

Collaboration in International Policy for the Climate Displaced

Global

Capstone

Victoria Schrag

Abstract: This essay analyzes the problem of displacement caused by climate change, focusing on issues of climate justice and the protection of climate displaced peoples (CDPs) and arguing for the creation of a collaborative cross-UN framework for CDPs, the numbers of whom are projected to grow drastically in the next thirty years. Informed by a critical analysis of documents from international organizations like the World Bank and UNHCR, among others, it articulates a set of criteria for successful integration of resettled CDPs to be utilized in the formation of a CDP framework. These criteria are formulated based on an understanding of the literature on the topic and the gaps present in current policy regarding CDPs. The essay then analyzes two cases of resettlement, one past and one

ongoing, in order to demonstrate past issues in resettlement and to hypothesize the positive impacts that such a framework could have on climate displacement in the future by helping to fill gaps in policy. Based on this research and analysis, this essay concludes that a cross-UN framework could feasibly be pursued in order to provide CDPs with comprehensive protection.

Introduction

With the imminent onset of climate change comes a slew of related direct and indirect problems for the international community, one of which is displacement due to uninhabitable environments. Climate-related factors like drought, sea level change, desertification, and other factors already play a causal role in the movement of peoples from particularly climate-affected areas and communities, and some academics expect this trend to grow the population of climate displaced persons (CDPs) by about 200 million by 2050.¹ Sadly, but not surprisingly, the groups most affected by climate change displacement (CCD) are those that have not contributed significantly to the emission of greenhouse gases, which

are the leading cause of climate change.²

This, along with other issues of representation and agency, creates an imbalanced power dynamic between developed and developing countries in the climate change paradigm.

Although addressed through much academic literature, climate displacement has yet to be the object of a specific policy framework in global governance.³ Scholars suggest various steps forward, but (in part because of the complex nature of CCD) these ideas have many gaps, whether in a lack of feasibility or in an unreasonably or impractically small scope of provision. One such idea, supported by various members of the academic community, is that of creating

¹ Myers, Norman, “Environmental Refugees: An Emergent Security Issue” (May 22, 2005); Stern, Nicholas, “The Economics of Climate Change” in *Stern Review* (2006): 77.

² Ahmed, Bayes, “Who Takes Responsibility for the Climate Refugees?” in *International Journal of Climate Change*

Strategies and Management (January 8, 2018): 5-26.

³ Kuusipalo, Rina, “Exiled by Emissions—Climate Change Related Displacement and Migration in International Law: Gaps in Global Governance and the Role of the UN Climate Convention” in *Vermont Journal of Environmental Law* (2017): 615.

a convention on climate refugees.⁴ However, although this avenue would likely offer thorough protection to CDPs, it is highly unlikely that states would move to ratify a climate refugee treaty because of significant political barriers.⁵ Additionally, scholars express concern that treating CDPs as refugees would upset the refugee regime as it stands for the people it already protects.⁶

It appears much more likely that a policy framework can be created through the UN to account for the gaps in current policy by utilizing the international community's existing understanding of forced migration and involuntary resettlement. Thus far, although various UN bodies such as UNHCR have released statements or

guidelines on the resettlement of CDPs, there has not yet been a cross-UN effort to form a response to this issue; however, the mandates of many UN bodies have led them to participate in assistance to CDPs on their own terms. CDPs are not considered refugees, nor will this report argue that they should be. However, UNHCR's mandate to "provide international protection and humanitarian assistance" can be and has been extended to those that do not fall strictly under the category of refugee, now explicitly covering returnees and stateless persons.⁷ UNHCR is just one of the forty-one UN bodies with mandates and interests that address assistance to CDPs.⁸ My analysis of five of these organizations leads

⁴ Behrman, Simon and Kent, Avidan, "Climate Refugees: Beyond the Legal Impasse?" (London: Routledge, 2018).

⁵ McAdam, Jane, "Swimming against the Tide: Why a Climate Change Displacement Treaty Is Not the Answer" in *International Journal of Refugee* (October 2011): 2–27.

⁶ McAdam, "Swimming Against the Tide."

⁷ UNHCR, "Mandate of the High Commissioner for Refugees and His Office: Executive Summary," 1.

⁸ Platform on Disaster Displacement, "Recommendations for Integrated Approaches to Avert, Minimize and Address Displacement Related to the Adverse Impacts of Climate Change," *The Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage Associated with Climate Change* 11.3 (October 2018): 1–89.

me to believe that a cross-UN effort could effectively form a framework for CDPs.

Although climate change displacement may seem like an issue to address many years from now, the creation of such a framework is a crucial part of current preparatory environmental policy. Like many other aspects of climate change, if the international community does not take action now to formulate a plan for the potential millions of future CDPs, it is probable that there will be no sufficient recourse by the time the need is truly pressing. Additionally, as of 1995, at least 25 million CDPs were in existence, and, as mentioned before, this number has grown to a projected 200 million CDPs by 2050.⁹ Based on these numbers, it can be concluded that some provisions are necessary for this population—and the sooner they can be

mapped out and enacted, the better off the international community will be.

In the following pages, I investigate how the lessons learned from previous resettlement projects and policies inform a potential collaborative UN framework for CDPs. I first explore the literature surrounding CCD, addressing the academic conversation on related issues of protection, justice, the politics of policy, and the principles of Development-Forced Displacement and Resettlement (DFDR). I then elaborate my methodology by describing my logic for data selection for both document analysis and case studies. My subsequent section first briefly summarizes the key points of my chosen documents, analyzes the utility of and gaps in these documents, and addresses the bearing that they hold in a discussion of a collaborative framework on CCD. I draw

⁹ Myers, Norman, “Environmental Refugees: An Emergent Security Issue.”

conclusions from this analysis in an exploration of potential policy and key policy facets that this framework must address. In my following case presentation, I describe a historical case DFDR in Togo, detailing the successes and failures of the project and hypothesizing the potential impacts of a collaborative displacement and resettlement framework. I then describe the case of impending CCD in Tuvalu, suggesting that a collaborative framework should be the ultimate goal of the international community. Finally, I conclude with a few closing remarks about the future of such a framework.

Literature Review

Overview

When discussing potential solutions for the issue of CCD, one must pay attention to certain broader, yet interrelated concerns. Although the literature surrounding CCD

addresses many subtopics, this study benefits from analyzing the concept of protection as it relates to CCD, then moving on to a discussion of what justice means for CDPs' visible personhood. It then discusses in brief the influence of politics on policy enactment or lack thereof, and finally it addresses the current conversation surrounding DFDR and its relation to CCD.

Protection for the Vulnerable

The discussion surrounding CCD would not exist in large part without a general consensus that the phenomenon necessitates some level of protection from a governing body. However, what this looks like in practice is debated. Lorraine Elliott analyzes the interactive security needs of two populations in shaping this discussion.¹⁰ First, for many sovereign states, migration generates concerns of threats to traditional

¹⁰ Elliott, Lorraine, "Climate Migration and Climate Migrants: What Threat, Whose Security," in *Climate Change and*

Displacement : Multidisciplinary Perspectives (Oxford: Hart, 2010), 175-90.

state security.¹¹ Elliott postulates that this focus detracts from the attention paid to the needs of the second population, CDPs, and simultaneously causes governmental inaction towards these needs.¹² Despite this apparent misdirection of state attention, the academic conversation of CCD still centers around potential structural assistance to displaced persons. As noted by Walter Kälin, the vulnerability of CDPs is largely due to the inability of their home government to provide them with assistance, rather than its unwillingness to do so.¹³ This is just one facet of the legal and practical distinctions between CDPs and refugees,¹⁴ which creates a stumbling block for those who would encourage the creation of an environmental treaty for CDPs. Not only are

there significant legal barriers to such a treaty, but Jane McAdam argues that to focus on attempting to overcome these barriers would encourage the conversation away from more achievable alternatives that could provide immediate relief.¹⁵ She also brings up the functional inability of such a treaty to assist the majority of CDPs, since those actually crossing international borders make up a smaller percent of the overall affected population.¹⁶ This perspective, although perhaps discouraging on first glance, gives way to the thought of alternative solutions. Instead of a full-blown treaty, Elisa Fornalé and Curtis Doebbler suggest that UNHCR take a central role in the support of CDPs,¹⁷ while Rina Kuusipalo proposes that UNFCCC is best

¹¹ Elliott, Lorraine, “Climate Migration and Climate Migrants.”

¹² Elliott, “Climate Migration and Climate Migrants.”

¹³ Kälin, Walter, “Conceptualising Climate-Induced Displacement” in *Climate Change and Displacement : Multidisciplinary Perspectives* (Oxford: Hart, 2010), 81-103.

¹⁴ Kälin, “Conceptualising Climate-Induced Displacement.”

¹⁵ McAdam, Jane, “Swimming against the Tide: Why a Climate Change Displacement Treaty Is Not the Answer” in *International Journal of Refugee* (October 2011): 2–27.

¹⁶ McAdam, “Swimming Against the Tide.”

¹⁷ Fornalé, Elise and Doebbler, Curtis F. J., “UNHCR and Protection and Assistance for

situated to fill this need.¹⁸ While Fornalé, Doebbler, and Kuusipalo create valid arguments as to why these UN bodies should take leading roles in creating a CDP framework, they neglect to consider the possibility of a collaborative effort towards policy change. However scholars conceive of structures for assistance to CDPs, their ideas converge with an agreement that the current protection regime is insufficient.

Justice for the Underrepresented

Because the conversation on CDPs is primarily conducted among academics, it has lacked meaningful participation by the affected communities. Although, in name, communities are consulted throughout the

process, Brooke Wilmsen and Michael Webber find that CDP community needs are often overlooked and their agency diminished.¹⁹ This, they argue, is evident in the lack of attention paid to cultivating adequate livelihoods for peoples upon resettlement.²⁰ Similarly, Jane McAdam and Elizabeth Ferris emphasize the necessity of receiving consent from communities before resettlement,²¹ and Roger Zetter calls for both greater attention paid to the labels placed on these communities and a heightened understanding of the significance of power and force in decision-making.²² Ransan-Cooper et al. explore four specific conceptualizations of climate migrants— the

the Victims of Climate Change” in *The Geographical Journal* (November 9, 2016): 329–35.

¹⁸ Kuusipalo, Rina, “Exiled by Emissions.”

¹⁹ Wilmsen, Brooke and Webber, Michael, “What Can We Learn from the Practice of Development-Forced Displacement and Resettlement for Organised Resettlements in Response to Climate Change?” in *Geoforum* (January 2015): 76–85.

²⁰ Wilmsen and Webber, “What Can We Learn.”

²¹ McAdam, Jane and Ferris, Elizabeth, “Planned Relocations in the Context of Climate Change:

Unpacking the Legal and Conceptual Issues,” in *Cambridge Journal of International and Comparative Law* (2015): 137–66.

²² Zetter, Roger, “Protecting People Displaced by Climate Change: Some Conceptual Challenges,” in *Climate Change and Displacement : Multidisciplinary Perspectives* (Oxford: Hart, 2010): 131-50.

victim, the security threat, the adaptive agent, and the political subject—in order to understand how these frames are constructed,²³ and Aaron Saad responds by expanding this concept of CDP framing as a part of the conversation of climate justice.²⁴ For Kälin, the greatest concern in justice for and framing of CDPs is that of stateless individuals.²⁵ He submits that, no matter the *de jure* condition of the individual's homeland, the framework for CDPs should allow them to maintain a *de facto* state identity.²⁶ However, McAdam interrogates the idea that states are likely to lose their sovereignty simply because of territorial loss due to climate-related impacts, suggesting

that it would take a more structural failure of state for this to occur.²⁷ Katrina Wyman finds that the most important factors are first to determine whether CDPs have the moral right to safe haven and then to determine how many CDPs should be taken in by each high-emissions country based on level of responsibility and capability.²⁸ Taking a more nuanced position on this issue, Lorraine Elliott places her focus on a necessary de-securitization of migration in the traditional state-centric sense to allow the conversation to center more appropriately on the issue of human security for CDPs.²⁹ This would allow for increased climate justice by taking the focus off of the

²³ Ransan-Cooper, Hedda, Carol Farbotko, Karen E. McNamara, Fanny Thornton, and Emilie Chevalier, “Being(s) Framed: The Means and Ends of Framing Environmental Migrants,” in *Global Environmental Change* (November 2015): 106-15.

²⁴ Saad, Aaron, “Toward a Justice Framework for Understanding and Responding to Climate Migration and Displacement,” in *Environmental Justice* (August 1, 2017): 98-101.

²⁵ Kälin, “Conceptualising Climate-Induced Displacement.”

²⁶ Kälin, “Conceptualising Climate-Induced Displacement.”

²⁷ McAdam, Jane, “‘Disappearing States,’ Statelessness and the Boundaries of International Law,” in *Climate Change and Displacement: Multidisciplinary Perspectives* (Oxford: Hart, 2010): 105-29.

²⁸ Wyman, Katrina Miriam, “Sinking States,” in *Property in Land and Other Resources* (Cambridge: Lincoln Institute, 2012): 439-69.

²⁹ Elliott, “Climate Migration and Climate Migrants.”

security of developed countries and instead placing it on the well-being needs of the victims of climate change.³⁰ Elliot creates a well-developed case for this relationship between de-securitization and climate justice, making it a crucial part of future discussion on CDP frameworks. The literature surrounding justice for and framing of CDPs provides a foundation future frameworks, as it brings into perspective the importance of accounting for and valuing the contributions, agency, and needs of vulnerable communities.

Policy: Mixed Motives

Though, in an ideal world, the decisions made around the framing of the CDPs would be free of ulterior motives, in reality, policy-making is fraught with complexities and power dynamics. McAdam takes this concept so far as to wonder if

perhaps the motivation for non-state actors to push for a treaty for CDPs is based more on legal pertinence or political gain.³¹ She further notes that states lack the political will to take initiative in creating a treaty, postulating that perhaps a state's desire for "moral high ground" would be the only motivation to champion this kind of solution.³² McAdam and Ferris point out that the lack of action by the international community is likely directly linked to individual states' lack of concern, since the burden of response is currently an explicit state duty.³³ Elliot points out another potential factor in this outcome not recognized by McAdam and Ferris, clarifying that, in order to remove the traditional security lens from the migration conversation, it must also be de-politicized, since the politics point directly to state

³⁰ Elliott, "Climate Migration and Climate Migrants."

³¹ McAdam, "Swimming Against the Tide."

³² McAdam, "Swimming Against the Tide," 16.

³³ McAdam and Ferris, "Planned Relocations."

interests, rather than to human security needs.³⁴ Elliot's focus on the politicization and securitization of CDP issues provides essential framing for the creation of a CDP framework. These influences stand in the way of policy creation and necessitate conversation on how to address and perhaps dismantle these state tendencies moving forward.

Development-Forced Displacement and Resettlement: Climate Displacement Nexus

In working to identify possible alternative solutions, a number of scholars have looked towards the World Bank's 1980 policy of Development-Forced Displacement and Resettlement, or DFDR.

Though the practice is far from perfect, scholars have pinpointed its particular weaknesses and aim to improve upon these gaps of understanding in order to adapt the basic concepts to CCD.³⁵ Fifteen years after the original policy's creation, Michael Cernea developed a risk-prediction, identification, resolution, and research model, which he called the Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction model, or IRR.³⁶ This policy was meant to help reverse the risks involved in DFDR praxis, therefore aiming to undermine its own usefulness and negate the need for such a model by helping researchers and policy-makers address areas of risk before they became problems.³⁷ Since Cernea's model was created while the

³⁴ Elliott, "Climate Migration and Climate Migrants."

³⁵ Cernea, Michael, "Challenging the Prevailing Paradigm of Displacement and Resettlement," in *Challenging the Prevailing Paradigm of Displacement and Resettlement*, (New York: Routledge, 2018): 1-43; Wilmsen and Webber, "What Can We Learn;" Thomas, Kevin, "Development Projects and Involuntary Population Displacement: The World Bank's Attempt

to Correct Past Failures," in *Population Research and Policy Review* 21(4): 339-49

³⁶ Cernea, Michael M., "Impoverishment Risks, Risk Management and Reconstruction: A Model of Population Displacement and Resettlement," in *Risks and Reconstruction: Experiences of Resettlers and Refugees* World Bank: (2000).

³⁷ Cernea, "Impoverishment Risks, Risk Management and Reconstruction."

policy of DFDR was relatively new, it is, of course, lacking in much of the conversation of justice that has developed since. It is possible that this model did, in fact, help to mitigate certain risks of DFDR, but even as it exists today, the policy and practice are greatly flawed. Wilmsen and Webber analyze many of these shortcomings, focusing on DFDR's lack of focus on the agency of CDPs, lack of self-examination regarding development efficacy, lack of consideration for identity politics of communities being displaced, and lack of effort towards integrating the complex dynamics of these communities into their resettled locations.³⁸ They also point out the politics and power dynamics involved in DFDR decisions, which impact facets such as which populations are subject to movement.³⁹ Even more problematic is the

tendency of states to view CDPs as units of financial investment that must be placed in optimal locations for state functionality.⁴⁰ These concerns, however, do not mean that all facets of DFDR strategies must be discarded. Rather, an academic ability to appreciate the issues with DFDR policy can better inform the formation of a positive framework for CCD and allow the international community to account for vital provisions to allow CDPs the greatest agency and assistance.

Conclusions from Literature

The issues of protection, climate justice, politics of policy, and DFDR all inform the current conversation on CCD and possible steps forward. Specifically, lessons learned from DFDR address many issues of the proper implementation of the previous three topics, better preparing the

³⁸ Wilmsen and Webber, "What Can We Learn."

³⁹ Wilmsen and Webber, "What Can We Learn."

⁴⁰ Wilmsen and Webber, "What Can We Learn."

international community and its academics to move forward with possible integrated frameworks for the protection of CDPs. My review of the above literature, as well as a preliminary examination of international bodies with the power to effect change in this issue area, leads me to believe that a potential path forward can be created through the combined efforts and capabilities of UN bodies already involved in CDP assistance. These entities should come together to create a new framework for CCD utilizing the successful ideas of DFDR and informed by its weaknesses. In the rest of this study, I examine the potential for this policy, looking specifically at the criteria that must be met to allow for the highest potential success.

Methodology

I hypothesize that, through collaboration and by examining the lessons learned from previous resettlement projects, UN organizations can feasibly create a CDP

framework and provide the necessary practical tools for executing it. In this section, I describe my logic behind a choice of documents from various international organizations (IOs) on which to perform a discourse analysis of policies and recommendations regarding CCD. These documents help to inform the report with aspects of the history and current state of international responses to climate displacement, as well as the gaps present in current policy. I also explain the logic behind my choice of two resettlement cases.

I selected the following documents from IOs based on their relevance and date of publication. For the World Bank document, I searched for the earliest policy information available on DFDR. For the Platform on Disaster Displacement (PDD) and UNHCR documents, I searched for those that most directly addressed the issue of CCD and current UN body responses to the issue. For the CRIDEAU, CDRP, and

CIDCE Draft Convention, I utilized the most recent available revision.

The main World Bank document I analyze is Operational Directive 4.30 on Involuntary Resettlement, published in 1990. Although the policy began in 1980, this document is the most explicitly linked early policy document I have been able to access. This document allows me to look at the policy directives of DFDR early in its existence and examine the provisions, or lack thereof, present in the framework in order to inform my understandings of resettlement policy. The next document I look at in detail is a report by the PDD titled Recommendations for Integrated Approaches to Avert, Minimize and Address Displacement Related to the Adverse Impacts of Climate Change (2018). This document analyzes the past and present involvement of each of the various UN agencies involved with CCD, providing an understanding of which agencies are already

focusing on which CDP needs and helping to inform the basis of an integrated policy.

After that, I analyze UNHCR's Guidance on Protecting People from Disasters and Environmental Changes through Planned Relocations (2015), the most recent directly related document from UNHCR I have found. I chose to analyze this document because I wanted to focus on one specific UN organization's current platform towards CDPs in order to inform my understanding of UN involvement and of which organizations should be most involved in the creation of a CDP framework. I focused on UNHCR because of the organization's mandate and the close relation of refugees and IDPs with other displaced peoples like CDPs. This document also outlines recommendations which guide the formation of potential CCD framework.

The last document I analyze is a suggested policy framework created across various institutions (including CRIDEAU,

CDRP, and CIDCE). Titled the Draft Convention on the International Status of Environmentally Displaced Persons, the third version of this document was published in 2013 and covers many areas of CDP need without venturing into the territory of a refugee convention for this group. I chose to analyze this document for its valuable perspective on the necessary aspects of a policy for CDPs, and I draw on its structure and concerns in developing my own proposal.

I based my case selection on a logic of chronology, drawing information from an original case of DFDR and a current case of impending CCD in order to understand how best practice has changed and what issues are still prevalent. In these studies, I address problems on the ground with early DFDR and then take an in-depth look at a situation of imminent CCD. The details of these cases provide crucial information of what is needed to fill the gaps currently present in

resettlement policy and create a successful framework for CDPs.

The first case study I focus on is the Nangbeto hydropower project in Togo, which began in 1984. This case allows me to examine the usage of DFDR in a development-based project shortly after the policy's initial implementation in 1980. This therefore allows me to identify the policy's initial strengths and weaknesses in practice. I focus on areas in which the real-world implementation of DFDR did not fall in line with the stipulations of its policy. The second case study for this report surrounds imminent CCD in Tuvalu. It addresses the scientific predictions for the island, current perspectives of the residents, and cultural preferences to be taken into account in CCD policy implementation in the future. This case provides an example of a growing future need for explicit CDP policy in response to an unprecedented combination of external factors with internal need.

Analysis

In this section I first lay out the most relevant facets of the documents I have chosen in order to analyze them and draw connections between these documents and my hypothesis. I then use the information gathered from these documents to address necessary factors for the basis of a potential collaborative policy framework for CDPs. After this, I explore a historical case study involving displacement and resettlement by providing background for the case, examining gaps in policy and practice, and hypothesizing the impact that the provisions of a cross-UN framework could have had on case outcome. My second case is a current and future issue, rather than a historical one, so for this I provide history, background on current events, and the predictions of the scientific community of future dangers, subsequently hypothesizing the provisions

that a cross-UN framework could offer to this case.

Initial Exploration and Analysis of Documents

World Bank: Operational Directive 4.30 on Involuntary Resettlement

Many of the strategies presented in the World Bank's 1990 Operational Directive (OD) 4.30 remain relevant to the issue of CCD. The document outlines various provisions and plans for DFDR projects. The main foci of this document are conditions under which displacement occurs and how to handle displacement when it is necessary. It considers displacement necessary only when it is the sole feasible solution for a development project, which then requires a "detailed resettlement plan, timetable, and budget."⁴¹ The policy also claims that the main goal of Bank policy "is to ensure that the population displaced by a

⁴¹ World Bank Operational Manual, "Operational Directive 4.30," 2.

project receives benefits from it.”⁴² The plan includes intent to integrate resettled populations and allow them to have choice in their resettlement site and access to methods to create livelihoods for themselves there. The directive also stipulates that an “ex-post evaluation” must be completed to document the process and its impacts on the resettled population and the host location.⁴³

Each of these concerns elaborated on in OD 4.30 has significance in the development of a CCD framework. Such a framework must ensure extensive pre-movement planning, the formation of which CDPs must be a part. In order to claim justice in practice, the developers and practitioners of this framework must allow those in need of resettlement to have some level of choice in the process. In these ways, the durability of the issues being addressed

in OD 4.30 demonstrates that the creators successfully identified key long-term factors that are present across various regional divides during displacement.

However, as I discuss in the Togo case study, the beginnings of DFDR practice did not always implement these goals properly. Namely, there has been a demonstrated disconnect between DFDR policy and practice at the expense of the resettled population. A 1998 World Bank report outlines “serious lapses” in equitable treatment, maintenance of income, or compensation for resettled peoples in the execution of DFDR in Togo, China, Indonesia, Thailand, India, and Brazil between 1980 and 1998.⁴⁴ In these ways, although DFDR policy isolated various factors for successful resettlement, it failed

⁴² World Bank Operational Manual, “Operational Directive 4.30,” 1.

⁴³ World Bank Operational Manual, “Operational Directive 4.30,” 9.

⁴⁴ World Bank, “Recent Experience with Involuntary Resettlement Overview,” C.

to plan sufficiently for implementation. This principle is elaborated on later in this paper.

PDD: Recommendations for Integrated Approaches to Avert, Minimize and Address Displacement Related to the Adverse Impacts of Climate Change

The PDD's Recommendations for Integrated Approaches (2018)⁴⁵ addresses the evolution of the UN's organizational responses to CCD and provides a first-level analysis of the UN bodies currently involved in various facets of the CCD paradigm. The document focuses on the functions of various UN bodies in regards to CCD and identifies gaps, such as lack of cohesive and effective leadership in collaboration, and overlaps, such as current efforts toward

disaster response and risk reduction, in organizational activities.⁴⁶ It also acknowledges that the process of CCD is one that necessitates high-level coordination between institutions at the state, regional, and international arenas.⁴⁷ The document's analysis of current structures and organizational efforts to address displacement breaks down specific focuses of agency attention to displacement, identifies and reviews forty-one different UN bodies currently involved in assistance to CDPs, and differentiates level and directness of involvement.⁴⁸

The document addresses the utility of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee as a mechanism for coordinating actions across UN bodies in relation to CCD. It also applies the organization's definition of

⁴⁵ Platform on Disaster Displacement, "Recommendations for Integrated Approaches."

⁴⁶ Platform on Disaster Displacement, "Recommendations for Integrated Approaches."

⁴⁷ Platform on Disaster Displacement, "Recommendations for Integrated Approaches."

⁴⁸ Platform on Disaster Displacement, "Recommendations for Integrated Approaches."

“durable solution” to CCD: “A durable solution is achieved when [persons] 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.”⁴⁹ This definition helps to inform the criteria for success that I identify later in this essay. The methods listed to achieve a “durable solution” include return, local integration, and settlement in a secondary location.⁵⁰ However, because some CCD cases are permanent, this definition would need to be adjusted accordingly in order to offer sufficient protection to CDPs. In the case of some Pacific Islands, along with other

irreversibly climate-affected regions, eventual return may not be a possibility.

The document identifies each of the UN-related organizations working on CCD issues based on a chronology of CDP need (preparation for, during, and durable solutions to displacement) and a categorization of organizational efforts.⁵¹ A brief analysis of the recurrence of various organizations under different issue areas demonstrates that the organizations mentioned under the greatest number of subsection functionalities are UNDP and OCHA, followed by a tie between UNHCR and IOM.⁵² The document also provides a special focus on the role of UNFCCC in CDP assistance. Each of these five organizations has a direct connection to

⁴⁹ IASC, “IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for Internally Displaced Persons” in Platform on Disaster Displacement, “Recommendations for Integrated Approaches,” 17.

⁵⁰ IASC, “IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for Internally Displaced Persons” in Platform on Disaster Displacement,

“Recommendations for Integrated Approaches,” 17.

⁵¹ Platform on Disaster Displacement, “Recommendations for Integrated Approaches.”

⁵² Platform on Disaster Displacement, “Recommendations for Integrated Approaches.”

CDP assistance through their published strategy documents, strategic plans, or priority setting.⁵³ They also span all listed categories of organizational efforts, making this collection of organizations a strong set of leaders for the UN in addressing CDP protection.⁵⁴ Though this document accomplishes preliminary legwork in analyzing current collaborations in and overlap of UN program mandates and actions, it does not take any solid steps forward in creating a feasible collaborative approach to CCD. However, through its research and analysis, it provides fundamental information needed to propose the creation of a cross-UN framework for CDPs.

UNHCR: Guidance on Protecting People from Disasters and Environmental Changes through Planned Relocations

UNHCR's Guidance on Protecting People from Disasters and Environmental Changes through Planned Relocations (2015)⁵⁵ provides a similar perspective on resettlement to OD 4.30. Since UNHCR is one of the organizations on which the PDD document focuses heavily, a detailed understanding of UNHCR publication surrounding CCD is relevant to this report. The document emphasizes the importance of community involvement and the necessity of extensive long-term planning before any relocation. Additionally, it identifies contextual specificity as a crucial element of such planning, pointing out that the conditions, needs, and appropriate measures

⁵³ Platform on Disaster Displacement, "Recommendations for Integrated Approaches."

⁵⁴ Platform on Disaster Displacement, "Recommendations for Integrated Approaches."

⁵⁵ UNHCR, "Guidance on Protecting People from Disasters and Environmental Change through Planned Relocation," *Georgetown University School of Foreign Service* (October 7, 2015): 1-27.

to address these issues will vary. Community-oriented concerns like dissemination of information, cultural preservation, and the right to self-determination are also emphasized in the document.⁵⁶ On top of these matters, it sets forth a list of factors to be considered when determining the necessity and feasibility of relocation in a given situation, including risk, vulnerability and resilience, availability of options, and costs. Each of these issues is relevant for CDPs, but the document's recommendations would be more effective if expanded in scope.

The suggested legal framework of the Guidance assumes that the most involved actors will be states. However, in addition to a state-led response, an international framework is needed to solidify expectations and best practices, allowing states to focus on the practical

aspects of relocation as proposed by UNHCR. Rather than requiring states to formulate all parts of such a plan themselves, this could allow greater mobility in state mechanisms, as they would then bear less of the policy planning weight in resettlement. Although the states would still be responsible for determining and implementing case-specific responses, a cross-UN framework could provide an avenue of greater consistency between state practices.

External: Draft Convention on the International Status of Environmentally Displaced Persons

This Draft Convention,⁵⁷ the third version of which was published in 2013, proposes creating and instating an official legal status for CDPs. Any potential collaborative framework development across UN bodies necessitates such a status

⁵⁷ Prieur, Michel, et al., "Draft Convention on the International Status of

Environmentally-Displaced Persons (third version- May 2013)," CIDCE.

for CDPs (referred to in the Draft Convention as environmentally-displaced persons). The Draft Convention proposes this definition:

‘Environmentally-displaced persons’ are individuals, families, groups and populations confronted with a sudden or gradual environmental disaster that inexorably impacts their living conditions, resulting in their forced displacement, at the outset or throughout, from their habitual residence. (3)

If this definition were adopted by the international community along with many of the following provisions for CDPs, this would provide the basis for a strong policy to address CCD.

This Draft Convention was originally published in 2008 and has been in revision

⁵⁸ Prieur, Michel, et al., “Draft Convention on the International Status of Environmentally-Displaced Persons.” *Revue Européenne de Droit de l’Environnement*, (2008): 395-406.

ever since.⁵⁸ This long process has provided the Draft Convention’s researchers with the means to ensure that their policy propositions are informed by current developments. I use this Draft Convention as the functional base of a potential collaborative policy on CCD. The work done by this group of scholars is immensely valuable in providing both a template for policy production and in addressing various nuanced facets of policy. A cross-UN policy for CCD would build on the framework set forth in the Draft Convention, which includes a clear objective, necessary definitions, a set of principles and rights, a mechanism for status recognition of CDPs, an acknowledgement of the roles of various IOs, and an elucidation of measures for convention implementation.⁵⁹ This framework accounts for the most pressing

⁵⁹ Prieur, Michel, et al., “Draft Convention on the International Status of Environmentally-Displaced Persons (third version- May 2013).”

present issues, but it may be improved through the addition of more specific language regarding community engagement in the planning of resettlement conditions and options, among other items. I expand on the applicability of the Draft Convention in the next section.

Analysis of Potential Policy

The above documents from the World Bank, PDD, UNHCR, and the Draft Convention from CRIDEAU demonstrate the various overlaps and developments of new solutions that are present in policy discourse and policy creation across IOs. Codifying the concerns identified within each document into an overarching framework would allow for the international community to provide clearer expectations for states. As it stands, definitive best practice on CCD is not explicitly stated in official documents, so states must work

individually to ascertain what constitutes an appropriate response. Perhaps the next step forward is for the UN, as a well-positioned international actor, to integrate the existing sources of research into a central policy addressing the factors necessary for successful CCD and resettlement. Such a policy would also provide specific examples and expectations for states. In this section, I address why various UN bodies are already well-positioned to execute the formation of this policy and define what successful integration of such a policy would look like. I also address the various issue areas relevant this policy and discuss some potential barriers to this avenue.

Since UNDP, OCHA, IOM, and UNHCR are the most frequently and widely mentioned UN organizations in the PDD's analysis around CCD, these organizations would be a fundamental part of any future framework for CDPs. Each of their mandates also plays a significant role in

shaping their involvement with CCD. For example, UNDP's mandate is to assist countries in achieving new levels of development.⁶⁰ The organization is therefore particularly involved in pre-displacement and post-displacement activities.⁶¹ The mandate of OCHA is to prepare for and respond to emergencies,⁶² so it is mainly involved in pre-displacement and during-displacement assistance.⁶³ Similarly, UNHCR's assistance to CDPs and its contribution to the discussion and formation of policy is due in large part to its mandate to protect various displaced peoples. Particularly notable for this report is UNHCR's 2017-2020 Strategic Plan, which

aims to further "legal, policy, and practical solutions" to CCD.⁶⁴ Relatedly, IOM's mandate determines much of its involvement as well, as it addresses the "migration, environment and climate change nexus through policy dialogue, capacity-building and operational activities."⁶⁵ This leads the organization to be involved mainly in assistance in preparation for and during displacement.⁶⁶ Additionally, because of its specific mandate to encourage negotiations of climate policy on the international stage, the UNFCCC Secretariat (the body responsible for the creation of the UNFCCC) also plays a key role.⁶⁷

⁶⁰ UNDP, "UNDP's Mandate," https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/sdgooverview/mdg_goals/progress.html.

⁶¹ Platform on Disaster Displacement, "Recommendations for Integrated Approaches."

⁶² OCHA, "Who We Are," <https://www.unocha.org/about-us/who-we-are>.

⁶³ Platform on Disaster Displacement, "Recommendations for Integrated Approaches."

⁶⁴ Platform on Disaster Displacement, "Recommendations for Integrated Approaches," 36.

⁶⁵ Platform on Disaster Displacement, "Recommendations for Integrated Approaches," 48.

⁶⁶ Platform on Disaster Displacement, "Recommendations for Integrated Approaches."

⁶⁷ UNFCCC, "About the Secretariat," <https://unfccc.int/about-us/about-the-secretariat>.

Working together, these UN bodies and others could combine their prowess in policy advocacy, provision of legal advice, assistance in identification and implementation of durable solutions, provision of humanitarian aid, and dissemination of information.⁶⁸ Each of these organizations has some combination of significant stakes in, mandates relevant to, and resources well-suited to the issue of CCD. Therefore, examining the potential for a collaborative policy between these entities opens up the conversation surrounding the creation of a holistic approach to the issue.

Based on my research, a successful policy implementation of any collaborative framework for CDPs would entail four main factors. The first is consistency from planning to practice. This would involve open channels of communication between the UN, the host community, and the

resettled people, as well a tracking mechanism to catch potential complications of resettlement before they grow in severity. The second factor is the insurance of agency for CDPs through both a) the participation of the local population in planning and b) choice of location. States and UN bodies would consult with CDPs and give weight to their contributions when planning resettlement. One way for this to be implemented would be meetings between community leaders, state government leaders, and UN body representatives.

The third factor is regional differentiation in approach based on a) geographic factors and the scope of the climate damage issue and b) the history and cultural characteristics of the community in need of resettlement. This is particularly relevant to planning before displacement, but also applies in a discussion of

⁶⁸ Platform on Disaster Displacement, “Recommendations for Integrated Approaches.”

integration. It would be based on the information gained from CDP communities during planning meetings and could include identifying culturally similar host communities for smooth integration. Finally, the fourth factor is the provision of potentially permanent avenues for livelihood and integration of CDPs through cultural, economic, and social structures. In practice, this could include implementing resources and paths for CDPs to initiate their integration into the economy. In the rest of this report, for purposes of clarity, I refer to these criteria as Criteria 1, 2, 3, and 4.

A collaborative UN framework for CDPs would be shaped by the above criteria, an understanding of the literature surrounding justice in CCD, a thorough knowledge of relevant policy surrounding displacement, and an analysis of past cases of resettlement. One of the goals of this framework would be to provide states with specific avenues for planning and

integration, aiming to disseminate a set of best practices for CDP resettlement. As mentioned previously, for the purposes of this paper, the model for this framework would be based on the Draft Convention on the International Status of Environmentally-Displaced Persons. In the following paragraphs, I analyze the current gaps in the Draft Convention based on the four criteria outlined above.

First, the Draft Convention does not address strategies for Criteria 1: consistency from planning to practice. This could be improved by including a requirement for states to track the progress of a resettlement plan. Because of the potential for discrepancy between the written words of a policy and its practical realization, this framework would explicitly address the importance of Criteria 1 in resettlement. This policy would also focus on the importance of a tracking plan that would evaluate progress in short phases, rather than

performing an assessment solely at the end of the process. This would not completely safeguard against inconsistency, but would provide an expectation for the scope of evaluative measures to be taken.

Similarly, the Draft Convention neglects to outline ways to implement Criteria 2: the agency of CDPs. Although it addresses the issues of community participation and agency in planning and movement, it does not specify what this entails. It simply refers to the “right [of CDPs] to participate in the determination of policies and programs to prevent environmental disasters and to take charge, at the outset or throughout, of the consequences” and later to the responsibility of the state to “enable [CDPs] to have real influence on decisions relating to environmental threats.”⁶⁹ These statements, while they introduce the importance of CDP

agency, fail to provide specific methods of integrating participation, such as involvement of CDP communities during planning sessions or presentation of specific options for resettlement location. I provide a practical example of this in my case study on Tuvalu. Although this gap is understandable for a broad, unofficial convention, it would benefit from elaboration if implemented through a collaborative framework.

Additionally, the Draft Convention does not address Criteria 3: regional variation and specificity in approach. Perhaps the scholars responsible for its creation considered this an obvious aspect of resettlement planning; however, it is of sufficient consequence that it should be explicitly included. In addressing an issue so tied to environmental factors, the geographic makeup of both the country of origin and the

⁶⁹ Platform on Disaster Displacement, “Recommendations for Integrated Approaches,” 5.

host country should be a significant consideration in the creation of any resettlement plan. The need for this is demonstrated in the Togo case, where lack of attention to geographic factors caused the resettled population to experience economic strife. Also, the history and cultural characteristics of each region necessitate a specified approach. Regional history can also help resettlement planners develop a better understanding of the community's needs, since each one holds different traditions, worldviews, and value systems. The resettlement planning community could address these by attempting to identify which host communities might be best-suited to the CDP community, and particularly those that would best adapt to the community's culture.

To an extent, the Draft Convention addresses the necessity of Criteria 4:

provision for potentially permanent livelihood and integration. It outlines the rights of a CDP to refuse return, to work alongside other resettled residents, to be educated and trained, and to practice cultural traditions and lifestyles.⁷⁰ However, this section could also be improved upon by suggesting more specific state actions. It could address particular facets of the successful integration of resettled CDPs, such as education, job placement, and community involvement, or suggest state government efforts to offer a level of education in the population's main language or to adapt job trainings to cultural traditions. These examples would need to be presented in a case context, since CCD cases require a nuanced response. The aim of states should be to meet the economic needs of the resettled community while respecting

⁷⁰ Prieur, Michel, et al., "Draft Convention on the International Status of

Environmentally-Displaced Persons (third version- May 2013)," 7.

and accommodating their cultural preferences.

Of course, in the formation and implementation of a cross-UN framework as overarching as this, there are barriers to success. For one, as noted in the literature review above, the politics of policy are complex and often rooted in questionable morals. It is difficult to determine the motivation of actors on the international stage, and any state or IO could withhold support for this framework on the basis of self-interest. This policy also spans large, bureaucratic entities, the internal processes of which are known for running slowly, at best. These are just two potential confounding factors that could stand in the way of the development and practice of this framework; however, because of the potential benefits of having an overarching

framework for CDPs, the possibility still merits discussion.

Case Presentation

Togo: DFDR at the Nangbeto Hydropower Dam

DFDR policy provides the basis for much of the discussion surrounding CCD and resettlement, as outlined in the earlier review of CCD literature. Therefore, in addressing plans for CCD, it is crucial to be aware of the policies and impacts of early DFDR. The Nangbeto hydropower project in Togo, initiated in 1984 and completed in 1992, was one of the earliest official cases of DFDR implementation.⁷¹ The World Bank endorsed the resettlement of a total of 10,600 people from 34 villages close to the river into 9 host villages to make this project possible.⁷² Just one year after the resettlement, the project received a mark of

⁷¹ Thomas, Kevin J.A., "Development Projects and Involuntary Population Displacement: The World Bank's Attempt to Correct Past Failures," *Population*

Research and Policy Review 21, no. 4 (August 2002): 339-349.

⁷² World Bank, "Recent Experience with Involuntary Resettlement Overview," *Operations Evaluation*

approval in the project summary, noted as having “deserved special praise” for successful resettlement.⁷³

However, over the years following, the project’s poor planning showed its effects. One researcher recently noted that the relocated population would likely have benefited more if the relocation had not taken place.⁷⁴ The World Bank later stated that “the project was approved without much resettlement planning.”⁷⁵ Rather continuing to observe the process, resettlement was deemed a success shortly after the dam’s construction.⁷⁶ The Bank lacked any follow-through with the displaced population, failing to visit host communities between 1987-1996.⁷⁷ The 1998 World Bank report

identified a lack of safeguard policies or monitoring.⁷⁸ The resettled people were unable to produce crops due to soil exhaustion, and the carrying capacities of the host communities were stretched thin.⁷⁹ The resettled population also waited three years for compensation: the disbursal process did not begin until 1990, while physical resettlement was completed in 1987.⁸⁰ Because DFDR failed the resettled population in these ways, this case is crucial to consider in regard to future potentially permanent resettlement such as CCD. Since CDPs are typically members of communities with little-to-no role in climate change, there is an inherent interstate power dynamic in CCD, meaning that the international

Department, no. 17538 (June 2, 1998): 41–43.

⁷³ World Bank, “Recent Experience with Involuntary Resettlement Overview,” 41.

⁷⁴ Thomas, Kevin J.A. “Development Projects and Involuntary Population Displacement.”

⁷⁵ World Bank, “Recent Experience with Involuntary Resettlement Overview,” 41.

⁷⁶ World Bank, “Recent Experience with Involuntary Resettlement Overview.”

⁷⁷ World Bank, “Recent Experience with Involuntary Resettlement Overview.”

⁷⁸ World Bank, “Recent Experience with Involuntary Resettlement Overview.”

⁷⁹ Thomas, Kevin J.A. “Development Projects and Involuntary Population Displacement.”

⁸⁰ Thomas, Kevin J.A. “Development Projects and Involuntary Population Displacement.”

community must give every effort to mitigate the pain they experience.

Although this project was largely a failure, a more explicit, plan-oriented policy surrounding DFDR such as the one I propose for CCD could have improved the situation. For example, in relation to Criteria 1, if a more intensive tracking system were in place to address this need, the downhill trend affecting the resettled population would have been noted earlier. This could have allowed for Bank intervention when local actors failed to follow through on compensation.⁸¹ Of course, in an ideal world, a need for such tracking would never arise, but as the formation of resettlement policy is inherently an imperfect solution to a deeply complex issue, the policy itself must be prepared to address unforeseen issues as they arise.

To address Criteria 2, if the population had been allowed to participate in the planning of relocation and resettlement, this could have provided a warning mechanism. The resettled people in this case were also stripped of much of their agency and not provided compensation on a reasonable timeline, having to wait three years after resettlement. The project failed to take into account the issues outlined in Criteria 3 of geography, an oversight which eventually resulted in soil exhaustion and a lack of agricultural productivity. The displaced people were unable to farm for their economic gain because of the arid and rocky soil, leaving much of the population without a viable means to improve their livelihood and directly contradicting the goals of Criteria 4.⁸² If, instead, there had been more research on the geography before resettlement, the population might have been

⁸¹ Thomas, Kevin J.A. “Development Projects and Involuntary Population Displacement.”

⁸² World Bank, “Recent Experience with Involuntary Resettlement Overview.”

relocated to land better suited to their basic economic needs.

Tuvalu: Pacific Island Displacement

The case of Tuvalu is an unprecedented one, but one may apply to most Pacific Island countries within the next fifty years. The island nation is located in the southeast Pacific and is home to about 11,000 residents.⁸³ The first European settlers arrived to the islands around 1830.⁸⁴ This gave way to years of Western occupation, spanning forced labor trade in the 1850s, British missionaries and colonists between 1865-1915, and the American Navy during World War II.⁸⁵ Due to the missionary presence, most of the population of Tuvalu identifies as Christian.⁸⁶ During a

period of twenty-five years leading up to 1865, the population of Tuvalu decreased strikingly from 17,000 to 3,000 as a result of the forced labor trade.⁸⁷ Tuvalu declared its independence from British governance in 1978.⁸⁸ Tuvalu's CCD must therefore be considered in light of the cultural and economic impacts of its colonial history. This history also makes justice for Tuvaluans a unique and complex issue in combination with CCD.

The impacts of climate change on Tuvaluan life are numerous and growing consistently. These include salinization of farmland and drinking water, causing the

⁸³ Madaleno, I. M., "Climate Change in The Pacific: Tuvalu Case-Study," *WIT Transactions on Ecology and the Environment* 144 (2011): 243–52.

⁸⁴ Madaleno, I. M., "Climate Change in The Pacific: Tuvalu Case-Study."

⁸⁵ Madaleno, I. M., "Climate Change in The Pacific: Tuvalu Case-Study."

⁸⁶ Paton, Kathryn, and Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop, "Listening to Local Voices: Tuvaluans Respond to Climate Change," *The International Journal of Justice and Sustainability* 15, no. 7 (August 20, 2010): 687–98.

⁸⁷ Madaleno, I. M., "Climate Change in The Pacific: Tuvalu Case-Study."

⁸⁸ Madaleno, I. M., "Climate Change in The Pacific: Tuvalu Case-Study."

islands a consistent lack of potable water.⁸⁹ Additionally, Tuvalu deals with tropical cyclones, droughts, erosion, pollution, and marine ecosystem damage.⁹⁰ Most of the 11,000 inhabitants live in coastal regions, which are particularly vulnerable to these environmental threats.⁹¹ However, the country contributes a negligible amount to the phenomenon of climate change through greenhouse gas emissions.⁹² Due to the onset of climate change and rising sea levels, one of the country's scientists, Taula Katea, estimates that the islands of Tuvalu will disappear between 2045-2055.⁹³

Despite the changes in weather patterns, demonstrated and disseminated

scientific data, and daily experiences of the Tuvaluan population, a 2010 survey of island residents showed that 55% of Tuvaluans either do not believe in climate change or are unsure.⁹⁴ Most surveyed did not consider forced migration a threat to human security, while some considered it a cultural issue that would stand in the way of tradition.⁹⁵ Many participants “expressed a strong desire to look only at in-country adaptation and mitigation options ‘at this stage,’”⁹⁶ and other participants expressed interest in migration largely for reason of

⁸⁹ Braga, Patricia Benedita Aparecida, and Fabio Lanza, “Globally Unassisted Tuvaluans Affected by Climate Changes: Official Documents, Human Rights and the ‘No Future’?” *Ambiente & Sociedade* 19, no. 4 (2016): 179–93.

⁹⁰ UNDP, “Tuvalu,” UNDP Climate Change Adaptation, <https://www.adaptation-undp.org/explore/polynesia/tuvalu>.

⁹¹ UNDP, “Tuvalu.”

⁹² Braga, Patricia Benedita Aparecida, and Fabio Lanza, “Globally Unassisted Tuvaluans

⁹³ Braga, Patricia Benedita Aparecida, and Fabio Lanza, “Globally Unassisted Tuvaluans

Affected by Climate Changes.”

⁹⁴ Paton, Kathryn, and Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop, “Listening to Local Voices.”

⁹⁵ Paton, Kathryn, and Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop, “Listening to Local Voices.”

⁹⁶ Paton, Kathryn, and Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop, “Listening to Local Voices,” 692.

quality of life rather than climate-change.⁹⁷ Several were so influenced by their religious beliefs that they did not believe God would allow climate change to occur in the form of sea level rise.⁹⁸

This impending situation of CCD in Tuvalu is mirrored in many other Pacific Island nations. Island nations currently considered in danger of land-loss in the next 50-100 years, either partial or total, include Fiji, Kiribati, and the Marshall Islands, among others.⁹⁹ The issue of the permanent land loss of an entire country is yet uncharted territory, but it is one that the international community will soon need to contend with, according to Tuvaluan scientists.¹⁰⁰ In order to prepare for this eventuality, therefore, an integrated UN

framework for CDPs is particularly relevant and necessary.

Criteria 1, which addresses the principle of progress tracking, will become especially useful when plans must be coordinated across states due to the cross-border nature of Tuvaluan CCD. Since Tuvaluan resettling communities will be in transit between Tuvalu and the host countries, this adds a layer of complexity. This increases the need for accountability in order to ensure that both Tuvalu and host states, determined by the UN through this proposed policy on CCD, are taking steps to prepare and execute coherent, complementary plans for resettlement. To provide sufficient safeguards, the tracking mechanism can be synchronized across states, as well as across UN bodies.

⁹⁷ Paton, Kathryn, and Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop, "Listening to Local Voices."

⁹⁸ Paton, Kathryn, and Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop, "Listening to Local Voices."

⁹⁹ Worland, Justin, "How Leaders of Sinking Countries Are Fighting Climate Change," *Time*, (June 13, 2019)

<https://time.com/longform/sinking-islands-climate-change/>.

¹⁰⁰ Braga, Patricia Benedita Aparecida, and Fabio Lanza, "Globally Unassisted Tuvaluans Affected by Climate Changes."

Criteria 2 and 3 are also especially salient in this case, since the climate change issues being dealt with in Tuvalu are significantly different than any geographic issues previously involved with large-scale CCD, and since the missionary-colonial history of Tuvalu plays an important role in forming the sociocultural dynamic present in the nation now. As a result of the introduction of Christianity during 1860s, residents believe so strongly in the stories of the Bible that they do not believe that climate change and sea level rise can occur.¹⁰¹ Regionally specific understandings of history and culture can help policymakers work with Tuvaluans to develop a plan that is sensitive to their specific beliefs and values. This would solidify CDP agency in a climate situation over which they currently have no control. Perhaps the most difficult aspect of this case would be Criteria 4, since

the island nation is projected to sink within the next 40-50 years and the resettlement must be cross-border. However, even so, CCD has occurred across borders already: a large number Tuvaluans have migrated to New Zealand, and some have migrated to Fiji.¹⁰² The international community must therefore continue to work towards reasonable and viable policy solutions to help maintain sustainable integration.

Conclusion

The issues of CCD and provision for CDPs are much greater than one academic attempt to synthesize policy can address; however, I argue that a holistic solution could be created through currently-involved UN bodies coming together to enact a collaborative, regionally conscious policy outlining provisions for CDPs. As recognized in the PDD's analysis of UN involvement in CCD planning,

¹⁰¹ Paton, Kathryn, and Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop, "Listening to Local Voices."

¹⁰² Paton, Kathryn, and Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop, "Listening to Local Voices."

“displacement related to climate change is by definition a complex and multi-causal issue that requires system-wide coordination and planning at national, regional, and international levels.”¹⁰³ Rather than definitively determine the best combination of UN entities, this paper aims to explore the possibilities of collaboration and to identify the gaps in current CCD policy (or lack of policy). Future research on this area could explore the various combinations of policy collaboration surrounding CCD or delve more deeply into one of the principles of successful CCD policy outlined in my methodology and elaborated on throughout this paper. In any case, the current predictions of climate change researchers and the findings of academics in the field of forced displacement demonstrate a clear need for a comprehensive policy framework for CDPs. It would be unacceptable for the

international community to neglect CDP communities as climate change becomes increasingly severe. Therefore, I propose that the next step is to continue exploring the possibility of a collaborative cross-UN policy framework for CDPs in order to allow the greatest possible protection for this highly vulnerable group of people.

¹⁰³ Platform on Disaster Displacement, “Recommendations for Integrated Approaches,” 70.

Bibliography

- Ahmed, Bayes. “Who Takes Responsibility for the Climate Refugees?” *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management* 10, no. 1 (January 8, 2018): 5–26. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijccsm-10-2016-0149>.
- Braga, Patricia Benetida Aparecida, and Fabio Lanza. “Globally Unassisted Tuvaluans Affected by Climate Changes: Official Documents, Human Rights and the ‘No Future?’” *Ambiente & Sociedade* 19, no. 4 (2016): 179-93. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1809-4422asoc129rlv1942016>.
- Cernea, Michael, and Julie K Maldonado. “Challenging the Prevailing Paradigm of Displacement and Resettlement,” in *Challenging the Prevailing Paradigm of Displacement and Resettlement*, 1-43. New York: Routledge, 2018.
- Cernea, Michael M. “Impoverishment Risks, Risk Management and Reconstruction: A Model of Population Displacement and Resettlement.” In *Risks and Reconstruction: Experiences of Resettlers and Refugees* World Bank: (2000). <https://commdev.org/pdf/publications/Impoverishment-Risks-Risk-Management-and-Reconstruction.pdf>
- Elliott, Lorraine. “Climate Migration and Climate Migrants: What Threat, Whose Security.” In *Climate Change and Displacement : Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 175–90. Oxford: Hart. Accessed October 12, 19AD. <https://librarysearch.temple.edu/catalog/991036817039003811>.
- Fornalé, Elisa, and Curtis F J Doebbler. “UNHCR and Protection and Assistance for the Victims of Climate Change.” *The Geographical Journal* 183, no. 4 (November 9, 2016): 329–35. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12193>.
- IASC. “IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for Internally Displaced Persons” in Platform on Disaster Displacement, “Recommendations for Integrated Approaches to Avert, Minimize and Address Displacement Related to the Adverse Impacts of Climate Change.” *The Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage Associated with Climate Change* 11.3 (October 2018): 17. https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/WIM_TFD_II.3_Output.pdf.
- Kälin, Walter. “Conceptualising Climate-Induced Displacement.” In *Climate Change and Displacement : Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 81–103. Oxford: Hart, 2010. Accessed October 12, 19AD. <https://librarysearch.temple.edu/catalog/991036817039003811>.
- Kuusipalo, Rina. “Exiled by Emissions—Climate Change Related Displacement and Migration in International Law: Gaps in Global Governance and the Role of the UN Climate Convention.” *Vermont Journal of Environmental Law* 18, no.4. (2017): 6:14-647. <http://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail/detail?vid=0&sid=bddacca1-fbc2-466e-b3e6-1db7cd1a4c6b%40pdc-v-sessmgr02&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWwhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#AN=124064615&db=1gs>

- Madaleno, I. M. "Climate Change in The Pacific: Tuvalu Case-Study." *WIT Transactions on Ecology and the Environment* 144 (2011): 243–52. <https://doi.org/DOI:10.2495/ECO110221>.
- McAdam, Jane. "'Disappearing States,' Statelessness and the Boundaries of International Law." In *Climate Change and Displacement : Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 105–29. Oxford: Hart, 2010. Accessed October 2, 19AD. <https://librarysearch.temple.edu/catalog/991036817039003811>.
- McAdam, Jane. "Swimming against the Tide: Why a Climate Change Displacement Treaty Is Not the Answer." *International Journal of Refugee Law* 23, no. 1 (October 2011): 2–27. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/eeq045>.
- McAdam, Jane, and Elizabeth Ferris. "Planned Relocations in the Context of Climate Change: Unpacking the Legal and Conceptual Issues." *Cambridge Journal of International and Comparative Law* 4, no. 1 (2015): 137–66. <https://doi.org/DOI:10.7574/cjicl.04.01.137>.
- Myers, Norman. "Environmental Refugees: An Emergent Security Issue" (May 22, 2005) <http://www.osce.org/eea/14851>.
- OCHA, "Who We Are," <https://www.unocha.org/about-us/who-we-are>.
- Paton, Kathryn, and Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop. "Listening to Local Voices: Tuvaluans Respond to Climate Change." *The International Journal of Justice and Sustainability* 15, no. 7 (August 20, 2010): 687–98. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2010.498809>.
- Platform on Disaster Displacement. "Recommendations for Integrated Approaches to Avert, Minimize and Address Displacement Related to the Adverse Impacts of Climate Change." *The Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage Associated with Climate Change* 11.3 (October 2018): 1–89.
- Prieur, Michel, et al.. "Draft Convention on the International Status of Environmentally-Displaced Persons." *Revue Européenne de Droit de l'Environnement*. (2008): 395–406. https://www.persee.fr/doc/reden_1283-8446_2008_num_12_4_2058.
- Prieur, Michel, et al.. "Draft Convention on the International Status of Environmentally-Displaced Persons (third version- May 2013)." CIDCE. <https://cidce.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Draft-Convention-on-the-International-Status-on-environmentally-displaced-persons-third-version.pdf>.
- Ransan-Cooper, Hedda, Carol Farbotko, Karen E. Mcnamara, Fanny Thornton, and Emilie Chevalier. "Being(s) Framed: The Means and Ends of Framing Environmental Migrants." *Global Environmental Change* 35 (November 2015): 106–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.07.013>.

- Saad, Aaron. "Toward a Justice Framework for Understanding and Responding to Climate Migration and Displacement." *Environmental Justice* 10, no. 4 (August 1, 2017): 98–101. <https://doi.org/10.1089/env.2016.0033>.
- Stern, Nicholas. "The Economics of Climate Change." *Stern Review* (2006): 77.
- Thomas, Kevin, "Development Projects and Involuntary Population Displacement: The World Bank's Attempt to Correct Past Failures." *Population Research and Policy Review* 21(4) (Aug 2002): 339-49 DOI:10.1023/A:1020004429047.
- UNDP. "Tuvalu." UNDP Climate Change Adaptation. Accessed December 13, 2019. <https://www.adaptation-undp.org/explore/polynesia/tuvalu>.
- UNDP. "UNDP's Mandate," https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/sdgoverview/mdg_goals/progress.html.
- UNFCCC. "About the Secretariat," <https://unfccc.int/about-us/about-the-secretariat>.
- UNFCCC. "About UN Climate Change." <https://unfccc.int/news/un-climate-change-conference-2017-aims-for-further-faster-ambition-together>.
- UNHCR. "Guidance on Protecting People from Disasters and Environmental Change through Planned Relocation," *Georgetown University School of Foreign Service*, October 7, 2015, 1–27. <https://www.unhcr.org/protection/environment/562f798d9/planned-relocation-guidance-october-2015.html>.
- UNHCR. "Mandate of the High Commissioner for Refugees and His Office: Executive Summary," 1-2.
- UNHCR, "UNHCR's Strategic Directions 2017-2020" in Platform on Disaster Displacement, "Recommendations for Integrated Approaches to Avert, Minimize and Address Displacement Related to the Adverse Impacts of Climate Change." *The Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage Associated with Climate Change* 11.3 (October 2018): 49. https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/WIM_TFD_II.3_Output.pdf.
- Wilmsen, Brooke, and Michael Webber. "What Can We Learn from the Practice of Development-Forced Displacement and Resettlement for Organised Resettlements in Response to Climate Change?" *Geoforum* 58 (January 2015): 76–85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2014.10.016>.
- Worland, Justin. "How Leaders of Sinking Countries Are Fighting Climate Change." *Time*. Time, June 13, 2019. <https://time.com/longform/sinking-islands-climate-change/>.
- World Bank. "Recent Experience with Involuntary Resettlement Overview." *Operations Evaluation Department*, no. 17538 (June 2, 1998): 41–43. <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/105291468743997746/pdf/multi-page.pdf>.

World Bank Operational Manual. "Operational Directive 4.30: Involuntary Resettlement." (1990): 1-9. https://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/c41b5296-4485-43e3-a1d5-0876c39b1b19/OD430_InvoluntaryResettlement.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CVID=jqeB1iA

Wyman, Katrina Miriam. "Sinking States." In *Property in Land and Other Resources*, 439-469. Cambridge: Lincoln Institute, 2012.

Zetter, Roger. "Protecting People Displaced by Climate Change: Some Conceptual Challenges." In *Climate Change and Displacement : Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 131-50. Oxford: Hart, 2010. Accessed October 12, 19AD. <https://librarysearch.temple.edu/catalog/991036817039003811>.