Regional Workshop on Planned Relocations to protect persons from disasters and environmental change in the Latin American context *

May 2 and 3, 2018
San José, Costa Rica

- Synthesis Note -

KNOMAD Thematic Working Group on Environmental Change and Migration

* The workshop was organized by Elizabeth Ferris (Georgetown University, Director of the Institute for the Study of International Migration), Susan Martin (KNOMAD Thematic Working Group on Environmental Change and Migration, Chair), and Jonas Bergmann (KNOMAD, Consultant) in collaboration with Elena Correa (former World Bank staff) as well as Nadege Desiree Yameogo (Focal Point of KNOMAD's Thematic Working Group on Environmental Change and Migration) IOM, UNHCR, and the Platform on Disaster Displacement. The workshop report 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 Nadege Desiree Yameogo (nyameogo@worldbank.org).

Table of Contents

Workshop Objectives

The KNOMAD Thematic Working Group on Environmental Change and Migration convened this workshop with three specific objectives:

1) To learn from the experiences of planned relocations undertaken in Latin America;
2) To present and receive feedback about the Guidance and Toolbox for Planning Relocations developed by Georgetown University, IOM, and UNHCR in collaboration with the World Bank's KNOMAD Working group on Environment and Migration and the Platform for Disaster Displacement;
3) To encourage governments and other actors to begin to consider how planned relocations can be used as disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation strategies.

The workshop built on prior meetings organized by KNOMAD's Thematic Working Group, including an April 2017 Workshop on "Practical Tools for Planned Relocation in the Context of Climate Change" and an October 2016 workshop on planned relocations for World Bank staff, as well as meetings previously convened by other partners.

Workshop Background

Disasters and environmental change have always affected the habitats in which people live. In extreme cases, such as riverbank erosion, the physical space where people live simply disappears and people have no option but to move elsewhere. In other cases, livelihoods, properties, or public services are damaged or destroyed to the extent that inhabitants perceive that they must move to find an adequate place to live.

There are also cases where people continue to live in places where their lives, property, and wellbeing are at risk—whether because of sudden-onset disasters (such as flooding) or the slow degradation of living conditions (such as drought)—and communities wish to relocate or governments require them to leave. Climate change will accelerate the pressures on habitats and governments are likely to consider Planned Relocations as a means to reduce disaster risk or to adapt to climate change. And yet, Planned Relocation also carries risks for those it is intended to benefit, including the disruption of livelihoods as well as the loss of income, socioeconomic networks, and cultural heritage.

Recognizing the gap in knowledge on Planned Relocations despite their widespread use in some contexts, a group of States, international organizations, and experts developed *Guidance on Planned Relocations* through a series of international meetings held between 2011 and 2015.[1] This *Guidance,* published in 2015, provides overarching principles for States and other actors to plan and implement Planned Relocations to protect people from disasters and environmental change. The *Guidance* underlines that Planned Relocations are complex, multidimensional processes and should normally be a last resort and adopted only when other alternatives are not possible. When it needed, they should be carefully planned and involve the participation of affected people. While there are certain general principles that carry across all Planned Relocations, the way in which decisions are made and implemented will depend on the particular national and local contexts, the available timeframe, and the underlying triggers.

[1] Brookings Institution, Georgetown University and UNHCR, *Guidance on Protecting People from Disasters and Environmental Change through Planned Relocations*, 2015. https://georgetown.app.box.com/s/qwx6dcvl9762fv9itnqn98ogx1h3sjzz.

The background research, which analyzed and highlighted lessons from past experience, and informed the development of the *Guidance,* suggests there are many things that can go wrong.[2] In a second step, a toolbox was developed to address the need for better planning, implementation, and monitoring of relocation programs. A *Toolbox: Planning Relocations to Protect People from Disasters and Environmental Change*[3] begins identifies five *cross-cutting* elements that repeatedly surfaced in lessons from prior experience.

The next step in the process is the dissemination and application of these practical tools, including specific measures and examples of good practices to assist States and other interested actors in translating them into concrete laws, policies, plans, and programs. To this end, the workshop in May 2018 was organized by the Thematic Working Group (TWG) on Environmental Change and Migration of the Knowledge Partnership on Migration and Development (KNOMAD) of the World Bank. It was convened in collaboration with the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University, the International Organization for Migration, the Platform on Disaster Displacement, and the UN High Commissioner for Refugees. The workshop, held in Spanish, included approximately 30 representatives from relevant public entities of Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, and Uruguay, as well as participants from international organizations, civil society organizations, and academic experts.

The workshop was divided in three parts (for the agenda and list of participants, see Annexes 1 and 2).

- **The first part** consisted of a brief welcome by Elizabeth Ferris, Marcelo Pisani (IOM Regional Director), and Marco Formisano (UNHCR Head of Regional Legal Unit), followed by an introduction to the Latin American context with respect to disasters and climate change by Elena Correa (former World Bank) and Juan Carlos Mendez (Platform on Disaster Displacement). The first session concluded with a presentation by Elizabeth Ferris and Elena Correa on the Toolbox.
- **In the second part,** various experts from academia, international organizations, and non-governmental organizations discussed their experiences with planned relocations and their relevance vis-à-vis the Toolbox. In five consecutive sessions, a total of 16 presentations were given.
- **In the third part,** participants broke into working groups to assess the utility of the Toolbox and to identify challenges and obstacles to using relocations as a means of protecting people from disasters and environmental change.

Synoptic Insights from the Workshop Presentations

a) General insights

Presentations by IOM and UNHCR stressed the importance of that any **approach to planned relocations must be based on human rights, participation, and a view to durable solutions.** The purpose of planned relocations must be to safeguard human life and dignity. Planned relocations must be carried out for the benefit of relocated people and in a way that respects and protects their rights and dignity, bearing in mind that people have the right to a healthy environment and right to life, as enshrined for example in the San Salvador Protocol. Basic principles of planned relocations include state responsibility; the centrality of the interests of relocalized and

[2] Petz, Daniel. Planned Relocations in the Context of Natural Disasters and Climate Change: A Review of the Literature. Brookings-LSE Project on Internal Displacement. June 2015. https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Brookings-Planned-Relocations-Annotated-Bibliography-June-2015.pdf.

[3] UNHCR, Georgetown University, and IOM. A toolbox: Planning Relocations to Protect People from Disasters and Environmental Change. 2017. https://georgetown.app.box.com/s/lagulcgiunmuzv4c7ogx2ywypfo4lla1.

host communities; the need for evidence to determine planned relocations; the consideration of specific needs such as those of marginalized groups; as well as the respect for family and community unit.

Consequently, a sound **legal framework** for planned relocations is key. Without a robust legal basis and the provision of adequate housing options, planned relocations can be tantamount to illegal evictions. The rationale for planned relocations must consist of protecting the human rights of affected people, including the rights to life and physical and mental integrity, to health, to an adequate standard of living, to livelihood and work, to a shelter, and to proprietary, among others.

Generally speaking, **relocation is considered a measure of last resort,** since it touches a variety of human rights. Planned relocations risk infringing a range of human rights of both individuals (such as freedom of movement) and of communities (such as access to economic and social rights). Groups whose rights can be affected include relocated people, people who remain in place, and receiving communities. Even within these groups, populations are not homogenous and have differentiated protection needs. Less impactful alternatives are preferred, even if they may be more expensive. States must have compelling reasons, robust evidence, and a sound legal basis for undertaking planned relocation. In other cases, planned relocations can be tantamount to forced eviction and result in arbitrary displacement. Protecting their citizens is the primary responsibility of the state, which have to respect, protect, and fulfill the human rights of persons within their territory or subject to their jurisdiction. This includes the obligation to take preventive and corrective measures to defend their rights, such as through planned relocations. There is a wide range of human rights that have to be taken into account at each stage of the relocation, such as the right to information and participation, the right of access to remedies, and the right to request a planned relocation. From a rights-based perspective, the importance of the emotional, cultural and spiritual part of relocation must also be stressed. For example, persevering human networks is an important task when carrying out relocations. Another critical lesson learned consists in the importance of engaging with affected communities, so they feel ownership over the process. The terms information sharing, consultation, and participation should not be used interchangeably – they all are distinct processes on a spectrum of degrees of engagement from passive to active, and all of them are equally important. Prevention and mitigation measures such as risk evaluation, collection and dissemination of risk information, early warning systems, evacuation plans, and community education can help to ensure the right to information and the right to right to full participation in decision-making and in the development of plans.

After relocation, sustainable and self-sufficient futures must be built, such as through livelihoods and vocational training, adequate housing, and access to basic services, among others. The planned relocation does not end until relocate persons no longer have needs or vulnerabilities related to the planned relocation and can enjoy their rights at least at the same level as pre- planned relocation or before the impacts of disasters and environmental change affected the enjoyment of such rights, and at a level that is at least equal to that of host populations. Any relocation must be undertaken with a view to finding durable solutions that protect people's dignity and rights over the long run.

b) Central American regional perspective on relocations and disaster displacement

Already today, the challenges for the relocation of people displaced by disasters and environmental change are significant in the region of the Central American Integration System (SICA). SICA is the institutional framework of the Central American Integration Association, created by the States of Costa Rican, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama. In addition, Belize and the Dominican Republic serve as full members of the SICA. In this region, the population is projected to grow from around 57.3 million in 2015 to more than 80.5 million by 2050. By 2050, the number of people living in urban areas is expected to increase by more than 75%. At the same time, geographic location and socioeconomic conditions make SICA one of the regions most vulnerable to and threatened by climate change. Over the last decade, the most frequent disasters were storms, flooding, drought, and epidemics, followed by volcanic activity, mudslides, landslides, fires and extreme temperatures, as well as earthquakes. In the past decade (2008-2017) disasters affected approximately 4 million more people than compared to the decade before (1998-2007). While the region has succeeded in

reducing the economic cost of disasters by about two thirds in this period of time, the cost still amounted to more than 4.380 million dollars in the past decade. More than 2,300 people died due to disasters in this time, and more than two thirds of these casualties occurred in only three countries: the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, and Guatemala. According to the IDMC, in 2016, more than 80,000 people were displaced internally by disasters in the region.

The region also faces several dynamics with major relevance for future disaster displacement. These include increasingly salient climate change, dynamics of urban-rural development in the face of growing urbanization, the technological revolution, international migration, aging, as well as issues associated with the demographic dividend. These dynamics intersect and multiply, providing both challenges and opportunities.

The Toolbox is a useful instrument for the region for at least three reasons. First, it allows advancing one common basic conceptual definition that permits to promote agreement on what planned relocations entail. Second, it allows framing the analysis of implications of relocations, a mapping of vulnerability to threats, and the identification of vulnerable people. Together, these analyses can provide the necessary evidence for decision making. And third, the Toolbox allows framing the analysis of different strategic instruments of the social, economic and environmental sectors of SICA and their relationships with planned relocations, which helps to build the political basis for decision making.

c) Antigua and Barbuda

When Category 5 +++ **Hurricane Irma hit Antigua and Barbuda in September 2017** with winds at 320 km/h and the eye of the hurricane passing through the center of Barbuda, the island became factually uninhabitable. The island was under water, and the wind drove objects as far as 600m away. 95% of homes were damaged. The entire main infrastructure, including the only hospital, the airport, and the harbor, was damaged or destroyed, as well as shelters, historical cultural sites, and government buildings. Severe damage also occurred in the agricultural sector. In the aftermath of the hurricane, the island lacked waste management as well as social structure.

Anticipating the arrival of the hurricane, the unprecedented response included **mass mobilization within 48 hours to ensure a safe evacuation of the entire population of Barbuda (approximately 1500 people) to Antigua**. In Barbuda, the evacuation started with a 'Triage': Pregnant women, nursing mothers, girls and boys, old people, and people with disabilities were evacuated first. In Antigua, there was a need to prepare accommodation and integration, find adequate land, housing, food, and options for the placement of children. Economic assistance, social and health services had to be anticipated, as well as the impact of the new arrivals on local businesses. The mobilization and evacuation implied urgent tasks, such as the coordination of all relevant actors and sectors; transportation by sea, land and air; the need to ensure deployment arrangements, reception and food, shelter, care of special needs, including psychosocial support; the need to create a database with data on registration, creation of profiles and processing of all evacuees; the coordination, analysis and allocation of resources, staff, and volunteers; and the support of evacuees and their immediate needs with a view to regain independence.

Executing a mass evacuation on a scale and complexity previously unknown and in such a short time resulted in **serious challenges**. The shelter management was particularly demanding, with many people missing. Establishing criteria for help in shelters also proved difficult. Another obstacle consisted in implementing new measures for the people of Barbuda, including medical benefits, social security, identity documents, replacements, and others. Reconstruction of houses was difficult due to the challenging building codes. Ultimately, the hurricane also triggered tensions between Barbuda and Antigua due to the slow arrival of aid and land problems. The largest challenge consists, naturally, in reshaping the environment and fostering long-term resilience.

The case also provides **several lessons to be learned**. There is an urgent need to establish standard operating procedures based on best practices and to have a plan in place for evacuations of different sizes of groups of people—from individuals to groups to whole communities and populations. It is equally necessary to have an

articulated policy and legal base in place, as well as to guarantee their application. Governments should aim to use internationally accepted humanitarian standards of operation and best practices. They should be prepared and able to quickly request humanitarian resources as needed. It is helpful to have one identifiable official agency or body that handles and coordinates all action and requests. There is need to ensure an intersectoral section of personnel trained in emergency management. The case also shows the need to ensure that all interested parties know their functions in case of an emergency; a mapping of partners and their links in emergencies (international, regional) can be useful. Providing solid data collection and analysis services is key. Finally, any emergency response must protect environmental integrity.

d) Colombia

In the Capital District of Bogotá, planned relocations have been used to safeguard families located in zones of high risks which cannot be mitigated otherwise, and to improve their living conditions. The Bogota District's Development Plan includes the relocation of 4,000 families. *Caja de Vivienda Popular* (CVP) is the entity in charge of planning and implementing this relocation. This entity has aimed to relocate an average of about 1,000 persons per year between 2016 and 2019. Based on a robust legal foundation, the process of relocation is envisaged in various stages, starting with transitory relocation, handover of a plot of land, economic compensation (a subsidy to facilitate low income people to have access to a legal and safe home), as well as the selection of a new home and post-relocation support. Main obstacles encountered revolve around delays in the work schedule through private firms, as well as an absence of planning in the formulation of real estate projects, stalling the project at 41% of the envisaged number of relocated persons to date. Lessons learned include the need to foster co-responsibility of families in advancing their ultimate relocation; to empower the planning team in charge of relocations with required resources and administrative power; to engage in long-term planning; to formulate financial instruments that support access to housing; to control property declared as "at-risk" and define its use; to develop strategies to support integral, sustainable development of communities; and to pay special attention in the process of relocation to needs of displaced victims of the Colombian conflict that moved to urban areas, including to questions of land restitution.

In Medellin, the city´s Land Use Plan implies the relocation of families due to infrastructure projects, urban renewal, creation and consolidation of public zones and disaster risk management. Decisions on relocations are undertaken in the context of urban planning. Since 2016, a policy to protect residents from the impacts of all those interventions is being developed. This policy includes relocation of displaced people within a human rights framework. Its main objective is to fulfill all human rights of displaced people and protect their livelihoods and ways of life, regardless their land tenure status, and the cause of displacement (infrastructure projects, urban renewal, public zones, or disaster risk management). The policy is carried out in several stages to formulate the projects in order to protect the rights of affected people, and also, several stages in the cases of relocation. The relocation stages are: (i) institutional strengthening and organization (ii) identification and assessment of impacts caused by involuntary displacement on several capitals: human, social, economic, spatial, environmental, political and legal, (iii) analysis of relocation alternatives and formulation of the Relocation Plan, (iv) implementation of the relocation plan, (v) implementation of post-relocation plan, and (vi) ex-post evaluation.

e) Costa Rica

Costa Rica and its approximately 4.5 million citizens face a variety of environmental risks, including large areas at risk of flooding, landslides, as well as volcanic and seismic activity that have made relocations necessary in the past.

For example, when the Cinchona earthquake hit Costa Rica in 2009 (6.2 on Richter scale), 22 people were killed, 17 went missing, and approximately 100 were injured. 71 communities witnessed damages, and more than 125,000 people were indirectly affected by damage to their homes, or lack of communication and interruption of services, among other factors. With more than 2,900 damaged homes, losses totaled USD 675 million. The town of **Cinchona** was particularly severely affected. The damages required a relocation of the community to

safer space in Nueva Cinchona. The new location would be home to 93 families, and include an integrated urban center, shops, recreational areas, as well as buffer zones, among other things.

Besides ex-post relocation, Costa Rica also has experience in preventive relocation. Between November 16 and 27, 2016, Category 4 **Hurricane Otto** struck the country, directly affecting more than 10,000 people in more than 450 villages and causing 10 deaths. With serious damages to infrastructure such as bridges, roads, and canals, total losses amounted to USD 200 million. Initially it was determined that 200 families had to be relocated as a result of the hurricane; however, after a detailed analysis this figure was reduced to 50 families who have to find new plots and receive funds from the government to build the houses.

f) Guatemala

Guatemala has been repeatedly affected by severe disasters, such as Hurricane Mitch in 1998. When the hurricane hit, it devastated the economy and caused more than 250 casualties. In the metropolitan area of Guatemala City, it seriously affected especially poorer populations living in marginalized housing and areas of high risk. After the hurricane, about 75 families from the municipalities of Guatemala City that make up the Great Southern City Commonwealth—where approximately three million inhabitants live—were moved from affected settlements to a more secure zone in the Monja Blanca neighborhood of the municipality of **Villa Canales**. Initially, they were placed in shelters, while the relevant authorities of the government of Guatemala found and bought land to provide them with lots, and granted subsidies to families to acquire the lots. Finally, the families were relocated to areas that lacked basic services like water or transportation, and were characterized by serious overcrowding. Only the lots were provided; houses were not built.

In another case, planning was more comprehensive. When a landslide buried the community "El Cambray" in the municipality of **Santa Catarina Pinula** in 2015, it claimed more than 280 lives, with 70 people missing, 185 buildings destroyed and 73 severely damaged. In the ensuing relocation process, houses were completed by means of loans and donations. However, relocations were only one part of a larger set of practices employed by the Guatemalan government to reduce risks associated with housing deficits. Further measures include for instance the acquisition of lots with basic services; the provision of basic services; improvements and extensions of housing; and others. Generally speaking, planned relocations in order to reduce risks from natural and man-made hazards in Guatemala involve several institutions that, among other things, identify at-risk populations and support acquisition of land. Guatemala currently attempts several reforms, such as involving the corresponding institutions to identify populations at risk (natural hazards and violent communities); creating lists of precarious communities through technical and scientific studies that identify where the risk cannot be mitigated on-site; supporting neighborhood improvements; improving water and sanitation systems, housing quality and other urban community infrastructure.

g) Haiti

The approximately 10.4 million inhabitants of **Haiti** (2012) are highly vulnerable. Haiti is the most at-risk country in the Latin America and Caribbean region on the Global Risk Index 2018, and ranks 14th worldwide. 90% of the population is at risk of natural disasters, 59% live below the poverty level (2012), and 24% below the level of extreme poverty (2012). Growing urbanization and lack of urban planning multiply pressures arising from environmental degradation.

The **methodology for relocations from spontaneous to planned camps implemented after the Haitian earthquake in 2010** provides valuable insights for other cases as well. The earthquake caused around 200,000 casualties and displaced 1.5 million persons to over 1,555 camps, the majority of them impromptu camps. The displacement took place in an urban context, with Port-au-Prince being the main city affected by the earthquake. The camps were characterized by an extremely high population density, including camps in the metropolitan area of Port-au-Prince. The majority of displaced people in the camps came from the same area where the camps were located. Risks facing the populations in camps were high, including lack of access to basic services; exposure

to natural disasters and protection risks; a cholera epidemic since 2011; threats of forced eviction; lack of access to socio-economic activities; and a gradual donor fatigue that slowed humanitarian action.

The **final goal was to close the camps and find durable solutions for the affected**. To end displacement, several pathways were used: retrofitting and reconstruction; rental subsidy ('cash for rent'); return; formalization (urban integration); and relocation to planned camps. Yet challenges included, among other things, the sheer volume of funding needed for the entire populations in the camps. The lack of a land registry system and the complexity of the tenure system in Haiti constituted another major challenge for closing camps. Nonetheless, the displacement situation also provided some opportunities. For example, return areas were accessible; nearly 80% of the displaced were tenants before the displacement, and houses for rent were available in the metropolitan area.

People from spontaneous camps were relocated to planned camps since they faced protection risks, environmental risks or lack of access to basic services. The people to be relocated were selected on vulnerability criteria. Since the measure was initially designed to be provisional, more than 3,000 families (approximately 14,000 displaced persons) were relocated to temporary camps equipped with minimum standards in terms of shelter and supply, and facing an indeterminate situation in terms of land ownership. However, the temporary design has now, after a few years, resulted in serious problems of protection and access to basic services. In March 2018, 97% of those initially displaced no longer live in the fields; but two-thirds of families that continue to be displaced live in temporary shelter structures, many of whom refuse to leave the camps, worried that they could be even worse off afterwards.

Lessons learned from this case include the need to assist the communities of origin and return as soon as possible after disasters. The duration of displacement is a key factor for the type of durable solution available. As the example of temporary solutions that become semi-permanent illustrates, a long-term perspective combined with clear planning and available resources for durable solutions should be aimed for from the start. The case also emphasizes the importance of knowing the existing land tenure regime and anticipating limitations associated with it, including tension between the right to housing and the right to property. There is a need to incorporate a localized understanding of these dynamics from the start of interventions to foster legal security.

h) Honduras

Honduras faces increasing environmental risks leading to more disasters. At the same time, it witnesses important demographic growth as well as higher concentrations of people in coastal areas that result in a larger number of people likely to be affected by disasters in the future. One example can be found at the coast of the Golf of Honduras, where climate change is having severe socio-economic and environmental impacts. Several potential causes of impacts on the coastline include: the rising sea level due to climate change; a sinking of the tectonic plate intensified after an earthquake; the construction of a deviation channel of the Motagua River, decreasing flow of water and sediments in the coast; the decrease of the natural water flow due to the construction of three dams in rivers that flow into the wetland; and the construction of a series of breakwaters along the coast of Omoa.

A combination of these factors is causing sea water intrusion in the communities of **Barra del Motagua** and **Barra Cuyamel**, Omoa, which are home to 84 families. Motagua is surrounded by the sea on one side and wetlands on the other. Around 300 meters of the coast directly in front of the communities have already been lost in the past two years. The sea is now entering the homes of the families in the communities. Further observed environmental impacts include changes and losses of ecosystems; erosion and instability of the coast; changes in the composition of the soil; losses of productive soil; impacts of salinity on air, soil and water; deforestation through sea water and sand intrusion; as well as large deposits of garbage and waste stranded from the sea. Waste from the Motagua river adds to the problem. Identified social impacts include outmigration, the breaking of family ties, and hurdles to access education. In addition, increasing numbers of people engage in day labor, and more elderly have to take up work again to support their households. Close to Motagua, Cuyamel is located

on a sandbar between the Caribbean Sea and the Cuyamel River. Recently, the site has experienced dramatic and rapid climate impacts, and witnessed the abandonment of one house destroyed by the sea, the loss of several trees and the removal, as well as the transfer of a power line that was at risk of falling into the sea. Three families had to be relocated to the school of the community of Barra de Cuyamel to temporarily protect them from the intruding sea.

Overall, the **environmental impacts on the communities are severe and relocation is required.** Homes and livelihoods of the affected families are increasingly damaged or destroyed. More and more people are displaced, have no access to drinking water, productive land to grow food, or livelihoods such as fishing. The communities themselves are increasingly isolated due to the road, flood and mud conditions. People are more and more exposed to populations of mosquitoes that carry diseases due to flooded areas; they also face exposure to dangerous marine garbage such as broken glass and syringes. However, although the area was declared an uninhabitable high risk zone, no action has been taken so far. Local authorities state that they have neither the resources nor the capacity to relocate those communities.

i) Mexico

More and more frequently, disasters strike Mexico, causing widespread loss and damage. For example, in late summer 2017, in the course of only two months Mexico was hit by two earthquakes, two tropical storms, and three hurricanes. Already now, large geographical areas, as well as large numbers of people and houses are exposed to droughts, earthquakes, floods, tropical cyclones, heat waves, landslides, and tsunamis. For example, as much as 88% of the land surface, more than 101 million people, and about 27 million houses were prone to landslides in 2010. With population growth, particularly in risk zones, these numbers are projected to rise. One part of the problem is inadequate territorial planning. The annual economic impact of disasters varies from year to year, reaching an annual average of USD 2,147 million from 2000-2014 and causing 186 casualties. This number is down from 506 casualties in the period of 1980-1990, when the annual average economic cost was around 700 million US dollars.

The **general institutional framework for relocations** in Mexico consists of various legal and financial instruments, including the National System of Civil Protection, the General Law of Civil Protection, and the General Law of Human Settlements, Territorial Planning and Urban Development. Prevention of displacement is aimed for through territorial planning, urban development planning, an atlas of risks, social programs, and relocation of population in risk areas, among other things. All levels of government are involved: Municipalities are in charge of attributions for land use, promoting and regulating development, risk reduction, and others, yet given the heterogeneity of settings, not all municipalities have sufficient financial or technical capabilities to fulfill their responsibilities. States are usually responsible for managing federal resources for risk reduction, but some have their own state funds. The federal government spends most resources for planning and risk reduction, and develops the methodologies applicable by all other entities. Relocation has implied a high level of federal government participation, due to the low capacity of municipal level.

The cases of La Junta Arroyo Zarco, Villahermosa, and Milenio III (1998) and Vida Mejor III (2005) highlight challenges associated with relocations. When **La Junta Arroyo Zarco** in the municipality of Tenampulco, Puebla, was destroyed by a flood of the Apulco River in October 1999, the community was relocated. However, the land for relocation was five kilometers away from the original location, and the houses built did not correspond to the existing ways of life. Considering that their quality of life had decreased after relocation, several members of households migrated internally or to the USA. In **Villahermosa**, the first relocation of about 388 families took place after floods in 2007. For some of the affected inhabitants, the relocation meant moving more than 18km from their original city. A problem commonly encountered was the lack of housing tenure and legal uncertainty. Most families were also active in the informal economy after relocation. The relocation was characterized by service failures and internal operating problems, and resulted in social division of the community. In the cases of **Milenio** III (1998) and **Vida Mejor** III (2005), in Motozintla, Chiapas, at least 800 houses were destroyed after heavy rainfall in 1998. In 2005, heavy flooding and landslides occurred. Economic activity was centered mainly

in the agricultural sector, which was severely impacted. The population on the banks of the Xelajú River faced especially great exposure and social vulnerability, as well as problems in land tenure. The responses of the authorities were structural measures in the Xelajú River, aimed at reducing vulnerability through housing development, civil works, flood risk reduction measures, and others. For some families, the government chose relocation from the risk areas. Problems with relocation revolved mainly around the lack of adequate, nearby land. In the relocation to Millennium III, the selection of new land for 152 houses and 576 people (or 143 families) was not based on a hazard analysis and marked by a lack of transparency.

Two further Mexican examples show the challenges associated with planned relocations. In both cases, the decision to relocate was taken after disasters struck. Yet the cases showcase largely different approaches. First, in **Acapulco** in the state of Guerrero, after Hurricane Paulina hit in 1997, several families who lost their homes and those who lived in risk areas were to be relocated. Second, in **Nuevo San Juan Grijalva** in the state of Chiapas, after a landslide affected the town in 2007, planned relocation was intended to address territorial dispersion and lack of services of the population and raise the Human Development Index. In both cases, relocation plans were devised, but only in Acapulco was a census of damage and affected households conducted. In terms of legal frameworks, both cases built on existing federal and state norms and the events fostered the development of the local regulatory and institutional framework. When it comes to needs and impacts on the affected population, the cases were quite distinct. In Acapulco, a Temporary Employment Program was implemented hiring 5,000 people, 329 of them in the reconstruction of homes. While in Acapulco, the first 350 houses were delivered furnished with a bunk bed, a stove, a dining room, and a pantry in individual lots sized 120m², in Nuevo San Juan Grijalva, needs were covered more holistically, including spiritual, cultural, health, recreational and development dimensions. In the case of Acapulco, land was purchased and expropriated in the neighboring communities, or came from remaining lots of the Land Tenure Regulatory Commission (CORETT). The locations were in the periphery of the city. In Nuevo San Juan Grijalva, by contrast, land was acquired in the same municipality, located 7 kilometers from the municipal seat. Various challenges emerged in Acapulco. The conclusion of the Temporary Employment Program could not be traced due to a lack of information. The peripheral location of the new homes meant that a large number of the houses were abandoned, and cases of invasions of abandoned properties were detected. A discrepancy between different planning instruments led to the outcome that the new homes for the relocated families were considered habitable, but were actually located in flood zones. In Nuevo San Juan Grijalva, the degree of marginalization decreased slightly after the relocation, but remained high. The community lost 6.3% of its population in only three years (2007-2010); and while there were some improvements in living conditions, unemployment was marked.

Several lessons can be learnt from these cases. In the first three cases, social stress to adapt to the relocations developed by different government programs was significant. The quality of life of affected people was impaired, many of whom faced negative transformation and de facto exclusion. In the latter two cases, an important gap consisted in the lack of monitoring and evaluation. Long-term follow-up to understand the sustainability of interventions was not carried out. The cases highlight the need to analyze and consider thoroughly the needs and impacts that relocations will have on the population; for example, in one case, the relocation involved changes in lifestyle, since the design of the house did not allow its inhabitants to carry out their usual activities and the size was insufficient for the size of the family, and the distance of the homes to their former location represented costs to the families. Uncertainties in land tenure were omnipresent. Finally, the cases highlight the importance of framing relocations in broader territorial planning and planning processes, and their differentiated articulation in all relevant instruments. The cases were neither documented nor evaluated.

j) Uruguay

Uruguay did not face severe disasters until 2007, when large floods affected the country. The government developed a National System to respond to climate change alongside a National System related to Disaster Risk Management. The country provides interesting examples of relocations from precarious areas formed mostly by public lands that cannot be regularized due to being contaminated and/or flooded. A National Relocation Plan

was designed in 2010 to relocate people living in those areas. Specifically, the state was asked to relocate these at-risk communities and to demolish existing constructions in order to avoid generating new settlements in risky areas. They also prepared local plans on developed land with all basic services. 2,500 families were resettled during the first five years. They were not relocated collectively, but were included in housing programs developed in legal urban areas.

The cases highlight the need to pay attention to three key processes: first, the integrated management of water resources; second, environmental territorial planning; and third, a holistic approach to climate change and disaster risk reduction. They show that the use of local resources in the housing component can be very beneficial. The cases also highlight that social aspects are key in relocations, such as the participation of affected people in the construction of their own houses to raise ownership and commitment. Furthermore, they show how public spaces can be recovered.

Selected Themes Arising in the Workshop Discussions

In the last part of the workshop, participants broke into working groups to assess the utility of the Toolbox and to identify challenges and obstacles to using relocations as a means of protecting people from disasters and environmental change. Key questions concerned how to improve the adoption of planned relocations as policies for risk reduction, where needed; which obstacles exist; and how these could be overcome.

In terms of obstacles, participants identified a lack of political will to engage with the issue as the primary obstacle. Incentives for federal governments to invest in risk management—including planned relocations—are often missing. This lack of will was described as often being accompanied by complicated disconnections between national and local level governments. Furthermore, environmental risks are not always incorporated adequately in land management plans. This gap tends to be further aggravated by a frequent lack of land registry offices. In many instances, normative frameworks around planned relocations are non-existent or characterized by weak compliance.

In terms of solutions, there was particular appreciation of the sections in the Toolbox on **land** and **information, consultation and participation,** and **financing,** which were considered as key to the success of planned relocations. While the Toolkit was developed for use in cases where there is time for planning relocations—rather than relocations undertaken in the immediate aftermath of a disaster—it is clear that at least among the countries represented in this meeting, some individuals and communities are permanently relocated after sudden-onset disasters. It could be worthwhile to adapt the Toolkit to immediate post-disaster situations where the timeframe for planning relocations is limited. It also might be useful to engage more specifically with those working on disaster risk reduction and disaster preparedness.

Beyond the toolbox, participants called for a preventive, ex-ante approach to risk prevention, risk management, and protection as opposed to the current approach that was described as mostly driven by after-the-fact responses. The workshop participants emphasized that all **territorial planning instruments should include planned relocation and must be integrated with each other**, with special emphasis on those that are legally or normatively binding. The integration should include the most comprehensive plans—such as Development Plans—as well as more sectoral and granular ones such as Territorial Plans or Disaster Risk Management Plans, always taking into consideration different scales and rural-urban interactions. There is also a need to **collect, analyze, and publish more granular and disaggregated data** that generate the necessary evidence to confirm the need for risk prevention. Local authorities should be encouraged to compile data at the municipal level and include risks in land management plans. Equally important is the dissemination of existing data, such as the local vulnerability data in Central America compiled by the Central American Integration System (SISCA).

It was considered necessary to work on the visibility of planned relocations and the instruments created to safeguard the protection of affected people. Participants stressed the need to develop **advocacy strategies**

adapted to each country context, for instance through workshops, dissemination materials, as well as dedicated training on the Toolbox with universities and entities that already work on the subject at the national and at the regional level. To this end, **"steward" agencies and organizations could also be identified** that champion the risk prevention agenda. An important task in this context was the need to carry out a thorough analysis of the main actors (politicians, practitioners, and civil society) concerned with planned relocation in each country and at all levels. This analysis could ideally be carried out by public institutions responsible for risk prevention and management to be determined in each country. Once the analysis has been carried out, working groups could be created to define areas at risk and advance in the planning of risk prevention and management measures, including relocations where necessary. Participants also discussed the importance of analyzing the cost and benefits of planned relocation, which could help to build political will.

Participants also stressed that they learned valuable insights from the experiences presented by others. They agreed that there is still a lack of knowledge around existing cases of planned relocations and examples of good practices that flow from them. **Collecting cases and identifying these models** would be an important step forward. One of the recommendations coming out of the workshop was to collect basic information about relocations, using a simple template, which would enable comparisons between, for example, large and small-scale relocations, or between relocations in urban and rural settings. While several of the participants indicated that they would disseminate the Toolkit in their respective organizations, they also called for an international meeting to share experiences across regions, feeling that they had a lot to learn from other regions as well as Latin America. It was suggested that **the Guide and the Toolbox be shared and presented at further expert meetings revolving around thematic clusters**, such as land and financing. These thematic meetings would preferably be regional with extra-regional international participation to stimulate a richer exchange of experiences. Participants also recommended **introducing the theme of planned relocations in other areas of international coordination**, such as the Regional and Global Risk Management Platform (MINURVI), the Regional Conferences of Population and Development, and platforms developed by city networks such as the Local Governments for Sustainability (ICLEI).

ANNEX 1: Agenda *(Spanish)*

Mayo 2	**Actividad**
8:30 – 9:00 am	**Bienvenida** – Palabres de apertura - Objetivos del taller -- Introducciones breves de participantes y organizadores *Beth Ferris (Georgetown, World Bank); Marcelo Pisani (IOM Regional Director); Marco Formisano (UNHCR Head of the Regional Legal Unit a.i.)*
9:00 – 9:30 am	**Introducción al contexto latinoamericano** con respecto a desastres, cambio climático y la necesidad de pensar en relocalizaciones planificadas y PDD *Elena Correa (former World Bank), Juan Carlos Méndez Barquero (PDD)*
9:30 – 10:00 am	**Presentación de la Guía y la Caja de Herramientas** sobre Relocalizaciones Planificadas *Beth Ferris & Elena Correa*
10:30 - 12:30 pm	Sesión 1: **Experiencias de los participantes** con respecto a relocalizaciones planificadas, y relevancia de la caja / del guía con base a éstas *4 Presentaciones de 20 min por cada caso - incluye 5 min de discusiones - 4 casos en esta sesión* • **Juan Pablo Tovar** Colombia Caja de Vivienda Popular Bogotá Coordinador Reasentamientos • **Análida Rincón Patiño** Colombia Doctorado en Estudios Urbanos y Territoriales de la Universidad Nacional de Colombia Sede Medellín, Coordinadora Observatorio de Reasentamientos Coordinadora • **Diana Osorio Conlledo** Guatemala Mancomunidad Gran Ciudad del Sur Coordinadora de Gestión de Información Territorial *Moderación: OIM*
1:30 – 3:30 pm	Sesión 2: **Experiencias de los participantes** con respecto a relocalizaciones planificadas, y relevancia de la caja / del guía con base a éstas

	4 Presentaciones de 20 min por cada caso - incluye 5 min de discusiones - 4 casos en esta sesión • **Rubén Almejo Hernández**, México CONAPO Subdirector de Desarrollo Regional Sustentable • **Oscar Zepeda Ramos**, México CENAPRED Director de Análisis y Gestión del Riesgo • **Moisés Edgardo Castro Mejía** Honduras Alcaldía de Omoa - Departamento de Cortés Oficial de Riesgos Alcaldía de Omoa *Moderación: ACNUR*
4:00 – 6:00 pm	Sesión 3: **Experiencias de los participantes** con respecto a relocalizaciones planificadas, y relevancia de la caja / del guía con base a éstas *4 Presentaciones de 20 min por cada caso - incluye 5 min de discusiones - 4 casos en esta sesión* • **Raquel Lejtreger** Uruguay Vivienda, Ordenamiento Territorial y Vivienda de Mujica Ex - Viceministra • **Gabriella Cecilia Portillo** Regional SISCA, Secretaría Ejecutiva de la Estrategia Centroamericana de Vivienda y Asentamientos Humanos (ECVAH) • **Luis Guzmán Brenes**, Costa Rica Cruz Roja CR Sub Director de Gestión del Riesgo • **Intervención de Erika Pires,** Fundadora de RESAMA (Red Suramericana sobre Migraciones Ambientales) *Moderación: PDD*

Mayo 3	
9:00 – 10:00 am	**OIM: Implementación de la relocación planificada: desafíos clave, práctica efectiva y lecciones aprendidas de la experiencia global y regional de la OIM** • **Fernando Calado**: Resumen de los aspectos legales y de derechos humanos de la relocalización planificada • **Fernando Calado**: Resumen de desafíos prácticos, en particular relacionados con los derechos a la tierra, incluidos ejemplos de otros países Lecciones aprendidas de estudios de casos regionales:

	• **Amalia Torres** - Relocalización en Haití, metodología utilizada para reubicaciones en Haití, resultados y lecciones aprendidas • **Fernando Calado** - Relocalización en Colombia *Moderación: Elena Correa*
10:00 – 11:00 am	**ACNUR**: **El ACNUR y la protección y relocalizaciones planificadas** • **Luis Diego Obando**: Lineamientos generales del ACNUR sobre reubicaciones planificadas • **Carlos Picado Rojas** (CNE Costa Rica): Estudio del caso de relocalizaciones preventivas en el contexto de Hurricane Otto • **Marco Formisano**: Estudio del caso de Antigua y Barbuda en la región caribeña *Moderación: Beth Ferris*
11:30 am – 1:00 pm	**Discusión en pequeños grupos:** 1) **Análisis de la Caja versus las experiencias latinoamericanas presentadas** • ¿Cuáles son los contenidos más útiles para su futuro trabajo? • ¿Qué se puede aprender de los otros estudios de caso presentados? **2) Obstáculos, potenciales, y soluciones** • ¿Cómo se puede mejorar la adpotación de relocalizaciones planificadas como políticas por la reducción de riesgos de desastres y para la adaptación al cambio climático? • ¿Qué obstáculos existen? • ¿Qué propuestas se sugieren para superar esos obstáculos? *Moderación: Participantes eligidos en los grupos*
2:00 – 3:00 pm	**Discusión en plenario** *Moderación: Participantes eligidos en los grupos*
3:00 – 3:30 pm	**Conclusiones del taller** – Cierre (Beth Ferris, Elena Correa)

ANNEX 2: List of Participants *(Spanish)*

#	País	Funcionario	Institución
1	Internacional	Amalia Torres	OIM
2	Colombia	Análida Rincón Patiño	Observatorio de Reasentamientos Medellín
3	Internacional	Beth Ferris	Georgetown University, Banco Mundial
4	Internacional	Brendan Tarnay	OIM
5	Costa Rica	Carlos Picado Rojas	Sistema Nacional de Gestión de Riesgos
6	Guatemala	Diana Osorio Conlledo	Mancomunidad Gran Ciudad del Sur
7	Internacional	Elena Correa	anteriormente Banco Mundial
8	Internacional	Erika Pires	RESAMA (Red Suramericana sobre Migraciones Ambientales)
9	Internacional	Fernando Calado	OIM
10	Internacional	Gabriella Cecilia Portillo	SISCA, Secretaría Ejecutiva de la Estrategia Centroamericana de Vivienda y Asentamientos Humanos (ECVAH)
11	Costa Rica	Gerardo Quiros	UNDP / UNETE
12	Costa Rica	Iván Brenes	Sistema Nacional de Gestión de Riesgos
13	Internacional	Jonas Bergmann	Banco Mundial
14	Internacional	Jose Riera-Cezanne	anteriormente ACNUR
15	Internacional	Juan C. Méndez	Plataforma sobre Desplazamiento por Desastres
16	Colombia	Juan Pablo Tovar	Caja de Vivienda Popular Bogotá
17	Internacional	Luis Diego Obando	ACNUR
18	Costa Rica	Luis Guzmán Brenes	Cruz Roja CR
19	Internacional	Marco Formisano	ACNUR
20	Internacional	Marcelo Pisani	OIM
21	Internacional	Michela Macchiavello	OIM
22	Internacional	Miguel Urbano	ACNUR
23	Honduras	Moisés Edgardo Castro Mejía	Alcaldía de Omoa - Departamento de Cortés
24	México	Oscar Zepeda Ramos	CENAPRED
25	Uruguay	Raquel Lejtreger	Vivienda, Ordenamiento Territorial y Vivienda de Mujica
26	Costa Rica	Roxanna Avendaño	Sistema Nacional de Gestión de Riesgos
27	México	Rubén Almejo Hernández	CONAPO