys) and data that require persons to come forward and register, wherein they usually have to prove their identity and situation (as is the case with administrative records). Questionnaires are sometimes considered to be subjective, as the information is gathered without verification. When verification is required, however, data is considered to become more objective. Ensuring that all eligible individuals are incorporated into register data without bias also improves objectivity. Yet exceptions to the practice of obligatory verification prior to registration exist, and this can be an important consideration in some IDP situations, where displacement is related to less easily verifiable event or threat.

In Colombia for example, the Victims' Law employs the principle of good faith in both the Victims Registry and programs targeted for IDPs. According to the Law, the State must presume the good faith of the victims when they express harm suffered in regards to the armed conflict. When doing so by any legally accepted mean, the administrative authority must refrain from requesting any further proof to the victim.⁽⁹⁷⁾

While objective data is more neutral and hence more helpful for assessing socioeconomic indicators, other constructs such as social cohesion or future intentions are more highly dependent on perception. These types of data thus need to be gathered through subjective measures. The purpose of the statistics being produced should always be considered when selecting and tailoring data collection tools.

a. Census (see Chapter 4, section C.1. in the IRRS)

National population censuses, which are a complete enumeration of the population, usually closely follow international standards and recommendations. They are often also monitored by independent observers. Therefore, the quality and completeness of data collected is usually good. The fact that IDPs are not always included in censuses is however a challenge and often, even when they are included, it is not possible to identify them as a separate group for the purpose of data analysis. Currently, the UN Census Recommendations⁽⁹⁸⁾ do not include questions for identifying IDPs in its recommended core variables. Some of the regional recommendations, however, do. For example, the UN Economic Commission for Europe's Recommendations for the 2020 Censuses of Population and Housing⁽⁹⁹⁾ includes information on IDPs. Those recommendations underscore the need to measure the magnitude of displacement and suggest that the date of arrival and the place of previous residence should be

⁽⁹⁷⁾ Article 5, Law 1448 of 2011.

⁽⁹⁸⁾ https://unstats.un.org/unsd/publication/seriesM/Series_M67Rev3en.pdf

⁽⁹⁹⁾ https://www.unecce.org/fileadmin/DAM/stats/publications/2015/ECECES41_EN.pdf

included. Yet IDP data are specified as a “derived non-core topic,” so the power to decide whether the items are included or not rests with individual countries.

Table 4.2 (page 38) shows an overview of questions included in censuses which helped identify how many IDPs resided in the country at the time of the census. The questions included here are linked to displacement as such, but most questionnaires first ask general questions on movements from usual place of residence, where from and when. The approach to how questions are asked and how much detail one is able to extract varies. While some have chosen an approach where they ask specifically about forced displacement, others ask more open questions about reason for moving, only specifying forced displacement in the response options. Most countries/regions link the forced displacement to war and conflict only, but for example Colombia’s census and Somalia’s population estimation survey also include other reasons, such as other types of violence and natural disasters.

b. Sample surveys (see Chapter 4, section C.2. in the IRRS)

Sample surveys are usually conducted more frequently than censuses and are the main tool for collection of more detailed socio-economic statistical information on persons, households and communities for many NSSs. Information on IDPs has traditionally been collected through specialised sample surveys especially designed for the mapping and profiling of IDPs. In some cases, the IDP population has also been included in broader sample surveys. Côte d’Ivoire’s approach to supplementing their census information with surveys showcases the benefits of pairing the two sources (see Box 4.2).

Box 4.2 Côte d’Ivoire: Use of surveys

In Côte d’Ivoire’s last census, IDP-specific questions were addressed to all persons born before September 2002, when the country’s first civil war began. Through the census, the number of people who reported at least one displacement-related was 688,745. However, the census was unable to take achievement of durable solutions into account.

Thus, additional estimates were able to occur through the use of supplementary sources. For instance, in 2005 the École Nationale Supérieure de Statistique et d’Économie Appliquée carried out a survey on the living and return conditions of IDPs. The survey solely occurred in five departments in the southern half of the country. In-depth characteristics of IDPs were collected like the standard of living of households, access to livelihoods, access to documentation and access to land. Through this separate approach, over 20,000 more people who had experienced displacement were identified.

A challenge when conducting general surveys that also include IDPs is that there is often little information on who is and is not an IDP and where he or she resides. In order to draw a sample which represents the whole IDP population, information that appropriately identifies IDPs is necessary. A census, listing or a complete register can be good sources for this, but are not always available. Incomplete data sources or a mixture of various sources is therefore often used as a sampling frame, as is the case with Kosovo (see Box 4.3). In other cases, methods which do not lead to representativeness, such as snowballing (asking an IDP if he or she knows of other IDPs) are used.⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ This makes it difficult to say whether the information collected is possible to generalise to the IDP population as a whole, which is an important quality requirement in official statistics. It is also important to highlight that even when a sampling frame for IDPs is available, they often include inherent biases with under-representation of specific vulnerable groups such as women.

The selection of respondents within a household also influences the potential for doing analysis. The potential may be limited by the fact that the head of the household is generally asked to respond to a survey. The household head is context-specific, but is generally understood as being a man. This way of selecting a respondent within the household makes it challenging to capture the perspectives on women and children, as the man will be responsible for giving the information about the rest of the family. Hence it will e.g. be difficult to collect information on attitudes, intentions to move, decision-making power in the household, domestic violence, and reproductive health disaggregated by gender when using a head of household approach. Similarly, the choice of enumerators, question phrasing, time, and location of interviews are all relevant considerations for ensuring that a survey can produce adequate gendered analysis in general and also for analysis of the IDP situation.

⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ See: <http://www.unhcr.org/598088104.pdf> for more information about the difficulty of collecting representative data on IDPs.

Box 4.3 Kosovo: Combining multiple data sources for comprehensive analysis

In 2013 the Ministry for Communities and Return (MCR), UNHCR, and the Danish Refugee Council (DRC) initiated a profiling exercise to enable a comprehensive analysis of the protracted displacement situation within Kosovo. A review of secondary data was conducted to assess the availability, reliability and consensus around existing population estimates, in order to determine an agreed-upon baseline for the targeted population groups and inform the sampling frame for the household survey. Several information sources on IDPs in Kosovo were used, including databases on Serbian IDPs in Private Accommodation (data from the Serbian Commissariat for Refugees and Migration - SCRM), Serbian IDPs in Collective Centres (data from SCRM and UNHCR), and Roma, Ashkali, and Egyptian IDPs (data from UNHCR). The 2011 Population Census from the Kosovo Agency on Statistics (KAS), which included several questions relating to migration, was used to extract information based on selection criteria for Albanian IDPs.

To complement the lists above, lists of Albanian IDPs who had filed claims for lost property with the Kosovo Property Agency, as well as a list of Albanian IDPs who had directly approached the DRC and the Mitrovica North Administrative Office, were also used.

During 2016-17, the profiling exercise was implemented and it produced a sample-based demographic profile of the displaced population within Kosovo, disaggregated by age, gender, location and ethnicity. The profiling also collected information in regard to the social and economic integration of displaced persons; displacement-related challenges and vulnerabilities; resources and capacities; enjoyment of rights and access to services; as well as future intentions and plans.

The exercise was implemented with funds provided by the MCR and was jointly overseen by KAS, SCRM, UNHCR, and the DRC, with technical support from JIPS. To ensure collaboration and coordination throughout all stages of the profiling process, a Profiling Working Group was set up which, in addition to the organisations mentioned above, also included United Nations Development Programme, the International Organisation for Migration (IOM), United Nations Population Fund, United Nations Children Fund (UNICEF) and the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

c. Administrative data and registers (see Chapter 4, section C.3. and D.1-D.3. in the IRRS)

Registers are usually maintained and updated for administrative purposes, but they can also be a good source for compilation of statistics.⁽¹⁰¹⁾ Information on IDPs can be found in general civil or population registers, other administrative registers that have ability to identify IDPs, and in IDP-specific registers. In countries where IDP-specific registers exist, they are typically the main source of information on these populations, especially when it comes to measuring the total number of IDPs. Some registers can provide data on core demographic characteristics like sex and age, and may also contain information on education, health, housing, livelihood and others, depending on the purpose of the register.

Civil and population registers usually are maintained by national governments, while IDP-specific registers also can be maintained by the UN or NGOs. In some countries where the issue of IDPs is of particular importance, special administrative registers or multiple-source-databases, aiming for comprehensive data coverage of their IDP population have been established, such as in Colombia (see Box 4.4). Registration in these systems is often linked to accessibility of government services and provisions, and most registers allow for assessments of both the current population (stock) and incoming and outgoing persons (flow).

That said, keeping registers up-to-date is often a major challenge. Internal displacement is dynamic, determining whether or not someone has achieved a durable solution and should no longer be included is difficult, and proportions of the IDP population are often excluded due to not wanting or not being able to register leading to their under-representation in the system. Thus, while register data can be used to extract overall statistics in order to support assistance provision and protection of IDPs if already in place (and provided that legal conditions are cleared for data sharing and confidentiality is secured), new systems should not be established for the primary purpose of producing IDP statistics. Registers can come with high resource burdens and sometimes even adverse

⁽¹⁰¹⁾ A register has been defined in RAMON as a "database which is updated continuously (often for administrative purposes, such as population registers or building registers) and from which statistics can be extracted / aggregated/computed." http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/ramon/nomenclatures/index.cfm?TargetUrl=DSP_GLOSSARY_NOM_DTL_VIEW&StrNom=CODED2&StrLanguageCode=EN&IntKey=16702785&RdoSearch=BEGIN&TxtSearch=register&CboTheme=&IsTer=&IntCurrentPage=1&ter_valid=0

protection implications for IDPs. As a result, there are many instances in which other collection methodologies are preferable.

Efforts are currently underway to improve the coverage and quality of civil registration in a number of countries, as this is seen as a more cost-effective way of collecting and maintaining population information. Because birth and death registrations are linked to the right to access services, comprehensive civil registries could be a useful way to obtain proof that a person is a citizen of his or her country even when legal documents cannot be provided. IDPs are not always included in these registers however, and if they are, it is not necessarily possible to identify them as IDPs.

Box 4.4 Colombia: Use of registration

The official source of IDP figures in Colombia is the Single Victims' Registry managed by the Unit for the Assistance and Comprehensive Reparation to Victims (Victims' Unit). Victims, 90 per cent of whom are IDPs, can be included via declaration or via judicial sentences. The Registry only removes victims when their claims are found to be fraudulent. A project is currently ongoing for determining when a displaced person's vulnerabilities linked to displacement cease, and hence should no longer be counted in the Registry as an IDP (see Box 5.1).

In order to be included in the Registry, a victim should come forward and present a declaration before the Public Ministry. According to the Victims' Law, and in order for the declaration to be considered, the victim has to declare within a two-year period from the time when the displacement event took place.

The declaration is sent by the Public Ministry to the Victims' Unit where it is assessed under the principles of dignity, good faith, legitimate trust, and prevalence of the fundamental right. The assessment consists of a verification process of the time, place, and mode in which the human right violation(s) occurred. Based on the information contained in the declaration, as well as the information gathered during the verification process, the Victims' Unit decides to either include or deny the inclusion of the person in the Single Victims' Registry.

Once the victim is included, he or she is entitled to access the components of assistance and reparation provided in the Victim's Law, such as economic compensation or land restitution, in accordance with the nature and the intensity of the human right violation. The inclusion in the Single Victims' Registry should be sufficient for the relevant government agencies to provide the attention, assistance, and reparation in compliance with the law.

If the Victims' Unit denies the inclusion in the Registry, the requestor is entitled to appeal for reconsideration before the Victims' Unit. A judge can order the inclusion of a victim through a sentence.

The Single Victims' Registry provides a snapshot of the characteristics of the events that took place as part of the internal armed conflict in Colombia. For this reason, the information regarding mode, time and place remains in the Registry as it occurred. Only a few situations may result in adjustments of the Registry. These include the birth of a child to IDP parents, the death of a victim included in the Registry, or the update of identification data on the victims.

Additionally, the Victims' Unit updates the information of the victims included in the Single Victims' Registry in order to assess the Effective Enjoyment of Rights (also see Chapter 5). The information gathered through both primary and secondary data from other government agencies is stored in the National Information Network (RNI), an instrument created by the Victims' Law to consolidate all the information produced from both the registration process and the provision of assistance and reparation to the victims.

d. Operational data collected for humanitarian purposes

Operational data are not primarily collected for the purpose of producing official statistics, but rather to help better inform targeting and support. The data source used will vary depending on needs and possibilities, but also include the traditional data collection methods which have been described above. If the methodology used is available and the quality standards of official statistics are met, they may be good sources also for the national statistics producers, provided that data can be shared.

An additional frequently used approach for assessing the number of IDPs when other sources are difficult to institute are population movement tracking systems. Such systems are now established in more than 30 countries and implemented either jointly with the Government or by humanitarian actors. Examples of such tracking systems are IOM's Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) and other population movement tracking initiatives often deployed for example by UNHCR or other humanitarian actors. These systems are particularly designed to capture

cases of acute population movements, and especially when these take place for large population groups that are easier to capture. Given their purpose, these systems can provide ad-hoc IDP flow statistics such as incidents of displacement, location (to and from), and time. Humanitarian distribution and assistance lists as well as camp lists are also data which can be used for statistical purposes, however they rarely provide sufficient coverage of the overall population or use definitions in line with the Guiding Principles.

Many of these sources can potentially be used as additional input to creating a sampling frame given that they follow quality standards and have a sufficiently broad scope. They are however usually not accessible for the NSS, or taken into account for the production of official statistics as they were not produced through a body mandated by the NSS for this purpose. In order for them to be useful for official statistics, they need to be shared with and endorsed (following quality standards) by the agency responsible for producing official statistics.

e. Big data

Significant expectations and methodological efforts are currently being channelled into the possible use of alternative large-scale data sources (big data) for statistics in general. Enormous amount of unstructured data can be found on the web such as internet traffic data (e.g. from Google, Facebook and other social media) as well as through GPS/mobile phones. These data can, if legally downloaded and systemised, provide a rich stand-alone data source, or potentially provide auxiliary information also for statistics on IDPs in the future.

Table 4.2 Examples of direct IDP-related questions/questionnaires from the 2010-round of censuses

Census Question/Topic	Response Category	Unit of Measurement
Azerbaijan For those who changed the former place of residence: refugee (forced migrant); i. Since what time has (...) been living here?; ii. Place of former residence? (state, region)	i. Year; ii. State, Region	Individual
Bosnia and Herzegovina i. Was the person displaced in B&H (after 30 April 1991)?; ii. Has the person returned to the settlement he/she was displaced from?; iii. Is the person still formally-legally considered displaced person?	i. Settlement and municipality the person was displaced from; ii. Yes/no; iii. Yes/no	Household
Colombia The main cause for changing your place of residence on that occasion was:	i. Difficulty to find a job or shortages in your means of subsistence; ii. Risk or as a consequence of natural disaster (flood, landslide, earthquake); iii. Threat or risk to your life, freedom of integrity, due to violence; iv. Education needs; v. Health reason; vi. Family reasons; vii. Member of a nomadic community or other reason	
Côte d'Ivoire i. Have you been forced to leave your place of usual residence due to war or armed conflict?; ii. When did you leave your place of usual residence?; iii. Where was your place of usual residence?; iv. Have you returned to or do you have the intention to return to your usual place of residence before the war/crisis?	i. Yes/no; ii. 1.2002, 2. 2010/2011 or 3. 2002 and 2010/2011; iii. Enter S/P or commune; iv. intention of return/stay/move elsewhere	The questions were asked to every individual in the household
Kosovo What was the main reason why you moved to your current place of residence?	Employment/education/family/1998-1999 was reason/other	
Philippines Did have a separate section in the 2007 census (not in latest census of 2010): Questions for households in temporary relocation area: i. Current residence in temporary relocation area; ii. Date moved to current residence; iii. Previous residence; iv. Intention to reside in previous residence within one year?	i. Yes/no; ii. Month/year; iii. Barangay, city/municipality, province; iv. Yes/no	
Somalia (A population estimation, not a full census) i) What was the main reason why this household left its place of origin?; ii) What are your plans regarding the place of origin for the coming year?	i. Insecurity, drought, floods, total loss of livelihood (destitution), better economic opportunities elsewhere, lack of access to services, other ii) Stay here in this current location, return to place of origin, temporarily return to place of origin, relocate to another place permanently, have no plan	

Many NSOs are now looking into how big data can be properly assessed and the quality ensured as a source for official statistics. Important incentives for this work is to increase cost efficiency of statistics production, to reduce respondent burden, and to develop new statistical products. One of the major challenges is then to ensure that the data used are representative for the actual target group. Not only are IDPs potentially less likely to have access to the technology that produces big data like credit cards or mobile phones compared to the general population, but if one sub-group of IDPs is more likely to have access to technology than another (for instance, women versus men or ethnic/religious minorities), the sample coverage can be skewed towards only a certain group's experience.

f. Qualitative data

In IDP contexts, qualitative data typically includes key informant interviews and focus group discussions. Rapid assessments or community gatherings are sometimes also used. However, responses typically cannot be proven to be representative of the population in question. Therefore, even though valuable for programming, assistance, and informing sampling approaches, qualitative methods are usually not used for production of official statistics directly. They can provide added value to the use of the other sources described above however, for example when designing questions or verifying surprising results in the main data sources. Qualitative data can also explain statistical findings, and hence add value to the analysis of data. Furthermore, qualitative methods can be helpful for gaining insight into the perspectives of different groups, such as women and men, or different age groups, especially when conducted in appropriately disaggregated settings. These methods are generally also a good opportunity to gather data on more sensitive topics, such as gender-based violence.

g. Summary sheet

The main displacement-related data sources which can be used for production and dissemination of official statistics, are presented in Table 4.3 (page 42). For each of the sources, it is specified whether or not they capture stocks or flows and how broad their coverage typically is. Key IDP specific advantages and limitations are also specified. For an in-depth presentation of the general advantages and limitations of the sources, see the IRRS. Assistance data, big data, and qualitative data have not been included because they are typically not used for production of official statistics and because their approaches differ substantially. While some have good methodological approaches and good coverage, others might cover only small areas or lack other qualities required. It is therefore difficult to provide general specifications.

For further discussion on different data sources for displaced populations, refer to Chapter 4 of the IRRS. References to other, pre-existing guidelines and further discussion of the strengths and challenges encountered with these different methodological approaches are detailed more extensively there. To illuminate how IDP-specific registration is used, examples of Ukraine's and Bosnia and Herzegovina's approaches are discussed in depth in Box 4.5 below.

Box 4.5 IDP registration in Ukraine and Bosnia and Herzegovina

Ukraine: Use of a national IDP database

In Ukraine, the Ministry of Social Policy is responsible for establishing and maintaining the country's unified IDP information database. The database was created expressly for the purpose of recording information about and accounting for the number of Ukraine's IDPs. However, it was not created in consultation with Ukraine's NSO. Thus, the database's quantitative information on IDPs is not currently used for official statistical purposes due to uncertainties around its quality. It also cannot be used for statistical purposes because it does not account for the exact place of habitual residence, deaths, or marriages, making it impossible to calculate an accurate stock of IDPs.

When IDPs arrive at a new place of residence following their displacement, it is their responsibility to obtain a certificate of registration.⁽¹⁰²⁾ Obtaining this certificate entails applying through the structural unit assigned to deal with social protection in the IDP's new area of residence, or through designated officials defined by local councils. People with disabilities and persons whose ability to act is limited can apply through a representative.

With this certificate, IDPs are able to obtain monthly targeted aid, re-apply for social payments, pensions, enrol a child into preschool/school, and access medical services, among others.

Only persons older than 14 are included in the database. For children 14 and younger, parents apply on their behalf. If a child has arrived without his or her parents, the application can be submitted by a relative with whom the child resides. If the child has arrived without relatives, the application is submitted by an assigned legal representative at the child's location. When a child is enrolled in a welfare, health care, or social protection institution, the application is submitted by the head of the institution.

Students who obtain a certain education/qualification level and register their place of residence at their dormitories have the right to obtain the IDP certificate if they do not wish to return to his or her previous place of residence.

⁽¹⁰²⁾ This responsibility is in accordance with decision N509 of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine on the Registration of IDPs, established on October 1, 2014.

Prisoners who served or currently serve their sentences at detention facilities and had or currently have their place of usual residence within the areas recognised as IDP areas of origin are also entitled to obtain the IDP certificate following their release from prison, provided that they do not want to return to the previous place of residence.

Members of the military who served in the army and had their registered place of residence in the areas recognised as areas of origin for IDPs, also have the right to obtain an IDP certificate (apart from the army conscripts and the compulsory military service for officers).

The application form for registering IDPs includes the following information:

- Name, middle name, family name;
- Citizenship status;
- Date and place of birth;
- Sex;
- Registered and actual place of residence;
- Contact information;
- Cause of the internal displacement;
- Criminal history;
- Disability status/need for technical or other rehabilitation facilities;
- Housing, social, medical, educational or other needs
- Professional history;
- Presence of accompanying minors, i.e. non-adult IDPs who arrived together with him/her (if necessary);
- Information about the place of training/upbringing of the child (name of the institution);
- Information about representatives in-law who accompany young children, persons with disabilities, or persons whose ability to act is limited.

In order to obtain the IDP certificate, it is necessary to submit proof of Ukrainian citizenship.

If the document offers proof that the applicant's usual place of residence is in the recognised areas, the IDP certificate (or a refusal to issue the certificate, explaining why the certificate was refused) is given to the applicant on the day of submission. If the document does not offer proof that the applicant's usual place of residence is recognised areas, the applicant can supplement his or her claim with a military registration card, record of employment, document that confirms the right of property ownership, official enrolment from a child's school, medical documents, photos, or other records.

If the application for registration is submitted by the applicant's representative in-law, a document that identifies the representative in-law; or a document that confirms the authorities of the person as the representative in-law; or a birth certificate if the rights of the child are to be formalized are also needed.

Bosnia and Herzegovina: Internal displacement database and registration system

In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the first truly comprehensive official registration of displaced persons was carried out in late 2000 after the Bosnian war by coordination between ministries and local authorities. Updating the register then began after applications for status revisions were compiled throughout the country, and was completed in 2005. The Database of Displaced Persons (DDPR)—the key source of quantitative data on internal displacement—was established that same year. Despite a solid methodology, the complex administrative structure makes it challenging to collect reliable data.

In order to be included in the database, displaced people had to either submit a displaced person request or were assigned a displaced person or refugee status in accordance with the law. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, a person is officially counted as an IDP if he or she is registered by the municipal authorities. Though there is no dedicated update of the DDPR, anytime anyone changes their IDP status with Bosnia and Herzegovina's identification agency, the update is immediately passed onto municipalities. This status is used to determine the provision and distribution of benefits.

D. Challenges with collecting IDP numbers

1. Stocks and flows

As described in Chapter 3, displacement-related figures and statistics are most commonly produced as “stocks” or “flows.” Yet in real-life practice, significant considerations and challenges come up when working with these measurements. In principle, the flow of new displacements will feed into the stock figure captured at a certain reference date. This stock will increase or decrease over time based on the net-flow obtained by comparing inflows (people becoming displaced) and outflows (people whose displacement can be considered to have ended).⁽¹⁰³⁾

In regard to IDP statistics, however, significant caveats arise. First, fluctuations in stock figures can often mask certain micro-trends, such as displacements taking place between two reference dates, that are not necessarily made clear simply by observing two or more stock figures. Thus, a noted increase or a decrease in stock occurring between any two reference dates cannot always be interpreted as simply a linear increase or decrease in stock occurring between two reference dates. This is particularly the case in contexts for which reports are published at irregular or wide intervals. The wider the reporting interval is, the more likely it is that reported figures are less representative of all instances of displacement within that period—be it inflows or outflows. As an illustration, stock data on IDPs in the Philippines, recorded annually, often masks a large amount of short-term displacements that occur throughout the year.

Fluctuations may also be symptomatic of other, more technical factors, such as the extension of the geographical coverage of a data source, the inclusion of new counting methods and tools, or even changes to the indicators used. Therefore, a smaller stock figure might not simply indicate a decrease in the total number of IDPs, or an improvement to the security situation. Conversely, a higher stock figure does not necessarily indicate a worsening of a certain context and a higher number of IDPs—this might simply be due to the inclusion of previously-displaced-but-unreported persons.

Second, comparability of figures produced also depends on the concepts, specifications, and indicators being defined in a consistent manner. This is particularly significant in contexts where the collection and processing of displacement-related data is not the sole responsibility of the government or one unique stakeholder. As mentioned in Chapter 3, different agencies may use different definitions and variables to come up with stocks and flows, which can make them incompatible, unrepresentative of the situation of part or all displaced individuals, and their application to comparative analyses subsequently problematic.

⁽¹⁰³⁾ A detailed description of the considerations around the concept of “end of displacement” can be found in Chapter 2, further discussion on the currently used approaches to operationalising this into statistical measurement in the below section on characteristics of IDPs.

Table 4.3 Summary sheet of the main displacement-related sources

Source	Coverage	Provides Stock Figures	Provides Flow Figures	Advantage for the Production of IDP statistics	Limitations
Census	Complete (For the general population)	Yes	Possibly between censuses	Can provide an accurate estimate of IDP stock for an entire country or entity; Potentially allows for comparison with other population groups; Good sampling frame	IDPs, especially those living in camps, are often not included; Needs to include questions which identify IDPs; IDPs need to self-identify, risk of undercounting; Questions often asked on household level leading to the wrong numbers
General Survey	Sample can say something about whole population if representative	Usually no	If repeated regularly	Flexibility of use (and modification); Can capture both stock and flow data; Can be implemented as often as resources allow; Allows for comparison with other population groups; Trust/confidentiality; Easier to reach those who are afraid/have no incentive to register	Lack of consistency due to modification or if multiple surveys conducted simultaneously in the same location; Rely on at least some degree of access to IDPs; Burden on respondents; Safety of interviewers; Risk of not being able to get representative sample for IDPs; Subjective
IDP-Specific Survey	If representative sample, this can be used to draw conclusions on IDP population in general	No	If repeated regularly	Allows for a broader set of questions targeted towards IDPs; If included, allows for comparison with host/local population; Trust/confidentiality - easier to reach those who are afraid to/have no incentive to register	Does not allow for comparison with other groups unless these are also representatively included; Burden on respondents; Safety of interviewers; Risk of not being able to get representative sample for IDPs; Subjective
General Civil or Population Register	Ideally complete for population in question	Partially	Partially. If covers migration (typically population register), yes	Can provide an accurate estimate of IDP stock using a consistent methodology for an entire country or geographical entity; If migration is included (population register), this information can also be used to assess displacement; Continuously updated; Low cost	Does not always include IDPs and might be difficult to access in times of conflict/war; Difficult to identify IDPs; Bias in who registers due to lack of trust/lack of seeing the use
IDP-Specific Register	Complete if everyone comes forward to register	Yes	Yes, if regularly updated	Can provide detailed info on IDPs; If updated, good sampling frame	Bias in who registers due to lack of trust/lack of seeing the use; Usually depends on IDPs voluntarily registering themselves and/or their families, thus it may lead to undercounting (of IDPs who have not registered) or overestimates (if fraudulent registrations are not dealt with)
Population Movement Tracking Systems	The area monitored	Usually no	Partially (depends on method)	Can provide an overview quickly after causing event	Verification processes are challenging therefore accuracy is questionable; Often lack method to adequately identify internal displacement from other population movement due to environment/context in which they are rolled out

A common example of such discrepancies can be found when conflating outflows with end of displacement. In many contexts, end of displacement is directly linked to the concept of “return”. Thus, in some cases, end of displacement might be demarcated by individuals moving back to their habitual place of residence following a displacement event. However, based on the IASC Framework’s definition of a durable solution, neither of these criteria on their own would suffice as a valid or reliable measure of the end of displacement. That said, it has not yet been fully operationalised how these criteria should be understood or measured. A durable solution to displacement does not necessarily imply return, nor does physical return alone fulfil the criteria of a durable solution.⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ Using returns to remove people from the total stock of IDPs can therefore be questioned, as there is no indication that they have indeed achieved a sustainable end to their initial displacement.

Also, demographic changes such as births and deaths will impact reported IDP figures. Whilst the death of an IDP is a straightforward situation when producing statistics, the birth of a child to displaced parents is more complex, as referenced in Chapter 3. It is often the case that countries with more protracted cases of displacement, such as Azerbaijan or Colombia, incorporate births into IDP stock registries. This practice ends up increasing the stock number and sometimes contributing to higher flow counts, although new displacements are no longer taking place.⁽¹⁰⁵⁾

Consequently, keeping track of stock and flow data remains a challenge within and between NSOs and other actors collecting displacement data. In addition to the caveats detailed above, these challenges occur due to: difficulty with delimiting flows, variation in measurement and reporting units across data, imprecise and varied data collection and monitoring methods, and inferring stock and flow data from one another. These challenges are explained in more depth here:

- **Difficulty with delimiting flows:** Identifying the start and end dates for recording flow data is difficult, particularly in many conflict contexts. In some cases, such as Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Government considers the beginning of the conflict as the start date. In Iraq, however, the start date for displacement flows is often captured on an event-by-event basis and is reported on in reference to the event and its evolution. An example of this is the Mosul Offensive in Iraq, where statistics and reports were produced specifically in relation to the event and its characteristics, and strictly delimited to its beginning and end, clearly differentiating from other cases of displacement in the country.
- **Different units of measurement and reporting:** Conflict-related displacement stock data is often collected and reported on at fixed intervals, whereas disaster-related displacement stock and flow figures are usually recorded in relation to a specific event.
- **Data-collection intervals:** That data is collected and reported on at fixed intervals (e.g. monthly, quarterly, annually) in conflict settings, regardless of the evolution of events on the ground, impacts ability to precisely account for flows. It tends, however, to be adequate for assessing stocks at various points in time.
- **Imprecise flow monitoring methods:** In many countries, movements are recorded as “arrivals” or “departures” to/from a given location. Recording these movements as only arrivals or departures does not enable determination of whether the movements were voluntary or forced, whether they involve IDPs already counted or not, and thus how they should be precisely qualified (e.g. new, secondary displacements or returns). When capturing flow data through movement tracking systems, it is typically also not possible to examine in more detail the specific reasons for which people are moving. In addition, movement tracking systems typically only capture larger groups of people moving at the same point in time, and can miss out on more gradual population movements, such as individuals or single families fleeing a smaller-scale event.
- **Inference of flows from stock data and vice versa:** At times, flows might be estimated from positive or negative net changes in stock data. This can occur when the number of IDP returns is computed from net increases in the stock of returnees over a given period of time. This does not, however, take into account the degree to which returning IDPs really achieve a durable solution, nor the process of potential achievement of durable solutions through local integration or resettlement elsewhere. Also, calculating a stock from flow data (which are usually collected more frequently) carries some risks of inaccuracy. This is particularly true in situations like major disasters or violent conflict in which access to certain areas is limited or impossible. In such contexts, flow data might include wide estimates that require cleaning up and can only be verified much later.

Also, when stocks and flows are not treated separately, the likelihood of double- or triple-counting displacement increases. From the perspective of producing statistics, a *displaced person* refers to someone who has been forced

⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ See Chapter 2, p. 21 for the IASC Framework on Durable Solutions definition, and Chapter 5, pp. 54-56 for more discussion on durable solutions.

⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ Colombia has recently mitigated this issue by counting the accumulative stock of IDPs and breaking down stock numbers into years so that, when disseminated, it is possible to see how flow counts have decreased overtime.

or obliged to physically leave their place of usual residence. On the other hand, *displacements* refer to the number of instances of displacement that have occurred in a given location during a specified period of time or in relation to a particular event. A displacement is therefore not the same as a displaced person: one person displaced three times would equal three displacements, but three displacements do not necessarily refer to three displaced people. This distinction is significant, as a high number of displaced persons and a high number of displacements can tell different stories. For example, high number of displacements might refer to the impossibility for an individual or group to sustainably return to their place of habitual residence, repeatedly forcing them to flee, while the number of the displaced people may remain relatively low. Similarly, an arrival at a flow monitoring point or a camp might refer to persons or groups that had already been counted but whose temporary departure for different purposes was not captured or factored in calculations. To ensure accurate accounting, it is critical to keep these concepts clear and to collect and label data accordingly.

2. Individual versus household-level

Average household size data (AHHS) also plays a significant role in displacement statistics. When the unit of data collection is not an individual IDP but instead a family or a home—a practice that is common across several countries—household-size and composition need to be considered. In these cases, it is necessary to convert the data to household members or persons.

This conversion raises the question of the accuracy of using household size as a unit of measurement. For example, the AHHS used might be a national household size average. Yet some regions might have significantly different averages, causing potential under or overestimates. It also raises questions around distinctions between household members who do and do not meet the definition of an IDP. Although this might allow for producing estimates, over a large enough population this also may result in significant inaccuracies in the overall population size.

The challenges in using AHHS also concern the treatment of demographic changes, such as the birth of children pre- or post-displacement. Furthermore, a household might increase in size over time, particularly in protracted cases. Therefore, when there is a lack of up-to-date contextually specific household-size data, significant uncertainty can be added to displacement statistics.⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ For this reason, the Philippines corrects its displacement figures once they have verified how many members of the same family are simultaneously sheltered in more than one location.

When using AHHS for producing IDP statistics, IDP numbers are also based on the assumption that the whole was displaced together, which often is not the case. Depending on how and from which household member data is collected, this can result in over- or underestimation of the total number of individuals that were displaced. Questions can also arise in regards to the different stages of integration experienced by different household members at different points in time. Furthermore, failure to account for split families can lead to double-counting. This particularly occurs in contexts where pendular migration is a common occurrence, that is, when individuals move to tend to their land or to fish, leaving part of their family behind.

3. Compiling data for international comparisons

As discussed previously in this report, numbers of IDPs are collected in various ways depending on the displacement context, their purpose, and the type of actors compiling these statistics. These variations make it necessary to validate data before embarking on international comparisons.

Often IDP statistics come from a large number of sources. Although a high number of sources can signify a greater volume of data to validate figures, it is important to distinguish between sources (which collect and provide the data) and publishers (who merely relay it and are therefore using the same figure as another entity). The use of the same figure by several publishers, e.g. news reports or even humanitarian dashboards, does not necessarily mean a higher level of quality or reliability and might simply signify the absence of many actors producing displacement-related data in an area or country. For this, understanding the methodology involved in collecting, cleaning and reporting data is crucial.

That said, this information is rarely easily available. In general, compilation of IDP statistics at the international level is challenged by the fact that different sources or publishers often do not use the same concepts in the same manner,

⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ IDMC, 2016. Global Report on Internal Displacement, Methodological annex, available at: <https://goo.gl/1uCTJ3>

and data from different sources provides different understanding of the situation. On the other hand, in contexts where IDP statistics are sensitive or difficult to obtain, availability of data from multiple independent sources can also serve an important purpose in allowing for triangulation and validation.

For general production of statistics most major international agencies will use certain specific, standard methodologies across various countries, facilitating the compilation of figures and statistics globally. For statistics on internal displacement, however, the lack of standardised practice on the phenomenon results in these statistics often being inconsistent from one data collector to another depending on agency mandate, or incoherent across different contexts due to country-specific challenges and limitations. Understanding the methodology and being aware of its caveats is a prerequisite for providing a realistic picture of each context, minimising the risk of over- or underestimating figures at global level.

E. Conclusion

This chapter highlighted the importance and existence of high quality and well-defined frameworks, legal and conceptual guidelines, and tools for the purpose of counting IDPs in official statistics. It is the responsibility of the NSS to collect and disseminate data on these groups, which in turn allow governments to ensure adequate attention to their needs and rights.

For statistics to be useful, data on displaced persons or groups also need to be aligned, interoperable, and of sufficient quality to be used as a basis for decision-making. This, however, requires a clear understanding of the displacement phenomenon in each context and the suitability of the tools for official statistics production. Different tools can be used for different purposes and each include caveats that need to be properly understood. The appropriateness of such methods and models will have a critical impact on the quality of the data, the prevention of avoidable mistakes and consequently of badly planned assistance measures or duplication of efforts.

Beyond numbers, the following chapter will examine in more detail the different characteristics relevant to be captured in statistics on internally displaced persons.

5

Collecting IDP characteristics: challenges and applications

This chapter will discuss the different characteristics which are related to IDPs, their applications and the challenges related to measuring them properly. It will use examples from various countries to highlight some of these challenges and also underscore successes achieved while pursuing collection of official IDP statistics.

A. Why are IDP characteristics useful?

Determining whether a person is or is not internally displaced is the first step of collecting quality IDP statistics. Collecting quantitative data on characteristics of IDPs is thus an important part of this process in that it makes it possible to differentiate between those who do and do not meet certain criteria. In addition to the core identifying IDP criteria, characteristics enable identification of when displacement began and can capture aspects that are important for understanding progress and attainment of durable solutions. Characteristics can also illuminate the socioeconomic situation of IDPs, thereby informing appropriate operational and policy response. Lastly, they offer means of comparing conditions between IDPs, other potentially vulnerable groups and the general population of the country. Indeed, without characteristics to complement, data on numbers can be significantly less useful making it imperative that characteristics are accounted for in official IDP statistics.

B. Identifying IDPs in official statistics

Given the legal and statistical definitions of IDPs elaborated upon in Chapters 2 and 3, two characteristics are key for identifying people as internally displaced. These two characteristics require that an IDP:

- Experienced a forced/involuntary physical movement (forced or obliged to flee due to a reason in line with the letter and spirit of the Guiding Principles); and that he or she
- Is within the internationally recognised borders of the country where the displacement event took place.

How an IDP is identified is contingent upon the data approach employed. While IDP-specific databases and registers will follow certain regulations and criteria for entering a person into the system, results of a survey-based approach are always dependent upon how a question is asked and how a respondent chooses to reply. In a database or register, which covers a broader set of the population, IDPs can only be identified if there is a specific (set of) variable(s) which makes identification possible. Information on migration (change of address) in conjunction with the reason for this move might be such variables. In censuses and general surveys, a common approach is to include questions which ask about recent migration and reason for migration (see Table 4.2 in Chapter 4 for census examples). For surveys which specifically target IDPs, identification will usually be carried out prior to the survey through registers of pre-identified IDPs, or through a specific listing.

In addition to identifying internally displaced persons, some other characteristics related to the displacement history and future plans are often collected about IDPs for practical, operational, or policy development reasons. These include data on:

- Place of usual residence (the place the person identifies as his/her home);
- Current place of residence;
- Secondary movements;
- When displacement occurred;
- Future plans and durable solutions preferences.

Chapter 5 of the IRRS also discusses different variables which can be used to identify refugees and asylum seekers. Many of the indicators are similar to what is outlined above, but as IDPs remain within the internationally recognised state borders, it is often even more difficult to capture these movements in administrative or other data. Another important aspect is the fact that a person can satisfy the criteria for inclusion in IDP statistics even though he or she resides at their place of usual residence having returned after being displaced, but without having reached a durable solution. For IDP statistics to provide useful information for the purpose of policy making and response, capturing these groups is pertinent.

C. Characteristics for measuring durable solutions

For measuring overall characteristics of internally displaced populations, this report takes as a starting point the IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for IDPs, which provides guidance on the characteristics that determine if durable solutions for IDPs are achieved. As specified in Chapter 2, the Framework defines the end of displacement as a time when IDPs no longer have any displacement-related needs and can pursue their human rights without discrimination related to their displacement; it also offers a set of eight criteria that can be used to determine and measure progress towards this. Yet in practice, operationalising these eight criteria in statistical terms and concretely measuring if and when a durable solution has been achieved, is complicated. There is an ongoing need to better measure progress towards durable solutions in order to inform policies and programming. Understanding which characteristics and related indicators are best suited to assess durable solutions is thus important.

As a rights-based framework, the IASC approach advocates for complete freedom from all displacement-related vulnerabilities, needs, and discrimination, especially because IDPs can sometimes be more susceptible to victimizations and human rights violations compared to their non-displaced counterparts. Critical to measuring this is the extent to which IDPs may suffer from discrimination on account of their displacement. The IASC Framework therefore emphasises that physical movement in and of itself (e.g. returning to one's place of usual residence) does not constitute a durable solution on its own, therefore 'returned IDPs' do not automatically count as no longer displaced. In statistical practice especially, return to the place of usual residence is often used as a defining characteristic for end of displacement. However, in addition to overlooking some of the problems that displaced persons may continue to face even after their return, focusing only on physical movements fails to produce statistics that shed light on displacement's socioeconomic impact (e.g. through hindrance to livelihoods or continued community tensions). Hence, statistics on IDPs and analyses on durable solutions need to more comprehensively look at the characteristics of an IDP population. The criteria outlined in the IASC Framework provide a useful starting point for defining these characteristics in a context-specific way.

There is an increasing need, driven by the demand from governments and international organisations, to transform the IASC Framework into a concrete analysis tools so that a systematic approach to measuring durable solutions can be developed. Indeed in 2015, an interagency process was set up to operationalise the Framework. Under the leadership of the Mandate of the UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of IDPs, a group of development, humanitarian and peacebuilding actors, coordinated by JIPS, are working to develop indicators and guidance for comprehensive durable solutions analysis in internal displacement situations.⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ The overall objective is to ensure that joint responses for seeking durable solutions to displacement are based on a comprehensive and agreed-upon

⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ For more information on this process, please see: <http://www.jips.org/en/profiling/durable-solutions/measuring-progress-towards-solutions>


evidence-base. Through a set of standardised indicators and guidance, the outcomes of this process also serve to provide a unified starting point for statistical analysis on durable solutions to internal displacement.

Given the broad nature of the criteria outlined in the IASC Framework, each of the eight can be broken down to several indicators. For example, access to adequate standard of living can include indicators on food security, access to water, energy, health care, sanitation, and education, among others. Hence, as per the guidance proposed in the durable solutions project, selection of core indicators to focus on will be context specific and guided by a variety of considerations based on existing statistical reporting, contextual analysis, and the challenges perceived to be most pressing to the IDP population in question (as outlined in Chapter 2 and 3 IDP contexts vary significantly). The guidance to operationalise the IASC framework therefore proposes an approach for context-specific indicator selection, including:

- Selecting the indicators in the library that are aligned with the SDG indicators and that are reported on in the specific context, and assessing their relevance for the IDP population. Prioritising these indicators aims to guarantee availability of comparable data between IDPs and the general population as part of national reporting towards the SDGs.
- Selecting additional indicators in order to ensure that all the eight criteria are represented. This selection is recommended to be done in consultation with displaced communities, as well as stakeholders working to support durable solutions.

This process is illustrated in Figure 5.1 below.

Figure 5.1 IASC criteria: Proposed process for identifying context specific core indicators



When deciding on indicators to measure characteristics of IDPs, the indicator library of Chapter 5 in the IRRS can also be consulted. The proposed set of indicators reflect the integration and wellbeing of refugees and asylum seekers along legal, economic, social, and cultural dimensions. Further, they are divided into core, non-core, and additional variables and linked up with the SDGs. Many of these indicators are also relevant in an IDP context and some countries have also begun to adapt their own related frameworks for determining the cessation of the situation of vulnerability linked to displacement (see an example from Colombia in Box 5.1). As this is a new area of work for many national statistics producers, however, cooperation among actors and knowledge sharing is key.

Box 5.1 Colombia: The Effective Enjoyment of Rights Framework

The Constitutional Court's Ruling T-025 of 2004 addressed internal displacement in Colombia as a protracted situation and ordered the Government to measure the progress towards the enjoyment of rights of IDPs. In 2008, the Constitutional Court adopted the first set of indicators to assess the Effective Enjoyment of Rights. Since then, both the Government and the Follow-Up Commission established to monitor the implementation of the IDP public policy in the country have conducted three separate national assessments using household surveys over a representative sample of the population within the Victims' Registry.

The main purpose of the assessment is to evaluate both the impact and the progress of public policy on victims in the country (including IDPs). Despite data not being collected from census, the official statistics produced by the assessments have been crucial for the Colombian Government's response to the Constitutional Court and for improving policy so that it better targets IDPs.

The Effective Enjoyment of Rights Framework includes the following indicators: minimum subsistence, health, education, housing, income generation, return and resettlement, life, integrity, freedom, security, identification, family reunification, comprehensive reparation, collective reparation, economic compensation, land restitution, protection and guarantees of non-repetition, rehabilitation, satisfaction, prevention, land protection, food security, justice, truth, and participation.

Based on the Effective Enjoyment of Rights indicators, the Colombian Government established criteria to determine when an IDP has overcome the vulnerabilities linked to his/her displacement. The list of criteria is included in the Presidential Decree 2569 of 2014. The indicators for this vulnerability assessment include: having age appropriate identification, access to food, access to health services, access to education for children and youth, income generation (for the household), adequate standard of living, and family reunification.

The criteria used to determine when an IDP has overcome the vulnerabilities linked to his/her displacement show the extent to which an IDP has achieved socio-economic stabilization. Once a victim overcomes the situation of vulnerability he or she is no longer targeted for displacement-related assistance, but is still targeted for other components of reparation. To-date determining the overcoming of vulnerability does not imply exclusion from the Victims' Registry.

Finally, The Constitutional Court Ruling 373 of 2016 ordered the Victims' Unit to carry out comparative analyses between displaced and non-displaced populations particularly related to the effective enjoyment of the rights to life, freedom and personal integrity. It also encourages the Government to use the same comparative approach to assess whether IDPs enjoy their rights to housing and income generation. With this ruling, the Constitutional Court lays the groundwork for the Government to set up the thresholds to compare IDPs and non-IDPs in a country where one in eight inhabitants is registered as an IDP.

1. SDGs in characteristics determination

In the years leading up to 2030, the SDGs will play an important role in policy discussions. While no SDG is specified for displaced populations, many indicators can be disaggregated by migratory status and, more specifically, by displacement situation. To date, the process of operationalising the IASC Framework into indicators has identified 30 directly relevant to measuring durable solutions to IDPs. These are specified in Table 5.1. A second initiative, the Expert Group meeting on Improving Migration Data in the Context of the 2030 Agenda,⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ has identified another 27 indicators which they recommend be disaggregated by migratory status. The second column specifies which tier the SDG indicators currently are placed in.⁽¹⁰⁹⁾

⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ For more information, see: <https://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic-social/meetings/2017/new-york--egm-migration-data>

⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ A tier indicates the level of methodological development and the availability of data at the global level for different SDG indicators. Tier 1 indicators are conceptually clear, have internationally established methodology and available standards, and data are regularly produced by countries "for at least 50 per cent of countries and of the population in every region where the indicator is relevant." For tier 2 indicators, data are not collected as regularly by countries, while tier 3 indicators do not have internationally established methodology standards. The reason for splitting into tiers is to make it easier to plan for further work on the indicators and develop global implementation strategies. It is also an indication of which indicators are more easily collectable at the current stage. The tier classification is based on an overall global assessment, availability and clarity of data on country level may therefore lead to another national classification. Independent of tier, all indicators are seen as equally important. Which tiers the indicators are in is adaptable, once methodology and data become available, the tier is changed.

As Table 5.1. shows, there are similarities in relevant SDG indicators for measuring IDP characteristics and the broader migration context. Differences of these two approaches mainly relate to the different purposes of these initiatives: while the IASC framework focuses on identifying discrimination and vulnerabilities specifically related to internal displacement, the Expert Group on Improving Migration Data focuses on broader policy implications of migration and, to some extent, displacement. Most of these indicators are linked to measuring an adequate standard of living as these indicators are more prevalent in the SDG indicator framework. However, for a comprehensive durable solutions analysis, additional indicators relating to other rights remain relevant, as outlined above in section B.

The SDGs will receive much attention in the coming years, and a disaggregation of these indicators by displacement will visualise the situation of IDPs in a broader context. Some countries have therefore, based on their own initiatives, decided to disaggregate selected indicators by displacement situation. Somalia (see Box 5.2) is an example of this approach.

Box 5.2 SDGs disaggregated by displacement status in Somalia

The Somali Government has decided to work towards monitoring 66 of the SDG indicators. It has categorised the SDGs into the groups of economic growth and related sectors, social services, climate change and the environment, and enablers to sustainable development, and there are efforts to disaggregate the SDGs by displacement status. These efforts are in line with Somalia's efforts to create a National Development Plan, which aims to develop monitoring and evaluation mechanisms for tracking these indicators and the path to achieving the targeted SDGs.

D. Capacities of data sources

No single source presented in Chapter 4 is typically well suited to cover all different indicators recommended to be measured on internal displacement and the inherent biases in all sources must be taken into account when choosing which is most appropriate. Data collection not targeted to IDPs specifically will usually include less aspects of the durable solutions framework, but will make it easier to compare IDPs' situation with the general population. For instance, a survey aimed specifically at IDPs will usually cover many of the IDP-specific characteristics linked to the eight IASC framework criteria (e.g. family reunification), whereas a national level household survey would typically only focus on a few elements that help to determine to what extent IDPs are able to enjoy some of their rights in comparison to the general population. Also, in addition to surveys, other data sources are often needed to gather more sensitive information and to understand underlying social structures.

Given its scope, a census will usually only have room for a few displacement-related questions. It therefore only covers general characteristics such as access to public services, basic living conditions, and livelihoods. In some cases, questions related to security and documentation might also be asked. As long as IDPs are included and identifiable in the data, a census is very useful for a comparison between IDPs and other groups because it covers the whole population.

Table 5.1 SDG indicators recommended to be disaggregated by displacement/migration

Indicator in the SDG Framework		Tier	Durable Solutions Indicator Library	Expert Group on Migration Data
1.1.1.	Proportion of population below the international poverty line, by sex, age, employment status and geographical location (urban/rural)	I	x	x
1.2.1.	Proportion of population living below the national poverty line, by sex and age	I		
1.2.2.	Proportion of men, women and children of all ages living in poverty in all its dimensions according to national definitions	II		
1.3.1.	Proportion of population covered by social protection floors/systems, by ...	I	x	x
1.4.1.	Proportion of population living in households with access to basic services	III	x	
1.4.2.	Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, with legally recognized documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure	III	x	
2.1.1.	Prevalence of undernourishment	I		
2.1.2.	Prevalence of moderate or severe food insecurity in the population, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES)	I	x	
2.2.1.	Prevalence of stunting (height for age <-2 standard deviation from the median of the World Health Organization (WHO) Child Growth Standards) among children under 5 years of age	I		
2.2.2.	Prevalence of malnutrition (weight for height >+2 or <-2 standard deviation from the median of the WHO Child Growth Standards) among children under 5 years of age, by type (wasting and overweight)	I		
2.3.2.	Average income of small-scale food producers, by sex and indigenous status	III		
3.1.1.	Maternal mortality ratio	II		x
3.2.1.	Under-five mortality rate	I		x
3.2.2.	Neonatal mortality rate	I		
3.3.1.	Number of new HIV infections per 1,000 uninfected population, by sex, age and key populations	I		x
3.4.1.	Mortality rate attributed to cardiovascular disease, cancer, diabetes or chronic respiratory disease	II		x
3.7.2.	Adolescent birth rate (aged 10–14 years; aged 15–19 years) per 1,000 women in that age group	II		
3.8.1.	Coverage of essential health services (defined as the average coverage of essential services based on tracer interventions...)	III	x	x
3.8.2.	Proportion of population with large household expenditures on health as a share of total household expenditure or income	II		x
3.b.1.	Proportion of the target population covered by all vaccines included in their national programme	III	x	

Indicator in the SDG Framework	Tier	Durable Solutions Indicator Library	Expert Group on Migration Data
3.c.1. Health worker density and distribution	I		x
4.1.1. Proportion of children and young people: (a) in grades 2/3; (b) at the end of primary; and (c) at the end of lower secondary achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (i) reading and (ii) mathematics, by sex	III/II		x
4.2.2. Participation rate in organized learning (one year before the official primary entry age), by sex	I		
4.3.1. Participation rate of youth and adults in formal and non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months, by sex	II		x
4.5.1. Parity indices (female/male, rural/urban, bottom/top wealth quintile and others such as disability status, indigenous peoples and conflict-affected, as data become available) for all education indicators on this list that can be disaggregated	I/II/ III		
4.6.1. Proportion of population in a given age group achieving at least a fixed level of proficiency in functional (a) literacy and (b) numeracy skills, by sex	II		x
4.b.1. Volume of official development assistance flows for scholarships by sector and type of study	I		x
5.2.1. Proportion of ever-partnered women and girls aged 15 years and older subjected to physical, sexual or psychological violence by a current or former intimate partner in the previous 12 months, by form of violence and by age	II		
5.2.2. Proportion of women and girls aged 15 years and older subjected to sexual violence by persons other than an intimate partner in the previous 12 months, by age and place of occurrence	II		
5.3.1. Proportion of women aged 20–24 years who were married or in a union before age 15 and before age 18	II		
5.5.2. Proportion of women in managerial positions	III		x
5.a.1. (a) Proportion of total agricultural population with ownership or secure rights over agricultural land, by sex; and (b) share of women among owners or rights-bearers of agricultural land, by type of tenure	III	x	
5.b.1. Proportion of individuals who own a mobile telephone, by sex	I	x	
6.1.1. Proportion of population using safely managed drinking water services	I	x	
6.2.1. Proportion of population using safely managed sanitation services, including a hand-washing facility with soap and water	I	x	
7.1.1. Proportion of population with access to electricity	I	x	
8.3.1. Proportion of informal employment in non-agriculture employment, by sex	II	x	x
8.5.1. Average hourly earnings of female and male employees, by occupation, age and persons with disabilities	II		x
8.5.2. Unemployment rate, by sex, age and persons with disabilities	I	x	x

Indicator in the SDG Framework		Tier	Durable Solutions Indicator Library	Expert Group on Migration Data
8.6.1.	Proportion of youth (aged 15–24 years) not in education, employment or training	I	x	x
8.7.1.	Proportion and number of children aged 5–17 years engaged in child labour, by sex and age	I	x	
8.8.1.	Frequency rates of fatal and non-fatal occupational injuries, by sex and migrant status	I		x
8.8.2.	Level of national compliance of labour rights (freedom of association and collective bargaining) based on International Labour Organization textual sources and national legislation, by sex and migrant status	I		x
8.10.2.	Proportion of adults (15 years and older) with an account at a bank or other financial institution or with a mobile-money-service provider	I	x	x
10.2.1.	Proportion of people living below 50 per cent of median income, by sex, age and persons with disabilities	III	x	x
10.3.1.	Proportion of population reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed in the previous 12 months on the basis of a ground of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law	III	x	x
10.7.1.	Recruitment cost borne by employee as a proportion of yearly income earned in country of destination	III		x
10.7.2.	Number of countries that have implemented well-managed migration policies	III		x
10.c.1.	Remittance costs as a proportion of the amount remitted	III		x
11.1.1.	Proportion of urban population living in slums, informal settlements or inadequate housing	I	x	x
16.1.1.	Number of victims of intentional homicide per 100,000 population, by sex and age	I		
16.1.3.	Proportion of population subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence in the previous 12 months	II	x	x
16.1.4.	Proportion of population that feel safe walking alone around the area they live	II	x	
16.2.2.	Number of victims of human trafficking per 100,000 population, by sex, age and form of exploitation	II		x
16.2.3.	Proportion of young women and men aged 18–29 years who experienced sexual violence by age 18	II		
16.3.1.	Proportion of victims of violence in the previous 12 months who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms	II	x	
16.3.2.	Unsentenced detainees as a proportion of overall prison population	I		
16.7.1.	Proportions of positions (by sex, age, persons with disabilities and population groups) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distributions	III		
16.7.2.	Proportion of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive, by sex, age, disability and population group	III	x	

Indicator in the SDG Framework		Tier	Durable Solutions Indicator Library	Expert Group on Migration Data
16.9.1.	Proportion of children under 5 years of age whose births have been registered with a civil authority, by age	I	x	x
16.b.1.	Proportion of population reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed in the previous 12 months on the basis of a ground of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law	III	x	

Surveys are more flexible than censuses in the sense that they are able to collect more in-depth information based on their specific aims, and, if needed, cover specific target groups. An IDP-specific survey will be able to cover a broad range of topics specifically relevant to internal displacement and related solutions. Their shortages are mainly linked to delicate and complex issues that are difficult to quantify. Also, comparisons with other populations typically require additional resources and use of standardised and comparable indicators. Further, more general surveys on living conditions and household budgets will usually not ask many IDP-specific questions unless a separate module on displacement is included, and IDPs are often not captured in sampling to the extent that would allow for comparison.

Similar to IDP-specific surveys, IDP-specific registers measure many characteristics of the IDP population, but comparison to the general population is hard. As the main purpose of registries often is administrative, they generally provide less information on social characteristics, however may be more detailed on other aspects such as housing, land, property, or access to compensation (see an example from Bosnia and Herzegovina in Box 5.3). Broader population registers will have similar features to a census as IDPs are not a specific target group. However, civil registers will typically provide information on access to documentation (birth, marriage, and death certificates). Because many countries conduct education registers or registers on social service provisions, these can also be applied when linkage keys exist.

Qualitative data are, as specified earlier, not broadly used for official statistics compilation because of their non-representative nature, but can be a valuable source for control and verification. In IDP contexts they are specifically important to help assess responses to sensitive issues which other sources might not provide reliable information on. This can be linked to for example security concerns, informal work/income, or integration.

How big data can be used depends on the data source and which information it contains. Some types of big data provide good methodological information and are of sufficient quality to be used in official statistics. However, since this is a very broad group of data types, it is difficult to specify which characteristics they can be useful for. Satellite images might, for instance, be useful to measure migration patterns while records from phone operators might be used to say something about expenditures, provided that all households have access to phones. As a third useful form, geo-tagging can be helpful for identifying whether a dwelling is located in an at-risk area or to check its access to public services when examining adequate standards of living.

Table 5.2 Overview of which data sources can provide a comparative analysis with the non-displaced population on durable solutions elements

	Census	Surveys		Registers		Population Movement Tracking systems
		General surveys	IDP-specific surveys	Civil registration	IDP registration	
Comparative analysis between IDPs and the non-displaced population possible	✓	✓	Partially	✓	X	X
Basic demographics	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Partially
Preferred durable solutions option/future migration plans	X	X	✓	X	X	X
Long term safety and security	Depends	X	✓	X	X	X
Enjoyment of an adequate standard of living without discrimination (e.g. access to services, housing, health and education)	✓	✓	✓	X	Depends	X
Access to livelihoods and employment	✓	✓	✓	X	Depends	X
Effective and accessible mechanisms to restore housing, land and property as well as family reunification	X	X	✓	X	Depends	X
Family reunification	X	X	✓	X	Depends	X
Access to personal and other documentation without discrimination	Depends	Depends	✓	Partially	Depends	X
Participation in public affairs without discrimination	X	Depends	Partially	X	X	X
Access to effective remedies and justice	X	X	✓	X	X	X

*Depends indicates that it depends on both the context and the tool

Box 5.3 Bosnia and Herzegovina: Choice of characteristics to measure

Bosnia and Herzegovina uses the Database of Displaced Persons in Bosnia and Herzegovina (DDPR), which captures various different types of data on IDPs. The DDPR was established by registering all IDPs in 2005. It contains a wide range of variables such as:

- **Municipality** of first registration, date of first registration.
- **Personal data:** Name, ethnicity, sex, birth date, place of birth, municipality, state, nationality, registrar number, number of household members in 1992 and today, status within the household in 1992 – e.g. head of household etc., have you been a refugee abroad after 1992?
- **Household data:** Members of household, number of household members supported by a person; number of children in the family who are under 18; number of employed family members.
- **Address/property information:** Address before the war, pre-war status of property, current status of property, current address, status of current property.
- **Return:** Have you requested the return of the property; have you requested voluntary readmission; do you want to go back; why not if no or not sure; have any of your household members from 1992 returned to the municipality they lived in before the war?
- **Living conditions:** Special needs, education degree, type of family support, employment status of registered person; employment status of spouse; profession of registered person; profession of spouse.

These variables, when updated, are beneficial for creating profiles of the IDP population and monitoring how they evolve over time.

E. Comparative analysis

Comparative analysis of IDPs and non-displaced populations is essential when attempting to understand displacement-related specificities or measuring progress towards durable solutions to displacement. This can be done either through comparison with non-displaced populations in the areas where they are living to assess the ways that displacement has affected their lives, or in relation to the general population of the country in question. Which approach to take will depend on the purpose of the data and context, but also on the ability to disaggregate data by different groups, which demands a rather large sample. Sufficient sample sizes are typically found within complete censuses or registers or, when these sources are not available, by linking data from different sources together. For the purpose of official statistics, it is also critical that, if samples are used, they are adequately drawn.

For operational or programmatic purposes, there might be other considerations as well. Sometimes smaller, more local comparisons might be more relevant and easier to achieve. In these cases, the sample is usually selected for areas with IDPs only and non-displaced households in the same areas are then selected as matched comparisons. This approach was used for example in the profiling exercise in Mogadishu, Somalia (see Box 3.2 in Chapter 3 for more information). If possible, conducting another survey at approximately the same time with the same questions can be used to compare characteristics with the general population.

Ideally, data on characteristics of the IDP population should also describe the situation of different sub-groups in the IDP population. A split by gender and age, for instance, may indicate which parts of the IDP population is most vulnerable. Analysing data with respect to other characteristics, such as region, type of area (urban/rural, camp/non-camp), ethnicity, disability, or education level might also give additional valuable information. When the data available allows, comparisons between particular sub-groups among IDPs and the general population can also provide useful information. An example can be to consider differences between the men and women in the IDP population and the general population respectively. Using censuses or registers that cover the whole population or all IDPs facilitate such disaggregation, such as in the case of the national census in Côte d'Ivoire (see Box 4.5 in Chapter 4). An advantage using such data sources is that they in principle cover the whole population, meaning there is a potential to publish statistics for small geographical areas and without a sampling error. As an example, Colombia has used data from the Single Victims' Registry to analyse gender differences in fulfilment of rights.

1. Linking different sources to improve information

As has been mentioned earlier in this chapter, different data sources can be linked to improve the information about individual IDPs and to compare with other population groups. There are several approaches to this based on level of access and type of variables.

The most advanced and accurate one is direct linkage on individual or household level. By using identification variable or variables, one can link persons or households together one by one. This is most common for registers as surveys and censuses usually would not include such identifiers. In countries where ID numbers exist and are commonly used, this type of linkage can be done, for example between different types of registers. Colombia is currently doing some of this record linkage with its RNI (see Box 5.4).

In some cases, identification numbers are also included in surveys. An example of this can be taken from KRI, where the identification number from the Public Distribution System is an identifier that can be used to link data on IDP households from different data sources such as registers and surveys, to identify households and link their data together.

Alternatively, when available, names of individuals and other characteristics can be used to link individuals together. This type of linkage is usually time consuming and challenging as names are often not properly recorded or spelled in a unified manner. Probabilistic methods can be used to improve the percentage of successful linkage, but this is also rather demanding. This approach should only be considered if linkage on individual level is really needed, maybe to link two registers together permanently. It will also be important to ensure that confidentiality agreements are taken into account when considering this approach.

More feasible, but less detailed, is to do a general comparison of results between different surveys or registers, although not on the individual level. If this method is used, it is highly recommended that the same approach has been used to get information from respondents. When comparing surveys for example, the questions used should be the same. Otherwise a risk exists that respondents will understand the questions differently, which might influence results. When planning an IDP specific survey, it can therefore be useful to look at questions from general,

recently conducted surveys, and use the same question formulations where feasible. This approach, especially if the surveys have been conducted at different points in time, will make it more difficult to find statistically significant changes than if conducted at the individual level.

Statistical matching or imputation to create linkages is also possible, but quite demanding. For more information on this and other approaches to data linkage, see the IRRS Chapter 4, section E. 1-4.

Box 5.4 Colombia: Combining data from surveys and administrative records

The RNI of the Victims' Unit manages the vulnerability assessment for the IDP population. For this purpose, the RNI uses a wide range of information sources. As a rule, data from administrative records prevails over data from surveys. This is due to the official nature of administrative records, which are produced by the government agency responsible for the fulfillment of the corresponding right (e.g. health, identification, education, etc.).

Nevertheless, there are cases in which chronologically or due to the nature of the information required, data from a survey prevails over the administrative record. For instance, to assess the criteria for adequate housing, a survey collected after displacement becomes more relevant than an official administrative record collected before displacement. On the other hand, an official administrative record of an in-kind housing subsidy is more relevant than a survey collecting the same information based on the victim's perception.

Data quality control is undertaken every time data is submitted to the RNI by a third party. Before the data exchange between partners, a technical document is agreed upon containing the relevant metadata from both variables and values. Third parties are always official sources and are a part of the NSS.

Coordination is key for the functioning of this data combination, as several government bodies collect information on IDPs in different registers for their administrative use. In general, government agencies share information through bilateral agreements, but the existence of several registration systems creates challenges for data sharing and the efficient updating of registers. Because IDP statistics are widely used in Colombia, consensus is crucial. This consensus is greatly enhanced through coordination mechanisms, as well as through the monitoring carried out by the Constitutional Court and the IDP Public Policy Follow-up Commission.

F. Conclusion

Collecting data on characteristics of IDPs is critical to ensure appropriate assistance and other operational response, as well as implications for policy-making. This includes capturing information on groups or individuals who meet a certain, well-defined set of characteristics, as well as changes and evolutions in the latter. Capturing such information should also allow for comparative analyses between the various sub-groups and their specific traits and needs.

This exercise should also include the analysis of progress made towards the achievement of durable solutions, which can also be linked to many of the SDGs. The definition of durable solutions in relation to displacement presents many challenges, in particular when trying to define the end of displacement.

As described here and in Box 5.5 below, linking different sources of data can help improve the availability and quality of the information being collected and disseminated. Another important element for this is stronger and deeper coordination between national and international actors, as further discussed in Chapter 6.

Box 5.5 Kosovo: Housing, land, and property compensation register

In Kosovo, displaced persons are entitled to claim compensation for lost housing, land, and property due to displacement. A large system was put in place for this purpose and a database was established to register all claims, whether they had been accepted or not.

These data could ideally be used as part of an assessment to find solutions to displacement. It does, however demand that data is shared with data processors and that some kind of personal identifier or personal characteristics are used to link the information to other data sources which measure other aspects of the durable solutions framework.

6

Coordination systems at national and international levels

The production of official statistics requires effective coordination. This chapter will focus on the different mechanisms for the coordination of IDP statistics. It will address effective national and international coordination approaches and will additionally describe the role that coordination has in the production of official IDP statistics. It will end by addressing coordination at the international level.

A. Why are coordination systems important?

Without coordination, data collection efforts can be duplicated, sometimes resulting in the existence of competing data and diverging results due to the use of incompatible specifications and measurements. Hence, effective coordination mechanisms are required to align quality standards and regulate methodologies acceptable for official statistics, to ensure best use of resources, and to disseminate statistics on IDPs for all relevant users and the general public.

Coordination efforts are most effective when cooperation occurs between stakeholders and technical partners at both national and sub-national or local levels. Coordination at the national level—which includes statistics coordinated through efforts within the NSS and in collaboration with external actors as relevant—helps to produce harmonised statistics that can inform coherent national response and policy development. Effective national coordination is also a prerequisite for international coordination. International coordination (i.e. reporting and collating IDP statistics at the international level) is important because it can improve national and global IDP statistics through exchanges of experiences and tools, and improved capacities overall.

B. Coordination of IDP statistics between national stakeholders

Bringing national stakeholders together is a key element in national coordination. Successful national coordination efforts are those that can foster cooperation on the production and dissemination of quality statistics on IDPs between involved government and partner organisations who, depending on the context, type of displacement situation, and available resources may have different roles.

1. What does statistical coordination cover?

Statistics are used to inform response and development of policies, as well as to measure the effect of implementation. Hence, monitoring the situation for displaced people is necessary to assess which policy measures are efficient and to evaluate policies already in place. Coordination of IDP statistics covers several different areas:

- **Data needs:** Both governments and partners depend on having data available for planning and implementation of policies and programs. As case examples incorporated into this chapter demonstrate, this is often challenging

because different actors have different data needs and use different specifications, therefore making data sharing less efficient and data less interoperable. Effective coordination however can help identify synergies and therefore improve coherence of data sources.

- **Timing/Timeliness:** The value of data also depends on when they are made available. During and following a crisis, they are generally required at fast pace in order to help government and humanitarian partners initiate an adequate response. In a protracted situation, the needs are different. Governments need data and statistics to formulate evidence-based policies aimed at supporting durable solutions. In order for information to be of more use, it ought to be made available to relevant ministries and their partners in line with their annual processes for planning and budgeting, enabling them to make priorities based on evidence. Overall, effective statistical coordination, must take timeliness into consideration.
- **Cost-efficiency:** Coordination of data collection initiatives enables cost-efficient production of statistics. Establishing one authoritative source of statistics on IDPs makes it possible for government and possible partners to pool resources for collection, analysis and dissemination of statistics. This makes it easier to reach consensus on factual issues, and facilitates cooperation on the development of evidence-informed policies.
- **Comparison:** Coordination of official IDP statistics also enables identification of relevant groups for comparisons, facilitating comparative analyses between IDPs and other relevant groups (e.g. host communities, urban population and people living in poverty) in order to create coherent policies and services across different segments of society.
- **Data sharing:** Data sharing is an important element of statistical coordination. Enhancing sharing of data between responsible data providers will enable production of analyses that are more relevant, stronger because they include different sources, and less burdensome on surveyed populations and the data collectors. Procedures for anonymization of data will ensure confidentiality when data are shared.
- **Quality:** The quality of statistics also needs to be coordinated in order to identify areas of improvement.

2. Coordination of statistics generated through national and international IDP response

The Guiding Principles state that national authorities bear the primary duty and responsibility for providing protection and humanitarian assistance to IDPs within their jurisdiction.⁽¹¹⁰⁾ This underscores that when it comes to internal displacement, authorities at national and local levels need to show leadership through proactivity and the provision of adequate governance structures. Such efforts better prevent, mitigate, and respond to displacement crises. Yet in many instances there is a lack of clarity as to which institutions are mandated to deal with internal displacement and further a lack of clarity as to how they are to comprehensively respond.

A comprehensive response to internal displacement depends on governance structures that contribute to the prevention, mitigation, and resolution of displacement. This includes designating a national institution as a focal point. The focal point is responsible for “ensuring sustained attention to the problem and also facilitating coordination within the government and with local and international partners” through all phases of displacement response, from prevention to durable solutions.⁽¹¹¹⁾ Countries that have not adopted a national law or policy on internal displacement are less likely to have appointed such an institution. In addition to national level coordination, sub-national, regional, and local authorities can play an essential role in internal displacement response. These authorities are often the first point of contact with IDPs and are often the ones IDPs turn to first for assistance.

National IDP response coordination mechanisms are most effective when they are created based on evidence and involve the producers of IDP statistics. Often, data on IDPs are produced by direct responders, e.g. those providing services to IDPs. For example, national IDP response coordination mechanisms in Ukraine and Colombia maintain administrative registers on IDPs. When survey data are collected, the national or local IDP coordination mechanism generally decides the topics to be included, like in Uganda, Somalia and KRI. Many national mechanisms outline how data on IDPs should be collected and used, even though statistics production itself is often not a core competency for these actors. In some instances, the national coordination mechanism for IDP response may be actively involved in the collection of statistics beyond what is collected for administrative purposes.

⁽¹¹⁰⁾ <http://www.unhcr.org/protection/idps/43ce1cff2/guiding-principles-internal-displacement.html>

⁽¹¹¹⁾ Brookings Institution, “A Framework for National Responsibility,” Benchmark 7, p. 18. Designating a national institutional focal point to coordinate and facilitate the provision of protection and assistance for IDPs is a legal obligation for States that have ratified the Great Lakes Protocol on IDPs and the Kampala Convention.

In addition to national response mechanisms, national and international organisations are critical partners to governments when responding to displacement situations, often also in the development of statistics. In international responses to humanitarian crises, the “Cluster Approach,”⁽¹¹²⁾ is a mechanism that helps to address response gaps and enhance action. Clusters are groups of humanitarian organisations, UN and non-UN alike, coordinating activities in different sectors (e.g. water, health, and logistics). They are designated by the IASC, have clear responsibilities for coordination, and typically generate substantial amounts of data. Thus, how the response to displacement situations is coordinated with non-governmental organisations has significant implications for official statistics.

At the national level, the Humanitarian Coordinator is responsible for establishing appropriate sectors and sectoral groups, and for appointing cluster leads. Humanitarian coordinators are responsible for ensuring that humanitarian actors build on local capacities and develop and maintain appropriate links with authorities, institutions, civil society, and other stakeholders. When the government and local authorities are in a strong position to lead the humanitarian response, the role of the Coordinator may be to organise international humanitarian responses in support of the government’s efforts, as is typically the case with disasters. In conflict situations, however, coordination and relationships with international humanitarian actors may be different.

The phase of a crisis and how the response to displacement situations is coordinated within a country have implications for the coordination of official statistics. The organisations involved in displacement response generate data through administrative procedures and service delivery to IDPs. For example, the government determines whether or not and why IDPs should be registered.⁽¹¹³⁾ In some IDP situations, the government may determine criteria for giving IDPs a distinct status, including passing laws regulating who is considered an IDP and establishing what rights and services they are entitled to, as discussed in Chapter 2. While overall inclusion of IDPs in civil registries is the responsibility of the state, and IDP-specific registries are also typically established by governments in relation to a specific legal status in countries where this is in place, various agencies often obtain data for a subset of the population for their specific needs.

Compiling and establishing inter-cluster or inter-sectoral population data is often coordinated through the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) via a “Humanitarian Profile.”⁽¹¹⁴⁾ The Profile attempts to count people with humanitarian needs on an ongoing basis. It aims to improve agreement among different actors on the total number of people affected, in-need, targeted, reached, and covered. Within the Profile, different groups affected by a humanitarian crisis are identified, such as the displaced, non-displaced, injured, missing, and dead. IDPs are a subset of the displaced group and are further separated out by the context in which they now live (e.g. camp or camp-settings, private or individual accommodations, etc.). Both government and humanitarian organisation sources contribute to the Profile, and the responsibility for overseeing these efforts are usually passed on to the government from OCHA over time.

3. Coordination through statistical strategies and systems

The aim of official statistical coordination mechanisms is to ensure linkages between separate efforts to collect, disseminate, and apply statistics to policy development, humanitarian response, and relevant national development plans. In many countries, national strategies for the development of statistics (NSDS) play a vital role in coordination. Many countries also aim to mainstream statistics on internal displacement into the NSS. Doing so brings IDP statistics into a standardised system for statistical production and consequently increases cost-efficiency and coherence of data.

An NSDS provides a strategy for developing statistical capacity while involving all relevant partners in data production. This means that through an NSDS, all organisations in the NSS work jointly to collect, process, and disseminate official statistics on behalf of national government. The NSDS also sets the goals for where the NSS should be in five-to-ten years and sets the priorities for getting there. It is developed among relevant stakeholders through a collaborative process, focusing on assessing user needs and finding ways to meet them.⁽¹¹⁵⁾

⁽¹¹²⁾ IASC guidance note on use of the cluster approach, [https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/system/files/documents/files/IASC_Guidance_Note_on_using_the_Cluster_Approach_to_Strengthen_Humanitarian_Response_\(November_2006\).pdf](https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/system/files/documents/files/IASC_Guidance_Note_on_using_the_Cluster_Approach_to_Strengthen_Humanitarian_Response_(November_2006).pdf)

⁽¹¹³⁾ Registration and profiling – CCCM cluster, http://cmtoolkit.org/media/transfer/doc/chapter_9.pdf

⁽¹¹⁴⁾ Humanitarian Profile, https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/sites/www.humanitarianresponse.info/files/documents/files/iasc_guidelines_on_the_humanitarian_profile_common_operational_dataset_2012-08-07.pdf

⁽¹¹⁵⁾ <http://www.paris21.org/>

An NSS often has an NSO that acts as the reference point for all standards, quality, and statistical applications, though this is not always the case. While an NSO can be integral to the functioning of an NSS, the ability of the NSO to maintain professional independence in theory and in practice is perhaps the most critical aspect of any NSS's strength.

Often coordination on IDP statistics exists between some organisations within the NSS and others producing IDP statistics, but typically not between all. In the Kurdistan Region of Iraq, for instance, the Kurdistan Region Statistics Office (KRSO) is coordinating their work with the statistical authorities in Baghdad, some UN organisations, but not with all those involved in the collection and production of IDP statistics (see Box 6.1). In Côte d'Ivoire, all ministries are responsible for collecting data on IDPs that are relevant to them. There is no coordination of the data collection, but the NSO is mandated to assist other government organisations in the data collection.

Box 6.1 Iraq and KRI: Mixed methods and mixed agencies

In Iraq and KRI, quantitative IDP figures are produced by different agencies using various data collection methodologies. The Ministry of Displacement and Migration (MODM) manages IDP and refugee cases throughout Iraq, and produces data on the type of assistance provided to those households in Iraq. In addition, the KRSO gathers quantitative data for KRI. The security directorate in KRI also registers IDPs arriving in the region. IOM also provides quantitative data on IDP movements to humanitarian actors.

The MODM, the World Food Programme (WFP), UNHCR, IOM and UNICEF are important providers of assistance to IDPs in KRI, and their data is also used to estimate the number of IDPs. However, since each institution sets their own criteria and carries out their own collection processes, data from these actors cannot always be compared. For one example, the MODM uses a data collection approach that focuses on an IDP's demographic background, elicited from the head of household during registration. The approach for identifying an IDP is different from that used by the KRSO when collecting temporal data on IDPs.

For another example, the MODM and IOM both collect data on displacement flows, but each uses its own reference period and criteria. Data collection methods also differ: IOM's DTM is updated on monthly basis, and bases its data collection on key informants and field visits. In contrast, the MODM does this in its registration centres based on visits by the head of IDP households.

The risk of inconsistencies is mitigated through collaboration and continuity. For instance, the KRSO and WFP have worked to implement a common definition of IDPs in their respective assessments of displaced and refugee populations. The MODM has also partnered with other institutions to develop common definitions. Multilateral collaboration between stakeholders through a unified set of definitions would significantly improve data interoperability in the context and, according to the KRSO, there is a need to unify efforts among players in the region to make numbers count, for more efficient coordination and distribution of resources.

In general, the challenges faced in coordinating statistical mechanisms are numerous and involve accommodating the needs of several organisations at once, each with individual aims, often with diverging definitions, and usually with different geographical areas of focus (see Box 6.2 for an example from KRI). All these issues combine to make comparability difficult. Having organisations working separately in this way typically results in the collection of statistics that are only partially comparable, even when common standards and definitions are used. In the absence of a common statistical framework for internal displacement, coordination efforts can still be made to agree on common standards, publish metadata and ensure transparency of methods.

More often than not, data collected as part of humanitarian responses by partner organisations (who generally operate in the worst-off areas within a country) tends to be the least comparable. This is particularly the case in displacement situations caused by conflict, where part or all of the territory of a country will often no longer be accessible to the government. To have statistics that provide a comprehensive picture of the IDP situation, it may be necessary for conflicting parties to cooperate on collecting data on displaced populations. Even though this is challenging, there are examples of countries that have managed to establish cooperation at a technical level, despite being part of different sides of a political or armed conflict. Some international or national aid agencies might also have access to different parts of a territory, producing estimates for the area they cover. The compilation of such partial figures from the various agencies can also help produce national or regional estimates.

If done effectively, coordination of statistics mitigates the challenge of competing or non-comparable figures. Establishing a single authoritative and reliable agency or focal point to facilitate consensus on source and methodology and to oversee dissemination of findings is a worthwhile pursuit in this regard. Across countries,

variation tends to exist when it comes to which agencies are appointed as focal points for collecting and publishing statistics on IDPs. Given the role of the NSS in coordinating statistics production across the areas of responsibility of different ministries and agencies, there are advantages to appointing the coordination of IDP statistics as a role of the NSS as well. The NSSs generally also have clear links to budget allocations and also have clear statistical laws in place to regulate production of IDP statistics. Thus, there is some concern associated with leaving IDP statistics out of NSSs because doing so creates a weaker link between IDP statistics, policy, and budgeting decisions. In practice though, IDP statistics are rarely included within NSSs. Often, this is because the data are derived from operational activities generated ad hoc and not as part of a statistical strategy. It thus follows that in some instances, like in Colombia and Azerbaijan, the focal point is part of the NSS and in others, like in Bosnia and Herzegovina, partner-involvement is relied upon (see Box 6.2).

Further, there is some evidence that working from within an NSS is a useful approach when attempting to improve weak coordination among official IDP statistics. Somalia for instance recently delegated responsibility for IDP statistical coordination to a new ministry, in partnership with its NSO. This appointment has led to the development of potentially strong new partnerships among multiple national and international organisations (see Box 6.3). Yet despite the importance of streamlined national coordination mechanisms, existing guidance on collecting statistics through IDP response is limited. In 2008, OCHA and IDMC developed the *Guidance on Profiling Internally Displaced Persons*, however this broad guidance is targeted at humanitarian practitioners and does not provide complete technical guidance for the production of statistics on IDPs.⁽¹¹⁶⁾

Box 6.2 Colombia, Azerbaijan, and Bosnia and Herzegovina: Focal points inside and outside of NSSs

In Azerbaijan, IDP statistics are produced within the NSS, as part of the centralised, country-wide system for coordination and production of official statistics. The State Statistical Committee of the Republic of Azerbaijan produces statistics for refugees and IDPs through combining quarterly and annual data on their current residence based on reports from the regional authorities. These data are then presented to the State Committee of the Republic on Deals of Refugees and IDPs. The State Committee distributes and publishes this information to the appropriate authorities, the public, and other relevant users.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees coordinates the production of official IDP statistics at the state level. The Ministry compiles data from two different administrative entities and a district that each have separate respective Ministries or Departments responsible for collecting IDP statistics. The Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees is, however, not formally a part of the NSS in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It instead independently coordinates statistics on displacement due to the need for continuous follow up on IDPs and refugees. The decision to appoint the Ministry as the entity in charge of official IDP statistics is something that was born out of a context-specific situation: at the time, the Ministry had had immediate access to all issues related to IDPs and refugees. Furthermore, the decision to appoint the Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees as responsible for official IDP statistics predated the formation of Bosnia and Herzegovina's NSO. Bosnia and Herzegovina's experience thus illustrates some of the practical realities many governments often have to face when considering how to best respond to and document large IDP figures.

In 2015 Colombia passed Law 1753 which led to the formal creation of its NSS. Even prior to that, however, the country's NSO (National Administrative Department of Statistics) worked to consolidate all statistical operations and classifications across governmental sectors and to align them with international standards. Under Law 1753, all government agencies producing statistics as well as those gathering data for administrative records, became part of Colombia's NSS, including the Victims' Unit, as the official body within the NSS responsible for producing statistics on IDPs. All information gathered by other governmental agencies is shared with the Victims' Unit to process and produce official statistics in alignment to the Effective Enjoyment of Rights indicators (see Box 5.1).

⁽¹¹⁶⁾ See, for example, OCHA, IDMC, (2008) *Guidance on Profiling Internally Displaced Persons*, http://www.jips.org/system/cms/attachments/455/original_IDP_Profiling_Guidance_2008.pdf

Box 6.3 Somalia: Enhancing statistical coordination to improve response to displacement

In Somalia, coordination mechanisms related to official IDP statistics have historically not been well defined. Several institutions work on IDP-related data issues include the Commission for Refugees and IDPs, the Disaster Management Agency, and Somalia's NSO, which mainly works to disseminate official statistics. However, in March 2017, the Government of Somalia announced that a new ministry, called the Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs and Disaster Management (MoH&DM), would now be spearheading responses to humanitarian affairs, internal displacement, and emergencies. It would also be tasked with finding durable solutions to recurrent droughts, floods and other crises.

The MoH&DM was created, in part, to establish coordination platforms within Government institutions regarding IDP-related issues. A key aim of the Ministry is to ensure a rapid and coordinated response to internal displacement situations. The Ministry now works to establish linkages between the National Development Plan and the SDGs, firstly by attempting to derive measurable indicators from the SDGs. It also now leads humanitarian coordination and response, and is working to finalise the Somali Disaster Management Policy.

Currently, the MoH&DM has the mandate for IDP data collection alongside Somalia's NSO. It is also currently partnering with international organisations like JIPS to receive support on the technical development of data collection methodologies to monitor the situation of IDPs as part of the National Development Plan. Other areas of work include unifying definitions between the IDP policy and statistical law, both in terms of the language used for statistical measurements and other general statistical descriptions.

Box 6.4 Côte d'Ivoire: Coordination of IDP response, but not of IDP statistics

Even though Côte d'Ivoire has a coordination mechanism for IDP response under the Office of the Prime Minister, there is no formal coordination mechanism for official IDP statistics. All involved ministries have to account for IDPs in their roadmaps and collect relevant information about them. Data on IDPs are collected by the Ministry in Charge of Solidarity or the Ministry of Interior and Security, depending on the event experienced by the population.

The National Statistical Institute (NSI) is mandated to assist and accompany other government organisations and structures in the collection of sectorial and specific data. The NSI is also mandated to collect all statistics at national and sectorial levels. International organisations provide technical and financial support to the Government in the management and care of vulnerable persons and coordinate actions on the ground.

C. Coordination on the regional and global level

A key goal of international coordination of official statistics is to build a framework to support countries in producing quality statistics comparable across countries. This ideally includes all aspects of the production process, aiming to support sustainable and cost-efficient statistics. The work is however often challenged by the lack of unified guidance on production and dissemination of IDP statistics, including at the national level.

Coordination of statistics at the international and national levels feed into one another. Coordination at the international level requires effective coordination of IDP statistics at the national level, as this is where statistics are produced. Yet national level coordination is strengthened by international guidance and standards to facilitate production of comparable high-quality data.

The UN is a key stakeholder for coordination of international statistics. With wide membership, a Committee for the Coordination of Statistical Activities has been established to:⁽¹¹⁷⁾

1. Promote interagency coordination and cooperation on statistical programmes and consistency in statistical practices and development;
2. Foster good practices in statistical activities of international organisations; and
3. Contribute actively to the development of a coordinated global statistical system.

More than 40 international organisations are members of the Committee, among them the UNSD and various agencies collecting data on IDPs as part of their activities.⁽¹¹⁸⁾ The members of the Committee are dedicated to enhancing international coordination on statistics, both among themselves and in cooperation with countries. However, the subject of IDP statistics has not been brought to the attention of this Committee so far.

The Kampala Convention is an important tool for development of IDP policies and response at the regional level, described in Chapter 2 of this report. Processes are underway to ensure an effective implementation and monitoring of the Convention, and in April 2017, a Conference of State Parties in Africa was convened as a mechanism for fostering cooperation and solidarity among States in its implementation. One of the aims of the conference was to outline a five-year action plan which would, in part, establish mechanisms for monitoring and reporting on situations of internal displacement.⁽¹¹⁹⁾ The plan is still to be developed.

Many UN agencies and international non-governmental organisations collect or collate statistics on IDPs. At country level, statistics on IDPs are produced by various actors. To mention a few approaches, UNHCR primarily collects data on refugees, but also on IDPs assisted or protected by the organisation. In its IDP statistics, UNHCR only includes conflict-induced IDPs to whom the Office extends its protection and assistance.⁽¹²⁰⁾

IOM also collects data on IDPs in various countries, primarily through their DTM. This approach usually includes IDPs due to both conflict- and disaster-related displacement, and the DTM typically has a broad geographical coverage. As a modular system, DTM comprises different tools and methods that can be implemented in various combinations according to the practical requirements of a given context, as opposed to one standardised methodology selection. As a result, the DTM uses slightly different methodologies and specifications in different country contexts, although it mostly relies on community level key informant interviews.

Other UN agencies and many NGOs are also involved in collecting data on IDPs, also typically for specific operational purposes (for example through the World Food Programme's (WFP) food aid distribution mechanisms). With varying levels of effective coordination amongst different actors, this often results in competing sources of IDP statistics and challenges in harmonising data.

The Joint IDP Profiling Service was established by a group of UN and NGO partners in 2009 to support governments, humanitarian and development actors to produce quality statistics and analysis of internal displacement.⁽¹²¹⁾ Investing in the production of guidance and the delivery of direct technical support and capacity building, a large part of JIPS' work focuses on the coordination of data production processes with the aim of strengthening consensus and improving coordination of evidence-based response. JIPS' work has been recognised and endorsed by several UN General Assembly and Human Rights Council resolutions.⁽¹²²⁾

At the global level, IDMC collates data on displacement from multiple sources to produce global estimates on displacement. IDMC's mandate to create and update a global database has been recognised and endorsed by several UN General Assembly resolutions.⁽¹²³⁾ IDMC aims to monitor the situation of IDPs in all kinds of displacement situations in line with the Guiding Principles and the Kampala Convention definitions. Many countries provide their national figures on internal displacement to IDMC, but the global estimates also build upon various other data

⁽¹¹⁷⁾ https://unstats.un.org/unsd/acsub-public/workpartner_ccsa.htm

⁽¹¹⁸⁾ Please find a comprehensive list of members at: <https://unstats.un.org/unsd/acsub-public/members.htm>

⁽¹¹⁹⁾ https://www.au.int/web/sites/default/files/newsevents/conceptnotes/32304-cn-concept_note_-_cosp_meeting_2017.pdf

⁽¹²⁰⁾ This includes people in "IDP-like situations", referring to a descriptive term of groups remaining in their country of nationality or habitual residence and face protection risks similar to IDPs, but who for practical or other reasons cannot be referred to as such.

⁽¹²¹⁾ See: www.jips.org for more information.

⁽¹²²⁾ General Assembly Resolutions A/C.3/68/L.63/Rev.1 from November 2013 and A/RES/70/165 from December 2015 on the Protection and Assistance of IDPs, as well as the UN Human Rights Council Resolution A/HRC/RES/32/11 from July 2016 and A/HRC/2-/L.14 from June 2012 on the Human Rights of IDPs.

⁽¹²³⁾ See 122.

sources at national and international levels, however incomparable and incomplete data for many countries remains a challenge.⁽¹²⁴⁾

D. Conclusion

This chapter described current coordination mechanisms of IDP statistics at the national and international level. Many different types of coordination mechanisms exist at the national level, differing in their mandate, composition and organisation. They also differ in how influential they are. The international coordination of IDP statistics today is limited, and current practice shows little comparability of statistics on IDPs internationally. Similar to challenges observed at the national level, the way the international community define and measure internal displacement internationally is not aligned.

Some initiatives do nevertheless exist, and several international organisations are committed to working with countries to enhance the production of quality statistics on internal displacement, including the Joint IDP Profiling Service. The EGRIS established by the UNSC is an example of an initiative to strengthen IDP statistics, and this report has taken stock of the current state of IDP statistics, and highlighted the need to align definitions, concepts and use of indicators. In the last chapter of this report, recommendations for the way forward will be made.

⁽¹²⁴⁾ See, for example, IDMC Global Report on Internal Displacement (2017), part 3: Inside the GRID.

7

Recommendations towards a statistical framework on IDPs

Based on the review of current practice in the previous chapters, this chapter aims to make concrete recommendations on a way forward towards a statistical framework on IDPs. This is done with the intention of paving the way for the production of comparable, quality statistics on these populations across different contexts in the future.

A. Regarding definitions and specifications

When considering the definition of an IDP for statistical purposes, two main categories should be considered: IDPs and IDP-related populations. For the purpose of consistency across different contexts, data collection should allow for separate reporting on the numbers of people belonging to these two categories to differentiate the different causes of population inflows, although depending on national frameworks, an IDP status may be extended to one or both categories.

1. IDPs

For the purpose of statistical measurement, IDPs are people who were forced or obliged to flee from their place of usual residence due to a causal event, and are currently living within their country of usual residence. Causal events have to be in line with the letter and spirit of the UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement. Although not limited to, causal events include: armed conflict, generalised violence, disasters, human rights violations, and natural and manmade disasters. Economic deprivation does not constitute a reason for a person to be included in IDP statistics.

Collecting migration data should be a standard practice in all countries. Such data should be able to be disaggregated by the reason(s) for migration so that it is possible to assess whether or not the movement was forced or involuntary in nature. The movement should occur as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of a causing event. In some cases, family members of IDPs may stay behind after the event leading to displacement, but then follow the IDP afterwards. In this case, they should also be included in the statistical category of IDPs.

Different data sources continue to use different approaches for identifying IDPs, ranging from a subjective reporting of the person to an objective verification in cases where assistance/specific benefits may be linked to displacement. Some causing events are however generally difficult to verify in an objective manner. In order to capture preventive movements (i.e. "in order to avoid the effects of" an event), or displacement due to less easily verifiable causes such as certain human rights violations, the overall recommendation for identifying IDPs for the purpose of official statistics is to use the IDP's subjective perception of the causing event based on self-declaration (i.e. asking, "why did you move?").

A person included in IDP statistics can be a national, stateless person, or foreigner as long as the place they fled from was their place of usual residence, and they remain within the internationally recognised boundaries of that country. Their legal status in the country is irrelevant to their status as an IDP for the purpose of statistical measurement.

In their search for durable solutions, IDPs may choose to return, stay where they are, or move to another place in the country. Nevertheless, none of the settlement options *on their own* imply an outflow of the IDP population, not even if the move includes a return to their usual place of residence. An IDP who has ‘returned’ therefore, is still an IDP for the purpose of statistics until reintegration has been completed.

In the following, however, IDPs are no longer to be included in IDP statistics:

1. Upon death;
2. When they leave the country, either for the purpose of seeking international protection or for other reasons; or
3. When they have attained a durable solution to displacement.

It is recognised that reporting on the end of internal displacement as outlined in the IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for IDPs is challenging and no internationally agreed upon statistical measure for it currently exists. At the same time, countries with a legally defined status for IDPs also face similar challenges in defining the cessation of this status, typically resulting in overly simplified definitions or continuously accumulating IDP statistics. In the absence of a unified statistical measure, countries may continue to use their own existing legal or *de facto* specifications. These may be reported on in addition to statistics based on unified practice, as recommended below. If national legal or *de facto* specifications are used, they should be clearly explained and metadata on these statistics shared. This will maintain transparency on how these statistics are produced, and on what criteria are used for determining the end of displacement.

Based upon ongoing international and inter-agency work, a unified measure on the end of displacement for the purpose of statistics should be developed to eventually allow for full comparability of IDP statistics.⁽¹²⁵⁾ Given that the IASC Framework is not directly operationalisable but rather focuses on an IDP’s progressive attainment of solutions, finding an internationally acceptable definition for end of displacement may also require the use of an authoritative process to clarify the key elements of end of displacement criteria. Detailing these elements in an addendum to the IASC Framework will be necessary to form a basis for statistical measurement and complete the statistical framework for internal displacement.

2. IDP-related populations⁽¹²⁶⁾

Children of at least one internally displaced parent born after the displacement event took place is another important group to include as a statistical category. Because they are related to IDPs without being IDPs themselves, statistics should allow for separate reporting on IDP descendants for comparability purposes. Children of internally displaced parents born after displacement should also be kept separate due to the different nature of this population inflow in statistics, although there are cases where countries extend a legal IDP status and/or provide specific benefits to persons in this category.

Other family members of IDPs not directly displaced themselves should not be included as a statistical category in official IDP statistics. However, it is recognised that official data on this group (especially those dependent on an IDP household) is often relevant for policy and programmatic purposes, and information on them is often collected as part of IDP-specific data systems. Those data should still be kept distinct from data on the other IDP-related populations outlined above.

Returning refugees may have very similar characteristics as IDPs, especially in contexts where return from international protection does not take place in safety and dignity, and they can continue to face displacement-related vulnerabilities or discrimination upon their return. However, it cannot be automatically assumed that returning refugees or other persons returning from abroad after displacement should still be considered in IDP statistics. They are only to be counted as IDPs if they have not found a durable solution to their displacement. To decide on this a similar assessment of their attainment of solutions as for the overall IDP population is required. For returning refugees this is referred to as “re-establishment.” Returning refugees and other populations returning from abroad should also be counted in IDP statistics regardless of their previous history if they are subject to a new displacement event.

⁽¹²⁵⁾ <http://www.jips.org/en/profiling/durable-solutions>

⁽¹²⁶⁾ This section does not consider the category of ‘IDP-like situations’ as it is a concept utilized by a single organization, rather than commonly used, and does not determine a statistical category of persons as such.

It is also to be noted that persons returning after seeking protection abroad are also included in the scope of the IRRS as a refugee-related population group. Any further development of recommendations for IDP statistics following this report must be aligned with the IRRS for this population group in particular. Due to the different causes of displacement used in the refugee and IDP definitions and subsequent statistics, the IRRS does not cover persons internationally displaced by disasters, who may have left the country and later returned.⁽¹²⁷⁾ This group may be captured as a migrant population in the taxonomy of international inflows and outflows of people in the Recommendations on Statistics on International Migration, albeit without differentiating between those who were forcefully displaced and those whose decision to leave their places of usual residence was voluntary in nature. Thus, for the consistency of national reporting on these different populations, there is also a need for elaborated guidance on the interoperable use of these statistical frameworks.


The below graphs (Figures 7.1 and 7.2) illustrate how people enter and exit the statistical category of IDPs, as well as the different IDP-related populations.

B. Regarding quality standards and specifications

1. General data quality


When data are collected, the quality needs to follow international standards as outlined, for example, in the *Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics*. This includes following agreed-upon statistical frameworks and definitions, generating proper documentation of how data have been collected and processed, ensuring confidentiality of all respondents, and establishing a dissemination plan including information on how the data will be made available to the public. Furthermore, the purpose of collecting data on IDPs needs to always be clear. Responsible parties should assess if the data is absolutely necessary to obtain and how frequently updates should occur prior to implementing collection.

Figure 7.1 Inflows, outflows and stocks from IDP statistics



⁽¹²⁷⁾ See the Platform on Disaster Displacement (PDD) for more information on this population. The PDD is a state-led process addressing the protection needs of people displaced across borders in the context of disasters and climate change, <http://www.disasterdisplacement.org/>

Figure 7.2 Statistical categories to be included in official IDP statistics



When collecting data for the purpose of production of official statistics, IDP data should be collected at the individual level whenever possible in order to allow for data to be disaggregated by individual characteristics like age and gender. Collection at the individual level also assists in avoiding over- or underreporting of figures and facilitates comparability across states and contexts. Collection should further strive to disaggregate data into the categories specified in the statistical framework recommended here. Again, this underscores the need to collect data on displacement history at the individual level, allowing for disaggregation of the IDP population by age, sex and other relevant characteristics.

2. Data sources

When selecting a source for collecting IDP statistics, specific criteria should be considered. Government, partners and other key users of data should evaluate the coverage needed, the measurements needed (i.e. stock and/or flow), and the advantages and limitations of the potential source, especially as it relates to the IDP context. The Summary Sheet in Chapter 4 offers an overview of these criteria and how they relate to key data sources for official IDP statistics, which can be used for guidance. While data source selection is a context- and capacity-specific decision that should be made responsibly on a case-by-case basis, there are cautions that span across situations:

a. Censuses

Censuses are only useful for capturing internal displacement when IDPs are part of the population counted. Thus, it is necessary that censuses include questions that help identify who is and is not an IDP. In line with the IRRS recommendations, key migration questions should be included in a population census (see Chapter 4, Section B.2.). Topics that could help identify IDPs include: (a) current place of residence and (b) migration from usual place of residence. Reason for migration is central to IDP identification and therefore should be included with an option for “forced displacement,” with supporting guidance for enumerators linking to all eligible causing events in the response categories. Additionally, in order to capture those who already have returned to their usual place of residence (after having been forcibly displaced) but who have still not reached a durable solution, a question on whether a person has ever been forced to flee should be added if feasible to do so. Standard questions should be developed to support the integration of these recommendations into census questionnaires.

With this approach, everyone who has ever been internally displaced is ideally captured. Though a risk for overcounting exists since there is no ability to determine who has and has not reached a durable solution, the

census may still be a good starting point for more in-depth durable solution surveys as censuses are often used as sampling frames.

b. Surveys

If surveys are used to collect information on IDPs, procedures to ensure questionnaires' high quality should be applied, e.g. by involving stakeholders in defining indicators and using cognitive testing and pilots to improve questionnaires. It is also key to create representative samples for the populations in question. If several different IDP-related groups are being assessed, representative samples for each group need to be established. If comparisons with the general population are one of the survey's aims, a representative sample for the general population needs to be created as well.

Strong sampling frames are integral to this process. Censuses, registers with high level of completeness, and listings are good starting points to create a sample, given that the IDP population can be identified; the IRRS provides more in-depth details on frames. If there are no reliable sampling frames available (which is often the case for IDP populations) one needs to assess the options available and feasibility of using identified sources as a starting point for sampling.

When it comes to household-level surveys, data are influenced by who is asked to respond. Often, surveys request that the head of the household responds. While the head of the household can vary from context to context, it is often the case that head is a male, provided that a male actually resides in the household. As a result, capturing gender-specific information such as that about intimate partner violence or reproductive health can be difficult. Disaggregating indicators on attitudes, intentions to move, and decision-making power in the household by gender can also be difficult. Thus, careful consideration should be applied when interpreting gender-specific outcomes. When feasible and culturally appropriate, using a random distribution of female and male respondents or interviewing more than one member of each household are ways to ensure more reliable data. Breaking certain key indicators down to individual level is always recommended within household rosters in order to ensure the disaggregation of at least some individual information like age, education, and occupation.

Also, when feasible and appropriate, IDPs should be included and identifiable as a separate sub-group in general surveys such as internationally standardised surveys (e.g. DHS, MICS, LSMS, EU-SILC) or national surveys (e.g. labour-force, household-consumption, health and livelihood surveys), as these are generally good sources of data on key IDP characteristics. In most countries, IDPs are only a small fraction of the population. Hence, it will often not be possible to present statistics on IDPs without oversampling them.

To note, developing a questionnaire module that focuses on IDP-specific needs for inclusion in general surveys that can be adapted to different within-country contexts is a cost-efficient way of obtaining quality IDP statistics — specifically statistics that enable comparison between IDP and general populations, if both are representatively sampled. Maintaining consistency in these questions over time also allows for the creation of time-series for IDP statistics. Incorporating questions that capture all eight IASC Framework criteria is key here. Stakeholders (including displaced communities themselves) should be brought in to determine the most relevant aspects of each criteria. Standard questions should be developed to support the integration of these recommendations into survey questionnaires.

When it is not feasible or appropriate to include IDPs as a separate group in general surveys, IDP-specific surveys are typically a good alternative. In these cases, though, it is still important to create a separate sample of the host population/the non-IDP population of the country so that comparisons are possible. If it is not possible to have a sample of the host population, questions should as far as possible be aligned to the ones used in other household surveys, to facilitate comparisons to the general population. Regardless, survey-based statistics should always come with both metadata and expressions for quality/accuracy. Existing guidance for the design and implementation of IDP specific surveys is available, and it is recommended that they are updated according to the recommendations of this report as needed.⁽¹²⁶⁾

c. Registers

Generally, administrative registers that contain information on IDPs and that can be used for statistical purposes should be made available for statistical compilation. For accurate capture of IDP statistics, an operational system

⁽¹²⁶⁾ See JIPS Essential Toolkit for practical guidance for planning and implementing an IDP specific survey: <https://jet.jips.org/>

for continuous data-updating and agreements for data sharing with statistics producers needs to be in place, also ensuring adequate confidentiality of the data in the register.

For statistical use of administrative data sources, it is important to have comprehensive documentation on the actual purpose of the register, the degree of coverage of the target population, the frequency of updates, and knowledge about the registration (in-and out flow) criteria/process. With many different register holders, both among national and international actors, the importance of using common terminology and statistical standards/classifications is crucial for cost efficient sharing and use. For all types of register, it is an advantage if a personal identifier—preferably a digit code—is established and used across registers so that data can more easily be linked and used for statistical purposes. Data linkages may also be used to ensure that a statistical register is kept up-to-date.

Confidentiality considerations require that access to all types of registers be limited to those actually working with registration or statistics production. Considerations should also be made to avoid misuse. In some contexts, IDP-specific registration might be discouraged due to political sensitivity of the displacement situation, the level of details available in such a system or the risks associated with such information being disclosed.

As registers depend on the population to come forward and register, self-selection bias exists as an inherent risk. Biases also exist due to barriers to registration for certain groups. Proper assessment for this risk should thus be in place before the register is used for statistics production. If there are biases and the source is still considered the best available, any necessary statistical adjustments should be made. Proper documentation is imperative here.

Furthermore, general registers, such as civil registration systems, should include IDPs in its scope and registration should be as easily accessible for these populations, as for the population in general. On-line registration systems will make it easier to access documentation on an IDP's legal status and citizenship. Advanced population registers also include internal migration as a key variable, and this can also be useful in the IDP context as IDPs can be re-registered with new (temporary) addresses once they have been forced to flee. Where available and up-to-date, this information can also be used for statistical purposes to provide an overview of internal migration flows.

If an IDP-specific register has been established, it is recommended that the data, adequately anonymised, are made available for statistical purposes to save resources and increase efficiency. Such a register should, however, not be established for statistical purposes alone due to the associated costs that come with this effort. It is generally more cost-efficient to collect data for statistics through surveys than establishing registers of the total population in question. If established, local registration centres can be used to help improve coverage (and quality) of data. Caution needs to be taken in order not to compromise the safety and security of IDPs, and it should therefore be ascertained that confidentiality is ensured.

3. Assessing durable solutions

Due to the complexity of the topic, this report will not provide concrete recommendations on which statistical indicators should be included as part of an assessment on whether a person has reached a durable solution. As has been discussed in Chapter 5, the eight criteria from the IASC Framework are a good general guideline on which elements are important to consider when assessing a durable solution. The work on durable solutions currently carried out through an interagency process to specify relevant indicators for the eight criteria is an important step towards being able to identify key statistical measures. The work is led by the Mandate of the UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of IDPs. As outlined above in recommendation A(1), a unified measure on the end of displacement for the purpose of statistics should be developed, based upon this ongoing work, to eventually allow for full comparability of IDP statistics. Detailing these elements, through an authoritative process, will be necessary to form a basis for statistical measurement and complete the statistical framework for internal displacement.

Until a more specific statistical framework is in place, or a more detailed interpretation of the current IASC Framework is made, however, countries should individually, decide which criteria are most relevant to measure in the specific context through an inclusive process. It is important to highlight the need for openness on metadata, including the definitions and specifications used for statistically defining the end of displacement, when national definitions are used. This will capacitate the monitoring of progress towards durable solutions, even if reporting on the end of displacement is not yet plausible.

The SDGs also play an important role in assessing some of the elements which are significant in achieving a durable solution. As many of the SDGs are related to the IASC indicators, these should be used as a starting point for assessing various aspects of durable solutions by comparing outcomes between displaced and non-displaced

populations. Disseminating related statistics to various stakeholders is then necessary in order to measure progress towards durable solutions and to measure the effect of related policies and interventions.

C. Coordination

In order to ensure a strong link between IDP statistics and their use for national policy-making, IDP statistics should be included into NSDSs and yearly statistical plans. Inclusion of IDP statistics into NSDSs and NSSs will help mainstream the production of IDP statistics and enhance the availability of comparative data. Furthermore, including IDP statistics in NSS mandates will facilitate adherence to international statistical quality standards, even when the primary focal point for data production is not a statistical agency.

A statistical law should mandate the establishment of a NSDSs and NSSs, as regulations are needed to establish the professional independence of official statistics. It is recommended that NSSs are mandated to produce IDP statistics. An entity or agency within the NSS should also be identified to coordinate the development, production, and dissemination of official IDP statistics at the national and local levels. The roles and responsibilities of other government and non-government agencies should be specified when relevant. The aim is to specify procedures for planning, collection, analysis and dissemination of IDP statistics.

All agencies involved in production and dissemination of IDP statistics should follow relevant protection and ethical data collection standards, and an ability and willingness to abide by these regulations should also guide the decision of the mandated agency.

The organisation responsible for coordinating IDP statistics does not have to be the collector or quality controller of the statistics, but should be responsible for ensuring that timely and quality statistics are extracted from existing data sources, produced, and disseminated. If possible, and given no other reasons to the contrary, the NSO can be given the role to ensure:

1. The production of quality statistics relevant for evidence-based policy and decision-making. This includes resource allocation both in emergency and protracted situations in order to monitor the displacement situation over time, and support durable solutions to displacement.
2. Official IDP statistics are produced according to agreed-upon definitions and specifications. Should international guidelines on IDP statistics be developed and endorsed, countries should align the production of official IDP statistics with these.
3. Statistics on internal displacement are made available to the government and its partners in time to be used for their annual planning and budgeting cycles.
4. Adequately anonymised official IDP statistics, which meet the test of practical utility, are made available to the public on an impartial basis by relevant agencies in order to honour entitlement to public information, in line with the *Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics*. In addition, respecting protection and confidentiality standards, the focal point for IDP statistics should facilitate the sharing of more detailed IDP data among relevant authorities and other stakeholders at the local, national and international levels in order to avoid unnecessary parallel data collection.
5. Displaced communities, as part of the general public and as data subjects, should also have access to the statistics produced. In some contexts, this will require specific efforts from the agency-side, especially if IDP populations have limited access to published data in a centralised way.

The focal point for IDP statistics within the NSS should ensure timely communication and collaboration with other partners working on IDP statistics and interventions, including civil society and national and international humanitarian and development partners.

A specific MOU between the NSS and the relevant focal points on this (e.g. information management working groups under clusters, UN country teams, or humanitarian country teams) could be developed to facilitate processes around data sharing, confidentiality, harmonising, and joint data production, as well as sharing of capacity and resources. This is not to say, however, that the NSS should have the sole responsibility for collecting statistics on IDPs, nor that all data collected by non-governmental partners should be shared with the NSS. The integrity of the response to displacement should always be the primary consideration underpinning data collection.

National governments have the responsibility to organise statistical production and provide capacity for it through human resources, training, and funding. The international community should, however, support the development of quality statistics on displacement. The intention is to establish participatory and transparent processes that build on best practices for production of statistics. Cooperation between displacement-affected countries and international organisations, as well as between countries facing similar challenges, should also be established. International partners should seek to avoid duplication of efforts and to pursue collaborative processes that adhere to endorsed statistical frameworks, as well, as part of this effort.

As part of the public dissemination of IDP statistics, governments are encouraged to make IDP statistics, including metadata, available to international partners. As an example, this could include that in line with the existing UN Resolutions,⁽¹²⁹⁾ NSSs share their data with IDMC. Countries are also encouraged to make displacement statistics available to other organisations collating and publishing IDP statistics at global and regional levels. Procedures for standardised reporting to an international statistical body, such as UNSD, should be further explored.

D. The way forward

The main goal of the current report is to take stock and give recommendations for a statistical framework on internal displacement. After the finalisation of the Technical Report on IDP Statistics, the aim is to produce refined International Recommendations on IDP Statistics, including a complete statistical framework, and a Compilers' Manual with a set of Internationally Comparable Standards on IDP Statistics. These can then be adopted by the UNSC and implemented by national statistical authorities as well as relevant regional and international organisations.

As part of these recommendations, internationally comparable indicators will be developed. It is recommended that they are used by national statistical authorities. Implementing comparable global indicators will improve the quality and comparability of national and international statistics and improve capacity for evidence-based decision-making and planning on different levels.

Alongside the Compilers' Manual, it is recommended that a capacity building strategy and related implementation plan are developed at the global level. They should contain concrete capacity-building activities and recommended tools and processes for the implementation of the International Recommendations on IDP Statistics, including for example, standardised questions for use in census and survey tools where possible.

At the national level, plans should be developed to address capacity constraints in the production of statistics on internal displacement. Countries can benefit from concrete recommendations, tools and guidance made available through the Compilers' Manual. The manual is envisioned not only to be a document, but rather a collection of tools and guidance needed to produce quality statistics on IDPs.

National and international partners producing IDP statistics should take note of the proposed statistical framework for IDPs and ensure coherence of their data with these standards as much as possible. Even though production of official statistics is the responsibility of governments, the international society should dedicate resources to support capacity enhancement of national statistical authorities in the development of IDP statistics and support implementation of the recommendations set forth in this report.

All partners involved in the implementation of these recommendations should have their work guided by relevant protection and ethical data collection standards.

To move this work forward the UNSC should request the continuation of the Expert Group on Refugee and IDP Statistics and provide it with a mandate to follow up on the recommendations of this report: to produce refined International Recommendations on IDP Statistics, including a complete statistical framework for internal displacement, and a Compilers' Manual with a set of Internationally Comparable Standards on IDP Statistics and an associated capacity building strategy and implementation plan.

⁽¹²⁹⁾ General Assembly Resolutions A/C.3/68/L.63/Rev.1 from November 2013 and A/RES/70/165 from December 2015 on the Protection and Assistance of IDPs, as well as the UN Human Rights Council Resolution A/HRC/RES/32/11 from July 2016 on the Human Rights of IDPs.

GETTING IN TOUCH WITH THE EU

In person

All over the European Union there are hundreds of Europe Direct information centres. You can find the address of the centre nearest you at:
https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en

On the phone or by email

Europe Direct is a service that answers your questions about the European Union. You can contact this service:

- by freephone: 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 (certain operators may charge for these calls),
- at the following standard number: +32 22999696, or
- by email via: https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en

FINDING INFORMATION ABOUT THE EU

Online

Information about the European Union in all the official languages of the EU is available on the Europa website at: https://europa.eu/european-union/index_en

EU publications

You can download or order free and priced EU publications from: <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publications>. Multiple copies of free publications may be obtained by contacting Europe Direct or your local information centre (see https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en).

EU law and related documents

For access to legal information from the EU, including all EU law since 1952 in all the official language versions, go to EUR-Lex at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu>

Open data from the EU

The EU Open Data Portal (<http://data.europa.eu/euodp/en>) provides access to datasets from the EU. Data can be downloaded and reused for free, for both commercial and non-commercial purposes.

Technical Report on Statistics of Internally Displaced Persons Current Practice and Recommendations for Improvement

The “Technical Report on Statistics of Internally Displaced Persons: Current practice and recommendations for improvement” provides a stock-take of the current state of official IDP statistics and preliminary recommendations for a way forward.

The report is part of the mandate of the Expert Group on Refugee and Internally Displaced Persons Statistics (EGRIS), established at the 47th session of the UN Statistical Commission (UNSC) in 2016 to draft international recommendations on refugee statistics* and a report on the feasibility of producing comparable technical recommendations for internally displaced persons (IDPs). Approximately 10 countries and 5 regional and international organisations were involved in the IDP sub-group of EGRIS and the drafting of the seven chapters of the Technical Report. The work was led by the Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS) and the sub-group reported to the EGRIS Steering Committee.

Against the backdrop of an ever-growing number of forcibly displaced persons as well as mixed and scarce guidance on production of statistics on them, there is a need to develop standards for comparable and quality official data and statistics. Building on existing technical work and country experience, this technical report has been developed through a collaborative process by the EGRIS sub-group on IDP statistics which includes government bodies and international agencies responsible for IDP statistics. Due to its mandate, the report is restricted to a technical stock-taking of current practices and is not intended to provide comprehensive normative guidance on the production of IDP-related statistics. Nevertheless, the challenges and considerations that arise when capturing these statistics are discussed in the report. It also discusses which coordination mechanisms are requisite when producing IDP statistics and provides preliminary recommendations towards developing a statistical framework on IDPs. Throughout the report, case examples from different countries and references to existing practices are also presented in order to provide a multi-layered understanding of the challenges and potential ways forward when it comes to aligning production of IDP statistics.

The report’s overall goal is to advance discussions on the quality of statistics on internal displacement—especially statistics that are nationally owned—and to improve official statistics on IDPs. It is trusted that this report can also contribute to strengthening evidence-based public policy and national response to displacement.

*The “International Recommendations on Refugee Statistics” are presented in a separate document.

For more information

<https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/>



Publications Office