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Workshop on Profiling of Internally Displaced Persons (IDP)
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Summary Recommendations
An inter-agency workshop on IDP profiling, conducted in Brussels on 22 – 23 March 2007, made the following recommendations:

- Within the overall institutional framework of the humanitarian reform process (IASC, "cluster approach", etc.) a permanent working group on IDP profiling issues should be established. This working group should be tasked to deal with political and technical/methodological issues and as such carry-on the activities of the working group on the draft IDP Profiling Guidelines (commissioned by the IASC) which will end its activities in May 2007;
- There is value and interest in setting-up an informal and open network of NGOs, international organizations, academic institutions, and government representatives in order to advise and support IDP profiling activities conducted by the humanitarian actors; and;
- An inter-agency response structure, organized as a "common humanitarian service", is needed, in order to organize and support IDP profiling activities in humanitarian crisis situations.

Introduction
The Workshop on Profiling of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) took place in Brussels on 22 – 23 March 2007, hosted by CRED on behalf of UNFPA and UNHCR. The Workshop was attended by 24 participants ranging from UN agencies, international organizations, NGOs, academic institutions and governments (Annex 1 List of Participants). It was facilitated throughout by Mr. Bobby Lambert of Channel Research.

Objective of the Workshop
The humanitarian reform process and the cluster leadership approach are innovations geared to improving the protection and assistance responses to IDPs and to assist in finding solutions that lead to sustainable return, recovery and development. An effective humanitarian response needs reliable population data for advocacy, planning, protection and assistance. Like all activities in response to IDP crisis situations, IDP profiling is a multi-agency task that requires effective cluster leadership, both at the global and Field levels, and the involvement of organizations and institutions that have specific technical expertise.

In view of what has been achieved so far through the inter-agency approach and other initiatives and experiences to try to address the issue of IDP profiling, the main objectives of the Workshop were to:

1. Explore and recap the various activities conducted on IDP Profiling within the humanitarian community and academic institutions;
2. Explore the possibility of establishing a network of IDP profiling partners;
3. Discuss approaches on how to establish an effective response mechanism in the area of IDP Profiling in support of an improved humanitarian intervention in an IDP crisis situation; and
4. Obtain feedback from stakeholders including governments on proposed concepts.

The background papers prepared for the Workshop are attached as Annex 2 and Annex 3. The workshop was organized to promote an open and transparent process under the collaborative approach. It also was expected to function as a reality check on the process achieved so far within the humanitarian agencies by bringing together UN agencies, NGOs, academic/research institution and donor governments.

**Workshop Proceedings**

The workshop was a mixture of plenary discussions, presentations and working groups (Annex 4 Agenda). On the first day, the umbrella concept which guides the direction of IDP profiling in the humanitarian context was introduced. OCHA provided an overview of the UN humanitarian reform and the Cluster approach. The session was followed by questions and answers where additional issues were clarified – e.g., clarification on the Humanitarian Partnership countries, and key differences in the new approach on accountabilities.

This was followed by the introduction to IDP profiling and UNHCR’s perspective which covered the topic of what is IDP profiling, how it is understood/utilized in the humanitarian community and what is UNHCR’s perspective on the issue.

The interagency working group elaborating guidelines for IDP profiling has defined the term "IDP profiling" as follows:

> To clearly identify groups and, if necessary, individuals that have been forcibly displaced, through the process of data collection, analysis and maintenance, in order to take the necessary action to advocate on their behalf, to protect, and assist them, and - eventually - bring a solution to their displacement.

The key objectives are to obtain core data (numbers disaggregated by age/sex; and location of IDPs) and context-specific information, such as causes for displacement, patterns of displacement, protection concerns, key humanitarian needs, and potential solution for the group (if available). The IDP profiling process originated from the need to have commonly agreed figures by all humanitarian actors, but at the same time to have a framework which allows for interagency diversity. The basis of IDP profiling, as such, is a range of methodologies which includes rapid estimation methods, household surveys, registration, and census that could be used to obtain the core data and context-specific information.

Within the humanitarian reform process, UNHCR is “Cluster Lead” in Protection, Camp Coordination/Camp Management (CCCM)\(^2\) – complex emergency, and Emergency Shelter\(^3\). The Cluster Lead is responsible to strengthen system-wide preparedness and technical capacity to respond to humanitarian emergencies and is accountable for ensuring predictable and effective inter-agency responses within sectors or areas of activity. This includes:

§ enhanced standard setting, monitoring and advocacy;
§ better surge capacity and standby rosters; and
§ consistent access to appropriately trained technical expertise.

---

\(^1\) Additional documents were provided at the workshop and can be provided upon request. See Annex 5 for the list of all documents provided.

\(^2\) IOM is the co-chair and Cluster Lead for CCCM Cluster in natural disasters.

\(^3\) IFRC is the Cluster Lead for the Emergency Shelter in natural disasters. UNHCR is the Lead for complex emergencies.
IDP profiling are tasks that fall within the responsibility of both the Protection and CCCM clusters.

Participants were then asked to give a presentation on their particular case studies, covering the following points:

§ organizational challenges (to conduct the profiling)
§ methodology used
§ characteristics/needs of IDPs
§ security and political difficulties faced on the field
§ sustainability challenges (how is the information kept up to date etc)

The following case studies were presented:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveys of Palestinian IDPs</td>
<td>FAFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP profiling in Somalia</td>
<td>Danish Refugee Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDPs in Myanmar</td>
<td>Mahidol University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP profiling in Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>UNFPA/ ENSEA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The presentations were followed by a small group work which reviewed the case studies from the angle of: 1) common issues, 2) opportunities and resources, and 3) challenges. While there were overlaps, many elements came out which became the building block for the working groups on the second day. Some of key issues which were common for both opportunities and challenges to all case studies were:

1. Identification of IDPs
2. Political dimension of IDP profiling
3. Structure of interagency cooperation
4. Methodological issues
5. Resources issue including expertise and funding

At a more general level, 2 questions came out which lead the discussions of the Group Work on the second day:

1. IDP situation are so different from country to country with variety and complexity of problems. Is there a representative IDP situation where a generic profiling can be conducted?
2. Did the studies result in better protection for IDPs? How do we integrate overall IDP profiling concept with empower the IDPs?

The second day covered the achievements to date in the area of IDP profiling in the areas of:

1. Standard setting
2. Reinforcing networks
3. Field support/ Capacity building
4. Fundraising
5. Next key activities

The key achievements include the draft IDP profiling guidelines (June 2005 – March 2007), interagency technical workshop on IDP profiling (October 2006), joint UNFPA/ UNHCR workshop on collaboration on demographic data collection in emergencies/ IDP situations (February 2007), various field support to country operations and joint fundraising effort through the 2007 Global Cluster Appeal.
The participants then broke up into 3 working groups\(^4\) to discuss how to take the IDP profiling process further from the angles of:

1. Organizational structure of IDP profiling
2. Partnership
3. Methodology and indicators

The working groups were followed by a plenary feedback focusing on the outcome of the working group and moving the issues forward.

The outcomes from the Working Groups on Organizational Structure and Partnership were very similar. Both proposed the establishment of

- a permanent working group on IDP profiling issues, dealing with political, technical, and methodological problems; this entity would carry-on the activities of the working group on the IDP Profiling Guidelines and institutionally be part of the IASC/"cluster" structure;
- an open and informal network of NGOs, international organizations, academic institutions, and government representatives in order to advise and support the humanitarian response actors; and
- an inter-agency response mechanism, following the "common humanitarian services" model, in order to support and organize IDP profiling activities in humanitarian crisis situations.

Working Group 1 proposed an “Interagency Profiling Service” composed of interested agencies, following the example of already existing "common humanitarian services", such as the Joint Logistics Centre (UNJLC) and the Humanitarian Information Centres (HIC). The proposed Interagency Profiling Service would be hosted by UNHCR and open to participation by other agencies. The new service will aim at pooling of existing resources (rather than appealing for additional resources) of participating agencies and will provide the following services:

- Secretariat
- Standard setting (guidelines, methodology)
- Operational response
- Advocacy (promotion of issues and analysis)
- Information (website, repository of information/ reports)
- Roster management
- Fundraising/ resource mobilization

The proposed Interagency Profiling Service will work closely with 2 entities – 1) Network of Research Institutions and NGOs, and 2) Working Group on Profiling Issues to be established under the Protection and CCCM Clusters. The network of Research Institutions and NGOs will be hosted by NRC who will provide the platform for the network by establishing a website and newsletters.

Working Group 2 on Partnership focused on the potential role the wide variety of partner institutions can play. The group started from the draft network concept (Annex 3) and came up with the following main requirement for the Partnership: 1) to provide the needed skills and expertise on IDP profiling, and 2) to increase awareness and promote involvement of a larger number of actors. The “Steering Group on IDP Profiling” would be under the IASC/ Protection and CCCM Cluster and would have close links with the donor governments. They will provide support and advice to operations. In addition, a network should be established which includes not just the UN agencies and NGOs, but also the research/ academic institutions. This would be a loose and flexible network focused on policy/ advocacy, methodological

\(^4\) Annex 6: List of Participants per Working Group
issues and knowledge management. They may be called upon to support an operation directly. The network will have a core group which would be regularly and actively communicating with a “Steering Group” to set standards on methodological issues. Beyond the network, the Partnership can take place bilaterally and through organization of technical workshops. It was especially recommended to reach out to NGOs, research/ academic institution as well as RSG W. Kaelin’s Office to ensure an enlargement of committed partners.

Working Group 3, tasked to discuss methodological challenges, spent a lot of time to discuss the draft IDP Profiling Guidelines. The Group provided some inputs for the Chapter on Methodologies:

§ Insert a hybrid model of a decision tree and a matrix to support the choice of methodology, as additional parameters (such as scenario, resources etc) to conditions and time are required. Further, the representation of time was not the most appropriate in the current decision tree;
§ Need to rank the indicators in the IDP Profiling Guidelines. This would allow for the scaling up or down depending on other conditions.
§ Definition of IDPs needs to be clearer.
§ Provision of focused technical advice by “core” expert group.
§ Development of Field Manual for practitioners who need more guidance as a phase 2 project.

Some group members had major reservations with regard to the draft guidelines. However, the discussion was hampered by the fact that not all members had in fact received and read the draft guidelines. However, all participants felt that any discussions should be built on what has been achieved so far through the draft Guidelines. Even though the draft guidelines are “work in progress”, the discussion showed that need to have more intense interactions between humanitarian practitioners and methodological specialists, to improve future up-dates of the guidelines.

It was suggested that the proposed informal network of NGOs, international organizations, academic institutions, etc. (see above) should set as one of its priorities to provide methodological feedback.

**Recommendations and Timelines:**
The following recommendations and action points emerged from the Workshop through both plenary and working group discussions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Creation of loose Network or Community of Knowledge which would support standard setting in the area of IDP profiling</td>
<td>NRC to take initiative and act as secretariat (first semester 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. As the “Steering Committee on the IDP Profiling Guidelines” will cease to exist in May 2007, TOR focusing of IDP Profiling for a new entity need to be elaborated. The new (sub) committee should ideally be created under the Protection/ CCCM Cluster</td>
<td>OCHA, UNHCR, UNFPA, and NRC, as well as other interested agencies, to work on TOR and to discuss with Protection and CCCM clusters (first semester 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Creation of an &quot;Interagency IDP Profiling Service&quot;</td>
<td>Feasibility study and consultations to be conducted under the leadership of UNHCR by all interested partners (position paper to be ready for IASC working group meeting in December 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conduct a technical workshop to discuss and review the Chad/ Somalia IDP profiling experiences</td>
<td>UNHCR, UNFPA, NRC, and DRC (September/October 2007)</td>
</tr>
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