Strategic Responses to Forced Displacement: An Opportunity for Collective Action

World Refugee & Migration Council

September 2026



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Declining donor funding, rising conflict, and persistently high levels of forced displacement are driving an escalating crisis in the international humanitarian system. The WRMC project identifies actionable reforms to prevent further systemic deterioration, with a particular focus on humanitarian responses for refugees and internally displaced persons. Current responses that prioritize life-saving aid, shift support to local partners, and improve efficiency are necessary. But they are insufficient for protracted crises and do not address the structural drivers of aid dependence. The project therefore explores how to reorient humanitarian action toward more strategic, context-specific approaches aligned with development and, where feasible, peacebuilding initiatives. Through expert consultation, the project will develop recommendations on improving early response design and preparedness measures; clarifying prioritization criteria and, where conditions allow, pathways toward more sustainable, government-led systems. It will also propose ways to strengthen data, financing, and accountability mechanisms that underpin these transitions. To translate findings into action, the project embeds strategic communication, stakeholder engagement, and open-access dissemination throughout, sustaining dialogue with governments, multilateral institutions, civil society, and other key actors to inform and influence policy. It will culminate in convening a conference of donor and displacement-hosting governments to align positions, build consensus on priority reforms, and advance coordinated approaches to financing and institutional change, producing a joint communiqué and practical proposals that build confidence in a revised system.

INTRODUCTION

The international humanitarian system established after World War II to protect refugees and crisis-affected populations is facing a profound challenge. U.S. funding, long its backbone, has plummeted by 57 percent and is increasingly earmarked for select countries aligned with American geopolitical priorities.

Other high-income member countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) are also cutting back. Official development assistance from the 33 members of the OECD's Development Assistance Committee fell by 23 percent in 2025, the largest annual drop on record, and is projected to decline further in 2026.[1] This is not a temporary shock but a prolonged disruption coming at a time when global armed conflict has reached its highest level since 1946 and nearly 118 million people worldwide remain forcibly displaced by persecution, conflict and violence, close to double the level a decade ago.[2]

The effects on the ground are severe and systemic. They are experienced most acutely in the middle- to lower-income countries where most of the world's forcibly displaced populations reside. Global economic shocks on domestic fiscal resources and high debt levels have further contributed to the deteriorating situation in host countries. Food assistance, nutrition programs, vaccination campaigns, health services, shelter, water and sanitation programs, protection services, and educational support are being sharply scaled back or even phased out altogether. United Nations humanitarian agencies and international non-governmental agencies (NGOs) are retrenching, laying off staff, closing offices, and terminating programs.

Modelling studies estimate that reductions in U.S. humanitarian assistance alone could result in more than 14 million additional deaths by 2030. When cuts by other major donors are included, this figure could rise to 22 million. These estimates predate the Iran conflict that according to the International Monetary Fund could push 45 million more people into acute food insecurity.[3]

To date, the humanitarian system's response to funding shortfalls has centred on a 'reset': prioritizing life-saving assistance, directing more funding to local partners, and reducing duplication and inefficiencies. Yet despite consistently falling well short of its targets, the system remains dependent on short-term fund-raising efforts and programs. Moreover, these shifts will not in themselves resolve the entrenched policies and institutional practices that sustain aid dependence in protracted displacement crises.

As donor fiscal space tightens amid rising security and social spending pressures, and the humanitarian system struggles to adapt, more sustainable and context-adapted responses are increasingly urgent.

This project explores these challenges with a specific focus on humanitarian assistance for refugees and internally displaced persons forced to move by persecution, conflict and violence. It identifies approaches better aligned with peace and development initiatives and contributes to UNHCR's

[1] Devex Newswire: The aid numbers are in — and they're ugly; April 10, 2026. OECD, "International aid fell sharply in 2025," April 9, 2026; OECD, "ODA projections for 2026 and the near-term", June 18, 2026

[2] PRIO, "Conflict Trends: A Global Overview, 1946–2025" (2026)

[3] Andrea Ferreira da Silva et al., "Impact of Two Decades of Humanitarian and Development Assistance and the Projected Mortality Consequences of Current Defunding to 2030: Retrospective Evaluation and Forecasting Analysis," The Lancet Global Health 14, no. 2 (2026)

ambition to halve the number of persons in protracted forced displacement dependent on humanitarian aid by 2035.[4]

OPERATIONAL CONTEXTS

The humanitarian sector has evolved into a global ecosystem of international organizations and NGOs with extensive technical expertise and rapid-response capacity. Built on principles of impartiality, neutrality and independence, it aspires to save lives, alleviate suffering, and uphold human dignity. In practice, it is under-resourced, shaped by donor geopolitics, and often constrained by policy and access restrictions. By default, it has remained engaged in protracted crises beyond the short-term emergency role for which it was originally designed. This produces perverse effects, entrenching costly dependency and institutional practices that do not address the problem.

Humanitarian action increasingly operates in fragile environments marked by poverty, insecurity, and restrictions on the rights of displaced populations, including freedom of movement, and access to employment, education, and health care. Successful transitions from emergency relief to sustainable development remain rare due to political failures and weak state capacity. In consequence, solutions remain elusive, trapping populations in poverty often for generations.

In conflict settings, humanitarians often work when no functioning peace process is in place, amid competing authorities and with limited resources. Where peace processes are underway, humanitarian agencies may not be fully included due to their concerns over impartiality; and the assistance they provide may even complicate negotiations among the parties to the conflict.

Current reforms target four persistent internal and mainly technical weaknesses: needs-based prioritization, localization, accountability, and mandate overlap.

Needs-based prioritization through joint needs assessments has long aimed at directing funding towards greatest need. But data on vulnerability remain uneven due to limited access, different methodologies, and inconsistent use of indicators. Donor geopolitical priorities, chronic underfunding, and inflated appeals undermine the credibility of needs assessments, and no system-wide framework exists to allocate funding across crises.

Localization (the shift to national and local delivery partners) holds some promise for improving efficiency and accountability and is well suited to contexts where government reach is limited. But progress towards implementing the localization agenda has been slow. Some governments are unwilling or unable to assume greater responsibility; local NGOs bring contextual knowledge and community trust but often lack the surge capacity, logistics and fiduciary controls required for large-scale operations.

Accountability to affected populations remains weak, with performance measured by delivery and reach rather than outcomes, and impact assessments are rarely required by donors.

Overlapping mandates create coordination efficiency challenges and intensify competition for scarce resources. They also contribute to sustaining a costly parallel aid system that impedes progress toward government-led responses.

These reform efforts share a common limitation: they do not address the strategic failure to match humanitarian action to context. In protracted crises in particular, operations too often proceed beyond the emergency phase without sufficient political economy or security analysis. In the absence of alternative responses, humanitarian agencies frequently assume responsibilities more properly held by states and thereby discourage government-led engagement.

The resulting parallel system is financially unviable, complicates cooperation with development partners and impedes efforts to include displaced populations within national development planning.

This project responds to this challenge by moving away from a single model of humanitarian action towards context-specific approaches. It examines how all stakeholders can contribute to structural reform of the sector by planning a phased-out approach for humanitarian aid from its emergency response role.

In protracted displacement situations, an optimal durable response would enable displaced persons access to employment, education and access to basic services to reduce their dependence on external assistance. Three broad country contexts can be distinguished:

Context 1	Context 2	Context 3
Countries with policies and institutional capacities that may require only time-limited emergency support.	Countries with the political will to embrace change but with institutional weaknesses and limited resources.	Countries with neither the will nor the capacity to support such an inclusive agenda.

[4] UNHCR, Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2025, June 2026, 13

To date, the financing instruments engaged to support all these situations have remained predominantly humanitarian and short term in nature and typically continue well beyond the emergency phase. In the process they have generated a level of dependency that leaves displaced populations trapped in poverty and discourages the emergence of alternative, more sustainable approaches.

In the current funding climate, refugee hosting states have understandably sought reassurance over the level of support they can expect in future. The project therefore emphasizes how complementary resources are required to address continuing humanitarian and development challenges in displacement settings. It will explore how changes to the current financing models and institutional arrangements can be matched to different operating environments, incentivize policy change and secure better outcomes for all key stakeholders.

THE CASE FOR COLLECTIVE ACTION

Central to the success of this initiative is the inclusion of all key stakeholders - donor and refugee-hosting governments, multilateral institutions, local authorities, and displaced communities themselves - in the design and development of future policies and implementation arrangements. The WRMC project emphasises a collective approach that maximises the use of complementary resources and capacities, reduces reliance on humanitarian aid, and improves outcomes for impacted populations.

Collective and coordinated engagement may provide the most important counterweight to a system that risks becoming increasingly fragmented and selective, driven by the security and geopolitical priorities of individual states.

Middle-power engagement is particularly relevant in the absence of clear international leadership during this period of rapid change. While middle powers are unlikely to replace previous levels of U.S. financing, they may be well-placed to support reforms that move beyond open-ended humanitarian assistance toward more strategic, sustainable and context-adapted responses in protracted displacement situations.

Many middle powers maintain long-standing commitments to multilateral cooperation and established partnerships with displacement-hosting states through humanitarian, development, and regional engagement. Their bilateral relationships and diplomatic flexibility may also enable them to pursue more candid policy dialogue with governments than may be possible for multilateral donors.

PROJECT GOVERNANCE

The World Refugee & Migration Council

The World Refugee & Migration Council (WRMC) brings together more than 30 internationally recognized leaders, including former heads of government, foreign ministers, senior UN officials, scholars, human rights advocates, practitioners, and individuals with lived displacement experience.

WRMC convenes international consultations, builds consensus across constituencies, and supports the co-creation of actionable recommendations. Its work has advanced responses to forced displacement, supported initiatives enabling the use of frozen assets to assist victims of corruption and displacement, strengthened regional migration governance in the Americas, and helped shape policy frameworks addressing climate-induced cross-border displacement.

Project Leadership

Ninette Kelley	WRMC Chair; four decades across the UN, government, and civil society; internationally respected expert on forced displacement.
Fen Hampson	WRMC President; Chancellor's Professor, Carleton University; leading scholar of diplomacy and global governance.
Ewen Macleod	Senior WRMC Advisor; humanitarian and development specialist with over 40 years of experience in crisis and post-conflict settings, including leadership roles at UNHCR and the European Commission.
Alison Lawton	Founder, Mindset Venture Group and Mindset Social Innovation Foundation; expert in social-impact investment across for-profit and non-profit sectors.

Advisors

The project draws on advisors: internationally recognized leaders, practitioners, and scholars from countries with large forcibly displaced populations and donor countries, bringing expertise in humanitarian policy, development finance, and international diplomacy, along with lived experience of forced displacement.

PROJECT DESIGN

The sharp reduction in humanitarian funding has accelerated a reckoning long underway but so far has focused attention only on immediate life-saving situations. This project seeks to identify actionable reforms to address key weaknesses, restore confidence in an adapted and effective humanitarian system, and deliver measurable benefits to affected populations in protracted forced displacement.

Theory of Change

The project operates on the premise that the humanitarian system's current crisis is both a structural and political problem as well as one of declining resources. The causal pathway is as follows:

01	→	02	→	03	→	04
Analysis Phase 1: practitioner-informed research yields evidence-based recommendations.		**Consultation** Phase 2: stakeholder engagement builds ownership and legitimacy.		**Diplomacy** Phase 3: coordination forges shared government positions.		**Dissemination** A joint communiqué and policy report anchor durable reform.

> **KEY ASSUMPTION**
>
> Collective action can potentially shift the political economy of humanitarian reform in ways no single government or institution can achieve alone. Outputs are targeted at senior officials and ministers to connect directly to decision-making authority.

Phase 1: Expert Roundtable

Phase 1 convenes a 1.5-day closed roundtable of up to 25 invited experts hosted by a leading institution with strong convening credentials on international affairs (subject to confirmation). The venue offers intercontinental connectivity, time zone accessibility, and the availability of an institutional host among the invited participants. Participants will receive a background paper circulated in advance outlining the system's challenges and helping to frame discussion on policy reforms required to build a more principled, effective, and financially sustainable framework. The roundtable will generate a prioritized set of reform options and policy recommendations.

Location	Host institution: leading institution (subject to confirmation)
Date	April 2027
Participants	Up to 25 experts; see Appendix A
Language	English; simultaneous French interpretation available
Background Paper	Circulated at least four weeks in advance
Rapporteur	Professional rapporteur commissioned to produce a structured summary and draft.

Discussion will focus on three thematic areas:

1. Emergency Response and Initial Design

Humanitarian engagement generally begins in an emergency when decisions and institutional arrangements are made that can shape longer term involvement. Initial state responses emphasize security and containment, typically delegating life-saving assistance to external partners. Governments and aid agencies often favour the establishment of camps to meet security concerns, facilitate aid delivery and stabilize displaced populations.

Beyond the emergency phase, longer-term recovery, such as rebuilding lives, strengthening skills and livelihood prospects, requires more than short-term assistance can provide. Yet governments often prioritize policies that discourage longer-term inclusion in favour of early repatriation. To that end, they adopt measures restricting mobility, employment, and access to national services that can prolong dependence on humanitarian aid, deepen poverty, and foreclose opportunities for displaced persons to contribute to host communities.

Key questions:

- What criteria should guide transition out of emergency aid to more predictable medium-term financing and operational options?

- What policy changes, institutional arrangements and support will be needed to facilitate this transition?
- How do emergency responses need to be adapted to facilitate such transitions?

2. Prioritization in Protracted Displacement Contexts

Host governments often resist a transition away from humanitarian assistance. Continued reliance on external support provides them with assurance of international solidarity and signals that displacement is not seen as permanent. Governments also fear that socioeconomic inclusion will strain local labour markets, entail prohibitive costs, and undermine repatriation prospects.

Yet evidence consistently shows that displacement is not a short-term condition but can persist for decades. Moreover, permitting mobility, labour market participation, and social inclusion can benefit both displaced populations and host communities, reducing costs, improving outcomes, and enabling displaced persons to accumulate assets and skills useful in exile and on return. Addressing protracted displacement requires building consensus on managing transitions in different contexts. This does not mean ending humanitarian support but rather reallocating resources towards the most vulnerable and towards complementary longer-term solutions financed through different instruments.

Key questions:

- How can humanitarian aid align more systematically with national development plans?
- What lessons can be drawn from integrating displaced populations into national systems?
- What institutional reforms, financing mechanisms, and preparatory measures are needed to support a transition to government-led systems?
- How do affected populations themselves define a successful transition?

3. Data, Evidence, Analysis and Financing for Sustained Transitions

Reliable data, evidence and analysis are central to sound policy and institutional change in protracted displacement situations. Building a strong evidence base requires mixed methods and longitudinal approaches that can capture how the affected populations themselves experience displacement, protection, vulnerability and self-reliance. Together with predictable financing, they support the incorporation of relevant data on displaced populations into national planning and budgeting systems. The choice, sequencing, and deployment of financing instruments should reflect the political and operational context.

Key questions:

- How can data and analysis systems, including AI-powered tools, better support secure government-led needs assessments, prioritization, resource allocation and context-sensitive programming?
- How can impact evaluations, particularly for high-cost interventions, be systematically embedded in program design and donor requirements?
- What evidence exists on the effectiveness of innovative financing mechanisms in forced displacement contexts, and what conditions enable them to succeed?
- How can financing instruments be designed and sequenced to lessen dependence on humanitarian funding?

The roundtable will produce a consolidated set of prioritized, actionable recommendations circulated to participants within two weeks for review and endorsement.

Phase 2: Stakeholder Consultation and Policy Engagement

- Circulating draft recommendations to governments, multilateral institutions, UN agencies, NGOs, and refugee-led organizations.
- Collecting written submissions over six weeks.
- Conducting 8-10 targeted government briefings.
- Producing a report with revised recommendations and strategic communications and dissemination activities.

> **EQUITY AND INCLUSON**
>
> The consultation actively seeks out voices from states with large forcibly displaced populations, with explicit outreach to Jordan, Ethiopia, Kenya, Bangladesh, Colombia, Lebanon, Türkiye, Uganda, and to displaced persons-led organizations including R-SEAT, with participant selection reflecting gender and geographic diversity.

Phase 3: Conference of Donors and Host Governments

Phase 3 convenes a 1.5-day conference of senior representatives from donor and displacement- hosting countries, co-hosted by a partner foreign ministry (subject to confirmation).

The venue is being identified through a comparative assessment of leading candidate cities, weighing diplomatic symbolism, government participation, cost, and co-funding potential. The venue will be confirmed in the fall of 2026, following WRMC diplomatic outreach to prospective co-host governments.

Format	Closed, invitation-only working conference. Plenary sessions alternating with thematic working groups on prioritization, financing, and institutional reform.
Participants	Senior officials or ministers from up to 28 invited governments.
Level	Minister or Deputy Minister / Director General equivalent.
Co-host	Partner foreign ministry; supporting refugee-focused NGO partner.
Language	English, with simultaneous interpretation determined by participant composition.
Pre-conference outreach	WRMC leadership will conduct targeted consultations with key governments in the six months prior.

- Zero-draft communiqué circulated to participating governments six weeks before the conference.
- Dedicated plenary session for communiqué negotiation using a WRMC-facilitated consensus process.
- Communiqué and final policy report published within 30 days of the conference.

In addition to the European Union, the following countries will be approached to participate:

Government	Government	Government	Government
Australia	Austria	Belgium	Brazil
Canada	Colombia	Czech Republic	Denmark
Finland	France	Germany	Greece
Iceland	Ireland	Italy	Japan
Mexico	Netherlands	New Zealand	Norway
Poland	Portugal	Republic of Korea	South Africa
Spain	Sweden	Türkiye	United Kingdom

Phase 4: Ottawa Policy Roundtable

Following the dissemination of the final report, the project will convene a targeted policy roundtable in Ottawa bringing together representatives from Canadian government departments, selected foreign missions, multilateral organizations, humanitarian agencies, civil society organizations, and academic experts. The meeting will provide an opportunity to present the project's findings and recommendations, discuss implications for humanitarian policy and reform efforts and identify opportunities for coordinated engagement on humanitarian action and forced displacement.

Appendix A: Project Timeline

18 Months

Period	Phase	Key Activities & Milestones
Jun – Aug 2026	Preparation	Project launch; commission background papers; advisors identified; initiate outreach to prospective co-host governments
Sep – Dec 2026	Research - Logistics	Analytical Briefs in progress; pre-roundtable consultations; Phase 1 venue and Phase 3 co-host confirmed (primary or alternate scenario activated)
Jan – Mar 2027	Phase 1 Prep	Roundtable Background Paper finalized; 25 participants confirmed; venue logistics secured; pre-reading distributed
Apr 2027	Phase 1	1.5-day expert roundtable; rapporteur report; draft recommendations
May – Jul 2027	Phase 2	Draft recommendations circulated; written submissions collected; targeted government and stakeholder briefings; pre-conference Phase 3 co-host outreach continues
Aug – Sep 2027	Analysis	Policy paper and recommendations finalized; communiqué zero-draft circulated to Phase 3 participating governments
Oct 2027	Phase 3 Prep	Communiqué zero draft revised; Phase 3 final logistics confirmed; ministerial invitations issued by WRMC Chair and President
Nov 2027	Phase 3	Inter-governmental Conference; communiqué negotiated and adopted; press engagement; co-host government joint statement; final policy report published; dissemination
Dec 2027	Phase 4 Ottawa meeting; close out	Ottawa meeting and strategy document finalized; funder reporting; project evaluation; 6-month follow-up brief commissioned

Appendix B: Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators

Indicator	Target	Data Source
Phase 1 participants	Up to 25 experts	Attendance list
Phase 1 venue in-kind secured	Confirmed host institution	Host confirmation letter
Phase 2 consultation responses	≥ 30 submissions	Consultation log
Phase 2 government briefings	8–10 bilateral meetings	Meeting records
Phase 3 host confirmed	Confirmed co-host government	MOU / host letter
Phase 3 governments participating	≥ 12 at senior official / ministerial level	Conference register
Communiqué adopted	Yes / negotiated text	Published document
Final policy report published open access	Yes, EN and FR	Publication record
Ottawa conference held	Strategy arising from that disseminated	Strategy finalized and disseminated
6-month follow-up brief	Produced and disseminated	Project records

Reporting to funders: Quarterly progress reports will be provided to all major funders. A mid-project financial review will be conducted at Month 9. A final report will be completed within 60 days of project completion.

Appendix C: Stakeholder Consultation List

Draft recommendations will be circulated to the following organizations for written submission and targeted briefing:

UN Organizations and Related Bodies

- IOM - International Organization for Migration
- OCHA - UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
- OHCHR - Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights
- UN Women
- UNDP - United Nations Development Programme
- UNHCR - United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
- UNICEF - United Nations Children's Fund
- UNRWA - United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East
- WFP - World Food Programme
- WHO - World Health Organization

Major International NGOs

- CARE International
- Catholic Relief Services (CRS)
- Center for Global Development (CDI)
- Danish Refugee Council (DRC)
- International Rescue Committee (IRC)
- Mercy Corps
- Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF)
- Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)
- Oxfam International
- Plan International
- Robert Bosch Stiftung
- Save the Children
- Samuel Hall
- World Vision International

Development Banks and Financial Institutions

- African Development Bank (AfDB)
- Asian Development Bank (ADB)
- European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)
- European Investment Bank (EIB)
- Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)
- Islamic Development Bank (IsDB)
- World Bank

National and Local NGOs in Major Refugee-Hosting Countries

- Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC) - Bangladesh
- Caritas Lebanon - Lebanon
- Forum for African Women Educationalists (FAWE) - Uganda
- Jordan Hashemite Charity Organization (JHCO) - Jordan
- Kenya Red Cross Society - Kenya
- Lebanese Red Cross - Lebanon
- Relief International - Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, Sudan
- Turkish Red Crescent (Kızılay) - Türkiye
- Uganda Red Cross Society - Uganda

Refugee and Displaced Persons' Voices

- R-SEAT (Refugees Seeking Equal Access at the Table) - coalition promoting refugee participation in humanitarian governance and global policy forums

Host-country government consultations will target foreign and interior ministries in Jordan, Ethiopia, Kenya, Bangladesh, Colombia, Lebanon, Türkiye, and Uganda.

Appendix D: Analytical Briefs

Four commissioned Analytical Briefs will be prepared in concise PowerPoint or similar presentation style format to support the project's analytical and policy-development work. Each brief will examine a specific thematic dimension of forced displacement responses and identify key evidence and policy implications. The briefs will inform the background paper, which is the principal framing document for the roundtable and subsequent stakeholder consultations.

Analytical Brief 1: Financing Forced Displacement Beyond Humanitarian Assistance	**Analytical Brief 2: AI and Forced Displacement Responses: Current Practice, Effectiveness, and Strategic Implications**
Purpose: Examines financing mechanisms beyond traditional humanitarian assistance, including development finance, concessional lending, risk-transfer instruments, private-sector investment, blended finance, and social impact instruments. **Scope:** Assesses the extent to which these mechanisms are being used in forced displacement contexts; their interaction with humanitarian financing; effectiveness in reducing long-term aid dependence; and political economy factors. Produces a typology of financing mechanisms and concludes with practical recommendations for aligning humanitarian, development, government, and private-sector financing.	**Purpose:** Examines how artificial intelligence is currently being used in forced displacement contexts, with particular attention to its potential to shift responses toward more inclusive, development-oriented, and locally owned approaches. **Scope:** Maps current and emerging AI applications including predictive analytics, refugee registration and identity management, needs assessment, service delivery, translation tools, education and livelihoods applications, crisis mapping, and asylum procedures. Assesses governance architecture requirements before AI systems are scaled in displacement settings.
Analytical Brief 3: Rethinking the UN Humanitarian Forced Displacement Response Architecture	**Analytical Brief 4: Donor Governments and Displacement -Hosting States: Identifying Areas of Converging Interest**
Purpose: Examines whether the current UN-centred humanitarian response architecture remains financially, operationally, and institutionally viable in the context of sustained funding decline and increasingly protracted crises. **Scope:** Assesses structural critiques including fragmented mandates, competition for funding, delivery overlaps, and parallel operational structures. Evaluates whether current reform efforts, including UN80 initiatives, thematic clustering, and shared services, meaningfully address underlying problems. Concludes with practical reflections on politically feasible reforms.	**Purpose:** Identifies countries and situations where the interests of donor states and displacement-hosting states converge in ways that could support more strategic, sustainable, and politically viable responses to forced displacement. **Scope:** Examines potential areas of convergence including stability, regional security, migration management, economic development, climate resilience, and labour mobility. Concludes with practical recommendations on how donor governments could support coalitions with refugee-hosting states while preserving protection principles.