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Internal displacement is a global challenge. Ever since its enumeration started in 1996, the number of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs hereafter) has risen steeply. The only exception is in Africa, where the number of IDPs affected by conflict has fallen since 2009 (IDMC 2012a). In every part of the world, the affected governments as well as the international community are struggling to meet the challenges displacement poses to their financial and human resources. Displacement also has devastating effects on the lives of the displaced persons. Most often, they are forced into a situation of physical and psychological distress which is hard to normalise even years after the end of the displacement situation. Besides this, displacement has ramifications on the host society and the places of origin of the displaced persons. It is also believed to contribute significantly to the process of formal and informal urbanisation: sometimes positively; most often negatively.

The adoption of the Kampala Convention in 2009 led to a significant decrease in the number of IDPs in the African Union - though, there has been very little success in dealing with the crisis of internal displacement elsewhere. Despite the investment of substantial resources, internal displacement is on the rise and becoming increasingly protracted in all regions of the world. There have been very few returns and few acceptable solutions. Though the rise in internal and intrastate conflict is often cited as an important cause for this increase in the number of displaced persons, it is not the only one. So, why is it that many protracted displacement cases have not been solved despite huge investments? One cause for this failure is related to the way in which interventions are envisioned, both in terms of time and concerned stakeholders. Addressing internal displacement is indeed a complicated process requiring coordinated efforts by different levels of actors. In order to minimise the negative impacts of displacement, it is necessary to develop a system that addresses internal displacement from its very starting symptoms. Further, this requires a deep understanding of the dynamics of change that displacement brings to the socio-economic and political aspects of livelihoods of the IDPs, the people in the IDPs’ places of origin, and the host communities. Sociological theories in their observation of human nature point out that people’s experiences always affect their further strategy for life. This interrelation of experience and its internalisation shapes what decisions people take in different circumstances.
of their future life. It guides how people respond to crisis and make decisions - big and small. As the response to IDPs is necessarily also a response to this human phenomenon of dynamism, it has to take into account the IDPs' change in perceptions towards their future livelihoods, brought about by their experience of displacement and the reality of having to cope with their displaced lives. It further requires that the host communities are understood and given important roles in addressing the implications of internal displacement.

There is a deep concern among actors that there should be a durable solution to the phenomenon of internal displacement: IDPs should have their basic needs met and their human rights protected. National and international humanitarian and development agencies, the government, and civil society have all played their parts in responding to the situation of internal displacement according to their respective mandates, resources, and reach. This has definitely had some positive results. For example, in Nepal the issue of the return of property belonging to the IDPs was brought up in the very first step of resolving conflict, the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) of 2006. Through the Articles 5.2.81 and 5.2.92 of this agreement, both the Maoists and the government showed commitment towards addressing the concerns of IDPs. Similarly, the government was quick to adapt the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement (GPID) – the only international guiding framework for IDPs – for use in national IDP policy. This would not have been possible without the interest and effort of all the above-mentioned stakeholders. Despite these encouraging mechanisms in policy, much less has been achieved in the field. Our study finds that when responses are framed several gaps in understanding the IDPs and host remain. For example, most steps are taken after the effects of internal displacement become a matter of grave concern, when the displacement situation has begun to disrupt the fabric of normal life in the host areas. And yet it would be possible to take action much earlier, at the first signs of possible displacement.

The objective of this toolkit is to address these gaps by identifying actions that could be taken at different phases of internal displacement as well as the actors best suited to carry out these actions. The efforts taken should aim at avoiding potential displacement situations in the first place, and to meet the concerns of existing IDPs. We do not elaborate where things have gone wrong, but from our analysis of the IDPs' responses, we have tried to extract messages for intervention. We list what issues each actor could contribute to, how it could be done, and what process is required; we flag points that are important to consider at each step.

1 Article 5.2.8 stipulates that both parties, without political bias, show their commitment to let displaced people voluntarily return to their place of origin, rebuild the infrastructure damaged by war, and facilitate a dignified rehabilitation and re-socialisation of the displaced people.
2 Article 5.2.9 states that any problem arising in the above-mentioned process will be solved by the mutual consent of political parties, civil society, and local organisations, and that all agree individually and as a group to bear the responsibility of creating an environment to build up mutual relationships and alliances.
The toolkit is based on our research engagement on conflict and displacement in the last seven years in Nepal. In this research, we have used qualitative approaches and methods. It is derived from extensive interviews with the IDPs, members of the host community, the intervening international agencies and their local partners, government actors at different levels, and national and international experts on the issue of IDPs and conflict.

We hope that the toolkit will be useful to the concerned actors as a guide to help design their interventions. We hope it will benefit different stakeholders who are directly and indirectly concerned with IDPs by helping them to make informed about choices in what to do and on what things to be careful about. We hope it will assist these stakeholders in setting their objectives in an informed way, and in monitoring their outputs and outcomes. This would then help to improve the agencies’ practice and outputs on intervention regarding IDPs. However, the toolkit is not a comprehensive manual. It is not an exhaustive list of actions and actors. It does not contain comprehensive details of each step for the mentioned actors, as we presume actions for each situation are context-specific. We present the toolkit assuming that this will be used as a framework to start with. So we have simply listed potential actions for each actor at different phases, rather than elaborating on how each actor should carry out these actions. This is because we assume that each of the actors is knowledgeable in their specific jobs, and is well aware of the mandates, operational guidelines, and scope of their own agencies. As this is a general guidance sheet, it should be used alongside other specific manuals related to each activity. Also, as it is a toolkit for showing what actions different actors could possibly do in different phases of displacement, it does not delve into depth about the rights, experiences, interests, and needs of the internally displaced persons or about incentives to actors.

Finally, this toolkit is based on studies of conflict-induced displacement in Nepal, and has to be adapted accordingly to address local situations elsewhere, or displacement caused by other natural and man-made disasters. Despite its focus on conflict-induced displacement, the authors of the toolkit are mindful that internal displacement caused by natural disasters, climate change, and development projects are also large in scope, have similar grave consequences, and require equal attention.
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1.1 The global situation of IDPs

Internal displacement due to conflict is a very serious problem which is not being adequately addressed. With the decline in interstate conflicts, it was assumed that the number of IDPs\(^1\) would also decrease. Alarmingly, the figures show the contrary to be true: while the number of intrastate conflicts has fallen dramatically since the end of the Cold War, countries have reported a growing incidence of internal displacement. Ever since its enumeration started in 1996, the number of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs hereafter) has seen a steady increase to a total number of 26.4 million in 2011 (IDMC 2011). Except in the year 2008, when the number remained constant, their number only decreased in 2011. However, this decrease must be attributed to a large number of returnees; new displacements in fact totalled 3.5 million in 2011, an increase of 20 per cent over the previous year (IDMC 2012a). It is important to mention that the figures mentioned above only cover conflict-induced displacement, and do not include those that have been displaced due to the effects of climate change, natural disasters, or development projects. For example, every year around 10 million people are displaced by development projects such as dams, highways, and urban infrastructure (Cerena 2000). In 2011, 14.9 million people were displaced by natural hazards alone (IDMC 2012b). Thus, the crisis will continue to challenge us for a foreseeable future. Adding these figures to those displaced internally by conflict would make the numbers of internally displaced persons the highest among those forcibly displaced.

Observations of countries with a high incidence of conflict-induced displacement show that intrastate conflict is the main reason for internal displacement. So we can assume that if intrastate conflict grows, more people

---

\(^1\) Unless explicitly mentioned, IDPs throughout this paper refers to conflict induced IDPs.
are likely to become displaced within their own country rather than flee their country. IDPs now outnumber refugees – people who flee for the same reasons but cross the border of the country. The latest available figure for refugees is 15.2 million while that of IDPs is 26.4 million (IDMC 2012a). This decrease in numbers of refugees is due to the fact that neighbouring countries now try to curb the flow of IDPs from across the border by implementing strict visa regulations.

**Table 1: Estimates of conflict induced IDPs across the world in 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>IDPs (in millions) at the end of 2011</th>
<th>Change since the end of 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>+4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and South East Asia</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>+0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>-4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IDMC (2011)

Though their absolute numbers may look low, in several countries IDPs make up a large percentage of a country’s population. In Somalia, for example, 16 per cent of their total population remained displaced in 2010 while in Cyprus this figure was even higher, at 23 per cent (IDMC 2011).

**Table 2: Top 6 countries with the largest IDP populations in the world**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>IDPs at the end of 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>3.9 – 5.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>2.3 – 2.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>2.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
<td>1.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>1.5 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IDMC (2012a)

**Some global figures on IDPs** (from the IDMC 2012a)

- At the end of 2010, the number of people internally displaced across the world by armed conflict, generalised violence, and human rights violation reached 26.4 million. This is the first time since 2005 that the total number of IDPs has decreased from the previous year.
- Over half of the world’s IDPs were in five countries: Colombia, Iraq, Sudan, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), and Somalia all had at least one million IDPs.
• Though the total number of IDPs decreased in 2011 compared with the previous year, more than three million people were newly displaced that was a 20 per cent increase on the previous year. This largest new displacement was caused by post-electoral violence in Côte d’Ivoire (more than 1 million IDPs) and the “Arab Spring” (800,000 IDPs).

• Around 2.4 million IDPs returned to their places of origin in 2011. The largest return took place in Africa (1.5 million IDPs) in countries including DRC, Côte d’Ivoire, and South Sudan. This was followed by the Middle East and North Africa (571,000 IDPs).

• The region with the most IDPs was Africa, with 9.7 million IDPs at the end of the year, consisting of 40 per cent of the world’s IDPs. Around 1.9 million people were newly displaced in Côte d’Ivoire and South Sudan. However as compared to earlier year this was a decrease by 13 per cent (Table 1). Significant returns took place in South Sudan which hosted 40 per cent of the IDPs in Africa.

• There were 5.6 million IDPs in the Americas: an increase of 4 per cent on the previous year (Table 1). This was primarily due to the increase in the number of IDPs in Colombia and Mexico.

• In South and South East Asia, there were 4.6 million IDPs at the end of year; this number remained the same as in the previous year (Table 1). The largest new displacements in the region were reported in countries including Pakistan (190,000 IDPs) and Afghanistan (186,000 IDPs). However, this was the first time in six years that the

---

**Challenges facing IDPs**

**Immediate short-term challenges:**
- Inability to fulfil basic needs, healthcare, and education of children
-Denied of basic needs
- Loss of regular economic and social support systems and assets
- Threats to physical security
- Loss of property
- Vulnerable to health problems

**Long-term challenges:**
- Psychological impacts related to experience of displacement and conflict
- Remaining unrecognized by the prevalent law
- Loss of means of livelihoods
- Difficulties in integration
- Possible retaliation by host community
- Possible difficulties in starting livelihoods due to lack of skills
- Lack of economic and social assets to make a living
- Problems related to fulfilment of basic needs- food, water, shelter, medication, education
- Loss of social safety nets
- Loss of means of psychological fulfilment like recognition, identity, participation, and Autonomy
- Change of identity, recognition and participation
- Denied of civic rights
- Loss of documents
- Loss of social and political space
- Threats to physical safety
- Disconnection with the family and home community
- Issues of confiscated property and inability to protect or get back the property
- Dealing with victimised family members
- Psychological trauma related to separation of families, threats to left-behind families and helplessness to protect them
- Loss of social and political space in the place of origin
- Lack of environment for return
- Inability to get back own property and deal with secondary occupants
- Lack of relevant information about the ongoing situation in the place of origin and scope for return
- Multi-local households
- Uncertainty of return
- Protracted situation of displacement
- Siphoning away of help from intervening agencies
The number of IDPs has fallen. This was mostly due to the return of IDPs in Pakistan and Sri Lanka.

- In the Middle East, there were 3.9 million IDPs at the end of 2010, an increase of 10 per cent over the previous year (Table 1). This huge increase was in Yemen, Libya and Syria due to violence accompanying the “Arab Spring”.
- In Europe and Central Asia, the number of IDPs remained the same as in 2010 (Table 1).

1.2 The IDP’s situation in Nepal

In Nepal, the first incidence of displacement came to light during the Maoist conflict in 1996. However, people had been displaced before that due to development projects, the extension of national parks and conservation areas, and regular natural calamities like floods that hit the country each year. Even during the Maoist conflict, the displacement of people began before the Maoists took up arms in February 1996. However, this paper is based on the observation of IDPs due to the Maoist conflict. In the ten years (1996-2006) that followed the Maoists taking up arms, the armed conflict between the state and the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoists) displaced more than 10 per cent of the total population (IDMC 2009). As elsewhere, it is hard to give an accurate number of the displaced people. Their estimates vary from as many as 600,000 (Aditya et. al 2006) to 75,000 (IDMC 2006) people. Putting a number on IDPs in Nepal was complex for various reasons: unmonitored migration to India, voluntary invisibility due to the stigma attached to the concept of IDPs and fear of isolation from the host society. Besides this, in the initial phase, the IDPs were unaware of their status as “IDPs” (a concept relatively new to Nepali society) and so did not register themselves as such. This later changed, once again making enumeration difficult: a large number of people claimed to be IDPs, attracted by the benefits provided by the state and international organisations. Further, no organisation is in charge of keeping comprehensive data on the internal displacement situation (such as creating a national database). So the data on IDPs are rather scattered—collected according to the needs of the agency rather than for comprehending the overall situation of IDPs.

Displacement occurs largely from rural to relatively urban areas. Depending upon viability, people either travelled to safer regional headquarters or to the capital, or took refuge in nearby urban centres which for most of the rural villages are the district headquarters. Social networks and familiarity with the host community largely determine the choice of destination and how people manage their livelihoods in the initial phases of displacement. Other than their social networks in the host area, IDPs sometimes have few means to cope with their psychological distress and inability to provide for basic needs. Thus, there is a high level of dependence on the assistance of friends, relatives, and the
host community when the IDPs’ available resources are used up. For this reason, the host community occupies a central position in the displacement phase. However, interventions in policies and practices have ignored the presence and role of the members of the host communities. This has augmented hostility and mistrust between the host and the IDPs, making integration difficult and prompting the creation of formal and informal restrictions on access to the basis of livelihoods in the host area. These circumstances have made it difficult for IDPs to earn their living. For members of the host communities, this mistrust and latent conflict has created insecurity and disrupted their daily lives. For other actors such as development practitioners, this conflict may impede the smooth implementation of their interventions and also create jealousy and mistrust by the members of the host community especially when they are equally needy of material benefits.

In Nepal, the IDPs are not a homogeneous group. They have a diverse socio-economic and political status even after they are displaced. So they have different needs and varying ideas about possible solutions after displacement. The groups and their major concerns are presented in the box 1. In general, living conditions for most of the IDPs in Nepal are difficult. Though there are certain commonalities, the difficulties they face concerning livelihoods largely vary, based on differences in their socio-economic and political status after displacement (see box 1). What they have in common is that they have been forced to leave their places of origin out of violence or fear, and have had to leave behind in their villages different assets associated with their daily living. Such assets include resources that sustained their livelihoods like land and cattle, financial and social assets, and spaces needed for a dignified life. Apart from this, the main concerns differ depending on the group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 1: Categories of IDPs with their respective concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political and socio-economic elites</strong>, like local leaders and landlords, are often able to support themselves. Their main concerns are to have their confiscated property returned and to regain their lost status. However, in the present situation, they prefer to live in urban areas, visiting the rural areas to maintain their property and political status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Displaced professionals</strong> like teachers and health workers can find relatively well-paid jobs in the cities and towns because of their specialised skills and knowledge. In a situation of prolonged displacement, they use available opportunities to enhance their knowledge and skills and create networks and spaces that help them to establish themselves in the urban areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low-skilled people</strong> often live in precarious conditions, and can hardly afford to cover their basic needs. For most of them, their farming skills become irrelevant in the cities. They have very few other assets that enable them to make a living. They have weak social and political capital and cannot access support from support agencies. Their main concern is to have better income opportunities so as to fulfil their basic needs. But, as they had no significant assets to lose in their rural areas of origin, they would rather stay in the urban area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The restitution of property and regaining of political and socio-economic space back in the place of origin is of concern to those IDPs that are socio-economically better sustained and have significant political access in the urban area. While urban areas have provided opportunities for broadening their career horizons
and have provided a better job environment for some IDPs, their concern is having an income that is sufficient for providing better facilities to their families. For others, the lack of skills demanded by rewarding jobs in urban areas has resulted in their taking on menial jobs: they become labourers in stone quarries, sand mines, apparel factories, brick kilns, local porters, street vendors, drivers, conductors, domestic labourers, and construction workers. These jobs are irregular, mostly have unhygienic environments, and provide a level of income that is not sufficient to fulfil basic needs in the urban areas. Such IDPs have a weak socio-economic standing and political access and are concerned with getting a sustainable income source to meet their minimum basic needs in the host area. Interventions are sorely lacking: on the one hand, in terms of providing support for the IDPs to build their own livelihoods; on the other, in terms of creating the environment for their return and reuse of property.

The gender aspect of internal displacement is also significant. In rural areas of Nepal, the tradition of bartering means that cash is not mandatory to obtain many goods and services. But in urban areas, cash is needed for buying goods and services required for daily life. To earn cash, displaced women often move out of their houses and become economically active. This expands their role within the family, changes the household division of labour, and redefines family and social relations.

This marks a significant change to the nature of women's employment and household roles in rural areas: their new skills and knowledge change their capacities to pursue livelihoods. It also changes their emotional landscape: fear, anxiety, and their perceptions towards their future livelihoods. Similarly, there is also a change in women's participation in the community. This is particularly prevalent in communities which are emerging – like slum settlements and new communities where IDPs have settled. Through women's groups, displaced women have become active in social activities in their communities. These changes create a basis for redefining the division of labour and their roles in society in women-friendly ways. However, though women have become active agents in the household and community, these changes are yet to be recognised at the macro level. The macro-level polices and programmes on internal displacement still look at women from a "vulnerability" perspective and emphasise traditional protection issues. It ignores the fact that there are new needs of women in the new spaces and issues that they encounter after displacement. So in formulating policy, it is crucial to consult women's associations of internally displaced women and women of the host society.

Interventions through policies and practices provide an important context for influencing the livelihoods of people after displacement. In policy, the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement and the National IDP Policy of 2007 are the explicit frameworks that address the issues of IDPs in Nepal. However, they have failed to provide adequate ways of responding to the IDPs.
Some crucial causes of failure will be discussed in this report. In practice, there is an involvement of different tiers of actors. These can be divided into donor groups, international development agencies and their Nepali partners, international humanitarian agencies, the Government of Nepal, and local organisations at the field level. These actors have encountered different types of problems during their engagement with IDPs. Similarly, the IDPs have their own set of problems, both due to a lack of adequate response and due to the present form of interventions. It is in everyone's interest to understand these problems, to come up with a more adequate form of response. In the section below, we analyse the challenges faced by the different actors and the IDPs.

1.3 Challenges faced by actors engaged in responding to IDPs in Nepal

Internal displacement causes adverse impacts on various aspects of the life of IDPs while also posing challenges to the actors that respond to the situation. It is impractical to come up with an exhaustive list of challenges that the IDPs, the host community, or the intervening actors face, because the challenges are context- and time-specific. Nonetheless, below we have listed some of the most common major challenges faced by IDPs and the different stakeholders responding to the internal displacement situation. First, we give a summary of the general challenges faced by the actors and the IDPs. Then we give further details of the problems faced by each of these actors at specific phases of displacement: pre-displacement, the process of displacement itself, and post-displacement.

1.3.1 General problems

For the IDPs

- Inability to build their livelihoods and provide for basic needs
- Inability to make a decent living due to a lacking resource base and spaces for participation, collaboration, recognition, and contribution – psycho-social aspects that are needed for a fulfilling life
- Inability to protect or retrieve confiscated property and to make their desired use of it
- Difficulties in integration with the host community
- Not recognised by national policies

For international actors

- Lack of a comprehensive database – and thus, of sound knowledge – of the local dynamics related to internal displacement; for example, being unaware that there are different groups within the IDPs and that they have different concerns
• Difficulties in accessing the true IDPs and the different levels of vulnerability within them, and in distinguishing IDPs and host
• Danger of creating hostility between the IDPs and the host
• Inability to adequately address the needs of IDPs and thus failure of the intervention programmes
• Constraints on resources

For the host communities
• Unmanaged crowding resulting in constraints on resources, opportunities, and services
• Feelings of insecurity due to an influx of new people with diverse backgrounds who arrive in their community in distress

For the government
• Lack of comprehensive knowledge about the IDPs and resulting inability to address the actual needs and interest of IDPs
• Constraints on financial resources due to conflict and lack of technical expertise to deal with the situation
• Difficulties in reaching the most vulnerable within the IDPs.

1.3.2 Specific challenges during the pre-displacement phase

For the IDPs
• Physical and psychological threats from warring sides
• Women and children or the elderly often left to negotiate with the warring sides
• Psychological effects of having to decide to leave one’s place of habitual residence
• Problems related to safely carrying movable assets and protecting immovable assets
• Problems related to obtaining information about the destination
• Uncertainty about the future
• Moving with vulnerable groups like elderly, children, and disabled
• Lack of resources to support a smooth escape and settlement in host area
• Lack of pre-information, planning, and organising a new place to live
• Lack of information about possible conflicts in the route
**For other stakeholders**
- Inability to control triggers of displacement
- Insecurity related to uprooting of people
- Disruption in their activities.

**1.3.3 Specific challenges after displacement**

**For the IDPs**

**Immediate short-term challenges**
- Inability to fulfil basic needs including healthcare and education-related needs of children
- Denied of basic rights
- Loss of regular economic and social support systems and assets
- Threats to physical security from parties who caused displacement
- Loss of property
- Vulnerable to health problems

**Long-term challenges**
- Psychological impacts related to experience of displacement and conflict
- Remaining unrecognised by the prevalent law
- Loss of means of livelihoods
- Difficulties in integration
- Possible retaliation by host community
- Difficulties in starting livelihoods due to a lack of skills relevant for employment in the new area
- Lack of economic and social assets to make a living
- Problems related to fulfilment of basic needs: food, water, shelter, medication, education
- Loss of social safety nets
- Loss of means of psychological fulfilment like recognition, identity, participation, and autonomy
- Change of identity, recognition, and participation – and problems in dealing with those changes
- Denied of civic rights
• Loss of documents
• Lack of social and political space in the new community
• Threats to physical safety
• Disconnection with the family and home community
• Issues of confiscated property and inability to protect or get back the property
• Dealing with victimised family members
• Psychological trauma related to separation of families, threats to left-behind families and helplessness to protect them
• Loss of social and political space in the place of origin
• Lack of environment for return
• Inability to deal with secondary occupants
• Lack of relevant information about the current situation in the place of origin and scope for return
• Multi-local households and problems related to managing them
• Uncertainty of return and future
• Protracted situation of displacement
• Siphoning away of help from IDPs to other issues by the intervening agencies

For the host communities
• Overcrowding
• Stretched natural resources
• Pressure on infrastructure and services
• Competition in the labour market
• Possible discrimination
• Siphoning of jobs and opportunities to IDPs by intervening agencies
• Possible rise in social insecurities
• Possible conflict over resources
• Inability to utilise the skills of the IDPs
• Possible feeling of insecurity due to arrival of new people with diverse culture and background

For national actors
• Inability to stop or scale down the scope of displacement
• Difficulty in obtaining information and addressing concerns of different kinds of IDPs
• Inability to recognise the heterogeneity within the IDPs and respond accordingly
• Constraints on resources
• Displacement as an additional agenda to deal with in the face of ongoing conflict and transition
• Need for more human and financial resources
• Difficulties in dealing with possible conflict between the host and IDP population
• Difficulties in reaching the real IDP population
• Difficulties in reaching the most vulnerable among the IDPs
• Lack of comprehensive knowledge about the actual needs and interest of IDPs
• Lack of technical knowledge to deal with the situation
• Lack of trust by the IDPs
• Failure to achieve return-related goal

For international actors

• Lack of a norm that enables international authorities to oblige national governments to respond to the needs of IDPs
• Inability to understand the dynamics between the help required by the IDPs and the delivery of the intervention programme
• Difficulties in obliging warring parties to act according to universal humanitarian and human rights principles
• Lack of outreach to the IDP population
• Strict mandates and inability to adapt to the changing needs of each situation
• Difficulties in getting local stakeholders to coordinate
• Not reaching the host population
• Lack of trust from local people
• Failure to achieve intervention objectives
• Tendency to face retaliation from other groups in the host population.

Box 2: Falling outside the definition

Citizens of Nepal are not eligible for refugee status in India, and vice versa. This poses particular problems for people who have fled one country to seek refuge in the other, as they are ineligible for formal support or protection. And, since they have crossed a border, they fall outside the definition of what constitutes an “IDP”. This is the case of some 400,000 people (Aditya et al, 2006) who were displaced from Nepal due to conflict and fled to India. The reason they chose to cross the border, which is open, was that the cities of India were closer and more familiar to them than cities in Nepal, due to the practice of seasonal migration. However, this choice left them – as neither refugees nor IDPs – without assistance from either country’s government.
1.4 Lessons from the internal displacement situation

Based on the above challenges we can draw lessons from current interventions into the situation of IDPs, and use these to improve future interventions. In the section that follows, we summarise and discuss the main challenges; in the final section, we propose how to address these challenges.

Need for a comprehensive database

A sound database is one of the most important bases for designing responses and implementing programmes and policies, both for the government and international actors. At present, the different actors have scattered data about the IDPs based on their own needs. There is a need for these actors to come together to build a comprehensive database that provides a sound basis for designing programmes for intervention. As mentioned above, the lack of a database means that the intervening actors are unable to identify the differences between the different categories of IDPs, take into account their different needs and interests, or make programmes and policies that effectively address their respective concerns. Similarly, they cannot estimate the scope of the problems, thus failing to obtain a better overview before designing intervention programmes.

Expanding the definition to cover all categories of IDPs

The present definition of IDPs fails to cover all people who have been displaced by conflict (see example in box 2). People who cross a border to flee conflict are not considered IDPs; Our research shows that if there is an open border and a long history of cross-border migration, then people who are displaced by conflict may be more likely to flee across the border to somewhere that is familiar to them, than to go to a new place in their home country. In such case, if the country they flee to has not ratified the refugee convention, then they are not recognised as refugees either. So these people remain virtually unaddressed.

Another instance where displaced people remain virtually unrecognised is when their displacement is not directly caused by conflict, but where conflict causes their means of livelihood to no longer be viable, forcing them to be displaced. In Nepal, there are cases of professionals like teachers, health workers, traditional singers (“Gaine”), and blacksmiths who were forced to be displaced because they could no longer carry out their occupation during the conflict.

These are categories of displaced people that the present definition given in the Guiding Principles cannot address. The government should make special efforts to find about different types of displaced populations, and recognise them as IDPs.
Including host communities as key actors both in policy and programmes

Local and traditional leaders and institutions of the host community have played an important role in supporting IDPs, but have largely been ignored in policies and programmes. When the host community remains virtually neglected as an actor, it poses difficulties to all stakeholders. For the government and the intervening agencies, neglecting the host community makes it more difficult to run their intervention programmes and to access the true IDPs. For the IDPs, it causes conflict and hampers their integration and their use of the host community’s resources; host communities play an important role in giving this access to them. Besides this, the host community could play an important role in providing information, mediation, and integration of the IDPs and the programmes in the community.

Compatibility between needs of IDPs and programmes designed for them

Our study finds that most often, intervening agencies have their own expertise and mandates that take precedence over local contexts and needs when designing intervention programmes. In the case of IDPs, this is usually a universal concept of basic needs: food, potable water, medicine, education for children, and shelter. But the needs of IDPs according to the local context may be different. As the intervention programmes are pre-defined, the agencies who implement these programmes cannot tailor them according to the needs of the local context. Thus, there is no compatibility between the needs of IDPs and the programmes that are designed for them. Moreover, along with a defined mandate, most of the intervening agencies operate for a limited time frame while IDPs may need intervention beyond the time frame of the project.

Changing choices after exposure to urban life

Displacement changes the livelihoods and perceptions of the future for the displaced people. As the majority of people move from rural to urban areas after displacement, it accelerates the process of rural–urban migration and the changing livelihoods that this entails. Thus due to their livelihoods in urban areas and their experience of displacement, IDPs may make different choices and develop different interests than they had in the rural areas before they were displaced. Policies and response programmes should take these changes into account. The experience of the new place and the system of life there changes the perception of people towards things and practices of daily life and their attitudes towards the future. For example, women IDPs came to know about a better education system and were attracted by the possibility of education and healthcare facilities that were available to their children in the urban areas. Due to a lack of these possibilities in their areas of origin, they were found
to be unwilling to return following their displacement to places with better infrastructure and services for livelihoods (See annex 1). Youths who came to more urban areas preferred to stay there or try to relocate to other areas where opportunities for education and employment looked better, rather than return to their place of origin. Therefore, after displacement, in most cases, absolute return cannot be obtained. Having lived in urban areas for some time, there are high chances that households become multi-local, with some members staying in the host area and some returning to their places of origin. This always affects urbanisation and leads to an increase in slums and squatters. Thus interventions need to be guided by the actual needs of the displaced people, rather than by the standardised, global “basic needs” concepts. Local contexts must take precedence over the mandates of the intervening agencies both in terms of the service package and of the time frame of intervention.

**Envisioning a long-term enabling process**

For IDPs, a durable solution combines short-term humanitarian assistance with support in enabling them to build their livelihoods by themselves. Without a vision for a link between short-term support and a long-term enabling process, problems related to internal displacement cannot be solved. This disjuncture leads to other kinds of problems. For example, after short-term assistance ends, IDPs often end up in slums because they cannot afford rents in other areas. Similarly, children often drop out of schools and are forced into child labour when education assistance for them ends. When the focus is on long-term enabling processes – such as creating an environment for regular employment – the IDPs will be able to fulfil their basic needs by themselves, and solutions become durable.

**Linking internal displacement with the broader development agenda**

When displacement is seen as purely a humanitarian issue, it is not incorporated into the development agendas of a country. But displacement is also a development issue, as it affects people's livelihoods and living conditions. Often it is the same countries which have long conflict and protracted displacement situations where human life is precarious and the human development index very low. Thus it is necessary to see internal displacement beyond humanitarian concerns, and integrate responses to IDPs into the development agenda in their places of origin and in the host community. It is here where the collaboration of humanitarian and development agencies find much relevance. The actions of humanitarian and development agencies along with development planning and programmes of the government must be coordinated, to link solutions to internal displacement with the broader development agenda.
1.5 Conclusion

Incidences of internal displacement are growing around the globe. Thus, the crisis will continue to challenge us for the foreseeable future. It is important to learn from the mistakes of past interventions and incorporate this knowledge into the design of future interventions. Above, we presented the global situation and figures of IDPs, followed by a synopsis of the situation of IDPs in Nepal. We pointed out the challenges faced by the IDPs and the agencies that intervene in the situation of IDPs in phases of pre- and post-displacement. In Part 2 of this report, we take up each of the underlined problems in existing interventions and suggest which actors could intervene and how. We maintain, however, that as situations are time- and context-specific, it is impossible to come up with an exhaustive set of recommendations for interventions: these are just general guidelines.

***
2 Addressing the concerns of IDPs

2.1 Introduction

The following section is the heart of the toolkit. Derived from the analysis of the challenges in interventions to address IDPs’ concerns by different actors, it presents some issues to be addressed, the actors that could be involved, and the procedures and precautions that should be taken when addressing the respective issues.

In the toolkit, we address issues that are lacking in the present interventions and would help to better address the concerns of IDPs as well as those of the intervening actors. The actors listed are those that intervened in the issue of IDPs generated by the Maoist conflict in Nepal. However, the list is not exhaustive; it is just a mapping of some of the actors and stakeholders that, in previous responses to IDPs, were seen as the most important in the field. The actors can be recognised as government bodies, local actors (representatives of NGOs and partner organisations of INGOs in the field), international development agencies, international humanitarian agencies, and donor groups for Nepal. Of course, new actors can be accommodated within these broader categories of actors. The procedures are steps that can be taken to address specific issues. However, we would like to caution that such steps are context-specific. We do not intend this to be a comprehensive manual with specific details for each step; instead, it is intended for use as a framework to start with. So we have listed potential actions for each actor at different phases, but without elaborating how each of them should go with it. This is because we assume that each of the actors is knowledgeable in their specific jobs and is well aware of the mandates of their own agencies, its operational guidelines, and scope. As it is a general guidance sheet it should be used alongside with other specific manuals related to each activity. Also, as it is a toolkit for showing what actions different actors could potentially carry out in different phases of displacement, it does not delve into depth with regards to actors’ rights, experiences, interests, or incentives. In the remarks section we have listed the precautions that the actors should take when they address each issue. These precautions are derived from our study on IDPs in the last 7 years.

1 Some other specific frameworks relating to issues of IDPs have been listed as essential reading.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues to be addressed</th>
<th>Actors (by whom)</th>
<th>Procedure (how)</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Making a comprehensive database | Government (Central Level) Ministry for Peace and Reconstruction in coordination with Ministry of Home Affairs, Ministry of Finance, National Planning Commission, Central Bureau of Statistics, Ministry for Local Development Local-level bodies of the government, e.g. LDO, CAO, Women's Development Office, NHRC UN Agencies UNOCHA UNOHCHR UNESCO UNFPA UNDP UNHCR UN Habitat | The government makes an identifying and database committee consisting of international and local-level actors and representatives of the IDPs. The donors support the committee with a basket fund. The committee does the following:  
- Identifies key host areas by survey with members of the host community as well as government data on the mobility of population.  
- Carries out a survey of the status of the displaced population based on an assessment in the host area and information given by IDPs themselves. The data collected should be as comprehensive as possible. This includes information related to the IDPs' status in their places of origin, their conditions in the host areas, and also their choices regarding possible solutions. |                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|                        | INGOS NRC² IRC Care Nepal LWF MN USAID Save the Children PLAN OXFAM TDH OCKENDON INF Action Contre la Faim Action Aid MSF | • Identifies IDPs of different groups and involves them in collecting comprehensive information in coordination with the members of the host community and national and international actors.  
• Creates an arrangement to regularly update the database. |                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|                        | National Non-government actors INSEC CWISH CVICT Centre for Information Concerning Social Awareness Nepal Red Cross Society Population Watch SAFHR LUMANTI Rakshya Nepal Maiti Nepal | • Makes the database accessible to actors dealing with IDPs and to development agencies working in possible host areas.  
• International actors provide the financial and technical support to the team. |                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |

² Because the internal displacement monitoring centre run by the NRC is the agency that has the mandate and expertise to keep a database of conflict-induced IDPs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues to be addressed (what)</th>
<th>Actors (by whom)</th>
<th>Procedure (how)</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Donors</strong></td>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>From the above database, the actors should identify displaced persons that are not covered in the present definitions and reformulate policy definitions to include them. They can do this by carrying out the following steps: Making a policy committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>• Making a policy committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>• This policy committee draws on the data and information provided by the database committee to identify different groups of IDPs and different categories within each group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JICA</td>
<td>• This committee then assigns a Local Peace Committee to actively provide updates about the new types of displaced population that may not be covered by existing policies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td>• Based on information given by the LPC and the database, the policy committee makes recommendations for changes required in the present policies to the cabinet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>• The cabinet establishes an examination committee of national and international experts and representatives from political parties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The World Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IMF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SNV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Making a national definition that covers all categories of IDPs</strong></td>
<td>Central Level Government Body</td>
<td></td>
<td>From the above database, the actors should identify displaced persons that are not covered in the present definitions and reformulate policy definitions to include them. They can do this by carrying out the following steps: Making a policy committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Peace and Reconstruction in collaboration with Ministry of Law, Cabinet Home Ministry and National Planning Commission form a central level policy committee.</td>
<td>• Making a policy committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local-level Government Body</td>
<td>• This policy committee draws on the data and information provided by the database committee to identify different groups of IDPs and different categories within each group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Peace Committee</td>
<td>• This committee then assigns a Local Peace Committee to actively provide updates about the new types of displaced population that may not be covered by existing policies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Based on information given by the LPC and the database, the policy committee makes recommendations for changes required in the present policies to the cabinet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The cabinet establishes an examination committee of national and international experts and representatives from political parties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues to be addressed (what)</td>
<td>Actors (by whom)</td>
<td>Procedure (how)</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It further sets up a subcommittee which works on continuous updates of the database. The subcommittee includes local leaders of the host community in the LPC committee, and IT experts.</td>
<td>Stakeholders who are responsible for implementation of programmes and policies</td>
<td>The task can be accomplished in the following steps:</td>
<td>The members of the host community may not all be equally willing to cooperate. In this case, the local leaders should be trained to represent all concerns at Village Development Committee/LPC to prepare a common ground for consensus. As this is very context-specific, a committee made up of the representatives from local-level government structures, humanitarian and development organisations, and NGOs/CBOs should be given the mandate to act according to the needs of the situation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • The cabinet agrees to make timelines for updating the policy at set time intervals. | Central Government  
Policymaking committee, mentioned above | • The examination committee of the cabinet mentioned above discusses the issues at stakeholder meetings and decides how to include hosts in IDP policy. | |
| • It then changes the national policy and issues a directive for the INGOs and NGOs who have programmes for IDPs in the field. | Local government body  
VDCs, municipalities, Local Peace Committees, | • Local-level NGOs and INGOs work together to set up a committee that makes programmes on how to include the host society as important actors. | |
| • Local-level NGOs and INGOs dealing with the IDPs' situation make programmes to do the following: | INGOs  
NRC  
IRC  
Care Nepal  
LWF  
UMN  
USAID  
Save the Children  
PLAN  
OXFAM  
TDH  
OCKENDON  
International Nepal Fellowship  
Action Contre la Faim  
Action Aid  
MSF  
Caritas  
And their implementing local partners in the VDC level | | |
<p>| • The UN bodies, INGOs and NGOs dealing with the IDPs' situation make programmes to do the following: | Including the host community as important actors | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues to be addressed (what)</th>
<th>Actors (by whom)</th>
<th>Procedure (how)</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| NGOs                          | INSEC, CWISH, CVICT, Centre for Information Concerning Social Awareness, Nepal Red Cross Society, Population Watch, SAFHR, LUMANTI, Rakshya Nepal, Maiti Nepal, CREHRA, Women for Human Rights, DOCFA | - Make aware of the situation, needs, and interests of the IDPs to leaders of the host community, user groups, women’s and mothers’ groups, and other local associations in the host community by involving them in meetings of the LPC.  
  - Make targeted focus group discussions with them on how to intervene in the IDPs’ situation in their respective communities.  
  - Use these leaders to sensitise the host community on the status, situation, and needs of IDPs through locally organised programmes e.g. the showing of local dramas, lectures in local schools, and door to door “Ghar Dailo” programmes.  
  - Involve youth groups to accommodate IDPs in their community by organising, sensitising and involving them in the intervention programmes. This can be done by choosing youth volunteers in the programmes of the local partners of the humanitarian and development agencies. | The examination committee of the cabinet mentioned above forms a collaborative committee to monitor progress and evaluate if the objectives are met. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues to be addressed (what)</th>
<th>Actors (by whom)</th>
<th>Procedure (how)</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need for flexible mandates that can be tailored based on the needs of the IDPs</td>
<td>Chief actors involved in this process are the UN Agencies - UNOCHA - UNOHCHR - UNESCO - UNFPA - UNDP - UNHCR - UN Habitat and UNOCHA, UNOHCHR, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNDP, UNHCR, UN Habitat</td>
<td>The UN assigns a special body to look at the issues of IDPs. At present, it is effectively the UNHCR which has this mandate, although it is chiefly equipped to deal with the situation of refugees. This body forms a subcommittee which, together with the local-level actors, identifies the needs of the IDPs in the local context before making any interventions. The UN specifies in its Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement the need for space to tailor interventions based on local needs, and for a collaborative approach by the agencies involved. The subcommittee ensures that there are the following provisions in the programmes of the international and local-level partners: When making mandates keep space for modification based on feedback from implementing agencies. Involve government and non-government local partners, different categories of IDPs (identified from the above-mentioned database) and hosts in making intervention programmes. Make interventions based on preliminary field surveys done by involving local partners, hosts, and IDPs. Keep space for adaptation based on monitoring and evaluation at regular intervals. Hold regular meetings and discussions with IDPs, hosts, local actors, and local implementing partners to provide feedback on the monitoring process.</td>
<td>This is a great change to the present system of how the international community deals with the situation of IDPs. At the international level, there is a need for a focal organisation solely for IDPs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGOs</td>
<td>NRC, IRC, Care Nepal, LWF, MN, USAID, Save the Children, PLAN, OXFAM, TDH, OCKENDON, INF, Action Contre la Faim, Action Aid, MSF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>INSEC, CWIN, CWISH, CVICT, Centre for Information Concerning Social Awareness, Nepal Red Cross Society, Population Watch, SAFHR, LUMANTI, Rakshya Nepal, Maiti Nepal, CREHPA, Women for Human Rights, DOCFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues to be addressed (what)</td>
<td>Actors (by whom)</td>
<td>Procedure (how)</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devise long-term support programme that enables IDPs to build their livelihoods by themselves.</td>
<td>The following are the main actors who can take leadership in the field: Government Actors at central level: National Planning Commission, Ministry of Finance and MoPR</td>
<td>Based on the comprehensive data base and study by the UN subcommittee mentioned above, identify the long-term needs of the IDPs in the local context. Local-level NGOs identify the IDPs’ expectations and the present conditions of intervention. These findings on long-term needs and present conditions are shared with the government. The government’s policymaking body works with donors, INGOS, and UN agencies to make a link between immediate relief works for IDPs and long-term sustainable solutions. Each agency is assigned with both long-term and short-term interventions based on the expertise they have. In coordination with national and international actors, the planning commission and the development agencies make specific programmes to address the concerns of each group: those who want to return, those who choose to resettle elsewhere, and those who want to reintegrate in the host community. The implementing partners provide support for entrepreneurship, for example by providing seed money, training, and markets for the produced goods and services. Based on the information of the database, make provision for basic needs and services like education and free healthcare for the IDPs, until the situation of internal displacement ends.</td>
<td>In many cases, different members of the same family choose different options. So most often households stretch between the place of origin and the host community or place of resettlement. This has both positive and negative consequences. On the negative side, it makes assessment of needs tricky and difficult. On the positive side, IDPs can become development actors in their places of origin, providing them with jobs, giving them a sense of fulfilment, and, importantly, motivating other IDPs to return to their place of origin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UN Bodies**
- UNDP
- UNOCHA
- UNHCHR
- UNHCHR
- UN Habitat
- UNICEF

**INGOS**
- NRC
- Care Nepal
- LWF
- MN
- USAID
- Save the Children
- PLAN
- OXFAM
- TDH
- OCKENDON
- INF
- Action Contre la Faim
- Action Aid
- MSF

**NGOs**
- INSEC
- CWIN
- CWISH
- CVICT
- Centre for Information Concerning Social Awareness
- Nepal Red Cross Society
- Population Watch
- SAPHR
- LUMANTI
- Rakshya Nepal
- Maiti Nepal
- CREHRA
- Women for Human Rights
- DOCFA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues to be addressed (what)</th>
<th>Actors (by whom)</th>
<th>Procedure (how)</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using the database, find out about the IDPs’ choices regarding return, resettlement to another area, or reintegration in the host community.</td>
<td></td>
<td>All these programmes should be based on the consent of the IDPs themselves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devise separate programmes for each group in consultation with relevant partners: For those who want to return, the programmes should address the issues of secondary occupants and restitution of property, and make reconciliation efforts for regaining their social and political space. For those who want to reintegrate in the urban areas: along with host community leader, carry out a reintegration process involving host leaders as the main actors. For those who want to resettle in the new areas, make provisions for integration in the new areas, for example by using the host community leaders as mentioned above. Humanitarian and development agencies with the government should make joint programmes where each agency leads different clusters and provides short-term relief support as well as long-term support that enables the IDPs to build their livelihoods in the new areas. This can be devised by having coordination meetings, mapping strengths of each actor for specific jobs, and working together on that basis. The leadership can be taken by a UN agency.</td>
<td></td>
<td>In all programmes: accommodate the heterogeneity within the IDP populations based on their cultural and social orientation, gender, and age group and generation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues to be addressed (what)</td>
<td>Actors (by whom)</td>
<td>Procedure (how)</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This body identifies services and products for which there is demand in the area, suggesting relevant livelihood support skills and training to enable IDPs to produce those goods and services.

This committee, along with the host community members, identifies and arranges for markets to sell these products and services, and monitors the outcome.

***
References and essential readings


***
Attitudes of IDPs to returning to their area of origin

Annex 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Male %</th>
<th>Female %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparents' generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ghimire (2009)
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