

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

IMPROVING THE U.S. RESPONSE TO INTERNAL DISPLACEMENT

Washington, D.C.
Wednesday, June 30, 2010

PARTICIPANTS:

Introduction and Moderator:

ELIZABETH FERRIS
Senior Fellow and Co-Director, Brookings-Bern Project on Internal Displacement
The Brookings Institution

Featured Speakers:

ROBERTA COHEN
Nonresident Senior Fellow
The Brookings Institution

DAWN CALABIA
Senior Advisor
Refugees International

KELLY CLEMENTS
Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration
U.S. Department of State

SUSAN REICHLE
Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and
Humanitarian Assistance
USAID

JAMES KUNDER
Senior Resident Fellow
German Marshall Fund of the United States

JOEL R. CHARNY
Vice President for Policy
Refugees International

* * * * *

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. FERRIS: Good morning, everyone, and welcome to this session on improving U.S. response to internal displacement. My name is Beth Ferris. I'm a senior fellow here at Brookings and co-director of the Brookings-Bern Project on Internal Displacement.

We're expecting one more speaker, but since he's last on the list of those to speak, I think we'll go ahead and start in the interest of time.

We have here today a very impressive panel of experts who've worked for many years in humanitarian assistance with refugees and internally displaced persons. Actually, I did a rough calculation of the number of years of humanitarian experience on this panel, and counting Jim Kunder, who will be arriving shortly, I'm sure, it's pretty close to 200 years, which doesn't say as much about our age, but many of us started when we were 10 or 12 years old in this field. (Laughter)

But we've come together today to launch the study that we commissioned that's been carried out by Roberta Cohen and Dawn Calabia, entitled "Improving the U.S. Response to Internal Displacement: Recommendations to the Obama Administration and Congress." We'll begin with a presentation of the report by Roberta and Dawn. Their bios are in the list that you've received, so I won't go into detail except to note that Roberta was the co-founder of the Brookings Project on Internal Displacement, and certainly is one of the -- if not the most -- recognized expert in the field in the world. A lot of experience as an expert and author and human rights activist over many years.

Dawn Calabia is a senior associate at Refugees International. Like others on the panel, she has a diverse experience as well having worked with the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, with UNHCR, working on the Hill, and now with

Refugees International. I should note that this evening she'll also be leaving to Kyrgyzstan and maybe Uzbekistan, depending on visas.

We then have Kelly Clements, deputy assistant secretary of the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration, who has also worked for many years with the State Department in various configurations on refugee and humanitarian issues. And I note that she's worked as well in the field in Bangladesh, Albania, and Geneva, although I'm not sure Geneva really counts as field, but certainly it's a different experience.

We'll then turn to Susan Reichle, who is senior deputy assistant administrator at USAID for the Bureau of Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance. A career foreign service officer, she was most recently stationed in Bogota, Colombia, where, as you know, this is one of the countries with a very large number of IDPs, the second largest in the world. And has also worked in Haiti, Nicaragua, and Russia.

Jim Kunder -- who will be arriving shortly, we hope -- is a senior resident fellow with the German Marshall Fund. As with others, he's had senior positions in USAID, working in Congress, Save the Children, a staffer in the U.S. Congress, also U.S. Marines.

Finally, we have Joel Charny, who's vice president of Refugees International and has worked with UNDP, Oxfam; many years of experience, both in the field -- the real field, not Geneva -- and the United States.

So we have an exciting panel presentation. Time will be short with so many speakers with so much to say. So in the spirit of the times, I have a little yellow card, which will indicate when you have just a few minutes left to speak.

Please. Please, Roberta and Dawn.

MS. COHEN: Good morning, everyone. By way of background, let me

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

recall that humanitarian and human rights emergencies, like the one in Kyrgyzstan right now, uproot massive numbers of people. Some cross the borders and become refugees, but most become uprooted inside their countries. The International Refugee System, which, since 1951, has assisted and protected those who cross borders, does not apply to internally displaced persons, or IDPs. It was only in the last decade of the 20th century when the Cold War ended and notions of sovereignty changed that international tension began to focus in a concerted way on how to assist and protect those displaced inside their countries when their own governments were unable or unwilling to do so.

Like refugees, IDPs have special needs and vulnerabilities that distinguish them from others in the population: loss of home; separation from family members; loss of livelihood and means of survival; loss of documentation, land, and property; vulnerability to physical abuse and sexual assault. Even after emergencies end, they often remain vulnerable in ways unlike the rest of the population.

Because of these special needs, the U.N. developed guiding principles on internal displacement; appointed a representative on IDPs; developed special institutional arrangements called the "cluster approach" for addressing the needs of IDPs; and international organizations, like UNHCR, began to stretch their mandates and resources to include IDPs.

Donor governments began also to expand their scope of support to encompass IDPs more regularly. For the United States, the single largest donor of humanitarian aid, the reasons have been humanitarian as well as political and strategic.

Conflict and displacement in a country undermine national stability and economic development and often jeopardize regional security. There are today some 27 million persons internally displaced by conflict and human rights violations, and tens of millions more by natural disasters, totaling more than 40 million IDPs. By contrast, there

are 10.4 million refugees of concern to UNHCR, plus 4- to 5 million Palestinian refugees cared for by UNRRA.

The need for a more holistic approach is evident. In looking at the U.S. response to internal displacement, our report used the indicators identified by Jim Kunder a decade ago. In his 1999 report on the U.S. Government and IDPs, he asked: Is there a policy? Is there a designated lead agency and coordinating mechanism? Is there legislation that specifically mentions IDPs? Is there adequate financial and human resources, congressional involvement, and active U.S. engagement with international organizations and NGOs assisting IDPs?

Since that report, the U.S. has moved in many ways to integrate IDPs in its humanitarian response. But shortcomings remain, which Dawn and I will now highlight.

To begin with, USAID issued a policy on IDPs in 2004 that makes internal displacement a priority for the agency. The policy covers all phases of displacement from prevention through solutions, emphasizes protection, and includes host families. It's an excellent policy that comes with implementation guidelines.

The problem is that the policy is not well known in USAID, not widely disseminated in and beyond the agency, and not regularly implemented. Our report, therefore, recommends that this policy be re-issued by the new USAID administrator and also updated to reflect new developments since 2004.

We further consider it important that other parts of the U.S. Government involved with IDPs -- the State Department, the National Security Council, congressional staff, Defense Department, FEMA -- be expected to know and to take into account the policy's provisions. This will avoid situations like one in which an ill-suited program for IDPs was put forward by an ambassador who did not know or feel bound by the IDP

policy. We further recommend an overall U.S. Government policy on humanitarian aid that establishes a clear standard for providing aid, ends unjustified disparities among vulnerable groups, sets parameters for military involvement in humanitarian aid, and overall provides the principles guiding decisions.

In the institutional area, the IDP policy reaffirmed USAID as the lead government coordinator on internal displacement and said AID should work closely with the State Department's Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration -- PRM -- which also plays an important and increasing role with IDPs through its funding of UNHCR, ICRC, and IOM. The two offices, however, have not yet developed what we would call a genuinely shared responsibility for IDPs. Turf battles, different approaches to humanitarian aid, and disagreements over UNHCR's role with IDPs have all contributed to breakdowns in the relationship in which the losers are the IDPs.

Because neither office has sufficient resources or skills to address the full range of IDP needs and because their respective institutions have different skills and comparative advantages to bring to the table, our report calls for a new division of labor between AIDs, DCHA/OFDA Office, and PRM to be overseen by senior officials at USAID and State and reinforced by strengthened NSC coordination. A new division should increase collaboration and also cover gaps such as protection concerns in natural disasters, early recovery measures, disparities in assistance between refugees and IDPs, education for IDP children. Working together, the two offices should mobilize the whole of the government since displacement situations often require preventive measures, emergency aid, protection steps, diplomatic intercessions, political settlements, and recovery and development programs.

With regard to staffing, we recommend increased IDP specialist staff in AID and PRM to ensure the integration of IDP concerns into policies and programs. One

full-time staff member on IDPs at OFDA and one part-time focal point on IDPs at PRM are not enough to address a complex issue involving huge numbers of displaced people. At AID we recommend IDP focal points in every relevant office as well as increased OFDA staff in the field. The appointment of an OFDA director -- a position vacant since January 2009 -- would redound to IDP protection and assistance.

At PRM we fear that IDPs risk becoming an afterthought in a bureau with a longstanding predisposition toward refugees. There should be at least one senior and several mid-level officials with special IDP expertise to follow crises worldwide on a full-time basis until such time as the issue can be genuinely mainstreamed.

As for training in the AID/IDP policy, the U.N. Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, and the U.N. durable solutions framework for IDPs, it should be mandatory for all government staff dealing with IDPs. Staff dealing with refugee issues are expected to know the refugee convention. Those dealing with IDPs should be trained in the international standards for IDPs. And at USAID, a senior staffer suggested that the performance evaluation of USAID mission directors take into account how they implement the IDP policy.

We appreciate State Department advocacy for IDPs and refugees in bilateral diplomacy, which has been taking place with countries of special interest to the U.S. We recommend systematic intercessions with governments on a worldwide basis encouraging them to adopt policies and laws on internal displacement to devote their own resources to IDPs and to address protracted situations of displacement. Most IDPs have been displaced five years or more.

We would add that it will reinforce U.S. advocacy abroad if the U.S. Government applies international standards for IDPs at home with those uprooted by disasters. The U.S. is a model for many countries and should set the right example.

Dawn will focus on additional recommendations. I would just end my remarks with the hope that the U.S. Executive Branch and Congress will modernize and revamp laws, policies, resources mechanisms, institutional arrangements, and programs so as to ensure help for the most abused and vulnerable populations in emergencies. Doing so will invigorate American leadership in the humanitarian area and make a difference in the lives of millions of uprooted people.

Thank you.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you very much. We turn to Dawn.

MS. CALABIA: I want to thank Brookings for continuing its involvement with this very important issue and to say that, as an advocate, doing this report was an opportunity to look at structures and look at historical precedents and developments. We came out with the idea that the whole of government approach is what's needed, and that's a very important concept and it's something this administration is talking a great deal about. Unfortunately, the whole of government approach when you look at humanitarian response, and particularly the diplomatic involvement that's needed to solve IDP situations, is a little lopsided.

So the military has a budget of \$708 billion, which Congress passes without a blinking of an eye, and the State Department and AID have a combined budget of about \$15.4 billion -- 1 percent, about 1.124 percent, of the U.S. budget. And the Senate in its wisdom has decided that that should be cut by \$4 billion. What's wrong with this picture?

We have a huge military, which has grown in its activities in what used to be considered development kinds of activities. In 1998, it had about 3.5 percent of overseas development assistance. By 2005, the OECD reported that they had 22 percent of the budget. AID's share of that overseas development assistance declined

from 65 percent to 44 percent.

Many of you in this room have watched AID shrink, watched its budget been encumbered, and watched the State Department's staffing and overseas operations decline. AID, in 1965, had double the staff it currently has and it was working in half the number of countries that it's currently trying to service.

We're concerned that the few and the good humanitarians that we have working inside the U.S. Government in various agencies, but particularly in USAID, OFDA, and in PRM, are really hamstrung by misunderstandings about exactly what it's trying -- we're trying to do, about why the timeliness of that action is really important, and why you need a whole of government approach, particularly that you need diplomacy and political muscle. No conflict situation, no IDP situation has been solved solely by humanitarian assistance. Humanitarian is important. It keeps people alive, gives people hope. It indicates that there's some attention to the issue from the international community, but it doesn't bring about the hard solutions that have to be done, even in natural disaster situations as we're watching in Haiti today and as we've seen in other places around the world, including in our own state of New Orleans and Alabama after Katrina.

We're concerned that the U.S. needs this humanitarian policy because it has signed up with the good donorship principles. One of the things that's interesting in the European Union is after more of the countries joined with the good donorship principles, they decided to adopt a humanitarian policy that said they would provide AID on the basis of need and not political or strategic objectives. That's a very idealistic standard, but it's one we think the U.S. and we think the public would endorse in the United States, and we'd like to see this administration take action on that.

We're also concerned that the administration has not asked for enough

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

money for these offices. We were pleased to see that OFDA's budget request this year and last year went up to over \$800 million. And that's a substantial increase from the end of the Bush Administration when the numbers were running in the 2- and \$300 million. But given the number of things that OFDA is expected to do -- in 2009, it responded to 82 different emergencies. And just think of what the staffing implications are if you have about 300 staff and you're responding to 82 different crises around the world where you have to deploy some staff, where you have to do assessments, where you have to figure out how you can leverage U.S. bilateral assistance.

Similarly, PRM is an agency that's grown -- excuse me, an office in the State Department that's grown since its inception in the late 1970s when, I have to admit, I was working on Capitol Hill and pushing the administration to create such a bureau. But even that organization's funding has grown significantly and its staff has grown, but it hasn't kept pace, unfortunately, with the amount of displacement. Interestingly, the amount of displacement in 1978 -- internal displacement -- is about the same as today: 27 to 28 million people through a forced conflict situation. And while PRM's budget has grown substantially, so have the needs of the organizations that it supports, the multilateral organizations that it supports through contributions.

As you know, PRM is the major funder of the UNHCR, the U.N. High Commission for Refugees. And it's also a major funder of the International Committee of the Red Cross and IOM, the International Organization for Migration.

But the UNHCR this year has appealed for a budget of \$3 billion. If the U.S. was to give a 30 percent share, which has happened in some years, that's a substantial amount of money, obviously. It's almost a billion dollars. And if UNHCR doesn't raise that money, we know a lot of things that need to be done for refugees and IDPs will not happen this year or maybe ever.

UNHCR this year has a special -- has a new budget structure that sets up pillars, and one of the pillars is for internally displaced people. And it's appealing for about 22 percent of its budget to deal with some 16 million people, not all the IDPs in protracted situations, but a substantial share of them.

So what happens if the administration fails to appeal -- or fails to have real needs-based budgeting on these kinds of issues? Many of us in this room worked for many years to convince UNHCR that it needed to have real needs-based budgeting, needed to look at what was going on, where people were living, what their conditions were like, and what would it really take to give them a basic, minimum, decent standard of survival.

Traditionally, in the past, when administrations have failed to ask for sufficient funding for issues that are understood on Capitol Hill, Congress has been willing to step up to the plate. And as we know in the case of the military budget, they'll even go above what the administration has requested to take care of certain manufacturers in their districts or contractors. We need a similar amount of advocacy with the Congress on the needs of internally displaced persons. The Congress needs to step up to the plate and do more hearings on this issue and conduct oversight of the kinds of operations the U.S. is currently conducting, either through the international organizations like UNHCR and ICRC, and the work that OFDA is trying to accomplish and the work that OFDA development missions are trying to do in serving the needs of internally displaced persons.

We need to have an evaluation of what really works and what kind of best practices are out there so that we can implement them more places. We need to learn how to involve beneficiaries better and to get state and local governments involved in dealing with the needs of the IDPs who, after all, are their own citizens. With evidence-

based research, with real efforts to involve the beneficiaries, the refugees, the IDPs, and also with working with local institutions, we have a chance of rebuilding societies, of giving people a stake again, and of getting countries to live up to their obligations.

And international humanitarian work is all about burden-sharing. We can't expect American taxpayers to generously fund these kinds of programs unless they feel they're effective and unless they feel there's a payoff. When I worked on Capitol Hill and when I worked for the church and when I worked for UNHCR, there wasn't a crisis in the world that we didn't get calls from people in the United States who had family, friends, had gone to college in that particular country, had institutional connections, and they would call us and say we want to help. What can we do? Can you find my sister? Can you find my brother?

Members of Congress respond to what their constituents are interested in as well as their own personal interests. And I think we need to do more to educate them on the needs of internally displaced persons. And the fact is that we don't have a lot of duplication. We don't have a lot of overlap in the international community. We have a lot of gaps. Generally, statistics indicate that IDPs get about a third of the assistance that refugees get. And if you go out and look at what refugees are getting -- water systems are buckets, shelter is plastic tarps -- those of you who've watched the news about Haiti know that we have 1.5 million people living under plastic -- something in the rainy season, something we don't think is a good idea.

We need to have more transparency in the operations of these agencies that are responding to humanitarian situations, humanitarian crises. We need OFDA to help us understand what the real needs of internally displaced persons are and how they could best be addressed. And if the Congress is not willing to substantially increase development assistance or other accounts to deal with this issue, then we have to

substantially increase funding to PRM and OFDA to make sure it's possible that refugees and IDPs are helped not just at the emergency stage, not just in the beginning, but in the middle and also in the hard work of bringing about solutions, dealing with protracted crises, particularly of internal displacement.

We need to get the regional organizations to pay more attention to what's happening in their neighboring countries. The OAU has just adopted a convention on internal displacement and now we need -- we're waiting for 13 countries to ratify it. One country has done so. It would require countries to have legislation and policies, hopefully, that would deal with internally displaced people and try to do everything possible to get them back to a normal way of life.

We need greater institutional clarity in the international system as well. As you know, we have a new architecture. Since 2004, we have OCHA -- the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs -- and the so-called cluster approach that attempts to give the world some understanding of when there is an emergency what agencies will step up and offer leadership and, hopefully, expertise in these situations.

We had the creation of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee, which has brought NGOs to the tables in a way that had never occurred before and which when Kofi Annan was leaving office -- and I worked for Kofi -- he said, "I don't know how we got along before the Inter-Agency Standing Committee, and I don't know how long we could ever get along without it again". We need our NGOs. We need our civil society partners with us at the table telling us when we're making mistakes and helping us do these jobs better.

We need bigger engagements internationally. We need to be -- have -- carry our weight at the United Nations on humanitarian reform issues and getting U.N. agencies to step up to the plate and do their jobs. We need to decide whether it's better

to have one organization learn how and effectively do protection of internally displaced persons or if we have to fund and capacitate nine different agencies to do that.

We need to understand what we need to do for early recovery, which is a cross-cutting issue in every crisis. Early recovery means trying to turn the policies back, turn the programs back to the state, to the local government, to the national government, to get communities involved in self-help projects, and to make it possible for people to take up their lives again, their civil, their economic, and their political lives. And we're not doing enough of that at the present time.

I point to a lot of studies that have been done in this town by the think tanks, including one that was done by CSIS, by Congressman Andrews and Congressman Kirk. It was called "Integrating 21st Century Development and Security Assistance." "U.S. national interests," they said, "will continue to require effective development assistance, including support for defense and diplomatic objectives as well as for traditional poverty reduction goals. But absent a concerted major effort to ensure significant improvements in diplomatic and developmental capacities" -- and I would say and humanitarian response capacities -- "the task force at CIS believes that the Defense Department will inexorably shoulder an increasing share of the burden in building the capacities of weak and failing states and rebuilding war-torn countries." They said, "As a rule, DOD programs should not be nested with -- should be nested with (inaudible) U.S. efforts to effective, accountable, and sustainable local institutions."

We have seen Secretary of State Clinton and Secretary of Defense Gates testifying together on Capitol Hill -- something that I had never seen before -- saying, yes, the State Department needs a budget. And guess what, the State Department is probably not going to get the budget that it's testifying for, but the military will. And yet we understand and we know that the civilian capacities are essential for our

government, the diplomatic capacities, the fact-finding, the evidence-based research and evaluation that we need to figure out how to do these jobs better and how to get internally displaced people back into their countries to deal with the reconciliation, to deal with the rehabilitation of the structures as well as the institutions of the country.

We know that right now we have -- OFDA has a request as a budget for next year of \$885 million. We think that OFDA probably needs closer to \$1.6 billion if it was really going to deal with helping people and developing the early recovery capacities so people could return and reintegrate into their communities with the hopes of sustainable livelihoods. We think PRM's budget needs to be substantially increased, as well as their staff and OFDA's staff. We think that the ERMA account, which hasn't been raised since 1995 -- I also worked on that at Capitol Hill -- needs to come up to at least double that.

We think it's really important that the Appropriations Committee, Senator Leahy, and Senator Mitch McConnell agreed on this, and Senator Gray, that there needs to be small emergency funds inside OFDA and inside PRM to allow for small responses to unforeseen situations and unforeseen kinds of needs. Right now there's a complex crisis fund that AID has of about \$50 million. Twenty million dollars of that is going to be spent in Kyrgyzstan based on AID's publications. And PRM has a small fund of about \$30 million.

It's dollars and cents, ladies and gentlemen, but it's making sense of big numbers. Internally displaced people -- they're men, women, and children. They're the potential next generation and this generation. They're people committed to lives of freedom and dignity. And I think it's our responsibility to try to help them do that.

The United States has been the leader in humanitarian response. We hope it'll be the leader on humanitarian reform and putting the needs of IDPs front and

center in our foreign policy, in our diplomacy, and even in our military strategies.

Thank you very much.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you, Dawn. And thanks to both of you, both for your presentations and for the hard work you performed in carrying out the research.

We turn now to response from two government officials, beginning with PRM, Kelly Clements. It's alphabetical order. (Laughter)

MS. CLEMENTS: Thank you very much, Beth. PRM has participated in many of these Brookings briefings over the years, and we do it with great pleasure. They're always worthwhile. The bureau has great respect for the institution, for its Project on Internal Displacement led by Beth Ferris. This is a place where serious thinking gets done and influential policy recommendations are formulated.

I want to thank Brookings and particularly the report authors, Roberta Cohen and Dawn Calabia, for this important report being released today. The report is well-researched, spot-on in many of its findings. The report recommendations clearly are the result of long and careful thought. Roberta and Dawn interviewed Assistant Secretary Eric Schwartz and other PRM and USAID staff as part of their research, and I know they interviewed many of you in this room. They did their homework. They brought their own insights to the table, as well as based on decades of experience working with population displacement situations around the world. We at PRM take the report very seriously.

Eric had planned to actually be with you all here this morning and asked me to convey to you how much he regrets his last-minute cancellation. He was called away four days ago to be in Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan for a firsthand assessment of that emergency, which has produced, as you know, tens of thousands of refugees as well as 300,000 internally displaced persons. He's there with Rob Jenkins from USAID's

Office of Transition Initiatives and, hopefully, will come back with strong recommendations.

He feels so strongly about this report and this event here today that he asked me to read verbatim a message he sent in from Uzbekistan. (Laughter) And I'm sure you will not be surprised at his active intervention.

"Thank you, Roberta and Dawn, for this rich and valuable report. I think it's great, and it reflects many of my own perspectives and what I've tried to do over the past 12-month period I've had the honor of serving as assistant secretary. I agree with so much of this report.

Thank you for emphasizing that we must define our task as addressing the needs of persons anywhere who are made vulnerable by civil conflict, human rights violations, or disasters resulting from natural hazards, whether or not they happen to be inside or outside their countries of origin. My current travel to Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan is a reflection of that perspective.

Thank you for urging that we continue to strengthen the capacity of UNHCR to address more comprehensively IDP needs that cannot be met by national governance.

Thank you for asserting that we need to articulate more clearly our broad perspectives on humanitarian policy, which is why I've sought to put the State Department and the administration on the public record on many of these issues over the past year.

Thank you for recommending that we need to match our intensive engagement with our traditional partners -- UNHCR, ICRC, IOM, WFP -- with a far more strategic approach to the U.N. cluster system, to the IASC, and to OCHA, which is why we put together such a strong USAID, State/PRM, State international organizations team

to participate in the recent OCHA donor support group meeting in Australia; and why we are considering ways to enhance our engagement and contributions in this area.

Thank you for encouraging much smarter integration in the work of State/PRM and USAID's Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance. Susan Reichle and I are working hard to achieve this.

And thank you for urging us not to succumb to the facile notion that one agency deals with IDPs and another refugees. Thank you for urging us instead to continue our effort to consider a division of responsibilities in terms of institutional comparative advantages in areas such as deployment capabilities, diplomacy, advocacy, and other capacities.

Your recommendations are smart and well-conceived and most of them reflect my own perspectives. I look forward to continuing our dialogue."

So as you can see from Eric's message, PRM appreciates this Brookings report. The report challenges us to significantly improve the U.S. Government's response to IDP needs. The report calls on the U.S. Government to formulate an overall government-wide policy on humanitarian aid. The report states that the U.S. Government's commitment to the world's internally displaced people needs to grow equal to our commitment to the world's refugees.

The report notes the division of responsibilities within the U.S. Government for the protection and assistance of IDPs needs to be clearer, better coordinated, without institutional competition. It urges us to develop greater expertise to address the complex needs of internally displaced populations. It calls for greater attention to IDPs at all phases of their displacement, not just during the emergency phase, but also reintegration, recovery, and long-term development.

And the report says that the U.S. Government needs to play a stronger

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

leadership and advocacy role on the international stage on behalf of the world's IDPs. On the issue of institutional coordination between State/PRM and USAID/DCHA, they communicate and coordinate on a working level and a policy level probably far more than many of you realize. Eric and Susan confer by phone many times daily.

MS. REICHLER: All hours of the day. (Laughter)

MS. CLEMENTS: Recently PRM and DCHA resumed monthly meetings. PRM and DCHA jointly participate in the U.S. delegations from the U.S. Government at a range of donor meetings that oversee the work of UNHCR, OCHA, WFP. We appreciate that DCHA invites PRM on disaster assistance response teams and on response management teams in Washington, when appropriate. And both bureaus conduct joint reviews of proposals when appropriate.

PRM and DCHA collaborate routinely on staff training. And most recently, during the past two weeks, representatives of our respective bureaus have sat side-by-side, shift after shift on the State Department's Kyrgyz Republic Monitoring Group, coordinating situation reports and working with our field reps to provide firsthand assessments of the population displacement.

There's no denying, however, that PRM and DCHA have had a difficult institutional relationship in some situations in recent years. There is room for improvement. Spurred on by the Brookings report, I can tell you that the leadership of PRM and DCHA right now are looking closely and very seriously at additional concrete steps we can take to make collaboration and coordination of our two bureaus even more effective. Some would say we're pressing the proverbial reset button. (Laughter)

We are discussing steps to ensure that our regional teams in Washington and in the field work more closely together on a range of issues, including needs assessments, program monitoring, evaluation strategies, and priority setting. We

will look for additional opportunities to cross-train.

Collectively, we want to bolster USG attention to IDP protection and expand capabilities to address gaps. We want to expand and examine ways we can close the gap between relief and development that has long been a challenge to both of our bureaus.

We are interested in combining our efforts to reach out publicly on the humanitarian issues we all care about. Earlier this week, Dave Robinson, the principal deputy in the bureau, and I met with Susan to discuss ways we can collaborate more effectively at the policy level. And together we will draft an action plan on next steps in the weeks to come. As we continue to digest the Brookings study and go through our own QDDR -- the Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review -- process, we're sure more ideas for collaboration will occur.

Change will take time and leadership, but you have our commitment. You should see some of the fruits of these efforts before long.

Finally, I want to respond to a few of the Brookings report recommendations that are specific to PRM. We are open to the report's recommendation that PRM change its name to reflect the bureau's broader humanitarian responsibilities, including IDPs. The State Department Bureau for Refugee Programs added "Population and Migration" to its name in the early 1990s to reflect the broader scope of its work, and there are good reasons why a name change might be appropriate now to reflect more accurately the bureau's work.

The report recommends that the legislative language be rewritten for the Migration of Refugee Assistance Act -- excuse me -- and Account, and the Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Account, so that they make specific reference to IDPs and host communities. Fortunately, Congress wrote legislation for these accounts

generously and we have not felt inhibited to restrict their use by population. However, we are open to exploring options for updating the legislative authorities in the context of potential foreign assistance reforms.

The report also recommends that UNHCR should fund a higher percentage of UNHCR's operations -- PRM should fund a higher percentage of UNHCR's operations than the current level of roughly a quarter to a third. This is an area where we agree. It is worth noting that the United States is by far the largest donor to UNHCR. We provided more than \$640 million in Fiscal Year 2009.

Our predictable and universal response to populations served by UNHCR and ICRC challenges other donors to share these international responsibilities. If we can do better, we will, and we should. However, despite strong congressional support annually for USG humanitarian efforts, we must also acknowledge the very difficult fiscal environment we are facing in the United States.

Lastly, let me confirm what the report recommends. PRM unequivocally endorses and supports UNHCR's expanding responsibilities for conflict-affected IDPs as part of the U.N. humanitarian reform process. We will strive to make this support even clearer and stronger as we press UNHCR for high performance in all of its responsibilities.

I want to close again by thanking Brookings, Roberta, and Dawn for this very useful report. Internally displaced persons, no less the refugees, deserve the most effective assistance, protection, and advocacy possible. The challenge -- the report challenges us to do more. And on behalf of Assistant Secretary Schwartz and all of us at PRM, I assure you that we will do our part.

Thank you.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you very much, Kelly. We turn now to USAID and

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

Susan Reichle.

MS. REICHLE: Thanks, Beth. And thanks everyone for being here today. But I first want to go back to sort of Beth Ferris inviting me here.

I think we first started to know each other a couple years ago when I was in Colombia as the mission director, most recently. And many of you know that's a country that is plagued with the title of having the second-largest IDP population in the world. And for every delegation that came through, we had to make the differentiation between Colombia and Sudan, and obviously the difference is in IDPs. And I think that really speaks to just sort of the diversity of the displaced population that we had.

But we were thrilled when Beth and several other colleagues agreed to come down and really to assess and look at what we were doing in Colombia, given our long experience there, and make some excellent recommendations. So I just want to publicly thank her for doing that. Because even though many of those recommendations were implemented after I left and took up this new post in September, it was incredibly useful, and I think it speaks to the expertise here around the table, listening to Roberta and Dawn, and having the opportunity to read the report. Unfortunately, I wasn't involved in the process of providing some input into the report, but I'm sure it's never too late to do that. Because my experience not only overseas as a foreign service officer, but now in leading this bureau over the last almost a year, it gives me a different perspective on how we as an interagency address these issues.

And I just want to thank Kelly for being here today in place of Eric. I know this -- it was very important for a lot of different reasons. But as Beth was e-mailing me to be here today, it was actually being sent to an e-mail address that I only get in Colombia, and Eric finally got me on the phone, and he said you have to be at the Brookings event. This is really important and you have to read the report and whatnot.

And I understood it once Eric brought it to my attention last week and had an opportunity to read the report. But I think there are just some really valuable recommendations here and lessons and things that I think we also, as we go forward with the implementation, can share.

The other thing Eric said is so I'm going to Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan, do you want to come? And I said I'd love to, but, as I think our colleagues pointed out here at Brookings, that we are still understaffed at USAID. We're working very hard to address those challenges, and I just could not get away to Kyrgyzstan this week. So Rob Jenkins, who is the head of our Office of Transition Initiatives, is there as part of the delegation. And given as well what was mentioned was the complex contingency fund, which is designed to address emergencies, Rob Jenkins being really the head of that, working with us closely, able to use actually \$15 million -- not \$20 million -- but to respond to the situation in Kyrgyzstan. And I think we'll get into this discussion a little bit more, but I think this is a way that the administration has really evolved in order to development mechanisms that can very quickly respond to crisis situations. So -- but just great to be here with Kelly.

And as she mentioned, she and Dave came over the other day because the work that we do on a daily basis really can't be overestimated. It's just -- it's continual. It's on country issues, it's on functional issues. And yet, I think a lot of the issues that are pointed here is how do we institutionalize that? Because we cannot afford, particularly for the IDPs that all of us in this room have worked so closely with over years and decades, we cannot afford to have that based on personalities and just good working relationships. We have to institutionalize this.

So, I just want to go through sort of a couple of the points that have been made, and I'll stay on point. And I know Beth will interrupt me with the yellow card, but

just first on the -- on particularly the IDP policy.

And I really want to recognize Jim Kunder because he wasn't here when it was sort of pointed out in the beginning, about 10 years ago, when he said, boy, we really need a policy, we need legislation, and we need funding for this. So while he's no longer in USAID, I hope that he feels somewhat rewarded by the fact that in 2004, under his leadership, we do have an IDP policy.

And I think, as you're pointing out here, how do we now get that out, get it really not just trained -- staff that are trained in the IDP policy, but held accountable? I found one of the recommendations really interesting about putting it into performance evaluations and really having that tied and linked closely.

Colombia, obviously, that was a country where there was a strong incentive to understand the IDP policy and the recommendations; my previous posts in Russia and Nicaragua perhaps a bit differently. But I think seeing the fruit of that labor.

The other thing I just wanted to point out is under the new administration, and as you probably saw the announcement by our administrator, we have the new Bureau for Policy Planning and Learning. Why is that important? Because that takes the policy unit, let's just take the IDP policy and the responsibility for that in order to ensure that everyone is trained and the knowledge management loop is completed, and that the support is given as well in order to implement the policy. So something that -- unfortunately, as you know, the Policy Bureau was dissolved several years ago and now it's back, and it's different. And I just want to really make a very public statement here about I think you will see some very fundamental changes now that we have the Policy, Planning, and Learning Bureau back here.

The other areas I just wanted to address, just sort of going through the comments that were made which I thought were, you know, really excellent, on the

importance of not just USAID officials understanding this, but as well State Department, other interagency officials. As many of you know with the Haiti crisis, Administrator Shah had only been in his job five days when he was very publicly designated the lead of the disaster response effort. And in that, one of the lessons learned was everyone -- because of the very clear command and control -- everyone understood that in the interagency, and so everybody came together and responded to that effort.

And we actually just did a Lessons Learned last week with the interagency, about 200+ people who were involved in the response. And one of the things that was so important was the -- that we need to do a much better job of training people on the issues across the interagency. And I thought that was an excellent recommendation that was made.

And (inaudible) everything from me standing in front of the group and I was responsible for the day-to-day operations, you know, that you need to have country clearance before you go in the country. If you're in a domestic agency such as HHS or FEMA, you don't even understand what "country clearance" means. So imagine IDP policy. You need to understand what an IDP policy is and how do you work with IDPs in that situation. So a lot of work to be done there and something we're doing really hard.

On the staffing recommendation, particularly that Roberta talked about, absolutely critical the OFDA director position, but I would remind you that there are many political positions that we're working on across the agency. But I put OFDA as sort of the most important position in DCHA to fill. And the administration is very, very focused on this, and I think you will see some good news coming out on that very quickly.

But as well, it's not just within Washington. It's the field offices. It's the staffing up, obviously, of relevant offices, and it's the training. It's the training across the board on the IDP policies and how do we work with them.

Kelly mentioned the QDDR process and so I just wanted to use this limited time to sort of share some of what I -- what all of us have been working on really for the last nine months. As a matter of fact, I came back from Colombia about a year ago next month. And I was walking through the State Department getting ready to do some briefings on Colombia, and I saw the secretary announcing the QDDR process. And I thought, oh, darn, I'm going to miss that. And that's something I feel so strongly about because we have to get our policies and processes.

And so the good news is actually I think that there has been a very deliberative process and it hasn't been just a couple months, let's get a report out the door. It's really been a year-long process, dealing with a lot of the issues that have been raised in the report.

So the first one I just want to address is something that is in the report, and that's about recovery. One of the things that Kelly talked about as well as the report talked about, the importance of recognizing you're not just responding in an emergency situation; that there is this period where you're also trying to pull yourself out, help work with a country out of the emergency humanitarian crisis, and plan for that recovery period. And, frankly, there is a gap within the U.S. Government. It's something that our teams in the QDDR have been dealing with very directly. And I think you'll see some interesting recommendations being made on that from everything from a bureau that perhaps deals with the issue of recovery and stabilization and transition to the issue of resources and surging, the importance of having people who are focusing on the issues of protection and reintegration.

One of the things we obviously saw in Colombia that had suffered under a civil war and IDPs, I would talk to IDPs who still self-identified as IDPs after 40 years. And so, how do you help them reintegrate into society? How do you help them actually

recover?

The issue of staffing that -- and budget, I think that was really appropriately raised here. As we've gone through the budget exercise with Deputy Secretary Lu and Administrator Shah, there is a real understanding after the Haiti crisis as to why it's so important that we really strengthen our capacity in these areas.

As was mentioned, there were 82 crises. And our staffing levels -- actually if you look at the core of OFDA, the core of OFDA 10 years ago was approximately 65 people with \$200 million that was spent on disaster response. Ten years later, it's over a billion dollars that we have spent on disaster response with a core of 67 people. Now, obviously we have hiring authority, we have different authorities. But one of the things that we were talking about very deliberately in the QDDR process is how do we strengthen that core? Because you have to build the house as opposed to always being in a response mode.

And the other element -- particularly looking at the diplomatic side as well as the development side-- it's not all about assistance, as the report appropriately points out and Kelly noted; the importance of the diplomatic agenda. And as we've had this dialogue during the QDDR and the PSD process -- I want to highlight the Presidential Security Directive that looks at development -- a lot about do we need a diplomatic dart? Do we need something that actually helps us surge on the diplomatic end as well as development side? Haiti is another excellent example of where clearly there was a very serious international agenda. The U.N. cluster system was set up. It was robust and yet did we have the surge capability within the U.S. Government to really interact with the U.N. in a very robust manner.

The other recommendation or issue that was pointed out is about resources and DOD, and we've been having this continual dialogue, obviously, the role

that the Department of Defense plays in humanitarian assistance and how do we leverage that. Some of the things just to put out there that we're looking at right now, for example, are memorandums of agreement that are institutionalized prior to a disaster, so that DOD assets are used to move our search-and-rescue teams immediately into a disaster situation. And we don't have to go through what probably Jim went through many more times than I did of exec sec to exec sec, you know, memos, which take time and effort and whatnot. But it's prepositioned and it's basically non-reimbursable, so it doesn't come out of the IDA account or other accounts there.

I could go on and on, but I know my time is limited, so I will just stop on really one, you know, really core piece of Administrator Shah's agenda, and that is what was pointed out in the report about evidence-based knowledge management. There is a lot of knowledge around the world about how we deal with IDPs. There is a lot of experience just in this room and many other corridors about what works and how do you integrate the humanitarian assistance with the livelihoods? How do you help people transition out of an emergency phase to a longer term recovery phase?

And so he has challenged us in the agency not just to have the evaluation and monitoring capability that we had before, but actually to come forward with hard-based evidence that will then come together and train the next generation of development professionals. So, we have an evidence-based summit that is planned for August related to counterinsurgency. As I mentioned, we just had one on Haiti and the lessons learned. And I will recommend strongly that we have one on IDPs coming very shortly because I think there's a lot of knowledge that exists and, again, not just within the government, much more outside of the government that we need to draw upon in order to improve our response.

Thank you.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

MS. FERRIS: Thank you very much, Susan. We turn now to Jim Kunder, who has many years of experience, as I mentioned earlier. Please.

MR. KUNDER: Thank you very much, Beth. And thank you, Roberta and Dawn, for doing the necessary work of reminding us there are tens of millions of people who need our focused attention. I associate myself with everything that Kelly and Susan just said, and I -- we're here to discuss IDPs, not tsunamis, but I sense a tidal wave of interest and expertise in the room, so let me be very, very brief.

I think the -- I really appreciate the focus on the transition between emergency assistance to long-term perspective with IDPs, since so many of the issues are legal issues and educational issues that require something more than an emergency phase. I really appreciate it since I do a lot of training with the U.S. Military, the emphasis on getting the military involved. In fact, if I had one concrete recommendation it would be that, as a follow-on piece of work, you do a major mapping exercise of where there are opportunities to insert IDP training. I happen to be involved in the training of the U.S. Government's new Civilian Response Corps at the Foreign Service Institute. And while -- because some of us who are instructors happen to care about IDPs, we talk about IDPs. But there's not a particular section on IDPs in that training.

There are many, many opportunities to do military training, European training, regional training in Africa, where we could take the knowledge we do have now and insert it into existing training opportunities. Because I do believe that there should be no diplomat or development expert around the world who doesn't come armed with some basic understanding of IDP issues and IDP problems that he or she can help address.

And then just one last thought. I mean, I -- you've touched all around the issue of moving forward here. I do think we need a diplomatic offensive to really come up with the IDP equivalent of the refugee convention. I mean, really we can do all these

things as outsiders, but, by definition, IDPs are within their own national boundaries. I think we need to take on the very, very difficult challenge.

A lot of -- I mean, we all know, a lot of countries are wary of outsiders coming in to grapple with internal displacement and all the political issues involved. But I do think we need to take this on as a major diplomatic intervention, a diplomatic offensive. And I think the tradeoff is that we do need to pay attention in the best Paris Declaration fashion to building local capacity to handle IDPs. And I think we could imagine a grant bargain where Western donor countries help build indigenous capacity to deal with IDPs at the same time that we grapple with adequate access and protection issues for IDPs.

So, you know, these are not in any way criticisms. It's just sort of expansion on some of the ideas you've already probed. But let me just stop where I started and thank you very much, Roberta and Dawn, for this excellent piece of work.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you very much. Finally, we turn to Joel Charny of Refugees International.

MR. CHARNY: Thank you. I want to acknowledge the audience. When I saw this was going to be in Falk Auditorium, I was going seriously? Falk Auditorium on the 30th of June, when we're competing with the UNHCR-NGO consultations? (Laughter) But we filled the room, so thank you for your interest and commitment on this issue.

I think it's an excellent report. It's almost scarily encyclopedic in its coverage. And, you know, I was sort of going through the recommendations and, okay, I agree with that; I agree with that. And, you know, as an advocate sort of, by the end, seeing sort of a 40-point agenda, you know, it does feel a little bit overwhelming, I have to say.

So I thought in my remarks I would just try and highlight or bring up a few things that I think are really critical.

You know, I think, those of you who are following this issue -- I mean, you know that there are, you know, reform proposals out there of the U.S. humanitarian architecture that include, you know, the idea of merging, you know, merging some components to form a sort of super humanitarian agency. And I want to be clear that I'm sympathetic with the approach that Roberta and Dawn took in the report, which is basically to say it will just be too complicated and too disruptive to go through, you know, what I think would be a bureaucratic nightmare of trying to merge, you know, say, PRM and OFDA, for example. And the key to me is not about merging and, you know, changing structures. It's about a unified U.S. Government response. I mean, I think that's what we need to be going for. And if that takes an MOU, you know, if that takes some kind of senior oversight, I mean, I think, judging from today's comments and from what I know of the leadership of these entities, I mean, I think the leadership is in place to make this happen. But we need to make sure that there's clarity on roles.

And another issue I want to bring up in this context is I think we need a joint commitment to a multilateral global response system. I mean, if there's one thing I would fault sometimes about the U.S. approach, is it tends to be bilateral in orientation. I'd like to see, you know, this whole idea of the U.S. needs to punch its way to really be influential. I think influential in the context of a global multilateral effort to improve our response to internal displacement and I think to make this happen, stronger staffing will be needed. And I endorse the recommendations in the report in that regard.

Obviously, more funding and flexible funding will be needed. I want to stress the flexible funding idea. It relates to a couple of the other points that I'll be raising.

We haven't mentioned as much maybe as we should have the whole idea of growing both the growing number and potential impact of natural disasters and displacement due to climate change. And I think the consensus is that much of that displacement will be internal. It will be largely about people displaced within their own country not crossing borders. So if you look at the strain on the system already, I think you have to imagine that strain being intensified as the result of climate change. And clearly more resources and stronger structures will be needed.

The next issue I would raise is -- and again, no one's used this term yet, although it's been implicit -- is to think -- I think when we think about internal displacement and the response, we need -- we do need to think about a community-based approach. This is not going to be, for the most part, about people in camps. So we have to have a holistic look at vulnerability that's not only the displaced people, but also the communities that are hosting them. There's a whole ripple effect in the displacement process that we see again and again. So we can't have compartments about, well, we can -- you know.

You know, I mean, for a long time I think ICRC actually pushed back around the whole concept of internally displaced people being exceptionally vulnerable. You know, let's look at vulnerability writ large, whether people are displaced or not. I think they finally accepted the validity of internal displacement as a special category of vulnerability. But nonetheless, we need to look at host communities and the overall impact on society and having sort of, you know, boxes of funding where you can only give those funds to displaced people, that that's clearly not going to work.

And then that leads into the whole return and reintegration or recovery and so on. I think the report makes an excellent point that, you know, there's never been -- you know, the whole durable solution language has never really been applied to

internally displaced people. Yet, I mean, there is a continuum. People have to be supported in the return process. Sometimes, people are unable to return.

I mean, you know, it's less stark if someone is displaced internally. I mean, I just spent two weeks in Khartoum. I mean, people from the South have been living in Khartoum for 20 or 25 years. Well, are they still internally displaced? We can debate that. Are they vulnerable? I think there's no debate around that because -- precisely because they haven't received sustained assistance around making their lives viable in Northern Sudan.

And then finally, again, an issue that might seem obscure in the context of some of the things that we're talking about, but which I really do want to raise up, is maintaining and strengthening the role of what, unfortunately, is about to become the special rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced people. Formally, it was sort of representative of the secretary general position.

Many of you -- I think almost all of you will recognize the name Francis Deng, who along with -- you know, was really the global leader on getting the Guiding Principles in collaboration with Roberta and the Swiss lawyer, Walter Kalin, who then succeeded Francis. And this position is now being turned into a special rapporteur position affiliated with the Human Rights Council. And, you know, given the well-known machinations that can take place at the level of the Human Rights Council, the fact that mandates, you know, by definition this is an aggressive mandate, this has already been eluded to.

You know, I think there's a real risk of, you know, kind of reducing the impact and potential influence of what has been a real leadership position that Francis and Walter have held. So we're counting, I think, on the U.S. Government to do its part to make sure that this doesn't happen, you know, to fight the good fight within the

confines of the Human Rights Council. Roberta and Dawn have the idea of, gee, maybe this shouldn't be a volunteer position? Right? Maybe we really need a full-time paid position in terms of the international leadership on these issues. So I, again, amid this huge agenda, I do want to make sure that we don't lose sight of that.

Thank you.

MS. FERRIS: Thank you very much and thanks to all of our panelists for many rich ideas and thoughts, and to you for your patience. We have time now for questions. You can direct them to any member of the panel or just throw general questions up in the air and see who catches it.

Please, if you'll introduce yourself, and we have a microphone that's coming. Yes?

SPEAKER: (inaudible) it's a pleasure to see old friends and colleagues who are still at it. And Roberta and Francis Deng certainly deserve the IDP Peace Prize for having pioneered all this.

Just to pick upon some of Joel and Jim's last remarks, what are -- since I'm not an astute or good reader of reports, I think this business of the rapporteur and making sure that doesn't happen is certainly an important one.

Taking that as an example, who has the lead? Who's going to follow up on this? And what are the other two or three implementable actions that might improve both the U.N. and the USG internal communications on this one. Dick Holbrooke first started the crusade on IDPs are people, too. It took a lot of pushing on his end at the U.N. We don't have him there, but who -- Susan and I think we'd pick up on some of these things. Who were some of the players that -- above our pay level that might move with some of your recommendations?

MS. FERRIS: You know, I wonder if we shouldn't take two or three

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

questions before giving the panelists a chance to respond. There in the back we have one and then here.

MR. LLOYD: I'm Mr. Lloyd from University of Maryland. I noticed that many of the studies that you've conducted are mostly on continental countries, countries whose borders are just over land with other countries. And I wonder if you have any studies about insular countries, like island countries or countries composed of many islands, which also, in their cases, they have their IDP people.

Like say, in Indonesia or the Philippines, we're in this country, so also plagued with Communist movements and Muslim sobriety movements and rebellions which went on for close to 100 years now. I wonder if you have ever conducted studies on cases of people who are internally displaced and could not move out of the country because they're composed of islands; not like in other parts -- of Southeast Asia, like Cambodia or Thailand or Vietnam -- they can move from one border to another. But for island countries, like the Philippines and Indonesia, how will these people move when they're also internally displaced, but still in the same country where they are living? And yet, they're fighting with Muslim (inaudible) and communist peoples. Any thoughts on this?

Thank you.

MS. FERRIS: Okay, thank you. We'll take the woman up here and then we'll give a chance for a response.

MS. MYSLOWITZ: Hi. I'm Anna Myslowitz. I'm with the Education for Peace in Iraq Center. And I was wondering if any of you could speak to the situation of IDPs in Iraq, and specifically, what the U.S. Government can do about that.

MS. FERRIS: Okay. Who would like to respond to the questions? Yes, Kelly.

MS. CLEMENTS: Maybe just to address Lionel's first question and then the third question briefly. We have an incredible cast of folks in the administration now with deep commitment to these issues, as you point out, whether or not we're talking about Ambassador Holbrooke or others in terms of the State Department leadership and USAID.

Now, in terms of the specific issue on the Human Rights Council, that's something that's being very actively pursued with Assistant Secretary Posner at DRL as well as Assistant Secretary Brimmer; something that we're continuing to pursue along with colleagues in Geneva in terms of moving forward on these. There are a number of proposals, I think, in terms of the report itself that we can be putting into, you know, an action plan going forward, and I think there's commitment to do that in terms of both on the political side, the management side, program side. It's going to be a matter, I think, of how we phase in various pieces of this because it's a very rich report, as all have pointed out.

In terms of the --

SPEAKER: (inaudible) predicting yes, a victory on that?

MS. CLEMENTS: I don't know that I could --

SPEAKER: (inaudible)

MS. CLEMENTS: No, I couldn't.

MS. CALABIA: But there's nothing to preclude the U.S. Government from having somebody working on this issue in a full-time capacity as special envoy, as special ambassador. It's something that we've done in the past. I would point what the Congress accomplished in trafficking, which is an issue most Americans have never heard of. Now we have a major tip report, a traffic report. We judge countries. We ask them to do certain things. We hold off certain kinds of assistance and even trade deals

because of a country's record on not dealing with the issue of trafficking, sexual trafficking, illegal labor trafficking. So I think that when there's leadership, when people take hold of these kinds of issues, you could make a substantial difference.

And the question of protection of people, one of the things I failed to mention was the need to fix peacekeeping, international peacekeeping as done by the United Nations or by coalitions of the willing, for ways to really protect civilians. There isn't any doctrine. There aren't scenarios. We don't have training capacities on these issues. We've started in a little bit in prevention of sexual abuse, but there's so much more that needs to be done. RI is taking -- working with a number of organizations in trying to convince the U.S. Military, the State Department, and others that this is an issue that demands priority consideration. If we're going to send out peacekeepers and we're going to say one of their duties is protecting civilians, they better know how it can be done, how you can patrol camps, how you can set up watch places, how you can have lighting in places as they did in Haiti with the latrines. These are issues that can be done.

We had a meeting recently and everybody sat around the table and said it would be nice if somebody came up with this, it would be nice if the U.N. did this. And the U.N. people turned around and said it'd be nice if a leading state like the United States did this, and then we could say, well, there are instances and there are doctrines, there are scenarios, there's training. We have lots of contractors in this country who are willing to train on any issue, so why don't we get them to work on this one? (Laughter)

And it would help in island states. It would help in island states if their own militaries, which are trying to protect their civilians, knew what could be done and if the civilians knew that that's what the military was supposed to be doing.

MS. FERRIS: Thanks. Just briefly on the question of island states, I know quite a bit of work has been done on displacement in both Indonesia and

Philippines, and this is an issue that's likely to become even more urgent with prospects of climate change and the possible disappearance of whole nation states and what that means both for the people concerned, but also for the international system.

I don't know, Joel, if you want to talk about Iraq, but certainly the large number of internally displaced persons in Iraq, the number who haven't been able to find solutions. I would argue that inadequate government policies to support return or integration communities of settlement are major issues, which, frankly, don't get a lot of coverage, perhaps because we're all focused on making sure that Iraq goes well and is presented as going well. But the reality on the ground, the humanitarian side, it's a little different picture.

MS. CALABIA: Yeah, Iraq is -- like other countries, had substantial number of informal squatter settlements, people who have been internally displaced. There are settlements where people get no access to government services. There are whole questions in Iraq of documentation. Without documents in Iraq you cannot access services, any service. In some ways it must have been one of the most litigious societies in the world because without that first document -- your birth certificate, your registration, your right to be some -- your ownership of your property -- you cannot access services.

The administration and the Congress have been trying to press the Iraq government to deal with this. They obviously say we have lots of other issues. But we know that there are over 2 million internally displaced persons. RI and a number of other organizations, including Brookings, have published papers and studies on this and ways to help those people reintegrate into society, get back their property or get compensation for the property they've lost. And this has got to be ongoing. You can't say you do it once and you never do it again. It needs to be on the front and center on the agenda. If you want people to believe in their society, they have to feel that the government is taking

their rights into account, whether they're Shia, Sunni, Christian, or another minority group.

MS. FERRIS: Okay. Roberta and then we'll take one more round.

MS. COHEN: I just wanted to make a comment on the position of the representative of the Secretary-General on IDPs. This is a very important position. It's one that has been the policy advocate and really the catalyst in the U.N. system on IDP policy and also on the development of standards and frameworks for durable solutions and on how IDPs have protection problems in natural disasters. It's kind of been the leader in terms of U.N. policy.

Now, the position is tied to the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights at the U.N. And there's a very unfortunate dynamic that develops. The High Commissioner for Human Rights has many rapporteurs on different subjects. There are country and there are thematic rapporteurs, and maybe there's a rapporteur on, say, North Korea, who does a report on North Korea. There may be a rapporteur on terrorism and human rights, counterterrorism, and the rapporteur will do a report. And the High Commissioner's office gives the same amount of attention and resources and staff, which is quite minimal, to every rapporteur. So here you have a person who makes a little trip here or there and writes a country report or you have a person writing on a subject like counterterrorism. And then you have the representative of the Secretary-General, who is dealing with 27 million IDPs from conflict and maybe tens of millions more from natural disaster, and has to mobilize the system very often with regard to taking care of these needs and also developing standards for dealing with new problems that arise. This is not the same position as a person writing a report on a particular country.

And the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, I would give them the prize for mindless bureaucracy because they see all of this as a pie. And so the

representative of the Secretary-General gets no more than whether it's one or a half of one person on the staff to help; gets no more than a certain amount of money that will go to a mission here or there. We could never have done the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement on that particular amount of funds. In fact, when Francis Deng had to go to Yale to meet with legal scholars to begin the process of the Guiding Principles, he did not have the carfare to go because the U.N. would not provide it. They have funds to give him for very rigid categories. If you want to make a mission to one country, we'll give you the funds.

The funding and the whole attitude toward this position is one that I think the United States ought to speak to and ought to have conversations with the High Commissioner of Human Rights and ought to look at the role of the representative and try to find a way so that the U.N. gives the position the support and the -- not only financial support-- but the political support and the understanding of what this position entails. It's so totally different, and we sort of go on year to year with this. So, as a result, the representative has always needed an independent institution to support him because he simply can't do the job effectively without that. And Brookings has played this role with the last two representatives; Walter Kalin will finish in the fall of this year.

There simply has to be a better arrangement and I think that the United States can do something here, mobilizing other countries as well to bring some common sense to the Office of the High Commissioner and the U.N. and how it deals with this.

MS. FERRIS: Thanks. Is it okay with our panelists if we go on for a few more minutes? Okay. Joel?

Okay. Then let's have another round of questions. We'll start over here one, two, three.

MS. SINHA: Good morning. My name is Anita Sinha, and I'm an

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

attorney with the legal NGO Advancement Project here in Washington, D.C., where I represent displaced communities in the Gulf Coast post-Katrina.

I acknowledge and appreciate the report's mention of the problem with classifying the situation post-Katrina as an IDP crisis, and I wanted to know if the authors wanted to elaborate on that a little bit.

Also, perhaps to Kelly and Susan, I wanted to know whether the current BP oil crisis is being regarded as a potential IDP crisis and if the lessons learned from Katrina are being implemented. And if so, how?

MS. FERRIS: Interesting question.

Yes, right here? Here and then back in the back.

MS. McBRIDE: My name is Kelly McBride. I work with the Carter Center.

This is just a suggestion regarding the rapporteurs from the U.N. system. I've collaborated with two: on indigenous people's rights and also on the independence of justice. Usually they have to find their own money, you're right. And they find it inside the U.N. system from the U.N. resident coordinator. So they really have to work, say, with Colombia or Ecuador, depending. And some are really aggressive and really creative and others just are sort of laid back. So the United States could certainly provide money and encouragement through UNDP for the special rapporteur on indigenous -- excuse me, on IDPs, so, you know, Colombia, Sudan, those different places. That's one suggestion.

MS. FERRIS: Thanks. And toward the back, yes? Yes, right here.

MR. PIAKA: Hi. I'm Asa Piaka. I'm with USAID. My question is about Capitol Hill, really, and the legislative process.

And you touched upon reform and expansion of legislative authorities to

include IDPs. My question is what are the politics behind that? Are there obstacles to that? Is there a lobby against that process?

And the second kind of related question is what role do you see for the NSC in terms of oversight? Do you envision a point person sitting at the NSC or in another branch?

Thanks.

MS. FERRIS: Maybe one more since you're all so disciplined.

(Laughter)

Yes, please. A microphone's coming, yes.

MR. MONTIYA: My name is Gabril Montiya from International Organization for Migration.

I was wondering how these policies are being shared in the field so that -- for IDPs specifically, so that implementing partners take them into account and effectively do that in their projects, in their programming.

Thank you.

MS. FERRIS: Okay. We have questions on Katrina, Gulf oil crisis, UNDP, and special rapporteurs, USAID, and how policies are shared in the field. Roberta?

MS. COHEN: Let me speak to the Katrina one. It's tremendously important for the United States to acknowledge that it has IDPs in its own country when there are natural disasters here. They were called everything under the sun, as you know, including refugees when they first appeared. But I would make this point: That the different parts of the U.S. Government don't always connect or communicate with each other. So you could have U.S. delegates at the U.N. or in Washington talking about IDPs as including those that are both conflict and natural disaster IDPs. The IDP policy of

2004 of USAID applies to both.

However, you can have domestic agencies that never heard about that. So they don't know that these are IDPs. They don't know what that means and they've never heard of the Guiding Principles. The Brookings project, Beth has sent recommendations to FEMA, for example, to include reference to the Guiding Principles and to other human rights and protection issues into the FEMA draft recovery framework.

But I would want to make one more point. It really pays for the United States to follow international standards on the human rights of IDPs. I think it'll protect them against international criticism. They have faced international criticism at the Human Rights Committee, which is the monitoring body for the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, where the response on what they've called racism and classism -- there have been strong criticisms of U.S. response on the basis of international standards. A universal periodic review is coming up of the United States. I would imagine that there will be those there that are going to raise Katrina and the treatment of IDPs and the rights of IDPs.

And so there are also lawsuits that are pending within the United States that have to do with preventive measures for a natural disaster. I think the U.S. could avoid -- in its own interest, could avoid lawsuits, legal action, and international criticism by complying with the international standards for IDPs. So I'm just handing out another reason for them to take a look at this.

Let me see, on the NSC, we have a section in the report that deals with that. We don't have a great deal of detail. I don't know whether Dawn wants to address that because she had recommended the revival of the contingency planning policy coordination.

MS. CALABIA: There used to be -- there was a committee in a previous

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

administration that was disbanded that brought people together looking at incidents and things that were developing and where they were across-the-board with discussions. Everybody was at the table. One of the things that's been very important for the new administrator at USAID is the promise that he will be at the table, and I hope he's at the table all of the time. And also, that whoever's doing the humanitarian policy for the State Department is also at that table. Because it's very important for us to understand what the implications or the impact of actions that the United States Government is taking or that it is advancing at the United Nations, for instance, and the impact that it's going to have on people, particularly on vulnerable groups like IDPs. So we think that's really important.

I'm going to jump to Capitol Hill since I have the microphone. There hasn't been a State Department authorization bill since 1995. There hasn't -- the Foreign Aid Act was created in 1961. It has 850 different authorities and provisions that relate to all kinds of things that no longer exist. There are amendments to that bill which talk about particular IDP crises because Congress wanted to do something: Darfur, they wanted to do something in Colombia, they wanted to do something in other countries around the world that made it to the front page. But Congress has not been able to agree on passing authorization legislation.

Every year it creates funding bills, appropriations. And in those bills, if you're somebody who follows it the way I do, you read the fine print in the back, and the committee report generally talks about refugee and internally displaced people and other vulnerable groups, including communities that are hosting refugees or IDPs, and the impact. But Congress has not grappled with the issue front and center, and that's what we think they need to do.

There are five different foreign aid reform bills in the House and the

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

Senate that have passed one body or the other body, the House or the Senate, that take bits and pieces, but there is no comprehensive foreign aid reform bill because, frankly, they were unable to get agreement. You all know the difficulties with cloture in the Senate. You now have to get 60 votes for everything.

And administrations obviously put their prioritization on domestic issues, national security issues. We would say that for the stability of the world, for regional stability, attention to refugee and IDP issues, prevention and resolution of those situations is extremely important. This administration has sent three assistant secretaries now to Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan. Is it just because we have a base in Kyrgyzstan? Is it because we don't want the Fergana Valley to go up in flames, and what could that mean for the world and for development and for peace and stability? These are really important issues. Susan spent a lot of time working in Colombia on the 4 million internally displaced people in Colombia, staggering amount.

So these are important issues. Congress looks at them piecemeal, but hasn't been willing or able to get together on this issue. When I talk to members they say, yeah, that's a really important issue, but there are so many other important issues, our time is extremely limited. We're hoping that -- we would have hoped that there was a foreign aid reform bill this year, and we're working to get attention to some of these issues -- to renaming PRM, to improving OFDA's abilities to operate -- but, so far, it hasn't happened. So bits and pieces are being done, small amounts of increases in staffing and some funding, but that's it.

So, no, I don't know anybody up there who's opposed to helping internally displaced persons. There is confusion as there as with the journalists during Katrina. What's an IDP, an internally displaced person? What's a refugee? And we have to help educate. And I hope everybody in this room would take that under

consideration.

MS. FERRIS: I'm sure they will. Other comments? Jim and Joel?
Susan?

SPEAKER: I'm fine.

MS. REICHLER: Just very quickly on the BP oil spill because I think that's, you know, so relevant obviously to what we're all dealing with every single day as we turn on the news, read the newspapers, thinking about where we vacation, people we know down there. One thing that the administration did immediately -- and I don't think this has gotten any coverage -- is really pulling together the interagency and the lessons learned. Just as when Haiti occurred and the earthquake, we immediately pulled in FEMA and others in the domestic arena and really worked as one team. And so that's one thing that's happened with BP, with the response. And in our agency, Maura O'Neill, who is really the right hand to the administrator as the innovation counselor, playing that pivotal role with OFDA, providing all the knowledge and the lessons learned and the experience. So that's one.

And then just, too, on this issue of policies and practices, I think it's so important. You can have lots of policies, but if they're not put into practice and, having spent most of my career in the field, it's really trying to take a lot of the policies that are developed here in Washington and then how to use them. And I think the work that we've done, particularly with IOM and the implementation guidance and the manual for working with IDPs, is one example of that in how we train people.

That's it.

MS. FERRIS: I want to thank the panelists and all of you, and I encourage you to read the report. You probably haven't read it if you just got it, but do read the report. And we'll certainly be following up both with the U.S. Government and

NGOs and others to try to make sure that issues of internal displacement are addressed seriously by the U.S. Government and, indeed, by the world.

Thank you very much. (Applause)

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

/s/Carleton J. Anderson, III

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2012

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190