

**Workshop on “Practical Tools for Planned Relocation
in the Context of Climate Change” ***
April 11 and 12, 2017
World Bank, Washington, D.C

Synthesis Note

**KNOMAD Thematic Working Group on
Environmental Change and Migration**

* The workshop was organized by Susan Martin, Chair, Kanta Kumari Rigaud, Co-Chair, and Hanspeter Wyss, Focal Point of KNOMAD’s TWG on Environmental Change and Migration, jointly with Elizabeth Ferris and Grace Benton, both from the Institute for the Study of International Migration, Georgetown University, Washington DC. The workshop synthesis note , prepared by Jonas Bergmann, does not express the views of the World Bank and its affiliated organizations, or those of the Executive Directors of the World Bank or the governments they represent.

For inquiries, please contact hwyss1@worldbank.org.

Table of Contents

1. Workshop Objectives.....	1
2. Background	1
3. Insights from the Workshop Presentations.....	3
3.1. Planned Relocation in the Context of Environmental Hazards in Papua New Guinea	3
3.2. Disaster-related Cross-Border Displacement.....	4
3.3. Climate-induced Planned Relocation in Alaska.....	5
3.4. Voluntary Home Buyouts in post-Sandy New York City	6
3.5. Planned Relocation as Part of Adaptation to Climate Change	7
3.6. Planned Relocation and Housing, Land and Property Rights.....	7
3.7. Flood Management and Preventive Relocation in Haiti	8
3.8. A NGO Perspective on Planned Relocation.....	9
3.9. MECLEP and Planned Relocation	10
3.10. UNHCR’s Perspectives around Planned Relocation	10
3.11. The Gramalote Relocation in Colombia	11
3.12. The Case of the Mekong Delta and Vietnam	12
3.13. Buy outs in New Zealand	12
3.14. Key Challenges and Opportunities.....	13
4. Selected Themes Arising in the Workshop Discussions.....	14
ANNEX 1: Agenda.....	16
ANNEX 2: List of Participants	19

1. Workshop Objectives

The KNOMAD Thematic Working Group on Environmental Change and Migration convened a workshop in Washington, DC on 11 and 12 April, 2017 with the specific objectives of:

- 1) Enhancing the understanding of the conditions under which planned relocations may be undertaken to respond to the effects of climate change and situating this specific type of movement within the broader context of mobility induced by environmental change;
- 2) Learning from insights from different geographical and contextual experiences on how planned relocations have been carried out in the past and can be carried out in the future;
- 3) Providing input and guidance for the development of practical tools (in particular the “toolbox”) on planned relocations.

This workshop built on prior meetings organized by KNOMAD’s Thematic Working Group, including an [October 2016 workshop on planned relocations](#) for World Bank staff as well as previously-convened [meetings by other partners](#). An important objective was also to further elaborate the toolbox on planned relocation which will be reviewed by States’ representatives at the workshop “Planned Relocations, Disasters and Climate Change on May 31, 2017 in Geneva, convened by Georgetown University, IOM and UNHCR.

2. Background

It has long been recognized that the interplay of a range of drivers with increasing environmental change, including climate change, will lead people to leave their communities. Some will leave because of the effects of sudden-onset weather-related disasters, others because the long-term effects of environmental change have destroyed their livelihoods. The timing of such mobility is likely to vary – some will move in anticipation of the effects of environmental change while others will move only when they can no longer survive where they are. Some will have the resources to move on their own and will likely follow existing migration routes. In some cases, governments will move to relocate at-risk populations in order to protect them from the effects of climate change. These planned relocations can occur *reactively* after a major sudden-onset disaster – when it is determined that people simply cannot return to their communities because the physical habitat is unsafe. In other cases, relocation will be planned as an *anticipatory* measure where hazards have increased the risk of continued habitation to unacceptable levels. Indeed, this type of intervention may be an effective measure to reduce disaster risk, as affirmed by the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. Finally, planned relocation can occur as a consequence of measures related to climate change adaptation or disaster risk reduction measures.

The Conference of Parties (COP) to the United Nations Framework Convention Climate Change, meeting in Cancún in 2010, encouraged enhanced action and international cooperation on planned relocation as one of three types of human mobility that should be considered within climate change adaptation measures. COP 21, which took place in Paris in 2015, requested the Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism to establish a task force to develop recommendations for integrated approaches to avert, minimize and address displacement related to the adverse impacts of climate change. Planned relocation is one such approach.

The Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University, the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the Institute for the Environment and Human Security of UN University, with the assistance of KNOMAD, have been working to develop guidance for States and other stakeholders on planned relocation in the context of natural disasters and the slow onset effects of climate change. Planned relocation has been defined for this purpose as: *“a planned process in which persons or groups of persons move or are assisted to move away from their homes or places of temporary residence, are settled in a new location, and provided with the conditions for rebuilding their lives. Planned Relocation is carried out under the authority of the State, takes place within national borders, and is undertaken to protect people from risks and impacts related to disasters and environmental change, including the effects of climate change. Such Planned Relocation may be carried out at the individual, household, and/or community levels.”*

Experience in relocating people demonstrates the complexity of the endeavor and the strong potential to violate basic rights and leave people much worse off. States faced with situations where planned relocation may be needed lack guidance on the basic principles and rights that apply to this challenging option. The [Guidance on Planned Relocations](#) therefore sets out general principles to assist States and other actors faced with the need to assess whether and how to undertake these programs. The aspiration is that these general principles will be helpful to States and supporting actors in formulating Planned Relocation laws, policies, plans, and programs. The Guidance was developed in consultation with representatives of States, international organizations, and experts from a wide range of disciplines and experiences, including disaster risk reduction, development, humanitarian response, human rights, climate change, migration, environmental studies, and law.

The next step in the process is the development of practical tools, including specific measures and examples of good practices to assist States and other interested actors in translating these general principles into concrete laws, policies, plans, and programs. This April 2017 KNOMAD workshop offered the opportunity to bring expertise from the working group to bear on the development of these practical tools. The April workshop brought together a broader group of experts to consider draft language around practical tools for actually planning relocations. The product of KNOMAD’s April workshop will be discussed at an event in May 2017 in Geneva with representatives of governments who are considering, planning or implementing relocations to protect people from the effects of environmental change, including climate change.

The workshop was divided in three parts.

The first part consisted of a brief welcome by Dilip Ratha, the Head of KNOMAD, and introductory remarks by Susan Martin, the Chair of KNOMAD’s Thematic Working Group on Environmental Change and Migration. Dr. Martin also briefly presented the main areas in which the Thematic Working Group has focused its work:

- 1) Advocate improvements needed in the data and analytic tools available to a) improve understanding of the determinants of migration, displacement and planned relocation; b) assess the impact of migration and planned relocation when used as adaptation strategies; c) identify ways to avoid displacement in the context of environmental change; and d) to assess the

impacts of adaptation and climate resilience strategies aimed at enabling those who wish to remain in situ to do so.

- 2) Integrate mobility considerations into adaptation and climate resilience planning to encourage more effective strategies to be developed to address migration, displacement and planned relocation.
- 3) Analyze and make policy recommendations on the role of resilience and vulnerability as determinants of environmentally-induced mobility and as factors affecting the success of adaptation and climate resilience strategies.
- 4) Increase understanding of the institutional and policy issues related to South-South environmental migration.

This workshop was part of this Thematic Working Group's last stream of work, which consists in providing guidance and operational recommendations to States and other actors on ways to protect all persons affected by planned relocation in the context of natural disasters and the long-term impacts of climate change. Dr. Martin also gave an introduction to the Guidance and Practical Tools on Planned Relocation, and Elizabeth Ferris, Project Director and Research Professor at the Institute for the Study of International Migration, Georgetown University, discussed existing knowledge and lessons learned from cases of planned relocation.

In the second part, various experts from academia, international organizations, and non-governmental organizations discussed their experiences with planned relocations and their relevance for the development of practical tools.

3. Insights from the Workshop Presentations

3.1. Planned Relocation in the Context of Environmental Hazards in Papua New Guinea

(Julia Blocher, UN University)

There are several lessons to be learned [from a planned relocation in the context of environmental hazards in Papua New Guinea](#), especially concerning customary land tenure regimes. 16 villages from the Manam island required internal relocation in 2003 as they were facing a high risk of a volcanic eruption. While the government acted quickly to eliminate the risk and islanders were willing to move in the beginning, their relocation soon turned into a challenging experience. The provincial government placed the approximately 9,000 people into care centers on the mainland in a former coconut plantation in disuse. Their livelihoods situation proved difficult, with limited access to fishing, timber, and other resources needed. Soon tensions erupted between the growing relocated population and the former owners of the farm, who reclaimed their land. Confrontations erupted and led to casualties. Due to these reasons and a high degree of economic and ancestral place attachment, their center of gravity remained the original island. Facing tensions and limited livelihoods, some of the islanders have decided to move back to the zone of volcanic risk, despite the fact that the island was declared uninhabitable and services have been cut off. Another staggered relocation is now planned into virgin forests on the mainland. The relocation site raises significant questions of environmental sustainability, economic viability, and livelihoods. It is also unclear whether the site may have been pushed for by the local government, as the host community is

hoping to profit from access roads for their coco farms. The estimated cost of this relocation amounts to three billion US dollar.

The main challenges which can inform the Practical Tools on Planned Relocation consisted in misunderstanding customary land tenure and place attachment. Relocations need to be aware of self-biases of implementing actors with modernist western understandings of land tenure that can conflict with social cohesion and indigenous understandings that transcend such individual-centered views. The majority of land in Papua New Guinea is under customary regimes, reflecting cultural and spiritual identity. The modern system of land titles exists alongside the customary ancestral inheritance system. Villagers tend to have no attachment or trust in the modern government and little belief in citizenship. Further complicating the situation, there is often little cohesion or understanding across communities. Relocations need to consider place attachment and social cohesion to avoid cycles of poverty which ultimately can lead to multiple displacements. Finally, the case also provides some lessons on alternatives to relocation. Some groups of islanders did self-relocate to a different place and host community, which can be seen as migration to trade partner and along customary kinship patterns. The case shows that relocations can also adhere to customary land boundaries and traditional trading patterns. This, however, was overlooked in the top-down resettlement process because it had the islanders crossing modern provincial boundaries. Summing up, the main lessons for the toolkit consist in considering place attachment and community in the decision to relocate, in taking into account customary land tenure systems, and in allowing for traditional adaptation pathways as alternative solutions.

3.2. Disaster-related Cross-Border Displacement

(Walter Kaelin, University of Bern & Platform on Disaster Displacement)

There are several lessons to be learned [from the consultations conducted for the Nansen Initiative](#), a state-led process on disaster-related cross-border displacement, and its successor, the [Platform on Disaster Displacement](#). The initiative had no specific focus on planned relocation, as it aligned itself with the efforts underway by Georgetown University, UNHCR, and Brookings. However, the consultations emphasized that relocation can also occur as a consequence of disasters where people cannot return to their place of habitual residence. In the consultations for the Pacific, planned relocation was considered as a measure of last resort, and not just a technical undertaking; rather it was an issue intrinsically linked to questions of cultural identity and belonging. These challenges are often exacerbated by customary land tenure and legacy issues resulting from traumatizing relocation experiences under colonial rule and World War II. An important factor identified was the agency of communities. For example, relocation in Tuvalu, where people undertook the movement on their own, turned out to be more successful than a past relocation that was enforced in Kiribati, which inhibited the rebuilding of lives and livelihoods. In Central America, the relocation processes seemed driven by communities, as for instance in Panama. In the Horn of Africa, displacements were flagged as the most significant form of mobility in the context of environmental change. Migration as adaptation was depicted as a more pertinent alternative than planned relocation. For Southeast Asia, planned relocation figured prominently on the agenda, especially in the Mekong Delta. Here, technical issues were highlighted especially around livelihoods risks, participation of relocated and host communities, as well as the importance of using international standards and translating them into local standards.

These experiences as well as the main recommendations given in the protection agenda can inform the Practical Tools on Planned relocation. The recommendations highlight the relevance of real participation of affected communities, including hosts; the importance of due consideration of cultural factors and land issues; and the need for adequate legal, policy, and institutional frameworks.

3.3. Climate-induced Planned Relocation in Alaska

(Robin Bronen, Alaska Institute for Justice)

More than a decade of experience and more than 100 different inter-governmental meetings between tribal, state and federal government representatives in the context of planned relocation in Alaska can inform the Practical Tools on Planned Relocation. Alaska faces a plethora of risks linked to environmental degradation and increasing climate pressures, resulting in a combination of repeated extreme weather events and slow ongoing changes that threaten the livelihoods of many communities. After a number of federal and state government reports have been published, the 2009 U.S. Government Accountability Office identified 31 communities as imminently threatened by flooding and erosion, out of which 12 made the decision to relocate. None have yet relocated because of the lack of an institutional and governance framework that authorizes government agencies to facilitate a community-wide relocation and no funding is, as a consequence, allocated for this effort. The Alaska Institute for Justice is now working with 15 of these communities, along with state and federal government agencies, to design a community-led relocation process.

The main principle highlighted was the right to self-determination of indigenous communities, going significantly beyond mere consultation or participation. The principle means determination the right to decide whether, when and how a relocation should occur. The main governance challenges revolved around the lack of mandate in government agencies; the lack of institutional frameworks to determine tipping points requiring relocation; and the lack of institutional processes to protect rights. Therefore, it was emphasized that the design of a governance framework is key to these relocations. The governance revolves around four components: 1 – including slow-ongoing environmental hazards into federal legislation (as of now, erosion and sea level rise do not qualify as disasters); 2 – creating good governance, ensuring human rights and self-determination, 3 – designing social-environmental monitoring and assessment of risks together with the communities; 4 – establishing frameworks for funding.

The main lessons revolve around the complexity of establishing such governance frameworks. An adaptive relocation governance framework means protecting human rights in a dynamic process, to secure adaptation in place where possible. Another important lesson concerns the determination of relocation thresholds and the continuous community-based environmental monitoring of hazards relevant for decisions to relocate. Relocation indicators have to be identified by the communities; if they cross thresholds a community relocation may become necessary. The indicators do not use single vulnerability assessments, which are considered inadequate snapshots in time established mainly through outside assessments but rather work with communities over time. The socio-environmental monitoring and assessment builds on the integration of indigenous knowledge with western science, for instance regarding storm forecasting and the documentation of flooding and erosion events. It was highlighted that coordination around monitoring and adaptation are key to the success of planning processes.

3.4. Voluntary Home Buyouts in post-Sandy New York City

(Liz Koslov, NY University)

The experiences with voluntary [home buyouts in post-Sandy New York City](#) can inform the Practical Tools especially when it comes to alternatives to the models of planned relocation discussed above. The risks from climate change are significant in NYC. Sea level rise in NYC is double the global average rate, and estimated to have added an estimated 2 billion dollars of damage to the damage caused by Hurricane Sandy in New York City. Staten Island was one of the boroughs hit hardest in Hurricane Sandy in 2012, with the highest number of deaths and the greatest proportion of affected residents.

In Oakwood Beach, a neighborhood of Staten Island, three people died because of Sandy. The community had been previously affected by another storm in 1992 that resulted in serious damage and flooding. While residents had demanded better coastal protection in the aftermath of that storm, little improvement happened. After Sandy, a group of neighbors convened and decided they wanted a buyout. This would mean that their area would be turned back into wetlands to serve as a buffer zone for residential land. The Oakwood Beach Flood Victims Committee reconstituted themselves as the Oakwood Beach Buyout Committee, a form of organizing in favor of buyouts which is rare. The governor of New York announced his support for the pilot buyouts. Those opting to participate would receive pre-storm value of houses as well as a 5% bonus if they moved within New York City. There was a 10% bonus for being part of a targeted cluster of homes, to prevent holdouts and issues with individuals staying behind and to avoid patch-work effects. Soon other communities wanted the state to extend the buyout program and buyout groups were formed across communities on the shore. However, the city opposed this demand for facilitated retreat and developed an acquisition for re-development program instead, arguing that too many lived along the coast and protection was a better approach than abandonment. The alternative offered by the city (to buy, and rebuild for redevelopment, often for other owners) was very unpopular among residents, partially due to concerns about gentrification of the coast, problems with the city's housing recovery program, and a long history of Staten Island residents not trusting the city authorities. Ultimately, these plans drove demand for even more buyouts, yet the State declared only two additional areas eligible for buyouts. It took more than a year to decide on additional areas eligible. The buyouts are very expensive programs, 75% of the cost of which is born by the federal government. The 25% local match has constituted a hurdle for less wealthy communities. The expected amount for Staten Island is likely to be more than USD 100 million.

Some important lessons for the Practical Tools consist in considering alternatives to more traditional planned relocation, such as buy-out programs. In the case of Staten Island, it was important that buyouts were seen as grassroots movements instead of top down orders. The local organizing effort seemed to empower those needing buyouts; that said, those with less power to organize and voice their concerns had less ability to compete for funding for buyouts. A potential challenge consists in diverging interests of different stakeholders. Local governments for instance tend to favor buyouts least, despite what their constituents want, because it decreases their tax base and is seen as detrimental to local development. The upfront costs of buy-outs are offset by the avoided costs later, yet these benefits do usually not accrue to local governments.

3.5. Planned Relocation as Part of Adaptation to Climate Change

(Michele Leone, International Development Research Centre)

The hotspot approach to adaptation and resilience taken by the IDRC can inform the Practical Tools to better understand migration processes as part of a broader suite of adaptation choices in deltas. The DECCMA consortium over 5 years with 4 main partners looks into 3 deltas including the India and Bangladesh parts of the Ganges. DECCMA focuses on Asian and African deltas because these regions are at the confluence of two defining trends of the 21st century: an urbanizing global population and climate change. To overcome a lack of data, it has conducted an extensive survey targeting ~15,000 households in both sending and receiving areas in the three countries, as well as new land use and land use changes mapping and delta level hydrological measurements. Vulnerabilities consist of low elevation, high flood probability, storm surge, land erosion and accretion, salinization, water logging, and others. There is a high dependence on freshwater and sediment flow, and a high sensitivity to small changes (like climate). In terms of socio-economic risks, quite vulnerable livelihoods depending on fishing and agriculture combine with high population density and population growth, high prevalence of poverty, gender inequalities, lack of connectivity, and others. Key findings include that it is essential to have a systemic perspective. Setting aside conflict-induced displacement, migration patterns are influenced primarily by perceived income differentials, which *in turn* are changing in hot-spots due to climate change. Gender patterns in migration are changing: more women are migrating and the family size threshold triggering migration is getting lower in climate hot-spots. This poses problems for agricultural productivity and food security (no more farming youth, etc.) And finally, migration is a complex phenomenon and many types are interconnected and influence each other. One aspect particularly relevant for the Practical Tools is that distress migration can lock communities in vulnerable “vicious cycles”. Therefore, proactive migration may be a necessary and effective response to risk when it allows increased numbers and means of migration, particularly in the case of major risks, such as sea level rise and land degradation (deltas), prolonged droughts (Sahel, semi-arid south Asia), and extreme events (deltas, Himalayan river basins, eastern and southern Africa). The Tool will also need to consider the fact that there are new vulnerabilities in areas left vacant by migrants and re-populated by other people.

3.6. Planned Relocation and Housing, Land and Property Rights

(Hugo Cahuenas, *International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies*)

The IFRC highlighted that planned relocations are already occurring across the region, including both proactive and reactive relocations. Moving and settling people in new locations may be an effective disaster risk reduction strategy (Sendai Framework), or a climate change adaptation strategy (Cancún Adaptation Framework 2010). However, planned Relocations are a complicated process with the potential to leave people much worse off – including violating basic human rights and not addressing humanitarian needs. There are also risks for the host community. The IFRC has developed forms for both authorities and citizens to raise their awareness of rights when they are to be relocated.

Ecuador’s experience in working on Housing, Land and Property (HLP) Rights is instructive for the Practical Tools on Planned Relocation. In the case of the relocation of islanders from Muisne, the area was declared as an environmentally protected zone and people living on the island were supposed to leave or to be relocated to the continental zone. Additionally, the disaster risk management authorities declared the

island to be a risk area. The government removed some public services (including electricity, water, sanitation, etc.), which ultimately constituted a type of forced relocation. The government, however, did not previously identify the land for the relocation and thereby created considerable anxieties within the communities to be relocated. An HLP rights working group was established under the auspices of the protection and shelter clusters and the country humanitarian team. The working group comments on the implications for HLP of governmental policy decisions. The government changed the policy which used to exclude non-formal tenancy. The HLP group also provides technical support to operational agencies, e.g. through analysis of vulnerability criteria for priorities for assistance. In the case of Muisne, the HLP group has developed a guidance note and checklist relating to each caseload of affected people on issues related to their tenancy status and HLP rights and produces regular notes on issues such as relocation. Against this backdrop and based on the existing international instruments, the IFRC team developed guidance and recommendations on planned relocations as regards Ecuadorian law. The main points of guidance in Ecuador concerned the right to due process, the consideration of planned relocation as a measure of last resort only, the consultation and participation of the community, the need for the government to previously identify the land, and the protection against forced eviction, e.g. through the removal of public services.

3.7. Flood Management and Preventive Relocation in Haiti

(Vincent Roquet, World Bank)

The flood management and preventive resettlement in Haiti's second-largest city Cap-Haitien holds several lessons for the Practical Tools. Cap-Haitien is a hilly city on the edge of the sea, and its flood-prone areas are increasing due to sedimentation, threats to mangroves by urban encroachment resulting in decreasing flood protection, and sea level rise. The government requested the World Bank to assist in finding solutions. The project Identified high flood risk zones through state of the art hydrological studies where it would be helpful to intervene. The initial plan as presented by the technical experts was to widen a canal (that is slowly being filled in by waste dumped there) and allow for dredging of a channel, which would involve an urban slum clearance operation. The plan was to resettle households in a 15-meter wide band on either side of a channel leading to the sea in order to allow for dredging of a channel with a width increased from 30 to 60 m. A social risk assessment was carried out in the zone by a locally-based NGO, in order to adjust the planning of the project based on local social realities. After the preliminary findings, the revised plan was to resettle households in a 15-meter wide band on the left side of the channel where social feasibility is greater, and to acquire an additional 10-meter wide band for conditional *in situ* resettlement. Resettlement on the right side of the channel is to be limited to 5 meters due to social challenges. Other relocation options were discarded due to the challenges posed to livelihoods; alternatives would have posed too many hurdles for those engaged in local economic activities. There were public consultations, and the idea was that people would be relocated away from the canal for two years and would return to improved housing that leaves enough space for the canal to help with flood prevention.

The urban slum clearance in the Bassi Rhodo outlet is widely supported by local authorities and populations - a clear advantage for the planning process. However, the resettlement planning is still underway and will require further consultations and studies. It was also highlighted that preventive

resettlement for disaster risk management in a context of fragility, conflict, and violence such as Haiti is particularly challenging and requires time and substantial resources. The governance and planning process is slow.

3.8. A NGO Perspective on Planned Relocation

(Alice Thomas, Refugees International)

The experiences of Refugees International in the context of relocations after disasters provide several lessons for the Practical Tools, even though the focus of the Tools is currently on slow-onset hazards. Refugees International has worked in various cases where relocations were very controversial even in communities that know they need to be relocated as they live in high risk areas. Often, there is only a limited amount of climate risk information available to local governments and local communities. Funding or alternative land available for planned relocation, even where the need is recognized, tends to be limited. Those most vulnerable to climate change effects and displacement, and therefore in need of planned relocation, are often the poorest and most disenfranchised. And oftentimes, people don't *want* to move. This was illustrated in two cases, the 2013 Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines and the 2015 mudslides in Myanmar.

In the Philippines, an awareness of hazard risks did not protect about 4 million people from being displaced in the course of typhoon Haiyan. Those displaced were primarily coastal communities who lacked secure land rights. In the aftermath, the government instituted a relocation plan for 200,000 households or about 1 million people. People were prevented from moving back and did not qualify for receiving humanitarian assistance if they did. However, this plan soon faced serious obstacles, including the lack of suitable, available land for relocation, the lack of sufficient funding, and the lack of legal and institutional frameworks for relocation. This resulted in protracted displacement of vulnerable households in camps and bunkhouses, and only a small percentage of households eventually relocated. Those relocated often faced significant challenges, ranging from loss of livelihoods to struggles in accessing social services and networks; most people went right back and tended to see both their vulnerability and their risk of recurrent displacement increase. Similarly, in 2015 flooding and landslides in Myanmar posed substantial challenges to affected populations and those engaged in planned relocation. 9 million people in already very poor and vulnerable areas were affected and suffered from both the disaster, as well as from an insufficient humanitarian response. Many proved unable to recover from the shock, and for some, collapsing river banks and landslides resulted in permanent displacement. The government, supported by international agencies, relocated some communities yet encountered similar challenges as those in the Philippines, primarily around lack of land, funding, and a legal framework. As a result, on the one hand, vulnerable households awaiting relocation found themselves in situations of protracted displacement. On the other hand, those relocated with no real participation and consultation, found themselves in remote locations that strained their access to livelihoods and services, often posed new environmental risks, and increased the incidence of poverty for many. Observers expect that migration away from the new sites is likely.

As Refugees International emphasized, national governments who pay insufficient attention to preventing/mitigating conditions are likely to bring about displacement and threaten human rights. They need to develop and implement human rights-based disaster management laws that focus on identifying

and addressing climate displacement risk (e.g., hazard and vulnerability mapping; early warning; evacuations), as well as implementing legal and institutional frameworks for planned relocation. Long-term monitoring and longitudinal studies are also required. Humanitarian agencies need to clarify their role in such relocations, and development actors need to focus more on sustainable disaster recovery and integrate climate displacement risk into laws and development planning. The main lessons for the Practical Tools from these largely unsuccessful reactive relocations thus point to several challenges: The risk of prolonged displacement due to lack of disaster preparedness as well as of land, funding, legal and governance frameworks for relocation; the risk of secondary displacement, due to inadequate relocations; as well as ultimately the risk of protection issues remaining unaddressed and people left more vulnerable than before.

3.9. MECLEP and Planned Relocation

(Susanne Melde, IOM)

The results of a major 3-year research project where IOM looked at different forms of mobility (including planned relocation) and how that impacts adaptation are instructive for the Practical Tools in several regards. The first case study on Manam Islanders is already explained above. The second case concerns the Mekong river delta and will be explained in more detail in a later section. The third case study examined a relocation in Nueva Boca de Cachon in the Dominican Republic. A close-by lake was thought to flood an entire village, and the President promised to address this risk through a planned relocation. Old houses were mostly destroyed, the relocation undertaken by the Armed Forces, and only a few people remained in the original location. After the relocation the flooding did not materialize. While the relocated villagers are doing better than before, they are still worse off compared to non-migrant households. Their herd animals are back in the old village because there was not sufficient land available to graze in the new location.

Two main policy recommendations followed from the case studies: sharing good practices such as through the Practical Tools and more significant investment in better prevention, early warning systems, and disaster risk reduction. The current share of the latter is still less than 1 percent of all official development aid. The main lessons for the Practical Tools are based on three main variables for the success of a relocation identified across the cases: the type of relocation and consequently the available timeframe; the political will to plan, finance, and conduct the movement; the availability of sustainable livelihoods, taking into account land tenure traditions, distance, diversification, which enable or impede long-term and sustainable solutions to adaptation.

3.10. UNHCR's Perspectives around Planned Relocation

(Mehreen Afzal & Erica Bower, UNHCR)

UNHCR's mandate in this arena is mostly in normative development, and the agency was a main actor in the development of the Guidance on Planned Relocation. Transferable principles from their work originate from human rights approaches, participatory approaches, and their work on durable solutions. Engagement with affected communities should go beyond mere information sharing towards consultation and ultimately real participation.

Experience shows that pending and during relocations, specific focus should be laid on managing mutual expectations as well as on preserving social networks. The latter are important stress buffers. One technique is relocate communities as a group, with temporary housing in close proximity. The importance of bringing items of high emotional, spiritual or cultural value cannot be underestimated. After relocations, the focus shifts to building sustainable futures, including through livelihoods and vocational training. Ensuring access to adequate housing, public and social services are imperative, and cultural heritage can serve as a tool for 'emplacement.' Monitoring and Evaluation are essential parts of relocations, and should, if possible, include longitudinal studies, adequate baselines operationalized with specific and measurable indicators and both qualitative and quantitative metrics that also cover environmental, social, cultural, economic, and human rights dimensions.

3.11. The Gramalote Relocation in Colombia

(Juanita Lopez, Independent Consultant)

Several lessons can be learned from the Gramalote resettlement in Colombia. A landslide affected more than 1000 families within the community, displacing about 3.400 of a total of 5.000 people. People dispersed across other communities, and finding the right place to relocate took longer than 1½ years. Criteria for the new location included geologic stability, environmental impact and ecosystem services, urban-regional and urban-rural relations, accessibility, public utilities, as well as the time needed for construction. Institutional and governance framework proved to be essential for the relocation. This included questions of mandate, trust-building, and designing of effective decision-making schemes. One key for success was setting up participatory processes. A next step included exhaustive surveys for establishing baselines, impacts and necessities, including detailed socio-economic characterization of each household and impact assessment. Important features were also title deeds and plot studies in the original site in order to define measures accordingly, including swap mechanism for owners and public housing program for tenants. Finally, a validation of the survey proved essential before final adoption.

For the actual implementation, the need for a comprehensive-impact based relocation plan was also emphasized, including components on 1. access to a safe and sustainable habitat; 2. reconstruction of the social fabric to build a resilient community; 3. economic development with a regional, comprehensive, sustainable approach; 4. governance and strengthening local government; 5. prevention and mitigation of impacts on the host population; as well as 6. effective and permanent communication mechanisms. In terms of finances, the Gramalote case cost \$180 million for 1.110 households or 3.400 people. The importance of sustainable funding sources beyond the actual relocation was highlighted, as well as the need to strike a balance between infrastructure and social and economic support programs. Furthermore, the funding can sometimes be divided up among various actors, including the state, but also private sector, churches, donations, and the inhabitants. To reestablish the local economy, the relocation planning should include plots for private investors, services, and business, as well as incentivize rural development and reestablishment of rural-urban-region economic trade links. Finally, there are several principles that require continuous attention throughout all work streams, including flexibility and adaptation to changing conditions during the process, "planning while doing", knowledge management, permanent communication mechanisms, and others. Strong support to the community during the transition is fundamental, for oftentimes more than 6 years, revolving around psychological support, income

generation, and social fabric strengthening. It was emphasized that it is not easy to synchronize people's expectations with legal, financial and technical constraints, and therefore, shared responsibility should be established from the beginning. An important reminder is that time is a huge challenge: being realistic based on technical elements is not always compatible with social vulnerabilities and political priorities.

3.12. The Case of the Mekong Delta and Vietnam

(Jane Chun, Independent Consultant)

Planned relocation in the Mekong Delta in Vietnam provides several lessons for the Practical Tools. Major stressors here include river bank erosion, frequent storms, and landslides. When developing and implementing the plan, it is essential to be clear about what consultation and participation is and what it encompasses. In the planning process, community perception is also central. Floods are seasonal and occur every year in the delta; they are part of daily life and planning, and this is essential to take into account when planning relocation. Other forms of mobility should be considered as alternatives, such as seasonal and circular movements which are common and necessary given floods and seasonal harvests. Moreover, the community is seldom homogenous, but made up of diverse individuals, with different vulnerabilities, needs and desires. There are often also different interests to relocate among residents. While the private sector can be helpful, there can also be vetted interests and nepotistic networks between local officials and local construction companies which can affect relocation plans to the detriment of those moved. In some cases in Vietnam, moving compensation was not paid to households but to companies. Planned relocation can also be used as a disguise to make way for development projects. It was also highlighted that relocations in the context of environmental change also need to take into account the environmental impact on the new surroundings, so as to not contribute to the problem that is forcing people to leave in the first place. The question what happens to those who choose not to participate is also important - in the Mekong, all households are categorized according to economic status, poor or very poor, and they are eligible for assistance. However, people who do not participate in relocation are no longer eligible for support when hazards occur in the future.

Legal and institutional frameworks are key to successful relocation. In Vietnam, the "National Strategy for Natural Disaster Prevention, Response and Mitigation to 2020" states that the aims to 'complete the relocation, arrangement and stabilization of the life for people in disaster prone areas according to the planning approved by authorized government agencies. Up to 2010, manage to relocate all populations from flash flood and landslide high-risk areas and dangerous areas to safe places.' Important frameworks in the context of planned relocation include dispute resolution mechanisms which should be third-party and impartial, and also be sensitive to local power dynamics and to navigating these dynamics. Health services, especially mental health, should be included where possible, as relocation is difficult, if not traumatic, and psychosocial support can help to mitigate some of the negative effects of migration. The "psychological assets" of households can shape how they experience and react to relocations.

3.13. Buy outs in New Zealand

(Emma Jacka, New Zealand)

The response to the Canterbury earthquakes in February 2011 provides interesting insights into innovative government action on planned relocation. The heavy earthquakes triggered the first state of emergency

in New Zealand's history, causing immense damage to the city and its buildings. Since New Zealand has one of the most extensive insurance systems in the world, the insurance claims were so significant that fears arose that insurers might pull out. Eventually, the government purchased damaged property and managed insurance claims. It intervened based on geotechnical assessments, categorizing properties according to the level of damage sustained. About 8000 "red-zone" properties needed to be cleared. The government offered voluntary "buy-outs" according to the land zoning assigned. Free independent advice on these offers was valued, and the possibility to talk to a representative about the offer was important for owners. It was very important to have leadership and technical experience at the meetings and throughout the process of engagement with the community. The communication in this situation was key - quick and simple messaging about options through public meetings, legal counseling centers, phone centers, and other tools helped people to overcome uncertainties.

Yet while there was a more than 95 percent uptake, around 100 property owners refused the crown offer and are still living in the red zones; they are scattered across the area and quite isolated. The government agencies tried to work with affected populations on a one on one basis, extended the timeframes and provided flexibility to accommodate different interests. The one-on-one counseling with landowners was particularly important for the elderly and represents an effort to consider minority and vulnerable groups. However, there was still considerable anger about the delineation of red and green zones. Those remaining in red zones face considerable challenges in terms of service provision and infrastructure, and also with crime in vacated areas. Another challenge consisted in dealing with different types of properties, including commercial properties and their owners, as well as uninsured properties. Finally, there remained the question of how to re-purpose the materials left in the red zones as well. The case highlights the need to balance the interests of property owners, governments, and insurers.

3.14. Key Challenges and Opportunities

(Päivi Koskinen-Lewis, World Bank)

As a discussant, Ms. Koskinen-Lewis commented on a few of the biggest challenges and opportunities regarding planned relocation, emphasizing that relocations often lack the necessary time for adequate planning, leading to very disruptive processes. When we have the luxury of planning, relocation sites should be designed in such a way that they become pull factors, designed in such a way that people want to live there. People feel that they are involved in designing the sites and feel that they can continue with their lives and eventually make them better. Participation was highlighted as a key factor to better outcomes for both relocated and host communities. Planned Relocation should aim to leave people better off, not only sustaining what they had before. However, even a well-managed relocation can be very challenging, and return is often desired. Changing livelihoods through trainings and other measures is often very difficult and time consuming. Therefore, alternatives to relocation should be duly considered, including within other neighboring communities or along traditional migration pathways. Although it should remain a last resort, we need an understanding of what to do with the communities who do not want to move out of places that become inhabitable. The questions about what to do when people do not want to move, especially when thresholds come closer, are particularly challenging. Furthermore, the funding for these often very costly endeavors constitutes an important hurdle. As alternative mechanisms, rental and loan agreements have been used with mixed experiences.

4. Selected Themes Arising in the Workshop Discussions

In the last part, the experts broke into four working groups to discuss the Practical Tools along the lines of four sections: the Planning Process; Developing and Implementing the Relocation Plan; and Establishing the Legal and Institutional Framework. This section briefly discusses some of the general themes that arose in the discussions.

Financing: It became evident that funding will be a key challenge for relocations, which are usually very expensive and take a long time to realize. Points raised concerned the paucity of data and knowledge on financing for planned relocation, including questions of real estate and buy outs. A governance framework is essential to allocate specific funding and clarify responsibilities. It was also highlighted that private sector engagement in financing could be a valuable pathway, and that the Migrants in Countries in Crisis (MICIC) initiative's repository of effective practices contains some examples of this type of private engagement. Diaspora engagement is also crucial to build on their skills and resources. Private to private financing (similar to private sponsorship of refugee resettlement in Canada) could be another innovative alley, as well as crowdfunding and other digital era mechanism. Furthermore, in some instances the issue may not be so much about using new funds but accessing existing streams more efficiently. Some participants discussed that the framing of planned relocation only as a last resort could prevent longer-term strategies and early anticipation which may prove cheaper and easier to realize. It was emphasized that well-planned relocation is costly, but can usually avert the even higher cost of inaction; however, the costs and benefits of such action may accrue to different stakeholders, and thus create conflicts of interest. Finally, as planned relocation is already included in some NDCs and NAPs, as well as in the Cancún Adaptation Framework, it will be important to explore how climate funding can be made available.

Monitoring, Assessment, and Anticipation: Participants noted that better monitoring and assessments in terms of displacement risk is needed at the household level: What makes one household more likely to be displaced than the other? The level of analysis (individual versus household versus community) should be considered. One important question concerns tipping points - at what point is a drastic decision needed, such as relocating a whole population? Social and environmental monitoring are key and will inform the tipping point of communities' decisions to relocate. There are certain indicators of stresses on communities (women pawning their jewelry, children not in school, malnutrition setting in), which are important to monitor. Drawing from the Warsaw loss and damage framework, there is a need to clearly qualify what is an imminent risk. Furthermore, the communities themselves have to be involved in identifying, monitoring, and assessing the indicators for the impact of the environmental threats on their health and well-being. This is especially important if there is a history of distrust in governments. Furthermore, the main way of starting the government's involvement is to get social environmental monitoring going. In the past, there have been indigenous strategies (conch shells warning system, etc.) that can provide important input into such monitoring. One has to bear in mind that the imposition of other views and tools through international actors can actually lead to the erosion of local systems of detecting disaster risks. Finally, the question will remain what to do when there is an imminent risk and people want to relocate, but funding is insufficient. In Alaska, for instance, government agencies in an effort to conserve funding have cut off infrastructure in some of the affected communities, effectively

plunging them into a humanitarian crisis. Other tribes who may have wanted to relocate initially fear losing funding streams for infrastructure if they try to relocate.

Timeframe: The importance of a longer-term anticipation for potentially necessary movements was highlighted. There should be clarity about reactive (after disasters) or long-term, anticipated planning for relocation, as they imply very different timeframes. Ideally we should look at relocation as preventive action, but relocation comes often as an afterthought. It was emphasized how important it is to have a plan in advance of potential risks, even if communities do not want to think about the issue – as when disasters hit, communities sometimes change their minds and an existing plan can help save time in responding to immediate needs. However, there may be limits to longer-term planning due to the uncertainty of climate and other projections beyond certain points in time. There remains the question of how sustainable any housing in any location will be in 50 – 100 years.

Vulnerable groups: There was agreement that the protection of vulnerable / minority groups requires more dedicated attention in the toolkit. Gender is currently not adequately reflected, for both female and male dimensions of the issue. In terms of approaches to responding to needs of vulnerable groups, in Canterbury, for instance, the one-on-one approach with case managers that could connect with NGOs and the community was a good way to address these groups and capitalize on existing relationships.

Presentation of Toolkit: It was noted that it will be worth exploring how to present the information and conceptualize the information. This includes the question for whom the Tools will be relevant and in which ways. A suggestion was a simplified version for policy makers, since some information may be too technical for decision makers. Training for policy makers on planned relocations, including different scenarios could prove helpful to get buy in and implement the recommendations.

The meeting ended with a brief discussion of next steps. The suggestions from the workshop would be incorporated into a revision of the Practical Tools, which would then be discussed at a workshop with government officials. When the final product of these consultations is completed, it would be disseminated widely. The general consensus was, however, that specific efforts would be needed to bring the toolkit to the attention of governments and civil society in risk prone regions, with particular attention to low income countries. Participants recommended that funds be sought for technical assistance and training of government officials on the tools and their potential implementation.

ANNEX 1: Agenda

<p><i>KNOMAD Workshop</i></p> <p><i>Planned Relocation in the Context of Climate Change Practical Tools</i></p> <p><i>April 11 - 12, 2017</i></p> <p><i>MC C2 -131, World Bank, Washington, DC</i></p>
--

DRAFT AGENDA

11 April, 2017

09:00-09:20 h	Introductory Remarks , Review of Objectives and Agenda Susan Martin, Professor Emeritus at Georgetown University, Chair of the KNOMAD Thematic Working Group on Environmental Change and Migration
09:20-09:45 h	Planned relocations: What we know, what we have learned from other cases, why is it important, pesky issues Elizabeth Ferris, Research Professor at the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University, Director of the project on Planned Relocation
09:45-11:00 h	Lessons Learned with Planned Relocations – Part 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Julia Blocher, UN University• Atle Solberg, Platform on Disaster Displacement• Robin Bronen, Alaska Institute for Justice
11:00-11:15 h	<i>Coffee Break</i>
11:15-12:15 h	Lessons Learned with Planned Relocation – Part 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Liz Koslov, NY University• Michele Leone, IDRC• Hugo Cahuenas, IFRC• Vincent Roquet, World Bank

<p>12:30-14:00 h</p>	<p>Public KNOMAD Seminar “Practical Tools in Planned Relocation”</p> <p>Introductory Remarks: Dilip Ratha, Head of KNOMAD, and Susan Martin</p> <p>Chair: Elizabeth Ferris</p> <p>Speakers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alice Thomas, Refugees International • Susanne Melde, IOM • Mehreen Afzal, UNHCR <p>Discussant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Päivi Koskinen-Lewis, World Bank
<p>14:15-15:15 h</p>	<p>Lessons Learned with Planned Relocations – Part 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Juanita Lopez, Columbia • Jane Chun, UNICEF • Emma Jacka, New Zealand
<p>15:15-16:15 h</p>	<p>Working Groups: The planning process - decisions about relocation and community participation.</p> <p>This session will work on several components of the planning process, including a) assessing the risk of remaining in the area; b) considering alternatives to planned relocation; c) preliminary assessment of whether there are feasible alternative sites and the necessary support for a Planned Relocation and d) consultation/participation of affected communities.</p> <p>Is the list of issues in the draft comprehensive? Are there other relevant cases that can be cited here? Any other lessons to be highlighted? Other suggestions for strengthening the section?</p>
<p>15:30-16:00 h</p>	<p><i>Coffee Break</i></p>
<p>16:15-17:00 h</p>	<p>Reporting Back & Discussion</p>

12 April, 2017

09:00-9:15 h	Wrap-Up of First Workshop Day
09:15-10:15	<p>Working Groups: Establishing the legal and institutional framework for Planned Relocation. This session will work on several aspects of the legal and institutional framework for Planned Relocation, including a) Making Sure a Legal Framework Is in Place; b) Establishing the Institutional Framework; and c) studying the impacts on affected communities.</p> <p>Is the list of issues in the draft comprehensive? Are there other relevant cases that can be cited here? Any other lessons to be highlighted? Other suggestions for strengthening the section?</p>
10:15-10:30	Coffee
10:30-11:15	<p>Working Groups: Developing and Implementing the Relocation Plan</p> <p>This session will work on the practical tools for developing and implementing the relocation plan. Topics include a) general and land issues as well as those around the provision of services; b) securing necessary financing for Planned Relocations; and c) measures pending and during relocation.</p> <p>Is the list of issues in the draft comprehensive? Are there other relevant cases that can be cited here? Any other lessons to be highlighted? Other suggestions for strengthening the section?</p>
11:15-12:15	Reporting back & Discussion
12:15-12:45	Conclusions and Next Steps
12:45-14:00	Lunch

ANNEX 2: List of Participants

***KNOMAD Workshop
Planned Relocation in the Context of Climate Change – Practical Tools
April 11 - 12, 2017
MC C2 -131, World Bank, Washington, DC***

List of Participants

NAME	AFFILIATION	EMAIL
Alice Mortlock	Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR)	amortlock@worldbank.org
Alice Thomas	Refugees International	alice@refugeesinternational.org
Andres Ignacio Gonzalez Flores	WB	agonzalezflores@worldbank.org
Camilla Schloss	World Bank	cschloss@worldbank.org
Dilip Ratha	World Bank	dratha@worldbank.org
Elizabeth Ferris	Georgetown University	Elizabeth.Ferris@georgetown.edu
Emma Jacka	Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA)	emmajacka@gmail.com
Erica Bower	UNHCR	bower@unhcr.org
Ganesh Kumar Seshan	World Bank	gseshan@worldbank.org
Grace P. Benton	Georgetown University	gpb25@georgetown.edu
Hanspeter Wyss	World Bank	hwys1@worldbank.org
Hugo Cahuenas	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies	hcahuenas@law.gwu.edu
Jane Chun	UNICEF	jane.m.chun@gmail.com
Jonas Sebastian Bergmann	World Bank	jbergmann@worldbank.org
Juanita Lopez	National Adaptation Fund of Colombia	juanitalopezpe@gmail.com

Julia Blocher	United Nations University/University of Liege	blocher@unu.edu
Kanta Kumari Rigaud	World Bank	kkumari@worldbank.org
Kayly Jennifer Ober	World Bank	kober@worldbank.org
Kirsten Schuettler	World Bank	kschuettler@worldbank.org
Liz Koslov	New York University	koslov@nyu.edu
Mariam Traore Chazalnoel	IOM	mchazalnoel@iom.net
Mehreen Afzal	UNHCR	afzalm@unhcr.org
Michele Leone	IDRC, International Development Research Centre	mleone@idrc.ca
Nadege Desiree Yameogo	World Bank	nyameogo@worldbank.org
Päivi Koskinen-Lewis	World Bank	pkoskinenlewis@worldbank.org
Roberta Romano	IOM	rromano@iom.int
Robin Bronen	Alaska Institute of Justice	rbronen@yahoo.com
Silke Heuser	World Bank	sheuser@worldbank.org
Sonia Plaza	World Bank	splaza@worldbank.org
Supriyo De	World Bank	sde@worldbank.org
Susan Martin	Georgetown University	Susan.Martin.ISIM@georgetown.edu
Susanne Melde	IOM, Global Migration Data Analysis Centre (GMDAC)	smelde@iom.int
Vincent Roquet	World Bank	vroquet@worldbank.org
Walter Kaelin	UNOPS/PDD	Walter.kaelin@oefre.unibe.ch