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Yousef Abo in the rubble of his home in the district of Tariq Al Bab in Aleppo. On the night of 22 February 2013 the Syrian regime launched a Scud missile which killed 120 people, including Yousef’s wife, two sons and two daughters. (Photo: © Pablo Tosco, February 2013)
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The Norwegian Refugee Council's Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC) has monitored internal displacement since 1998. Our annual Global Overview covers people internally displaced by international and internal armed conflict, generalised violence - communal, ethnic, political and criminal violence - and human rights violations. This current report is based on data and analysis gathered between January and December 2013.

Our research and analysis also show that the causes and impacts of displacement are multiple and often overlapping, including those related to disasters induced by natural hazards, impacts of displacement are multiple and often overlapping, human rights violations. This current report is based on data and analysis gathered between January and December 2013.

The first section of this document outlines the scale and main trends, causes and impacts of displacement in 2013. It goes on to explore key issues, challenges and changes in policy and practice needed to address the phenomenon and to promote the rights of internally displaced people (IDPs) at the national, regional and global level.

Five regional summaries are each followed by figures and descriptions of internal displacement in the countries we monitor in that region. The report provides information on 58 countries and territories overall, with dedicated country pages for 43. The country pages include estimates for cumulative displacement as of the end of 2013, which are also expressed as a proportion of each country’s population. If the number of IDPs has fallen significantly, the peak year and number are also given.

Figures for new displacements and returns in 2013 are noted where available, but actual numbers may well be considerably higher. It is also important to note that IDPs reported as having returned to their places of origin may not necessarily have achieved durable solutions to their displacement. Those who chose to integrate locally in their places of refuge or to settle elsewhere in the country are seldom monitored, meaning little information is given on their number or fate.

A note on methodology
To produce this report, IDMC compiled and analysed the best data available from national governments, the UN and other international agencies, national and international NGOs, human rights organisations, media reports and IDPs themselves. Field missions were also conducted in a number of countries during 2013.

We strive continuously with our partners to improve our methodology and the quality of our evidence and analysis. Such improvements, and the availability of better source data may have contributed to changes in figures for 2013 compared with previous years, alongside actual increases or decreases in the scale of displacement.

For countries where reasonably indicative data is not available, we have previously reported the number of IDPs as ‘undetermined’. This year, however, we have provided best estimates, while drawing attention to the sometimes considerable limitations of the information on which they are based.

Several countries mentioned in the regional annexes do not have pages of their own, because little or no new information has been made available since the end of 2012. We have also removed a small number of countries from the report. This does not reflect a conclusion that internal displacement no longer exists in those places, but rather the paucity of the data available for analysis. Algeria and Israel were cases in point in 2013. More information on these countries and detailed figures analysis can be found on our website: www.internal-displacement.org.

The availability and quality of information depends, above all, on national authorities’ capacity and will to collect and disseminate it as part of their response to displacement. We have made every effort to be accurate and up-to-date throughout this report. The number and reliability of sources, however, varies widely from country to country. Data may be based on reports of new displacements, or in some cases on subsequent assessments to determine how many IDPs need support. If reliable or credible information was not available about the scale of new or cumulative displacement, we have stated as much.

Our estimates are rounded up or down to the nearest 100. We state “up to” when we have reason to believe that the reported figures may overestimate the actual scale of displacement. This is often because only old source data is available and we have evidence that displacement has abated since. If we believe the reported figures to be an underestimate, we state “at least”. This may be because the source data does not cover all areas affected by displacement. Countries in which the number of IDPs fell to zero during the year are included in the report and the change explained. Those that had no IDPs for a second consecutive year in 2013 are not included, as is the case for Croatia.

We use UN Population Fund (UNFPA) figures to normalise our displacement estimates. We do this because other population figures are unreliable for some of the countries we monitor and using them would not yield comparable percentages. UNFPA’s statistics can be found at www.unfpa.org/swp.

Each country’s displacement figure is also compared with its ranking on UNDP’s Human Development Index. UNDP’s rankings are based on life expectancy, literacy and other education indices, and gross domestic product per capita. Countries that score up to 85 are considered highly developed, and those between 128 and 187 the least developed. A small number of countries are not ranked.

For the purposes of this report, we include Turkey, the Balkans, the Caucasus and the Russian Federation in the Europe and central Asia region, and Afghanistan in south and southeast Asia. Any boundaries, names or other designations shown on maps or elsewhere do not imply our official endorsement or acceptance of them.
Internal displacement worldwide in 2013 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 9
Internal displacement in sub-Saharan Africa . . . . . . . . . . . . 18
Internal displacement in the Americas . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 38
Internal displacement in Europe, the Caucasus and central Asia . 45
Internal displacement in the Middle East and north Africa . . . . 56
Internal displacement in south and south-east Asia . . . . . . . . 65
**Glossary of key terms and concepts**

**Armed conflict:** An armed confrontation between the armed forces of states (international armed conflict) or between governmental authorities and organised armed groups or between such groups within a state (non-international armed conflict). Other situations of violence, such as internal disturbances and tensions are not considered armed conflicts. (Source: ICRC, *Exploring Humanitarian Law: Glossary, 2009*)

**Generalised violence:** Threat to life, physical integrity or freedom resulting from generalised violence including: (i) civilian casualties as a result of indiscriminate acts of violence, including bombings, suicide attacks and Improvised Explosive Device explosions (ii) conflict-related security incidents. Such considerations are not, however, limited to the direct impact of the violence. They also encompass the longer-term, more indirect consequences of conflict-related violence that, either alone or on a cumulative basis, give rise to threats to life, physical integrity or freedom. (Source: UNHCR)

**Human Rights Violations:** Irrespective of the "type" of human rights – whether civil, political, social, economic or cultural – failure from the state to meet its duty to respect (to refrain from interfering with the enjoyment of rights), to protect (to prevent rights abuses by third parties) and to fulfil (obligation to facilitate access to rights) human rights.

While non-state actors (NSAs) are, under certain conditions, legally bound by international humanitarian law there is no unanimous agreement as to whether they can be considered bound by human rights obligations. The classical view is that only states are the subjects of international human rights law and therefore, as duty holders, can be said to "violate human rights". NSAs can however be held accountable for human rights "abuses", which the state has a duty to investigate, prosecute and punish as a means of redress and of prevention. In both armed conflict and times of peace, individuals also can be held criminally responsible for crimes under national and international law. (Source: IDMC)

**Durable solutions:** A durable solution is achieved when IDPs no longer have specific assistance and protection needs that are linked to their displacement and such persons can enjoy their human rights without discrimination resulting from their displacement.

A durable solution can be achieved through:
1. Sustainable reintegration at the place of origin (hereinafter referred to as 'return')
2. Sustainable local integration in areas where internally displaced persons take refuge (local integration)
3. Sustainable integration in another part of the country (settlement elsewhere in the country)
(Source: IASC, *Framework for Durable Solutions, 2010*)

**Internally displaced people (IDPs):** Internally displaced people are "persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalised violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognised state border." (Source: United Nations, *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, Introduction, para. 2, 1998*)

**Natural hazard:** Natural process or phenomenon that may cause loss of life, injury or other health impacts, property damage, loss of livelihoods and services, social and economic disruption, or environmental damage. (Source: UNISDR, 2009)

**Non-State Armed Groups (NSAGs):** Organised armed entities involved in internal armed conflicts that are primarily motivated by political goals and operate outside state control. (Source: Geneva Call)

**Protection:** Protection broadly encompasses activities aimed at obtaining full respect for the rights of all individuals in accordance with international law – international humanitarian, human rights, and refugee law – regardless of their age, gender, social, ethnic, national, religious, or other background. (Source: IASC)

**Profiling (IDPs):** A collaborative process whereby data on individuals or groups who have been internally displaced is collected, with the purpose of informing advocacy on their behalf, improving protection and assistance interventions and, ultimately, finding a durable solution to displacement. (Source: Joint IDP Profiling Service)

**Protracted displacement:** Protracted displacement is a situation in which the process for finding durable solutions for internally displaced people is stalled, and/or IDPs are marginalised as a consequence of a lack of protection of their human rights (Source: UNHCR and The Brooking-Bern Project on internal displacement, *Expert Seminar on Protracted IDP Situations, 2007*).

**Returnees:** IDPs who have returned to their homes or places of habitual residence.

**Vulnerability:** The characteristics and circumstances of a community, system or asset that make it susceptible to the damaging effects of a hazard. (Source: UNISDR, 2009)
Internal displacement in South and South-East Asia

Figures and causes
There were at least 3.2 million IDPs in Asia as of the end of 2013, down 21 per cent from 4.1 million a year earlier. They fled their homes as a result of armed conflict, violence and human rights violations, and around 80 per cent were in Afghanistan, India, Myanmar and Pakistan. While increased levels of fighting in Afghanistan, the Philippines and Myanmar led to a rise in IDP numbers in these countries, and in others such as Indonesia, a relative stability allowed for numbers to be reduced.

Accurate data on internal displacement is hard to come by, given the absence of effective registration and monitoring mechanisms, variation in definitions of what constitutes an IDP across the region and highly fluid population movements. In some countries, such as Pakistan and Thailand, displacement is not always officially acknowledged. No new information was available on Bangladesh, Nepal or Laos.

IDPs who seek refuge in official camps tend to be registered, and as such they are included in the numbers that are available. The same figures, however, tend to underestimate or fail to account for IDPs living with host families, in rented accommodation or in makeshift shelters. The closure of camps and the premature de-registration of IDPs also distort official statistics. Few efforts have been made to assess the extent to which IDPs have returned home or made progress towards achieving durable solutions.

The main cause of displacement was internal armed conflict between government forces and non-state armed groups (NSAGs) fighting for autonomy or regional control or resisting policies that result in political and economic marginalisation. Inter-communal violence was also a factor in India and Myanmar. The main agents of displacement were the various parties to the region’s conflicts, which in some countries included militias and vigilantes mobilised along religious or ethnic lines.
Disasters brought on by rapid-onset natural hazards caused significant new displacement in south and south-east Asia in 2013. Typhoon Haiyan, the worst disaster to affect the region since the 2004 tsunami, hit the Philippines in November, killing at least 5,600 people and displacing over four million. Such disasters make the already precarious living conditions of people displaced by conflict worse and increase their vulnerability.

New displacements
Around 714,000 people were newly displaced by conflict across the region during the year, nearly half the figure for 2012. The number of new IDPs fell by two-thirds in Pakistan, and was significantly lower in India. That said, 140,000 people were still newly displaced in Pakistan, 327,000 in the Philippines and 124,000 in Afghanistan.

New displacement in the Philippines took place mainly on the southern island of Mindanao, where government forces are fighting a number of NSAGs. The largest single displacement was in September in Zamboanga city, where three weeks of clashes between the army and a faction of the Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF) destroyed more than 10,000 homes and displaced more than 120,000 people. Half of those affected were still displaced as of the end of the year. The largest displacement in Pakistan was in Khyber agency in March, when clashes between NSAGs in Tirah valley forced at least 102,000 people to flee. Most took refuge inside the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) or in neighbouring Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) province. In Afghanistan, the drawdown of international forces has not been accompanied by a transition to stability. Nearly half of those newly displaced fled military operations and insecurity in the southern province of Helmand.

In India, new displacement was mainly triggered by communal violence between Muslims and Hindus in Uttar Pradesh in September, which forced around 51,000 people to flee their homes. In Myanmar, armed conflict and inter-communal violence displaced as many as 54,000 people. Of the total, more than 21,000 fled fighting between the government and the Kachin Independence Army (KIA) in north-eastern Kachin and neighbouring Shan states.

Protection issues
Protection challenges tended to be more acute in the initial phase of displacement, but IDPs were also at risk of physical harm and having their rights infringed in their places of refuge, including in camps. In Myanmar, police reportedly shot dead three displaced Rohingya women in a camp in Rakhine state during protests against relocation in June. IDPs’ freedom of movement was also severely restricted. In Pakistan, 12 IDPs queuing for food rations were killed and 24 injured in March, when a car bomb exploded in Jalozai camp, KP province.

Food, shelter and basic facilities were generally available in official camps across the region, but conditions often fell short of international standards. In most countries, however, the majority of IDPs live with friends and family or in rented accommodation or informal shelters. Some have moved to the relative safety of urban areas, where they have better access to services and job opportunities.

IDPs outside camps often have similar needs to those in them, but tend to receive far less assistance, threatening their long-term recovery. With their assets depleted, most have no choice but to borrow money or buy essential items on credit, pushing their households further into debt. A 2013 assessment of Pakistani IDPs living outside camps in KP province showed that more than half had done so. Elsewhere, others chose to cope by eating less, increasing the risk of malnutrition.
Durable solutions

Progress towards durable solutions was limited for the majority of IDPs in the region, and protracted displacement was a concern in most countries, particularly Afghanistan, India, Myanmar, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. Around 337,000 IDPs were reported to have returned home during the year, mainly in the Philippines and Pakistan. Most had been displaced for only a few days or weeks. A lack of effective monitoring across the region means returns tend to be under-reported and their sustainability not assessed.

Most returnees face significant recovery challenges, including the rebuilding of homes and livelihoods and regaining access to land and property. These were complicated by the loss of assets and the accumulation of significant debt during their displacement. In Sri Lanka, where the armed conflict ended in 2009, tens of thousands of returnees are still in need of housing, water, sanitation, livelihoods and food. The widespread presence of the military and ongoing surveillance also serve to undermine the return process.

Camps were sometimes closed before return was possible, leaving IDPs cut off from assistance with few other options but to fend for themselves. In India, the state government in Uttar Pradesh said that only 2,600 of the 51,000 people who fled inter-communal violence in September were still displaced at the end of the year. Local NGOs, however, put the figure ten times higher, with most IDPs living in informal settlements after their eviction from camps.

Relocation is usually intended to improve IDPs’ living conditions by providing them with better shelter, water and sanitation facilities. Given a lack of available land, however, relocation sites are often far from IDPs’ original homes and livelihoods or other sources of income. IDPs are rarely able to buy the land offered or to secure tenure in other ways. In Indonesia, an estimated 22,000 IDPs in West Timor still need livelihood and shelter assistance 14 years after fleeing from Timor Leste. Poor tenure security, a shortage of land and tensions between the IDPs and their host communities are all obstacles to their achieving durable solutions.

IDPs in urban areas struggle to find adequate housing, which is a major barrier to their local integration. They are also excluded from government assistance. As a result, IDPs in towns and cities throughout the region live in substandard conditions without access to basic services. In Afghanistan, urban IDPs and returned refugees have established informal settlements on public land without permission in cities such as Kabul, Herat and Jalalabad. Without tenure security, legal remedies, compensation or alternative housing options, many risk eviction, homelessness and increased vulnerability.

National and international response

National authorities’ responses to IDPs’ assistance and protection needs were insufficient across the region in 2013. Challenges include a lack of relevant policy or legal frameworks, failure to implement those that do exist, a shortage of data and limited access to those in need. Most governments pay minimal attention to IDPs’ needs after their return or to the needs of those trying to integrate locally or settle elsewhere.

A small number of countries made progress in developing frameworks to protect IDPs. In the Philippines, congress adopted a comprehensive bill on internal displacement in February. The president, however, vetoed it three months later on the grounds that some of its provisions were unconstitutional. A new bill was under discussion in the lower house as of the end of the year, and was expected to make progress during 2014. Afghanistan adopted a landmark policy in November that clearly defines an IDP and recognises their right to all three durable solution options. Sri Lanka published a draft policy in 2013, but it fell short of international standards, in particular because it failed to cover all phases and causes of displacement.

Efforts to collect data on the number and needs of all IDPs, particularly those living in protracted displacement, were lacking. This in turn prevents governments from designing appropriate policies and programmes. In Sri Lanka, the government and its international partners are to conduct a joint needs assessment, but its scope is still to be determined.

In countries such as Afghanistan, Myanmar and Pakistan insecurity continued to prevent humanitarian access to displaced populations. The Indonesian government placed access restrictions on some areas of Papua province, and the Sri Lankan authorities prevented some programmes from going ahead. In most countries, displacement tends to be viewed as a temporary problem and assistance focused on providing emergency relief in official camps.

Despite the international community’s growing recognition in recent years of the need to bridge relief and development initiatives to facilitate durable solutions, many obstacles remain. Longer-term humanitarian funding that allows for more sustained interventions and helps to ensure a more effective transition from relief to recovery is still the exception rather than the rule. Governments and development organisations such as UNDP, the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank will also have to make greater efforts to assess the needs of IDPs in protracted situations and ensure they are addressed in national development strategies and plans if durable solutions are to be achieved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Number of IDPs (rounded)</th>
<th>Government figures</th>
<th>UN figures</th>
<th>Other figures</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>At least 631,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>631,000 (UNHCR, January 2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td>The UNHCR figure does not reflect all conflict IDPs living in urban areas, as they are often mixed with disaster displaced as well as economic migrants and urban poor making it difficult to identify them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Up to 280,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>275,000 (Bangladesh Human Development Research Centre, 2007)</td>
<td>The IDMC figure is based on BHDRC’s 2007 estimate, plus thousands displaced since then. It also accounts for the fact that tensions and fighting have continued, making it unlikely that IDPs have returned, integrated locally or settled elsewhere in the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>At least 526,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The figure is compiled from various sources. It is conservative and represents only those currently living in official camps. It does not include those who have left the camps, but have failed to achieve a durable solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>At least 90,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The figure is compiled from various sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao People’s Democratic</td>
<td>Up to 4,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,500 (AI, 2012)</td>
<td>The majority of the IDPs forcibly returned from Thailand in 2009 have been resettled in a camp in Bonikharmay province. International access to the camp is limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>640,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400,000 in the south-east (The Border Consortium (TBC), 1 November 2013)</td>
<td>The IDMC figure is the sum of UN figures for Kachin and northern Shan, Rakhine and Mandalay and the TBC figure for the south-east of the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Up to 50,000</td>
<td>89,000 (2009)</td>
<td>50,000 (UNHCR Global Appeal, January 2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Information on IDPs is out-of-date and limited in scope. The IDMC figure does not include those displaced from the Terai region since 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>At least 746,700</td>
<td></td>
<td>747,000 (UNHCR, December 2013)</td>
<td>415,785 (IVAP, December 2013)</td>
<td>The UNHCR figure includes only those IDPs registered in FATA and KP agencies. It does not include those who are unregistered or those displaced in other parts of the country. The IVAP figure only covers those profiled in seven KP districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>At least 115,800</td>
<td>115,770 (Mindanao protection cluster, February 2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes people in government-recognised camps and relocation sites, displaced by armed conflict, clan violence and crime in 2013; but not IDPs displaced in previous years whose return or settlement elsewhere has not been sustainable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Up to 90,000</td>
<td>23,368 (Ministry of Resettlement, December 2013)</td>
<td>93,447 (UNHCR, 31 December 2012)</td>
<td>38,000 (civil society organisations, May 2013)</td>
<td>Neither the government nor the CSO figure cover all locations and all groups of IDPs. No figures have been made available since December 2012 for those who have returned, integrated locally or settled elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>At least 35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,000 – 100,000 (ICG, 23 October 2007)</td>
<td>There are no UN or government figures available. Demographic data shows the Buddhist minority in the three Muslim-majority provinces affected by conflict shrank by 25 per cent between 2000 and 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>At least 900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>146 families (UNMIT, 2012)</td>
<td>The IDMC figure represents families evicted in 2011 from an abandoned police station in Dili, where they had settled after being displaced between 1999 and 2006. They have since moved to the Aitarak Laran site, where they remain at risk of eviction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of IDPs in Afghanistan continued to rise significantly in 2013, against a backdrop of armed conflict, pervasive violence and abuses by non-state armed groups. Inter-ethnic disputes and local conflicts over land and water were also contributing factors.

The number of people newly displaced by armed conflict increased from 100,000 in 2012 to 124,000 in 2013. Almost half of the displacement in 2013 took place in the southern province of Helmand, where 53,000 people fled their homes. The total number of people displaced by conflict stood at 631,000 at the end of the year. The figure does not include IDPs in inaccessible locations and some informal settlements.

The ongoing transition of security responsibilities from international to Afghan forces has not been accompanied by improved stability. The number of civilian deaths and injuries documented in 2013 was at its highest since 2001. The United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA) reported a 14 per cent rise in civilian casualties compared with 2012, with the highest number of fatalities among women and children since 2009 attributed to an increase in clashes and unexploded ordnances.

Conflict caused displacement in southern, eastern and western Afghanistan, with most IDPs fleeing homes in Helmand, Kunduz, Badghis, Nangarhar and Ghor provinces. Protracted displacement is a growing concern, with more than 310,000 people displaced since at least 2011.

In the absence of comprehensive and disaggregated data, information available suggests that 65 per cent of IDPs are under 18, a similar proportion to the general population. There are almost equal numbers of male and female IDPs. Displacement dynamics varied significantly across the country during 2013. Some IDPs took refuge with relatives, while others were dispersed in host communities where they built or rented their own homes, or squatted government or private land. Increasing numbers sought the relative safety of towns and cities.

More than 75 per cent of IDPs surveyed in 2012 expressed the wish to integrate locally in their places of refuge. The newly adopted national policy on IDPs recognises local integration and settlement elsewhere as potential solutions to displacement, but authorities at all levels continue to link assistance and solutions to return, and only provide help to IDPs who go back to their places of origin.

IDPs were unable to exercise even their basic rights to food, water, adequate housing, health and education during 2013, and a chronic shortage of work left many struggling to survive on incomes well below the national average.

The national response remains inadequate, and is hampered by a lack of political will, weak local governance, the activities of non-state armed groups and ongoing armed conflict and hostilities.

The adoption in November of the national policy on IDPs was a welcome development. Key provisions include the prevention of displacement and a more coordinated response across government. The policy clearly defines for the first time who qualifies as an IDP, and sets out the government’s responsibility to provide protection, assistance and durable solutions. Implementation, however, has yet to take place. Future challenges include ongoing conflict, and elections scheduled for April 2014 that will disrupt the initial timetable for drafting implementation plans.

The international response was coordinated through the cluster system and the national task force on IDPs via its regional offices. Help was prioritised by ranking provinces according to IDPs’ documented needs and their exposure to conflict and other hazards, with an emphasis on life-saving assistance. The response was hampered by a lack of access and reliable data. The Common Humanitarian Action Plan (CHAP) for Afghanistan in 2013 was the best funded worldwide, but challenges in terms of financial oversight and transparency have also hindered humanitarian work. The development sector needs to engage more fully to meet IDPs’ longer-term needs.
There was no updated comprehensive information on the number of IDPs due to conflict, violence and human rights violations since the government’s count of more than 128,000 internally displaced Pahari and Bengali families, or more than 667,000 individuals, in 2000. Based on available information it was estimated that there were up to 280,000 IDPs in Bangladesh at the end of 2013.

The 1997 peace agreement between the government and the United People’s Party of the Chittagong Hill Tracts (PCJSS) has still not been fully implemented. The accord ended 24 years of conflict that broke out in 1973 in the south-eastern Chittagong Hill Tracts (CHT) region after the government rejected demands for greater autonomy from non-Bengali indigenous people known collectively as Pahari or Jumma.

The conflict forced Paharis to flee to the forests and to neighbouring India, while the government supported the settlement of Bengalis, Bangladesh’s majority community, including on Pahari land, as a counterinsurgency measure. Some settlers were then also displaced as a result of the fighting.

Tensions between Paharis and Bengalis have continued, with clashes displacing more people and preventing others from returning to their homes. Some have reportedly been forcibly evicted by the state or private companies without receiving appropriate compensation. IDPs are widely dispersed and face a number of challenges, including insecurity, lack of access to basic services and difficulty in rebuilding their agricultural livelihoods in the absence of secure tenure.

An amendment to the CHT Land Dispute Resolution Commission Act 2001 intended to improve the settlement of land disputes is due for approval in 2014.

India continued to experience new and protracted displacement during 2013 as a result of communal violence and armed conflict with a total of at least 526,000 people displaced at the end of the year. This figure likely under-represents the real number of IDPs since in India IDPs tend to no longer be counted once official camps are closed, even if they remain in displacement. In addition, many of the country’s IDPs are assumed to be dispersed in urban areas, and there is little or no information about their numbers or protection and assistance needs.

An estimated 64,000 people were newly displaced in 2013, more than half of whom were still living in displacement at the end of the year. More than 488,000 IDPs continued to live in protracted displacement, which lasts on average for five to ten years. A survey of IDPs conducted during the year by the NGO Centre for Social Justice identified ethnic identity and land disputes as the main causes of communal tensions.

Outbreaks of communal violence led to displacement during the year, in the north-eastern state of Assam and in the northern state of Uttar Pradesh. Riots displaced around 51,000 people from more than 150 villages in Uttar Pradesh in September. State authorities said that more than 90 per cent of those who fled had returned by the end of the year, but local organisations assisting IDPs said that more than 27,000 people were still living
Indonesia

**NUMBER of IDPs**
At least 90,000

**PERCENTAGE of total population**
At least 0.03%

**START of displacement situation:**
1999

**PEAK number of IDPs**
1,400,000 (2002)

**NEW displacement in 2013**
3,000

**CAUSES of displacement**
✓ Armed conflict
✓ Generalised violence
✓ Human rights violations

**Human Development Index**
121

There is no reliable figure for the number of IDPs in Indonesia, but based on information from government agencies, international NGOs and civil society organisations, it was estimated that there were 90,000 IDPs as of the end of 2013. Most fled widespread communal violence and conflict between 1999 and 2004. Others were displaced in 2012 and 2013 by religiously motivated attacks and land conflicts, both of which increased during the year. Armed conflict in eastern Papua province also caused new displacement.

Accurate data on internal displacement is unavailable because no profiling exercise to establish the number and needs of people living in protracted displacement has been carried out. Humanitarian agencies’ restricted access to affected areas in Papua has also hampered the gathering of information.

At least 12,000 people displaced by communal violence between 1999 and 2004 still live in informal settlements on the islands of Ambon and Seram in Maluku province, west of Papua. They face a number of obstacles to achieving durable solutions, including poor housing conditions, and a lack of access to land and property rights, basic services and livelihood opportunities. Over 4,700 households displaced from Timor-Leste nearly 14 years ago have been considered “new citizens” in West Timor.

In unofficial camps after the authorities forcibly evicted them from official ones.

In December, more than 3,000 people from the Karbi and Rengma Naga tribes sought shelter in displacement camps in the Bokajan area of the Karbi Anglong Hills district of central Assam, following ethnic violence between the Karbi People’s Liberation Tigers (KPLT) and the Rengma Naga Hills Protection Force (RNHFF).

In Assam, authorities closed the remaining camps where 12,000 Bengali-speaking Muslims and members of the Bodo tribe who fled inter-communal violence in 2012 were staying. The situation of IDPs outside of the camps is unknown. At the end of the year the security situation in the area remained tense and it is likely many remain unable to return.

Around 30,000 Bru people who fled their homes in Mizoram state in 1997 and 2009 also remain displaced in Tripura state. Hundreds more fled in fear in December amid tensions sparked by kidnappings the previous month.

In central India, more than 14,800 Adivasi people remained displaced as a result of recurring conflict over land and mineral resources. The fighting pitted government forces and allied militias against Maoist insurgents claiming to fight on behalf of the Adivasis. Clashes in May displaced another 10,000 people.

Conditions in displacement camps remain dire across the country. IDPs lack access to clean water, adequate shelter, food, security, clothing and health care. In Uttar Pradesh, camp conditions contributed to the deaths of more than 50 IDPs, most of whom were children under the age of 15. Harassment and threats from villagers in IDPs’ home areas often hinder their efforts to return, and the police tend to be unwilling to protect returnees.

Support for long-term solutions varied significantly between states in 2013. Some opted to compensate IDPs for their displacement, while others tried to encourage return by offering grants and housing. The state government in Jammu and Kashmir provided 350 temporary accommodation units, employment opportunities, utilities and livestock and farming grants in an effort to facilitate the return of Kashmiri Pandits displaced since 1990.

The governments of Gujarat, Assam, Andhra Pradesh and Odisha, however, made no such efforts to assist the hundreds of thousands of people who remain displaced there. India’s central government does not consider IDPs’ recovery and rehabilitation as part of its mandate.

In Uttar Pradesh, the state government’s measures to promote IDPs’ sustainable return of IDPs displaced centred on compensation. It distributed 500,000 rupees ($8,390) to 1,800 families from nine villages recognised as having been affected by rioting. It did not, however, consider IDPs from other areas as eligible.

Religious charities, madrassas, civil society groups and local communities took the lead in assisting IDPs during 2013. The National Human Rights Commission and the National Commission for Protection of Child Rights advocated on behalf of IDPs, but the fact that the country has no formal legislation on displacement in place hampered their efforts.

A national policy or law on IDPs is much needed to address their protection and assistance consistently and effectively, and to provide a framework for steps to facilitate durable solutions.
since 2003, but still face similar challenges. Other provinces believed to host significant numbers of protracted IDPs include Aceh, South-East Sulawesi and North Sulawesi.

Around 3,000 people were newly displaced in 2013, according to the government. Most fled an outbreak of violence in January that temporarily displaced around 2,000 Balinese settlers in West Nusa Tenggara (NTB) province, east of Bali. In neighbouring East Nusa Tenggara (NTT) province, more than 130 homes were burned down and nearly 1,000 people displaced in November by fighting between two villages triggered by a land dispute.

The low-level conflict between the government and the Free Papua Movement (Organisasi Papua Merdeka, OPM) displaced an unknown number of people in the province. The killing of eight soldiers by suspected OPM members in February prompted military operations in the Central Highlands region. The security forces targeted villages suspected of supporting the OPM, reportedly displacing several thousand people, most of whom sought refuge in nearby forests.

A decision by Indonesian courts in May to strengthen customary land rights of local and indigenous communities had still to be effectively implemented. As in previous years, indigenous groups continued to be exposed to forced eviction and displacement. In December, government security forces and private guards working for a palm oil company destroyed around 150 homes in Jambi and evicted at least 70 people from their ancestral land.

The government has failed to effectively protect and assist religious minorities and indigenous groups during their displacement or to guarantee their right to return. In East Java, 168 Shia Muslim IDPs were still unable to return nearly 18 months after being displaced. After living in a sports centre in Sampang district for nearly a year, they were forcibly relocated to a housing facility in June. Local clerics insist they convert to Sunni Islam before being allowed to return to their homes.

The National Disaster Management Agency is responsible for people displaced both by natural disasters and ‘social conflicts’, while the Ministry of Social Affairs has the mandate for relief during emergencies. There is no national policy or legislation on internal displacement, leaving the national response governed by a 2007 law on disaster management and 2012 law on the handling of social conflicts. The latter granted local authorities powers to deal with social unrest and strengthened the military’s involvement in conflict resolution. This has raised concerns because the government has at times failed in recent years to guarantee IDPs’ rights, particularly in terms of return and property protection. Instead it has tended to leave local authorities to shape their own policies, even when these clearly violate IDPs’ rights.

International organisations were not involved in responding to the humanitarian needs of people displaced by conflict and violence. Support was limited to helping the government assist some protracted IDPs. In late 2013, a number of EU-funded programs implemented by international NGOs came to an end. The decision was based on the fact that no major crises had caused large-scale displacement in the recent years and that many former IDPs had now successfully re-integrated. Effective solutions for IDPs still living in protracted displacement will require the government and the international development community to integrate their outstanding needs into national strategies and plans.

### Myanmar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER of IDPs</th>
<th>640,900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERCENTAGE of total population</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CAUSES of displacement**

- Armed conflict
- Generalised violence
- Human rights violations

**Human Development Index**

149

Protracted armed conflict between ethnic non-state armed groups (NSAGs) and government forces has caused internal displacement in Myanmar for more than 50 years. Fighting in the south-eastern and eastern states of Kachin, Shan, Kayah, Kayin and Mon and the regions of Bago and Tanintharyi started in 1962. The conflict has eased in the south-east in recent years, and by the end of 2013 the government had concluded ceasefires with most NSAGs. A nationwide ceasefire accord is planned for 2014. That said, renewed conflict between NSAGs in Kachin and northern Shan states flared in 2011 and caused new displacement in 2013, as did inter-communal violence between Rakhine Buddhists and Rohingya and other Muslim minorities in Rakhine state. Violence between Buddhists and Muslims began in Rakhine state in 2012 and spread to other parts of the country in 2013.

As of the end of the year there were 640,900 IDPs in the country, according to UN agencies and the Border Consortium, an NGO. Three-quarters fled their homes because of conflict. 400,000 in the south-east and 98,600 in Kachin and northern Shan. The remainder, or 139,000 in Rakhine and 5,400 in central Myanmar, fled inter-communal violence. Disasters brought on by natural hazards, and forced evictions linked to land grabs have also caused displacement.
Inter-communal violence in Rakhine caused up to 18,000 new displacements in 2013. In Meiktila, Mandalay region, a dispute in March degenerated into mob violence that killed 44 people and displaced 12,900, most of them Muslims. Inter-communal violence elsewhere displaced another 16,000. Conflict between the Kachin Independence Army (KIA) and government forces newly displaced 21,500 people in Kachin and northern Shan. 400,000 people are living in protracted displacement in the south-east of the country.

More than 60 per cent of the country’s IDPs, all of those in the south-east and up to 30,000 in Rakhine, live in informal settlements or with host communities. This limits their access to essential assistance and protection, although UN and other international organisations have assisted some IDPs outside camps and a number of host families too.

IDPs faced significant security threats in 2013. In June, police in Rakhine reportedly shot and killed five Muslim IDPs in camps in Parein and Kyin Ni Pyin. In November, three Muslim IDPs and a local Rakhine woman were reportedly killed in Pauktaw. Local authorities in Rakhine restricted IDPs’ freedom of movement, limiting their employment options and access to food. IDPs in Mandalay suffered similar restrictions, and a lack of water and medicines. Protection concerns for IDPs in Kachin and northern Shan included landmines, human trafficking, gender-based violence, forced recruitment and lack of psychosocial and health care.

More than 7,400 IDPs in Mandalay had returned to their homes by the end of the year, and local authorities plan the return of those remaining in the region during 2014. In the south-east, more than 900 had returned to their homes by the end of 2013. There were no reports of returns in other areas, or of IDPs integrating locally or settling elsewhere in the country. Obstacles to durable solutions in the south-east include the ongoing presence of government forces and NSAGs, sporadic fighting, land grabs by private commercial companies and the presence of landmines. IDPs also lack access to land, tenure security, livelihoods and legal civil documentation, which in turn restricts their freedom of movement.

In May, ahead of cyclone Mahasen, the government temporarily evacuated almost 78,000 people including some IDPs previously displaced by violence in Rakhine and whose camps were in low-lying areas.

Myanmar does not have a national policy or legislation on IDPs’ protection. Efforts to end the violence in Rakhine and the conflict in Kachin and Shan have been unsuccessful and IDPs’ plight in those areas has deteriorated rather than improved.

Political reforms and increasing openness since 2010 have led to a significant increase in international humanitarian and development assistance, and the response to IDPs improved in some areas in 2013, but more needs to be done to respect IDPs’ right to consultation and participation in the planning and implementation of programmes intended to address their needs. The shelter, non-food-item and camp management cluster together with the Joint IDP Profiling Service carried out an assessment in camps in government-controlled areas of Kachin and northern Shan. In Rakhine, however, increasing anti-UN and NGO sentiment among the Rakhine Buddhist population forced organisations to interrupt their assistance.

Seven years after the government and Maoist rebels ended their decade-long armed conflict, nearly all of Nepal’s IDPs have returned to their homes. An estimated 50,000 have been unable or unwilling to do so, mainly as a result of unresolved land and property issues and security concerns. The Maoists expropriated land that was then often sold or given to landless or tenant farmers. The absence of public services and a lack of livelihood assistance have also undermined the sustainability of returns.

Since 2007, episodes of separatist and criminal violence in central Terai, the region south of the Himalayan foothills, have displaced thousands of people. Both hill-dwelling Pahadis and their wealthier Madhesi counterparts on the plains have been affected, with most reported to have moved to the town of Hetauda and Chitwan district near Kathmandu.

Nepal’s constitutional assembly, which was elected in November 2013, is tasked with completing the country’s draft constitution, which will also clear the way for the 2006 national policy on IDPs and its related procedural directives to be implemented.

The government’s rehabilitation programme for IDPs, which is implemented via its District Administrations Offices (DAOs), has focused on their voluntary return, with support limited to covering transport costs.

Many of those still displaced as a result of the Maoist conflict, however, would prefer to integrate locally or settle elsewhere, given insecurity in their places of origin and the psychological trauma they suffered. Meantime they continue to live in urban areas, many of them in the Kathmandu valley.
Armed conflict continued to be the main cause of displacement in Pakistan in 2013. An estimated five million people have been displaced by conflict, sectarian violence and human rights abuses in the north-west of the country since 2004. Movements peaked in 2009, when three million people were forced to flee their homes, but by the end of 2010 the number of people living in displacement had fallen to around a million. Returns have since been offset by new displacement, with the total number of IDPs standing at around 746,700 at the end of 2013.

A hundred and forty thousand people were newly registered as displaced during the year. The majority fled from the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) to neighbouring Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) province. There are also an unknown number of unregistered IDPs from FATA, some of whom were identified by the IDP Vulnerability Assessment and Profiling (IVAP) project.

UNHCR registers IDPs on behalf of the disaster management authorities in KP and FATA. To be eligible for registration, applicants must hold a valid national identity card (CNIC) showing two addresses in an area the government has “notified” or officially recognised as affected by conflict.

Two major waves of new displacement took place in FATA during 2013. In March, heavy fighting between non-state armed groups forced more than 17,000 families to flee their homes in the Tirah valley in Khyber agency. Those affected fled into the bordering FATA agencies of Kurram and Orakzai and the KP districts of Kohat, Hangu, Peshawar and Nowshera. Intense clashes between the Pakistani army and non-state armed groups in Kurram subsequently displaced around 10,800 families in early May. Most IDPs took refuge in host communities, mainly in Lower Kurram, while others sought shelter in the New Durrani displacement camp in FATA.

Ninety-five per cent of registered IDPs in north-west Pakistan live with host communities, relying on social and family networks to help them find housing and employment. The remaining five per cent live in the region’s three displacement camps: New Durrani, Jalozai and Togh Sarai.

IDPs living in camps are generally considered to be in greatest need of assistance. That said, many outside the camps live below the poverty line and do not have adequate access to food, housing and basic services. An IVAP profiling exercise conducted in seven KP districts between May and December found IDPs’ primary humanitarian needs to be food, non-food items, assistance with rent and access to water and livelihood opportunities. The international response was coordinated through the cluster system.

Ongoing insecurity in north-west Pakistan exposed IDPs to threats to their physical security during 2013. In March, 15 were killed when a car bomb exploded at the Jalozai displacement camp in KP.

The national government continued to prioritise the return of registered IDPs to “denotified” areas where it deems military operations to be over. IVAP found that 79 per cent of IDPs planned to return to their places of origin as soon they were declared safe, and that 13 per cent planned to go back regardless of the security situation. More than 108,000 IDPs from FATA returned to their homes and were deregistered during the year. The government and international organisations provided transport and food rations.

In principle, returns should take place under the terms of a 2009 policy framework, which states that the FATA and KP authorities must ensure they meet national and international standards as safe, well-informed and voluntary.

More than 1.4 million people who have returned to FATA since 2009 continue to try to recover their livelihoods and rebuild their lives. Many found that their homes had been damaged and that they had only limited access to basic services such as health care and education. IDPs also said they had suffered substantial crop and livestock losses as a result of their displacement.

The national government approved the first phase of the Early Recovery Assistance Framework for FATA at the end of October, with a budget of $75 million for 2013. The framework aims to respond to the needs of FATA’s returnees by restoring communities’ capacity to recover, but no progress in terms of implementation had been reported by the end of the year.

There is only very limited information on the number and situation of IDPs in other parts of the country, particularly urban areas such as Karachi.
Armed conflict between the government and non-state armed groups continued to cause internal displacement in the Philippines in 2013, as did clan-related violence. Around 327,000 people fled their homes, of whom at least 116,000 were still displaced at the end of the year. Almost all of the displacement took place in Mindanao, the country’s poorest region, where conflict and violence rooted in under-development, poor governance and the marginalisation of Muslim and indigenous communities has displaced at least 3.5 million people since 2000.

More than a third of those displaced in 2013 fled within Zamboanga city, where heavy fighting between the government and a faction of the Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF) destroyed more than 10,000 homes and displaced around 120,000 people in September. Fighting between the government and the Bangsamoro Islamic Freedom Fighters (BIFF), a Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MLF) breakaway group, also caused displacement, as did clashes with the communist New People’s Army (NPA).

Many IDPs returned home in the weeks following their flight, but in Zamboanga around 63,000 were unable to do so because their homes had either been destroyed or were in parts of city declared “no return areas” prone to disaster. The majority of the displaced sought refuge with host families, where they were thought to be worse off than those in camps in terms of access to food and basic services. In the absence of a profiling exercise, the nature and extent of their needs remained unclear.

Recurrent disasters brought on by natural hazards caused much more displacement than conflict and violence in 2013. Typhoon Haiyan devastated the western and central areas of Visayas region in November, displacing over 4 million people. That said, displacement caused by conflict, tends to affect the same deprived communities repeatedly, gradually undermining their resilience and pushing them further into poverty.

Some IDPs displaced by conflict were also affected by disasters, disrupting their recovery or forcing them into secondary displacement. Flooding in central and western Mindanao in August made IDPs’ already precarious living conditions worse, particularly in the area’s poorly equipped camps and makeshift shelters. Some communities in eastern Mindanao affected by typhoon Bopha in December 2012 were already suffering increasing social and economic vulnerabilities as a result of conflict and previous displacement when the storm hit. Their remote location also hindered their access to humanitarian assistance.

IDPs’ needs often continue after their return. Recent assessments in conflict-affected areas of central Mindanao highlighted the fragile food security situation of the general population and found that both IDPs and returnees were worse off still. Many lacked access to water, sanitation, agricultural assets, education and health care. In Zamboanga, local authorities plan to help around 33,000 IDPs to return or settle elsewhere over the next six to 18 months. They have encouraged some who had settled in the city after migrating from other areas of Mindanao over the past decade to move to new sites nearby or return to their original provinces. Many opposed the plan, preferring to go back to their former homes in the city.

The government and the MILF, the country’s main rebel group, make good progress towards to finalising the Framework Agreement on the Bangsamoro in 2013, following its signing in October 2012. On 27 March 2014, the Comprehensive Agreement on Bangsamoro (CAB) was signed in Manila, opening the way for much-needed social and political reforms and for an increase of international funding towards recovery and rehabilitation programmes, including for IDPs. Meanwhile, a 1996 peace deal between the government and the MNLF has still not been properly implemented.

The government and its international partners have made significant efforts in recent years to address the immediate needs of people displaced by conflict and violence, but funding shortfalls have often impeded early recovery and rehabilitation initiatives. In 2013, the UN adopted a convergence strategy for Mindanao. By establishing a single integrated framework to strengthen the government’s capacity to address the humanitarian, security and development needs of IDPs and other communities affected by conflict, it aims to improve community resilience and facilitate long-term solutions.

Congress adopted legislation on internal displacement in February that recognised the right of all IDPs to protection and assistance, whether displaced by conflict, disasters or development projects. In May, however, President Benigno Aquino vetoed the law, arguing that some provisions were unconstitutional. A revised bill was tabled towards the end of the year.
There were up to 90,000 IDPs in Sri Lanka as of the end of 2013. They fled their homes during the country’s 26-year internal armed conflict, which ended in May 2009 with the government’s military victory over the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE). More than 480,000 IDPs have returned to Northern and Eastern provinces, but tens of thousands among them are thought not to have achieved a durable solution in addition to those still displaced.

There is a lack of independent and comprehensive data on IDPs and their needs, but it is hoped that a joint needs assessment scheduled for 2014 will address this to some extent.

The state occupation of land prevented the return of at least 30,000 IDPs living in protracted displacement in 2013, 20,000 of them with host communities, 7,000 in camps and several thousand who were relocated – not always voluntarily – by the government.

The situation in camps is precarious, with infrastructure in need of repair and some due to close because the land they are on has been claimed by the owners. IDPs were provided with housing on some relocation sites, but not with documentation, leaving them without tenure security. Nor did they receive compensation for lost land and property. Many returnees faced challenges in rebuilding their homes, accessing basic services and securing livelihoods.

Land issues were among the main obstacles to durable solutions. A circular published in January favours secondary occupation over the right to restitution, and no mechanism exists to deal with conflicting land claims, such as those in Mannar district where tensions between returning Tamil and Muslim IDPs flared in March. In April, the government began the acquisition of 6,000 acres of private land under military occupation in Jaffna for ‘public purpose’, which included the establishment of military bases and a military-run holiday resort. More than 2,000 IDPs challenged the acquisition in court, but rulings were still pending as of the end of the year.

The military continued to carry out what would normally be civilian activities in the north and east, including agriculture and tourism, to the detriment of IDPs and returnees with small farms and businesses who found it difficult to compete. Current and former IDPs have not received enough assistance to rebuild their livelihoods and household debt is significant. Some internally displaced women have reportedly resorted to sex work to make ends meet, while other IDPs and host families were said to be eating only two meals a day.

The widespread presence of the military and its monitoring of households contributed to feelings of insecurity among the civilian population. Women and girls felt increasingly vulnerable to gender-based violence, and the response to reported abuses was generally inadequate. The military also restricted civil rights, including freedom of movement and peaceful assembly.

Tens of thousands of Muslims expelled from the north by the LTTE in 1990 have registered as having returned, but in reality they are thought still to be living in their places of refuge in Puttalam or alternating between Puttalam and the north for want of adequate assistance. They have struggled to re-establish livelihoods and access housing and land in either place. Some who said they would prefer to integrate locally in Puttalam have been unable to register as residents there.

Sri Lanka has no comprehensive legislation or policy on IDPs. A draft policy published in 2013 by the Ministry of Resettlement needs revision to bring it in line with international standards. Among other issues, it focuses only on the initial phase of displacement and does not cover the achievement of durable solutions. IDPs and other stakeholders should also be consulted and participate in the development of the policy.

Since 2009 a presidential task force made up largely of current and former members of the military has been the main decision-making body on all matters of reconstruction and return in Northern province. Administrative barriers have prevented the approval of some initiatives in the north and east, especially capacity building and psychosocial support programmes.

International organisations have shifted their focus from humanitarian to development work since late 2012, but funding for both areas has been significantly reduced. Longer-term funding and support for protection work is much needed if current and former IDPs are to rebuild their lives.
There is no official data on the number of people displaced in Thailand by the ten-year conflict between the government and Malay Muslim separatist groups in the southern provinces of Pattani, Narathiwat and Yala. What is known is that among those trying to escape the violence, the region’s Buddhist minority has been disproportionately affected with at least 20 per cent forced to flee their homes since 2004.

The conflict showed no sign of abating in 2013, with insurgents continuing to carry out indiscriminate attacks against representatives and symbols of the Thai state, including teachers and schools. The security forces’ counterinsurgency campaigns were often accompanied by reports of human rights violations.

Most displacements have taken place from rural to urban areas inside the three provinces, with the dispersed Buddhist population regrouping in safer enclaves. Others have chosen to leave the region. Buddhists have moved to neighbouring provinces or to large cities such as Bangkok, while Malay Muslims have settled, often temporarily, in neighbouring Malaysia. IDPs who have stayed in the region remain exposed to low-level violence, but those who have left have reportedly managed to achieve some form of durable solution. Their main concerns tend to relate to the land and property they left behind.

The government’s efforts in recent years have mainly aimed to prevent a further decline in the Buddhist population. In 2012 it set up a fund to buy IDPs’ land to encourage them to return. In February 2013, the government started formal peace talks with Barisan Revolusi Nasional (BRN), one of the main insurgent groups, but they are yet to yield concrete results.
The Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC) is the leading source of information and analysis on internal displacement. For the millions of people worldwide displaced within their own country, IDMC plays a unique role as a global monitor and evidence-based advocate to influence policy and action by governments, UN agencies, donors, international organisations and NGOs.

IDMC was established in 1998 at the request of the Interagency Standing Committee on humanitarian assistance. Since then, IDMC’s unique global function has been recognised and reiterated in annual UN General Assembly resolutions.

IDMC is part of the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), an independent, non-governmental humanitarian organisation.

www.internal-displacement.org
facebook.com/InternalDisplacement
twitter.com/idmc_geneva