



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
The UN Migration Agency



A GLOBAL NGO NETWORK
FOR PRINCIPLED AND EFFECTIVE
HUMANITARIAN ACTION

IOM-NGO Humanitarian Consultation

25 September 2018
Geneva, Switzerland

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations	2
Executive Summary	4
Introduction	4
Opening Remarks and Setting the Scene	6
Discussion.....	7
Session I: Addressing Internal Displacement in Protracted Crises through the Triple Nexus of Humanitarian, Development and Peace	7
Panel discussion – Addressing Internal Displacement in Protracted Crisis through the Triple Nexus of Humanitarian, Development and Peace.....	7
Discussion – Collective outcomes and data; Donor H/D/P ‘siloization’; Good practice examples of fora for nexus discussions.....	8
Break out Groups	9
Working with Local Actors to Address Internal Displacement Including Capacity Development and Participation in Coordination Structures	10
Opportunities and Challenges for Joined-up Livelihoods Programming including in Urban Areas	10
Accountability and IDP Participation	11
Discussion – Internal displacement and voting rights; Jargon, marginalization and bad data; Links between protection and livelihoods; Red tape and cash assistance	11
Session II: IOM-NGO Complementarities in Protection	12
Global Roles and Protection Operations.....	12
Concrete examples: IOM-NGO partnership in protection	13
Discussion – IOM’s protection mandate; Coordination in protection; DRR, community-based protection, and resilience; Silos in protection	14
Session III: Transitional Justice and Internal Displacement	15
Discussion – Context and transitional justice initiatives; IOM’s involvement in returns; Replication of good practices.....	16
Closing Remarks	18
Annex: 2018 IOM-NGO Humanitarian Consultation – Agenda.....	19

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

AAP – Accountability to Affected Populations

ACBAR – Agency Coordinating Body for Afghan Relief & Development

CCCM – Camp Coordination and Camp Management

CODHES – *Consultoría para los Derechos Humanos y el Desplazamiento* (Consultancy for Human Rights and Displacement)

CSO – Civil Society Organization

DRC – Danish Refugee Council

DRR – Disaster Risk Reduction

DTM – Displacement Tracking Matrix

EC – European Commission

ECHO – European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations

FRD – Foundation for Rural Development Pakistan

GBV – Gender-Based Violence

HDN – Humanitarian Development Nexus

HDPN – Humanitarian Development Peace Nexus

HI – Humanity and Inclusion

HLP – Housing, Land and Property

HNO – Humanitarian Needs Overview

HPC – Humanitarian Programme Cycle

HRP – Humanitarian Response Plan

IASC – Inter-Agency Standing Committee

ICVA – International Council of Voluntary Agencies

IDMC – Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre

IDP – Internally Displaced Person

IOM – International Organization for Migration

IRC – International Rescue Committee

MEAL – Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning

MHPSS – Mental Health and Psychosocial Support

NFI – Non-food Item

NGO – Non-Governmental Organization

NNGO – National Non-Governmental Organization

NWoW – New Way of Working

OCHA – Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs

PCRC – Post-Conflict Research Center

RC/HC – Resident Coordinator/Humanitarian Coordinator

RRF – Rapid Response Fund
S-NFI – Shelter and Non-food Items
SDG – Sustainable Development Goals
SSOPO – South Sudan Older People’s Organization
TWB – Translators without Borders
UN – United Nations
UNCT – United Nations Country Team
UNDAF – United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNGA – United Nations General Assembly
UNHCR – United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
WASH – Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WB – The World Bank
WVI – World Vision International

Executive Summary

The fourth annual IOM-NGO Humanitarian Consultation was held in Geneva, Switzerland on 25 September 2018 under the overall theme of internal displacement. The Consultation was jointly organized by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA).

90 participants attended the Consultation, including 61 NGO representatives of 39 NGOs coming from 20 countries: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Iraq, Ireland, Lebanon, Pakistan, South Sudan, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, and Yemen.

During the Consultation, IOM and crisis response NGO partners deliberated on the following topics:

1. Addressing internal displacement in protracted crises through the triple nexus of humanitarian, development and peace;
2. IOM-NGO complementarities in protection;
3. Transitional justice and internal displacement.

In panel discussions and breakout groups, participants exchanged views on how IOM and NGOs can work better together to protect and assist internally displaced persons (IDPs), while continuing to seek durable solutions, and strengthen and scale up preparedness and prevention efforts. There was widespread consensus on the need to go beyond siloed approaches to programming and focus on joint outcomes. Partnership among a range of actors was considered key to making the humanitarian, development and peace nexus (HDPN) work. Localization of these efforts was also highlighted as being essential to bringing forward the HDPN agenda, given the extensive experience and insight that local actors bring. Participants noted that NGOs and IOM need to improve protection outcomes and consider mutual complementarities in protection more systematically, possibly through building on existing practical, operational examples, which serve as a clear reminder of the links between locally driven responses and effective protection. Questions of justice, restitution of land and property rights and reparation for victims of human rights violations in conflict were other key issues discussed. The UN Special Rapporteur on Human Rights of IDPs presented, for the first time publicly, her report on Transitional Justice and internal displacement. Transitional justice panelists provided rich contributions, concluding with a call for continued dialogue between NGOs and IOM on this topic. Facilitating IDP participation, including through the use of accessible language, and the importance of data on internal displacement cut across the discussions.

Introduction

To mark the 20th anniversary of the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement (henceforth, the Guiding Principles) in 2018, a multi-stakeholder initiative was launched, known as GP20. The GP20 initiative is an opportunity to strengthen operational responses and partnerships to empower internally displaced persons in the responses and solutions that affect them, and promote a stronger political agenda on internal displacement.

Held since 2015, IOM's annual Humanitarian Consultations provide a unique opportunity for IOM and current and potential future NGO partners to come together and engage in strategic dialogue, explore new ways of working together, and build better partnerships to deliver greater impact. The Humanitarian Consultations are meant to help inform IOM policy, programming and coordination and are part of IOM's active engagement with NGOs globally and throughout the year. The Consultations

complement IOM's consultations with the wider civil society that extend beyond the scope of crisis response. As frontline crisis responder, IOM plans to regularly alternate the Humanitarian Consultations between Geneva and regional hubs: it is envisaged that Consultations are held in the regions every second year, in order to bring dialogue closer to field realities and to enhance the inclusion of, and accessibility for, local actors.

More than 40 million people are displaced within the borders of their own country by conflict. The number of new internal displacements associated with conflict and violence almost doubled, from 6.9 million in 2016 to 11.8 million in 2017, and 18.8 million people were newly internally displaced by disasters in 2017¹. The unprecedented volume – and duration – of internal displacement today reminds that much more needs to be done to prevent, respond to, and resolve internal displacement.

The objectives of the 2018 IOM-NGO Humanitarian Consultation were to

- Allow dialogue and exchange on how IOM and NGOs can work better together to protect and assist internally displaced persons, seek durable solutions, and strengthen and scale up preparedness and prevention efforts;
- Provide a platform for inputs from the NGO community to inform IOM's work on internal displacement;
- Encourage reflection on opportunities and challenges in defining collective outcomes in addressing internal displacement.

The discussions focused on

- Addressing Internal Displacement in Protracted Crises through the Triple Nexus of Humanitarian, Development and Peace – Pursuing opportunities and identifying challenges for joined-up livelihood programming including in urban areas; Fostering accountability and IDP participation; Working with local actors to address internal displacement including capacity development and participation in coordination structures.
- IOM-NGO Complementarities in Protection – IOM's and NGOs' respective roles and approaches to protection activities. What complementarities can be identified, towards better protection outcomes?
- Transitional Justice and Internal Displacement – Policy, research, and practice perspectives to gauge challenges and opportunities.

¹ IDMC. "[Global Report on Internal Displacement \(GRID\)](#)." (2018)

Opening Remarks and Setting the Scene

In a pre-recorded address, **William Lacy Swing, IOM Director-General**, emphasized that internal displacement is still one of the world's greatest tragedies, 20 years after the launch of the Guiding Principles, which remain the global standard for States and humanitarian actors. Despite the fact that the internally displaced represent the single largest group of displaced persons, they were not included in the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration. IDP issues are simply too sensitive politically. IOM is pleased to be joining key humanitarian and development partners in the effort to galvanize action on key areas of internal displacement, including through the inter-agency GP20 Action Plan. Supporting IDPs and host communities forms the vast share of IOM's crisis-related work.² In 2017, IOM reached some 29 million internally displaced persons including through preventing displacement, responding to displacement, and supporting solutions. However, and in the spirit of "leaving no one behind," greater attention must be focused on addressing the root causes of displacement and reducing risk and vulnerability, as the world struggles to find solutions for those being left behind in protracted crises. IOM recognizes that effective responses to internal displacement extend beyond the capacity of any single entity. Highlighting that the most effective way to implement the Guiding Principles is partnership, Director-General Swing concluded by expressing confidence that his successor, Mr António Vitorino, would continue to prioritize engagement with NGOs in crisis response.

Ignacio Packer, ICVA Executive Director, noted that soaring internal displacement was threatening to frustrate the goal of leaving no one behind. The Global Compact on Refugees and the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration presented a landmark opportunity to address forced displacement in all its dimensions, although the references to IDPs had been gradually shed from the latter. Mr Packer nevertheless underlined that there are also strong precedents from which to draw inspiration. Guiding Principles were borne out of robust mobilization to address the crisis of internal displacement, and a mobilisation of a similar magnitude was now urgently needed. The UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of IDPs had been a catalytic and rallying force behind the GP 20 Action Plan, and ICVA is fully committed to advancing the Plan, which underscores the prominence of national laws and policies in preventing and resolving internal displacement, as well as promoting participation of IDPs, timely data on internal displacement, and a focus on solutions. Mr Packer encouraged participants to keep these priorities in mind during the discussions, noting that all the themes on the Consultation agenda – the triple nexus, complementarities in protection, and transitional justice – were directly linked to the GP20 goal of reducing and resolving displacement through prevention, protection and solutions for IDPs. He concluded by emphasizing that the Principles of Partnership – equality, transparency, results-oriented approach, responsibility and complementarity – must continue to underpin the collective work of humanitarian actors, noting that it is the spirit of partnership that would help actors find better, more creative ways of working.

Vincent Houver, IOM Deputy Director of Department of Operations and Emergencies, reaffirmed IOM's commitment to continue working closely with NGOs at all levels. Protracted displacement situations are the new normal and old approaches are no longer fit for purpose. A solutions orientation is needed from the outset of a crisis, for which humanitarian, development and peace actors have to come together and IDPs need to be included in national development and SDG plans. At the collective level, humanitarian actors need to continue identifying practical ways to operationalize the NWoW

² IOM's approach to addressing internal displacement is spelled out in [IOM Internal Displacement Framework](#) (2017), including IOM's principles of engagement, commitments, foundation for action, strategic approach, and operational objectives.

and turn the nexus into tangible reality on the ground, where needs are recurring and displacement is protracted. However, this effort must not hinder principled humanitarian action. Early warning mechanisms and context-based humanitarian, development and peace instruments remain key. IOM's own efforts to transition were evident both in policy and in practice, and IOM sees mobility as a potentially crucial component of resilience that can open new pathways for solutions.³ Mr Houver concluded by emphasizing that much of the Consultation discussions linked up to the core responsibilities of the Agenda for Humanity and to the joint and individual commitments of humanitarian actors.

Discussion

Participants underlined that powerful narratives can help avoid sovereignty and security issues when working with IDPs. Linking narratives to the operational footprint is key to maintaining a continuous focus on the plight of IDPs. While operating in protracted crisis contexts is not always simple, the States concerned are pragmatic and usually open to dialogue on humanitarian access and work. Participants noted that yet more could be done in spite of the difficult political environment. Dialogue on fundamental rights remains more challenging, however. Participants stressed the need for context appropriate solutions and for formulation of collective outcomes at country level. Participants also highlighted the rapidly changing context, for NGOs but also IOM, with the process of development and adoption of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration.

Session I: Addressing Internal Displacement in Protracted Crises through the Triple Nexus of Humanitarian, Development and Peace

Linking humanitarian and development actions is vital in responding to protracted internal displacement on the ground, and the interconnection with peace is increasingly being recognized. Session I consisted of a panel examining how IOM and NGOs can work together on nexus operationalization and towards collective outcomes, with due consideration for the challenges for humanitarian principles, operations and partnerships. The panel discussion helped launch more specific discussions in break out groups that followed, where representatives of NGOs and IOM discussed working with local actors to address internal displacement; opportunities and challenges of joined-up approaches in livelihoods programming, including in urban areas; and accountability and IDP participation.

Panel discussion – Addressing Internal Displacement in Protracted Crisis through the Triple Nexus of Humanitarian, Development and Peace

Panel moderators reminded participants that UN Secretary General Guterres had [called](#) for a triangle of humanitarian, development and peace actors to work towards collective outcomes, based on comparative advantage and over multi-year time frames.

Louis Hoffman, IOM Head of Transition and Recovery Division, reminded that IOM has been engaged across the three nexus areas for a good couple of decades and, since 2011, has had a transition and recovery team with hybrid humanitarian and development-principled programmes tailored for crisis

³ IOM. "[Progressive Resolution of Displacement Situations \(PRDS\) Framework](#)" (2016).

environments that coordinate long term planning with emergency operations. Programming includes DRR, durable solutions, stabilization and recovery, peacebuilding and transition and often involves locally-driven approaches and participatory processes and also, importantly, requires flexibility from donors. Health is another area where IOM has advanced partnerships across the humanitarian-development spectrum. In all these areas, IOM relies on partnership with local actors – their local knowledge is crucial to thoroughly understand the dynamics at hand.

Alyoscia D’Onofrio, IRC Head of Geneva Office and Senior Director of Governance Technical Unit, emphasized outcomes as the most important concept, the transformative potential of which is often missed. The main obstacles to change in organizations are project cycles, silos and structures, and habit. The twelve-month reporting timeframe makes organizations unaccountable for changed outcomes. However, it is easier to point fingers at donors but more difficult for organizations to be more outcome oriented. Clusters are useful but breed replication and repetition; a stronger organizing around outcomes is needed. There are reasons to be optimistic – including multi-year funding. Collective outcomes will mean processes of collective change. There is a lot that can be done, not least establishing a shared definition of success.

Ester Ruiz de Azua, IOM Ukraine Emergency and Stabilization Programme Coordinator, described the context in Ukraine characterized by multiple, overlapping crises and the different realities that different tranches of the population face. The conflict impacts access to services and has damaged civilian infrastructure in the contact line. In some conflict-affected areas, development actors are not allowed to step in due to political challenges, while in other regions reforms are ongoing (for example, investment in water infrastructure). Since 2016, the RC/HC has insisted it was important for development actors to step in and invest in crisis-affected regions. HRP in 2017 and 2018 have strongly incorporated the HDN. OCHA is very active in discussions on economic recovery, infrastructure and access to services, as well as formulation of collective outcomes.

Wendy Barron, ACBAR Board Member, presented on nexus operationalization in Afghanistan from an NGO perspective. Since the Government does not have control over the entire territory, the nexus cannot be completely Government-led. Nexus engagement and advocacy should be tailored to avoid politicization and should recognize the specific challenges, especially those faced by humanitarian and peacebuilding organizations when working outside of the Government-controlled areas. The space for principled humanitarian action must be preserved intentionally and vigorously, which may mean programming that does not fit Government-led plans or processes. The UN system needs to recognize others as strategic partners and adopt a genuine partnership approach. For example, there are no NGOs or donors at the UNCT which is problematic. ONE UN integration needs to be broadened to include NGOs and other local partners.

Discussion – Collective outcomes and data; Donor H/D/P ‘siloization’; Good practice examples of fora for nexus discussions

Participants emphasized that **data** was necessary to design collective outcomes that are nationally-agreed and context-specific, but also to monitor progress against these outcomes to get a clear sense of progress or regress. However, the question remains to what extent it is possible to embed IDP indicators in national reporting systems so as not to overburden national governments, particularly relevant as governments already have burdensome systems for reporting on SDGs. A good practice example in that regard is Ethiopia’s five-year **development plan, which incorporates the issue of IDPs**. Examples from Ukraine were shared of data collection exercises that can potentially inform collective outcomes. These include holistic assessments of infrastructure and services in conflict-affected areas,

or the humanitarian and development datasets that were collected by a Government ministry with the support from the WB and that could possibly inform the transition from the cluster system to the Government. In Ukraine, the idea is to **use the already developed UNDAF**, whose Pillar Four focuses on the Eastern conflict areas, **to develop collective outcomes**. Participants especially stressed that there can be no progress on collective outcomes without **a more collective agreement on a framework within which to collect and use data efficiently**.

Participants pointed out that **donors**, and the different H/D/P parts within them, are not good at talking to each other yet. NGOs should work on developing and enacting good practice models to influence how donors collaborate within and amongst each other. In Ukraine, donors across the board are averse to investing in conflict affected areas. The existence of a development donors group and the formulation of donor strategies in Ukraine are encouraging signs; nevertheless, there remain different funding cycles and mechanisms, i.e. ECHO focuses on the conflict zones while EC supports the other areas. Similarly, participants acknowledged that stabilization donors are not always consistent partners in helping bridge HRP and UNDAF funding.

GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLES – Towards Collective Outcomes
<p>Inclusion of internal displacement in UNDAFs</p> <p>Internal displacement is incorporated in UNDAFs in Ethiopia and Ukraine, which can be used as basis when thinking about collective outcomes.</p> <p>NGO forum ACBAR to leverage NGO involvement in triple nexus discussions in Afghanistan</p> <p>In 2018, ACBAR and ICVA organized a triple nexus workshop, which helped convey to donors the NGO perspectives on how to work together in the nexus, and subsequently led to a draft paper aimed at UN agencies to help advance work on aligning the three areas of the nexus.</p>

Participants asked for practical **examples of fora or processes that bring together different actors** in the nexus, especially since NGO coordination mechanisms in many countries involve humanitarian actors only. ACBAR from Afghanistan, highlighted by participants as one of the few exceptions where development actors are also

represented, described their efforts to gather NGO perspectives on the nexus through a workshop organized in close collaboration with ICVA (see box above).

Participants argued that too much focus was given to life-saving responses to the detriment of **root causes**, including climate change, given that climate change is likely to generate more displacements in the future.

Break out Groups

Break group recommendations centered on the following three axes:

1. **Whom to engage** – Participants recommended the need to engage different actors, including non-traditional actors, for example women's groups, local actors, host- and other affected non-displaced communities, and donors.
2. **How to engage** – Participants highlighted the need to empower and include IDPs (e.g. through IDP clubs), pay attention to use appropriate (local) language(s), simplify processes and make them more accountable and realistic, build on existing coordination fora and good practices (e.g. twinning), and build capacity long-term.
3. **What to engage on** – Participants outlined several areas of engagement including on education (e.g. teaching mother and host community languages), housing arrangements and rights, voting rights for IDPs, less cumbersome demands regarding cash transfer programming.

Collective outcomes can allow taking a broader focus. Various linkages came up repeatedly in discussions – linkages between local actors and AAP or between protection and livelihoods, with gender perspectives as a cross-cutting issue. A lot of nexus operationalization comes down to breaking silos among aid providers, and between aid providers and the affected communities.

Working with Local Actors to Address Internal Displacement Including Capacity Development and Participation in Coordination Structures

GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLES – Capacity Building
<p>Rapid Response Fund (RRF)</p> <p>IOM's Rapid Response Fund (RRF) – active in South Sudan, Sudan and Ethiopia and possibly expanding further – disburses funds to NGO partners while investing in their technical and organizational capacity, i.e. by reviewing their financial management systems and programmatic implementation experience and sharing recommendations; through field visits by IOM technical staff to strengthen the technical capacity of the NGO; by supporting them to meet relevant Cluster reporting requirements.</p> <p>Twinning in Afghanistan</p> <p>In Afghanistan, a two-year twinning initiative sees 24 NGOs twin with 24 international agencies, with the ultimate objective to enable local NGOs to apply for funding from various international donors.</p>

For IOM, Grand Bargain measures of success are key. Within the localization workstream, IOM focuses on the inclusion of local actors in coordination structures and on capacity building, among others. For NGOs, sustainability of funding to local actors remains key to the effective localization.

There is too much focus on **accounts-ability instead of accountability:** financial

systems should be simplified.

Break Out Group Recommendations WORKING WITH LOCAL ACTORS TO ADDRESS INTERNAL DISPLACEMENT
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Importance of local language and reporting systems – more flexibility is needed on evidencing 2. Leverage local NGOs and CSOs for AAP – while making sure to tailor to the local context 3. IOM should convene local discussions with NGOs 4. NGOs should engage proactively, regularly, and early in HPC including HRP and HNO, using NGO fora for analysis

Capacity building should be longer-term instead of the prevailing short-term interventions. Building of capacity of local actors – notably for advocacy – should be prioritized in programme design.

Opportunities and Challenges for Joined-up Livelihoods Programming including in Urban Areas

Break Out Group Recommendations JOINED-UP LIVELIHOOD PROGRAMMING INCLUDING IN URBAN AREAS
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bring in local actors and authorities to understand the intersection of H-D-P. Respect cultural aspects 2. Have appropriate fora where humanitarian, development and peace actors can develop collective outcomes. Start local! 3. In programme design, strengthen social cohesion – for example entrepreneurship grants not just for IDPs but also host communities 4. Base livelihoods on market dynamics, look at job creation, increase opportunities for women to access the labour market

Diverse actors have a role to play in contributing to livelihoods objectives: peace and security actors, local authorities, national government, the private sector, employers, host communities, affected populations. Incorporating gender, age and disability

concerns remains vital.

GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLES – IDPs in Urban Areas
<p>IDP Club</p> <p>In Zhytomyr, Ukraine, a local NGO will provide space for IDPs to meet, socialize, and discuss solutions to problems that affect them – an IDP club – with participation not only from displaced persons, but also local residents.</p> <p>IDPs on the board of a local organization</p> <p>IDPs sit on the board of a local NGO that provides entrepreneurship opportunities. Together with access to micro-credit and trainings in fund-raising, these measures help transition IDPs to self-reliance.</p>

It is necessary to think beyond the triple nexus by **considering**, for example, **transitional justice and land issues**. There was widespread recognition of the need to **break down silos** to better complement the different H/D/P responses, which should

integrate **local needs, demand, and capacity**. At the same time, livelihoods need to be linked with other sectors such as education and microfinance.

Break Out Group Recommendations ACCOUNTABILITY AND IDP PARTICIPATION
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Communication with affected populations must be accessible to them (e.g. language used in surveys). Accountability mechanisms must be translated in all relevant languages 2. Deliberate efforts are necessary to incorporate perspectives of women's and faith-based organizations and leverage their capacities for accountability purposes 3. Historical context must be understood, as a means to better understand the intersecting vulnerabilities. Affected communities need to participate in definition and review of collective outcomes

Accountability and IDP Participation

Participants considered that an in-depth **review of multitude of existing accountability mechanisms** was needed in order to come up with a better mechanism – not a new approach – that all relevant actors can feed

into as much as possible, with a point for centralizing data that would be accessible to all.

Special care must be taken so **jargon does not marginalize** the affected persons or other actors.

In-depth and systematic organizational reviews are needed to understand how organizations are built for purpose for HDPN and come up with a **theory of change to reduce artificial barriers to the nexus**. One should recognize that outsourcing MEAL functions does not help build internal organizational capacity in this regard.

Non-traditional actors should be engaged for AAP – for example, faith-based and women's organizations, child protection committees, market-based organizations – and their perspectives incorporated. Challenges and barriers need to be identified to better understand why these actors are not engaged more to strengthen accountability. WVI, for example, is undertaking an internal assessment of the barriers to a stronger engagement of non-conventional actors.

Discussion – Internal displacement and voting rights; Jargon, marginalization and bad data; Links between protection and livelihoods; Red tape and cash assistance

Interventions from the floor emphasized the importance of the issue of voting rights for IDPs and of supporting IDPs to advocate and campaign in support of their voting rights.

Participants acknowledged the need to **overcome jargon and technical language** when communicating with communities. In particular, they raised the related issue of multilingualism, providing an example of an accountability survey whereby an inadequate translation process and

insufficient training of enumerators resulted in collection of low-quality data. More generally, the focus should be on the participation of all people affected by internal displacement, including host communities, and not of IDPs only.

The importance of education and of **teaching the mother tongue** was stressed, as well as importance of teaching the language of the host community/country.

Participants underlined the **protection aspect of livelihoods interventions**, especially highlighting the need to consider gender perspectives and the position of vulnerable groups. Links were articulated between protection and livelihoods in conflict contexts (where livelihoods can be intertwined with conflict dynamic) and in protracted situations (with issues such as access to education). Participants suggested to start looking at those intersections programmatically (i.e. beyond mainstreaming). Participants also reminded that IDPs with temporary housing arrangements often faced challenges in accessing opportunities for self-employment and entrepreneurship.

Participants raised the issue of **restrictions faced by local organizations when delivering cash assistance**. Local organizations have difficulties to get certified, register with the government, and access the populations. Most of these restrictions are due to the regulations of the inter-governmental body Financial Action Task Force. IOM, as an implementer of cash programming but also a UN related organization, could advocate for less restrictions.

Session II: IOM-NGO Complementarities in Protection

The objective of this session was to identify elements and opportunities for IOM-NGO complementarities in humanitarian protection in internal displacement contexts, on policy and field levels. At the session, a six-member panel consisting of IOM and NGO representatives (DRC, South Sudan Older People's Organization, and TWB) elaborated on their respective organizations' global perspectives on protection. Panelists also highlighted specific examples from protection operations, including from North-East Nigeria and South Sudan.

Global Roles and Protection Operations

Nadia Akmoun, IOM Protection Officer, explained IOM's mandate and role in humanitarian protection. In humanitarian crises, IOM seeks to ensure that the protection of the rights of migrants, including displaced persons and affected communities, is upheld and their needs fulfilled. IOM fully adheres to the IASC definition of Protection and the IASC Statement on the Centrality of Protection in Humanitarian Action. IOM mainstreams protection across crisis response, integrates protection approaches within its assistance interventions, and undertakes specialized protection activities, including in family tracing, prevention and response to GBV, countering human trafficking, MHPSS, support with land, property and reparations, among others. It is in joint action with partners that human dignity can be upheld. How can IOM and NGOs further capitalize on comparative advantages to operate together – or in transparent and constructive dissent – towards agreed upon protection priorities? Leveraging on their different approaches, how can IOM and NGOs achieve mutually reinforcing effects on protection outcomes, for example in analysis of data, advocacy, case management, protection analysis/assessment and protection monitoring?

Kathrine Starup, DRC Head of Protection [force majeure prevented Ms. Starup from attending the Consultation in person. The following points, communicated to the organizers by Ms. Starup for the purpose of reporting, were in part presented at the event by IOM field protection coordinator Dina Parmer], underlined the different mandates, roles and responsibilities: DRC and other NGOs are 'self-mandated protection agencies' while IOM engages in 'supportive protection'. Both IOM and NGOs

engage with duty-bearers and rights-holders. Opportunities for complementarity that arise from these respective roles – if pursued together with the rights-based approach – include linking local to regional advocacy efforts *vis-à-vis* authorities on protection, or leveraging positioning for community-based protection. Complementarities in protection across project cycle should be explored (beyond the existing complementary approaches to evidence and data): complementarities in implementation, including possibly a results-based, multidisciplinary approach that could include setting collective protection outcomes; complementarities in M&E(AL), with opportunities for joint learning, joint evaluations, and AAP. Finally, NGOs wish to understand better what IOM's protection activities and advocacy look like in an internal displacement context.

Dina Parmer, IOM Field Protection Coordinator, emphasized the question of the concrete operationalization of the centrality of protection: in terms of funding (cycles of three/six/nine months are difficult timelines for protection) and of the different UN and NGO protection mandates, which sometimes compete or operate in siloed structures. Common narratives need to be strengthened and information bearers consulted, but often are not. IOM's multi-sectoral approach (MHPSS, shelter, health, etc.) represents an opportunity for protection actors to engage multi-sectorally. IOM and NGOs need to collaborate more in area-based approaches and see how different interventions link up, in terms of financing or model for collaboration. Partnership is often expected to be defined by money, when in fact frequently it is really about area-based interventions. IOM-NGO complementarity on data lies in ensuring that IOM contributes indicators to NGO-led process of collection, or conversely that NGOs assess indicators included in DTM. IOM intends to invest in interacting with NGOs to build capacity, whether in protection or other sectors.

Concrete examples: IOM-NGO partnership in protection

Agnes Olusese, IOM South Sudan Protection Officer, introduced IOM's protection portfolio in South Sudan which cuts across the protection continuum. IOM mainstreams protection, e.g. takes into account the context to understand if risks are associated with receiving certain NFIs at a specific location. IOM integrates protection – for instance, WASH programs integrating GBV prevention and response, or S-NFI or MHPSS interventions that deliver on their objectives while also empowering women economically and socially. IOM provides sub-grants to NGOs to implement stand-alone protection projects in different locations where IOM does not have a presence, going back to complementarity and leveraging local NGOs' deep reach and established relationship with communities. IOM works closely with these NGO partners to develop capacity to deliver quality projects. To this extent, IOM is contributing to localization and sustainability of response.

Donato Hakim, SSOPO Executive Director, explained that SSOPO – a grantee of IOM's Rapid Response Fund (RRF) – conducts protection projects in South Sudan supporting psychological and physical wellbeing and self-reliance. To illustrate, SSOPO mobilized a community support group to help an elderly man left behind in the conflict build his shelter. Grass-roots community protection is a sustainable approach that should be more strongly supported. Technical expertise of SSOPO can capacitate IOM to work with older people, or on community-based approaches, and access communities left behind, or service inaccessible areas. Going forward, critical gaps include short and intermittent funding opportunities, which negatively affects ongoing protection interventions. Implementing partners lack capacity in specific areas, for example case management, and IOM is invited to invest in more capacity in these activities.

Elie Kemp, TWB Head of Crisis Response, described how, in North-East Nigeria, IDPs speak a total of 30-40 languages but overwhelmingly receive materials in one or two languages only. Language in humanitarian action needs to be looked into more systematically. Language barriers can skew the

analysis of protection and other humanitarian needs, impede access to information and ability to communicate needs, and also compound other drivers of vulnerability. In North-East Nigeria, TWB provides terminology and translation support to the whole MHPSS sector, improving information on language and communication needs among IDPs as a basis for developing more effective communication strategies within the sector. Going forward, analysis should focus on how language is assisting protection outcomes. TWB routinely collects household-level information and will need to find a safe way to centralise and share that data.

Discussion – IOM’s protection mandate; Coordination in protection; DRR, community-based protection, and resilience; Silos in protection

Participants asked whether IOM was seeking a **formal protection mandate**. IOM explained that the Organization has held an engagement with protection of migrants for years and may not necessarily need to seek an even more formal protection mandate.

In the discussion, participants inquired into the **coordination of protection activities** between IOM and other actors and governments in IDP settings, and with UNHCR in mixed flows. IOM explained there was usually consultation with the government and in IDP contexts, constant communication, coordination, and close collaboration with UNHCR. Similarly, in mixed migration contexts, in Libya for instance, communication with UNHCR is ongoing on a daily basis at all technical and management levels. In view of the complementary role of the two agencies, the points of collaboration in country contexts need to be clear.

An ongoing partnership between HI and IOM in South Sudan was highlighted, whereby **HI builds capacity of IOM** staff in Bentiu on how to better take disabilities into account to improve IOM’s services.

Participants asked for good practice examples of **integrating DRR and protection**. IOM referred to the Organization’s work with Mercy Corps to develop toolkits for community risk mapping that were then used in CCCM interventions.⁴ Resilience is a **long-term process** linked to community-based protection; how do actors collectively work to identify a space in which they could follow through its various phases? **IOM-NGO partnerships required for this would have to be more long-term**, which in turn can drive learning.

The discussion emphasized that protection should not be a service but a right; how to make sure protection is not seen as an additional service within a portfolio of an organization like IOM?

Participants highlighted **silos in protection**, a sector-wide problem existing across the UN and NGOs. What is more, not a single donor provides money for integrated protection programs. Indeed, getting different protection actors to talk to each other was noted as one of the biggest challenges in protection coordination – for example, it may take months for child protection actors to start talking to counter trafficking actors, not to mention for protection actors to start speaking to those outside of protection, e.g. shelter actors. **Projectization** was singled out as another real challenge, and participants noted it will remain so, until organizations take a bigger lead in driving the donor agenda and start using the in-country coordination mechanisms to trigger a cross-sector debate. The former, it was stressed, demonstrates why **complementarity** is so central to outcomes – the diverse expertise of various actors needs to be acknowledged in breaking silos. Information sharing was emphasized as

⁴ Report forthcoming at <https://www.mercycorps.org/research-resources/resilience/strategic-resilience-assessment>. For more information see USAID. “[Resilience in Action: Climate & Ecosystem-Inclusive Disaster Risk Reduction](#).” (2018)

another challenge – S-NFI actors need to be able to look at protection risk analysis, meaning that protection actors have to be willing to **share information**.

Acknowledging IOM's multi-sectoral capacity and direct implementing model, participants asked if, as a UN related organization and to support localization, IOM was considering **decreasing direct implementation**. IOM responded that conversations had been ongoing, including with donors, about how to work with local actors. IOM will retain its operational character.

The importance of **coordinated advocacy** was acknowledged, given that **protection** was sometimes not seen **as life-saving**. Noting that protection issues like early marriage, GBV, and recruitment of child soldiers cannot wait until a war is over, participants invoked instances where protection had not been seen as lifesaving within the HRP process and underlined that humanitarian actors have the moral responsibility to educate others and show that protection influences long-term development. Participants also provided examples of cases of the inverse happening – i.e. only projects with a link to protection having a chance at being funded within the HRP process, which raises questions on **evaluation and feasibility of objectives in protection**.

ICVA asked if there had been developments on projectization at IOM, as this creates issues with continuity of protection interventions. IOM mentioned ongoing in-country discussions with donors on handing over and ensuring continuity, which required continued financing. Constant dialogue with donors, partners, and collaborating organizations on the ground is needed. IOM's added value is holistic crisis response that includes transition, recovery and development, which is critical because of how separate these two important funding sources can be. Further, it is not always clear that donors are genuinely committing to this approach. Protection is always underfunded in HRPs, which signals a broader problem.

Session III: Transitional Justice and Internal Displacement

The objective of this session was to examine aspects of transitional justice, increasingly recognized as a key element in achieving durable solutions for internal displacement. The panel highlighted perspectives on policy; research reflecting on social cohesion; IDP participation in policy development, implementation and monitoring; post-conflict reconciliation; and perspectives of local NGOs on transitional justice.

Cecilia Jimenez-Damary, UN Special Rapporteur on Human Rights of IDPs, presented for the first time publicly her report to be released at UNGA in October 2018, on transitional justice and internal displacement. Principles of transitional justice⁵ are referenced in the IASC Durable Solutions Framework. Transitional justice actions support prevention of displacement and can help strengthen the rule of law and accountability for any arbitrary displacement, reducing the risk of future displacement. They also contribute to durable solutions, where reparation and restitution have particular relevance. To achieve a transitional justice approach, a gendered approach must be applied and families with missing persons taken into account. Robust justice requires participation of IDPs and must be rooted in the fundamental non-discrimination guarantee and proactive investment in local capacities.

Nadia Siddiqui, Social Inquiry Co-Director, presented research led by Social Inquiry on social cohesion in Iraq. The research explores the social meaning of displacement and perspectives of ordinary people. Research teams are made up of affected people, which takes into account the impact of researchers'

⁵ The right to truth, right to justice, right to reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence.

social profiles and reflects efforts to contribute to social cohesion through programme design. Through this type of research, conflict-affected populations may influence discussions on transitional justice. The findings challenge some widely held assumptions, for example that joining extremist forces like ISIS is always voluntary, or that such actors are the only ones having committed abuses. Findings especially highlight that the underlying causes of conflict need to be addressed. However, in spite of the clear need for a wider focus on social cohesion, the discussion of transitional justice in Iraq remains centered on criminal justice only.

María Angélica Gómez, CODHES Coordinator of Gender and Ethnic Approaches, discussed participation as a right of IDPs in Colombia, emphasizing that participation in important decisions is enshrined in the Constitution. A 2011 law put in place National Victims Participation Roundtables (VPRs) – a system to collect and systematize the needs of victims; advocate; track plans and programs; request and perform accountability, with participation of IDP representatives. After 2016, situation has significantly deteriorated with victims losing political rights and leaders being assassinated. CODHES recommends VPRs for formulation of IDP policy because VPRs have the capacity to advocate and propose strategies and programs on national, regional and local levels. Also, inclusion of participation in legislation can allow for an incremental process of transitional justice and recognition of political rights limited by forced displacement.

Velma Šarić, PCRC President, discussed PCRC's work in Bosnia, where ethnic divisions remain high and transitional justice has been confined to criminal justice, with other mechanisms such as truth and reconciliation or reparation lacking. PCRC seeks to transform public opinion, represent voices and foster intercultural understanding, for example use media to combat hate speech or engage in peace education, including a project that celebrates stories of ordinary people who rescued others at times of mass atrocities. Photography and film are used to highlight several national journeys of transitional justice or tell stories of survivors of sexual violence in conflict to prevent its reoccurrence. Photo exhibitions are held in busy public spaces to amplify accessibility. The aim is to produce and promote media content that could serve as the axis of transitional justice process in Bosnia.

Carlotta Macera, IOM Iraq Project Officer, discussed capacity of for reconciliation of local civil society actors, whose identity has been substantially polarized in the conflict. IOM Iraq collects quotes from NGOs and finds they use terms *human rights* or *social cohesion* rather than *transitional justice* to characterize their work. NGOs are the first victims of the conflict and any reconciliation process needs to involve them, if local actors are to work on durable solutions. Most initiatives related to transitional justice are top-down, lack transparency, and fail to consult the victims, making it impossible to understand, capture, and address the root causes of the conflict. Donors are only focusing on physical infrastructure, not on rebuilding the fabric of society. There is no protection for human rights defenders and as a consequence they are afraid of speaking out.

Discussion – Context and transitional justice initiatives; IOM's involvement in returns; Replication of good practices

Participants argued that in some contexts and under some conditions, capacity building of local minority actors with the view to supporting transitional justice may risk leading to further fragmentation instead of helping resolve conflict, for example in Syria. The discussion also highlighted opposite examples, whereby the support for transitional justice process had helped a more successful transition in countries like Rwanda or South Africa. IOM noted that, provided that engagement on transitional justice is context-appropriate, there is value in engaging while conflict is ongoing,

particularly regarding the documentation of violations, while being mindful of the need to stay out of political agendas.

Participants questioned IOM's role in IDP returns to areas where conditions are not conducive and where causes of initial displacement persist, often under pressure from the government, invoking the concrete case of Ethiopia. IOM clarified that, firstly, the **primary responsibility for finding solutions to displacement lies with states**, which highlights the **importance of promoting the Guiding Principles**. As a rule, IOM does not engage in any movement of displaced persons or any other migrants against their own will; any movement needs to be voluntary. In situations where IOM and human rights organizations have a concern with conditions of return, including livelihoods, safety and security, the returns process is one that engages the entire humanitarian community. IOM undertakes the operational aspect of the process, but the solutions are in system-wide agreement.

Participants inquired into the **replication of good practices** when it comes to **transitional justice** initiatives. IOM explained that the Organization facilitates exchange by either engaging directly with civil society and government, or bringing together civil society from different countries. The example of Colombia serves as a reminder that it takes time to achieve transitional justice, it was noted. In Iraq, minority communities are in principle more aware of justice issues and NGOs on the ground work to build capacity for supporting their constituencies in seeking justice as well as seeking other types of support from the state.

Particularly on the Syrian context, **difficulties were acknowledged** that UN agencies encounter **when undertaking IDP registration** in areas under the control of different actors in Syria. Finally, participants inquired into the methodology for fact finding missions. IOM explained the Organization gathers information from a needs perspective, that is, for the purpose of delivering humanitarian assistance, and therefore does not systematically engage in fact finding missions, but rather assessments. Sometimes, for example in Iraq on HLP issues arising because of ISIS occupation, this had provided basic information to the Government. Methodologies are sometimes qualitative, for example focus group discussions, and at other times quantitative, depending on the context. In any case, fact finding missions are outside of IOM's mandate.

Closing Remarks

Laura Thompson, IOM Deputy Director-General extended thanks to ICVA for co-hosting, thanking the UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of IDPs and panelists for interesting insights, as well as the participants for active, forward-looking and constructive contributions. The HDPN session generated concrete recommendations, for example on improving livelihoods collaboration. Key elements of making HDPN work are partnerships amongst a range of actors, noting that locally driven efforts are essential to bringing forward the HDPN agenda. The protection session contemplated the difficulties of working in a structure with regards to sustainability, further reflected on breaking down silos, and explored IOM and NGOs' comparative advantages for collective protection outcomes. There is a need to build on those conclusions and to more systematically pursue identified areas of IOM-NGO complementarity in protection. Links between localization and protection were clearly articulated in discussions. Follow-up on Consultation discussions needs to be 'bottom-up' – with initiatives in the field leading the way. Finding solutions to displacement requires addressing questions of justice, restitution of land and property rights and reparation for victims of human rights violations in conflict and IOM will seek to continue dialogue with NGOs on that matter. Deputy Director-General Thompson concluded by encouraging all participants to take the inputs and ideas from the Consultation further and integrate them into their work, moving forward with determination.

Ignacio Packer, ICVA Executive Director emphasized that, while the Consultation was not physically close to the affected populations, it nonetheless enabled zooming in with granularity, as a result of good field expertise shared. Language and communication can become drivers of vulnerability. Mr Packer brought to participants' attention the forthcoming ICVA explainers and briefing papers, particularly on *Localisation* and *Navigating the Standards*. He also underlined the need to break down silos: within protection, on the nexus, etc. In order to dismantle silo mindset, he highlighted that leadership at multiple levels is needed, along with structural changes where donors have a role to play. Further, in spite of obvious links between violations and displacement, the latter had not been the focus of most transitional justice practices, as seen in the examples from Colombia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Iraq. 2018 marks the 20th anniversary of the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, and the implementation of the three-year multi-stakeholder Plan of Action is crucially important. The Plan focuses on national laws and policies, participation of the displaced, data, and solutions. Going forward, continuous and regular engagement is needed between NGOs and IOM. NGOs need to use their proximity to populations and expertise to bring national decision makers closer to the realities of affected populations. Mr Packer concluded by highlighting the need for a clear way forward, inviting action on the recommendations from the Consultation.

Annex: 2018 IOM-NGO Humanitarian Consultation – Agenda

Time	Session	Facilitators/Panelists/ Speakers
08:30-09:00	Registration	
09:00-09:45	Opening remarks / Setting the Scene	<p>William Lacy Swing, IOM, Director General (recorded)</p> <p>Ignacio Packer, ICVA, Executive Director</p> <p>Vincent Houver, Deputy Director of Department of Operations and Emergencies</p>
09:45-10:30	<p>Session I: Addressing internal displacement in protracted crises through the triple nexus of humanitarian, development and peace (Plenary)</p> <p><i>Linking humanitarian and development actions is vital in responding to protracted internal displacement on the ground, and the interconnection with peace is increasingly being recognized. The World Humanitarian Summit and Grand Bargain commitments, the UN Development System and Peace and Security reforms, and the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (GCM) have given a renewed impetus to realizing the humanitarian, development and peace nexus – where appropriate and feasible.</i></p> <p><i>Panelists will examine how IOM and NGOs can work together on nexus operationalization and towards collective outcomes, with due consideration for the challenges for humanitarian principles, operations and partnerships. Presentations will help launch more specific discussions to be held in break out groups. Representatives of NGOs and IOM will discuss opportunities and challenges of joined-up approaches between humanitarian, development and peace building efforts for durable solutions to internal displacement.</i></p>	<p>Panelists:</p> <p>Louis Hoffman, IOM HQ, Head of Transition and Recovery</p> <p>Alyoscia D'Onofrio, IRC Geneva, Head of Office & Senior Director Governance Technical Unit</p> <p>Ester Ruiz de Azua, IOM Ukraine, Emergency and Stabilization Programme Coordinator</p> <p>Wendy Barron, Asia Foundation Afghanistan, Deputy Country Representative</p> <p>Panel moderators:</p> <p>Melissa Pitotti, ICVA Geneva Head of Policy</p> <p>Justin MacDermott, IOM HQ, Humanitarian</p>

		Development Nexus Adviser
10:30-10:45	Coffee/Tea Break (<i>Virtual Reality Exhibition on Internal Displacement</i>)	
10:45-13:15	<p>Session I: Addressing internal displacement in protracted crises through the triple nexus of humanitarian, development and peace (Break out groups)</p> <p><i>Break out groups will discuss some important aspects such as opportunities and challenges for joined-up livelihoods programming, including in urban areas; working with local actors to address internal displacement including capacity development and participation in coordination structures; accountability and IDP participation. Break out group rapporteurs will report back to plenary key recommendations with a view to seizing opportunities and overcoming gaps and barriers on the ground.</i></p>	<p>Break out group moderators: <i>Joined-up livelihoods programming</i> Charlotte Stemmer, Oxfam Geneva Representative; Johan Grundberg, IOM Transition and Recovery Expert</p> <p><i>Working with local actors</i> Christian Wolff, ACT Alliance Programme Manager for Migration and Displacement; Christina Burwell, IOM Rapid Response Fund Manager</p> <p><i>Accountability and IDP participation</i> Nathan McGibney, World Vision Humanitarian Policy and External Engagement Advisor; Christie Bacal-Mayencourt, IOM AAP Officer</p> <p>Plenary discussion facilitators: Melissa Pitotti, ICVA Geneva Head of Policy</p> <p>Justin MacDermott, IOM HQ, Humanitarian Development Nexus Adviser</p>
13:15-14:15	Buffet lunch (<i>Virtual Reality Exhibition on Internal Displacement</i>)	

14:15-15:45	<p>Session II: IOM – NGO complementarities in protection (Plenary)</p> <p><i>Protection is a central pillar of humanitarian action. IOM adheres to the IASC definition of protection – all activities aimed at ensuring full respect for the rights of the individual in accordance with the letter and the spirit of the relevant bodies of law – yet in practice the broad scope of this definition requires enhancing complementarities to build a greater impact.</i></p> <p><i>This session will allow IOM and NGOs to discuss their respective roles and approaches to protection activities, thus laying down the bases for conducive interaction and the identification of complementarities. The discussions will further seek to explore the challenge of protection on the ground in protracted internal displacement settings with a view to HDPN in fragile contexts.</i></p>	<p>Speakers:</p> <p>Nadia Akmoun, IOM HQ, Protection Officer</p> <p>Kathrine Starup, DRC HQ, Head of Protection & Global Protection Adviser</p> <p>Agnes Olusese, IOM South Sudan, Protection Officer</p> <p>Donato Hakim, South Sudan Older People's Organization, Executive Director</p> <p>Dina Parmer, IOM field, Protection Coordinator</p> <p>Ellie Kemp, Translators Without Borders, Head of Crisis Response</p>
15:45-16:00	<p>Coffee/Tea Break (Virtual Reality Exhibition on Internal Displacement)</p>	
16:00-17:30	<p>Session III: Transitional justice and internal displacement (Plenary)</p> <p><i>This session will examine transitional justice, increasingly recognized as a key element in achieving durable solutions for internal displacement. Transitional justice consists of a range of measures that seek to address past human rights abuses such as reparations, restitution of land, property and housing, and justice – and security sector reforms – measures that in turn contribute to reconciliation and successful reintegration of IDPs.</i></p> <p><i>The session will examine these aspects, highlighting perspectives on policy; research reflecting on social cohesion; practice, challenges and opportunities when addressing housing, land and property matters; and IDP participation in policy development, implementation and monitoring.</i></p>	<p>Speakers:</p> <p>Cecilia Jimenez-Damary, UN Special Rapporteur on the human rights of IDPs</p> <p>Nadia Siddiqui, Social Inquiry, Iraq, Co-Director</p> <p>Igor Cvetkovski, IOM HQ, Global Focal Point on Land, Property and Reparations</p> <p>Velma Šarić, Post-Conflict Research Center, Bosnia and Herzegovina, President</p>

		<p>María Angélica Gómez, CODHES, Colombia, Coordinator of Gender and Ethnic Approaches</p> <p>Carlotta Macera, IOM Iraq, Project Officer</p>
17:30-18:00	Closing remarks and way forward	<p>Laura Thompson, IOM, Deputy Director General</p> <p>Ignacio Packer, ICVA, Executive Director</p>