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Abstract
Despite the fact that some forecasts suggest that a large number of individuals could become displaced by 2050, the institutional and operational linkages between climate and cross-border displacement continues to be complex. While refugees and IDPs are treated according to specific treaties, the status of cross-border displacement as a result of disasters suffers from a normative gap and the linkages between disaster displacement, its drivers and risk reduction seems rather underrepresented in existing research. The purpose of this research is to investigate if cross-border displacement is adequately addressed in institutional and operational frameworks, and how trans-boundary and regional cooperation plays a role in mitigating displacement risk in the country of origin or within regions. This was approached by interviewing fourteen relevant actors, conducting a questionnaire and assessing literature through a triangulation of data sources. By following the structure of four research objectives, the policy approach and the risk reduction approach were investigated. The study concludes that several factors can be inhibiting for successfully mitigating displacement risk. It is recommended that the objectives of the policy approach and the risk reduction approach are assembled in a coextending manner and that there is a need for leadership and stakeholder mapping. In order to guide forced migration, developing global outlines and then tailor those to national and sub-national binding points are recommended. Furthermore, data collection that identifies and categorises drivers for displacement is recommended in order to reduce risks.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

We live in a world that is currently undergoing rapid transformations in terms of climate, demographic patterns and politics. Increased occurrences of sudden-onset disasters such as heavy rainfalls, floods and hurricanes show that our climate is changing (PreventionWeb, 2017). Furthermore, current demographic trends indicate that more people are migrating from rural to urban areas, and our cities are becoming bigger and denser (Wamsler, 2014). Historically, the changes in climate, conflict patterns and global population movements have been a recurring phenomenon. However, whereas involuntary movement of people has previously been linked to conflict or violence alone, today we are beginning to see more complex and interrelated sources of movement due to climate variability, abnormal weather patterns and gradual changes in environment, climate, and livelihoods (Foresight, 2011).

Over the past 30 years, incidents of storms, hurricanes and floods have increased threefold (IOM, 200), and in 2010 the number of people identified as ‘newly displaced’ due to sudden-onset disasters was estimated to be 42 million as several big events took place. Moreover, 85 percent of all global displacement was triggered by sudden-onset disasters that year (IDMC, 2015). By 2015, the number of people displaced due to disasters remained high, and was estimated at 19.2 million (Bilak et al., 2016). For the future, some forecasts even suggest that by 2050 the number of people displaced internally and across border as a result of extreme weather conditions can reach up to 250 million people (UNHCR, 2015).

Yet, numbers cannot convey the important message alone. It is significant to mention that incidents of disasters and displacement have devastating effects on vulnerable communities, and many of those most exposed are residing in the developing world. Furthermore, an increasing number of people are already living in ‘climate change hotspots’ or have relocated to areas prone to natural hazards and consequently, they face a severe risk of secondary or repeated displacement, disruption of livelihoods, socio-economic challenges and unrest (UNHCR, 2015). Cross-border displacement is thus a global challenge and needs to be addressed (the Nansen Initiative, 2015).

Already in 1990, the Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) warned that climate change, amongst other factors, was expected to lead to migration and displacement (Bilak et al., 2016).
Despite efforts of anticipating future challenges, it still took more than a decade at the policy level to accept a possible connection between human mobility and potential impacts of natural hazards. Today, several initiatives have been developed and the topic is getting a lot of attention in international frameworks like; the Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts, and by the Conference of Parties (COP) of the UNFCCC upon the Cancun Adaptation Framework. Furthermore, the Hyogo Observatory has established a new centre dedicated entirely to study the environment and migration, the IOM has a MECC division (Migration, Environment and Climate Change) and the Platform on Disaster Displacement has been carried forward as a follow-up to the Nansen Initiative from 2013. This initiative was accepted by well over 100 countries and brought together key stakeholders to assess and review their national policy plans, and to apply the protection agenda for displaced persons in the context of disasters (the Nansen Initiative, 2015). Together with the New York Declaration on Migrants and Refugees, and two new Global Compacts on: 1) refugees; and 2) safe, orderly and regular migration, 2016 was a year that showed not only a willingness to come together and discuss global migration and refugee governance systems, but also an understanding on the urgency to address this.

However, while the initiatives are there, some issues remain. The link between environment and cross-border displacement continues to be complex. While refugees are treated according to a number of legally binding international treaties, the status of cross-border displacement due to disasters suffers from a normative gap. In most cases those people do not classify as refugees under the international refugee law, neither can they be considered IDPs once they have crossed an international border. Without regional and international agreements, critical rights such as humanitarian assistance and protection, remain threatened (IPI, 2015). Furthermore, distinguishing criteria between ‘forced’ and ’voluntary’ movement are yet to be elaborated, and the categorisation between ‘migrant’ or ‘refugee’ remains vague, which is partly due to the difficulty in measuring and identifying underlying factors for population movement (Ginnetti, 2015).

Lastly, as disasters exacerbate pre-existing vulnerabilities, initiatives on the ground are necessary. The principles of Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) address the challenges by building adaptive capacities, enhancing people’s resilience and coping mechanisms and thus avoiding cross-border displacement. However, the linkages between disaster displacement, its drivers and disaster risk reduction seems rather underrepresented in existing research.
Approaching displacement through the lens of risk-governance could not only help to identify and reduce the drivers of displacement, but further facilitate more readiness, preparedness and coherence in preparing for future disasters.

As such, the underlying assumption of this research is that cross-border displacement in the context of sudden-onset disasters is not adequately addressed in institutional and operational protection frameworks (Black, 2001; Cohen and Bradley, 2010; Gemenne, 2015). By not integrating the risk for displacement following disasters and climate change into planning processes, this ultimately leads to ad-hoc responses and does not build resilience (Warner et al., 2014). Therefore, the research aim of this thesis is to;

“Investigate how trans-boundary and regional cooperation could potentially play a role in mitigating displacement risk in the country of origin or within regions.”

The research has four key objectives:

1. Investigate the conceptual understanding of displacement, refugees and migrants, in the context of cross-border disaster displacement.
2. Identify existing displacement agreements and frameworks and assess their institutional and operational gaps, or limitations, in facilitating resilience and preparedness for sudden-onset disasters.
3. Investigate the trans-boundary willingness to address the phenomena of disaster displacement collaboratively.
4. Assess which disaster risk reduction measures can reduce the risk for displacement, and develop a set of recommendations based on these.

The novelty of current research builds on the protection gap in addressing displacement risk, while acknowledging a bulk of literature on the topic. In order to achieve the four objectives, the research is structured around two dominating doctrines in the mitigation and preparedness for disaster displacement, namely a protection and policy approach and a risk-reduction approach. While it is very difficult, if not impossible, to attribute a clear-cut separation when determining when movement is triggered by climate change and when it is triggered by other environmental factors or hazards, this research covers disaster-induced displacement rather than environmental or climate induced displacement.
Research Methodology

The research is conducted using a triangulation method of data sources. In order to capture different dimensions of the topic the methodology comprises a collection of secondary data such as key literature and two sets of primary data, consisting of quantitative questionnaires and qualitative interviews. This multi-method approach allows for cross-referencing of evidence and to maximise the understanding of the research question and objectives in place (Valentine, 2005). The different data collection methods will be explained in more detail in this chapter, together with specific consideration taken, how the analysis and interpretation of the data was undertaken and finally what limitations the research faced.

2.1 Data Collection

2.1.1 Secondary data collection

A desk-based study and secondary data collection was done in order to identify and articulate a conceptual understanding of how different concepts, definitions and terminologies are used and practiced. Furthermore, existing protection frameworks were assessed in order to identify gaps or limitations. Search engines, such as the Lund University Libraries “LUBsearch” and “Lovisa” were used, as well as “Google scholar”, “Mendeley” and “Researchgate”. The secondary data sources include academic articles and literature, publications and books, and aims to cover literature published between 2012-2017 and key words were ‘disaster displacement’, ‘cross-border displacement’, and ‘displacement due to sudden-onset disasters’.

2.1.2 Primary data collection

Primary data was collected through fourteen semi-structured interviews and a parallel online questionnaire which received nineteen responses. The reasoning for doing both qualitative and quantitative data collection was to expand the common conceptual understanding and perception of key concepts, to get a sense of the trans-boundary willingness to collaborate between relevant actors, and to understand how different initiatives were operationalised in the context of risk reduction. Additionally, the online questionnaire allowed for a broader outreach and is a great method to supplement qualitative data.
a) Semi-structured interviews

Semi-structured interviews allow respondents to articulate and provide the information he/she finds most appropriate and are thus a very dynamic and flexible data collection method. Allowing the respondents to shape the direction of the interview is essential in an exploratory study, as it gives an opportunity to get expert knowledge, descriptions of processes, experience and opinions. It furthermore provides more wide-ranging and multi-layered discussions (Harrell and Bradley, 2009). Seven interviews were done through Skype and seven face-to-face at the HQ in Geneva. The target group was international professionals and researchers in the field of displacement and migration, and DRR and CCA. A list of guiding questions was used in order to keep the conversation on track, and to ensure that the discussions followed the set of research objectives. The questions were divided into four main topics following the structure of the research objectives. A conceptual understanding of central terms and limitations and possibilities in protection framework policy were used as opening themes and in order to establish a baseline on common understandings. Secondly, constraints and enabling factors in trans-boundary cooperation and the operationalisation of DRR for mitigation, prevention or adaptation of disaster displacement was used to build a bridge between theory and practise.

By using a judgment sampling method (Harrell and Bradley, 2009), five key respondents were selected based on their role, their experience and affiliation. All fourteen interviews were analysed and interpreted equally and the function of having key respondents was in order to have a baseline and better organise the data in case there was a duplication of information or sources later on. The key respondents include; the former Head of the Secretariat of the Nansen Initiative, the Head of Data and Analysis from the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC), Program Officer at the Migration, Environmental and Climate Change Division at the International Organisation for Migration (IOM), the Disaster Displacement Officer from the United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR) and Senior Advisor on Disasters and Climate from the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC). The rest of the respondents were professionals and researchers from International Organisation for Migration (IOM), the International Labour Organisation (ILO), the Swedish Civil Contingency Agency (MSB), the International Centre for Climate Change and Development (ICCCAD), the Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). All interviews were recorded (after permission) and transcribed in order to fully capture the data input. The specific quotes of the interviewees will be anonymous. Appendix 2 shows a detailed overview of themes and the full interview guide is presented.
b) Questionnaires

The second, primary dataset was a questionnaire run in parallel with the interviews. According to David Simon (2006) a questionnaire is a simple tool for collecting information and can be used to compare or understand behaviours and attitudes, as well as providing baseline information. The intention of this questionnaire was to get quantitative information of the conceptual understanding in relation to the central themes, and to gain an understanding of the perceived willingness between relevant actors to collaborate. The questionnaire was also used to establish a picture of what facilitates or limits successful collaboration and to provide an anonymous space for respondents to articulate opinions and attitudes.

The online questionnaire was developed using “Typeform.com” which is an online survey system. It was designed by using a semi-structured method which “(..) combines some structured questions to obtain basic information with others that permit more flexible answers to convey ideas or perceptions in an open-ended manner” (Simon, 2006, pp. 166). The closed questions were organized through yes/no questions, rating scales (no knowledge/somewhat/expert), numerical scales (“tick the appropriate answer”), attitudinal and opinion choices (“please indicate your stand towards..”) and multiple choice. In places were respondents were allowed to freely articulate an opinion or understanding (such as the comment section), a word limit was enabled to avoid data saturation and difficulties in later quantification and analysis. The designed questions were based on findings from literature and formulated in synergy with the interview guide. Appendix 4 illustrates a detailed overview of the questions and themes as well as a cover note for the research.

The target group was identified as professional and experts in the field of ‘displacement in the context of disasters’, and with ‘specific knowledge in regard to international protection frameworks’. For information regarding the respondent of the questionnaire, please see Appendix 4. This was addressed already on the front page of the questionnaire link to ensure relevance and quality sampling. The questionnaire was then shared in relevant LinkedIn groups, distributed between relevant contact persons and professionals. It was posted consistently every week for four weeks, to ensure continuous attention as well as the chance to create a snowball effect. As some of the groups have more than 20,000 members, it is impossible to estimate how many people came across the questionnaire. Appendix 5 illustrates the process matrix for the quantitative data collection.
As questionnaires are known to be a less interactive research method than interviews, some specific considerations were necessary to keep in mind during, prior and after the study, to avoid response errors (Flowerdew, 2006). This was approached in the following ways:

- **Providing transparency** to the responders, by giving a proper introduction to the study, the purpose of the study, contact details and information on how the responses would be used and organised. As the sampling size was always anticipated to be relatively small (between 10-20 responses), this allowed for all responses to be undertaken personally, which ensured familiarity with the whole sample and further ensured that the data could be respected by using a strictly confidential policy.

- **Cultural sensitivity** meaning that the questions were formulated carefully so that no political, ethnic, religious or cultural content was present, and no power or wealth related topics were included. To ensure this, the responders were provided with an option to withdraw from the questionnaire at any time, skip sections, or select the option “prefer not to answer” whenever that felt relevant.

- **Language and interpretations** meaning that wherever possible, direct linkages between literature and official definitions and formulations were used, so that the respondents were not met by foreign concepts or unknown and abstract formulations. For that same reason, the language used in the questionnaire was kept in English.

- **Piloting** was done prior to the official launch of the questionnaire with a selected group of individuals (7 respondents). This was done to ensure that there were no interpretation difficulties, that the questions were not ambiguous, multi-parted, biased, negative / or double-negative, and that there was no technical phrases or jargon (Simon, 2006). The responses given during the pilot testing were afterwards removed from the full batch in order to keep the sample relevant and complete, and are therefore not part of the final sampling results.

### 2.2 Data Analysis

The analysis was done in two steps, and the primary datasets were treated separately.

The analysis and interpretation of the interviews was conducted by firstly transcribing the interviews with the use of a software and secondly organising the responses according to the four identified main themes. An inductive open-coding method was used to extract the outputs. The categorisation of responses was done by manually colour tagging the four main themes and furthermore by identifying sub-themes based on patterns and repetitions in responses. The outputs where organized in an excel spreadsheet and supplemented by manually tracking key terms, concepts, notions and key statements using the adobe search tool and the excel filtering function.
Furthermore, a separate matrix was developed, in order to get a visual picture of frequent responses and to better quantify patterns. Appendix 3 illustrates the open-coding method and matrix. The questionnaire analysis was done by calculating the percentage of selected options, based on the total amount of responses. On some occasions table and pie charts have been developed in order to visualize and present the results.

2.3 Limitations

The field of “environmental/climate refugees”, “environmental/climate migrants” and “disaster displacement / disaster-induced cross-border displacement” is a huge topic and subject to active debates. The conventional definitions are open to a variety of interpretations and it quickly became evident that the terminology is met with significant controversy. Therefore, the findings are approached with a certain level of sensitivity and awareness that different people might have a different conceptual understanding and are thus giving different responses. The research objective for investigating the conceptual understanding was intended to mitigate this issue by building a common understanding, and ensuring the target group was well-defined. In some cases, it succeeded, in others disparity still remains. Furthermore, in hindsight some of the data collection questions could have been formulated differently, especially in terms of consistency for what entails climate-induced displacement and disaster-induced displacement. This realisation was arrived to as a result of the increase in knowledge and understanding of the field of study. Anticipating this could only have been partly possible, but acknowledging some miscommunication is important when interpreting the data.

Due to time and capacity constraints, plus the general scope and purpose of the research delimitations were made in terms of focusing only on displacement due to sudden-onset disasters. Gradual and slow-onset disasters are in this research covered to a minimal extent and only where necessary. This affects the findings in the sense that gradual and slow-onset disasters such as; sea-level rise, land degradation and erosion, often need a different programmatic and policy approach and considerations, than sudden-onset disasters do. The recommendations are however still considered widely applicable, yet a certain level of context sensitivity must be applied.

As the research is concerning cross-border displacement, internally displaced persons (IDPs) are not covered. The legal aspects of refugees and IDPs are identified and used in order to understand the criteria that apply in the context of climatic disasters, but are not further elaborated.
The focus was put on inter-governmental agencies as the access to information from local organisations and communities was expected to be limited. This was compromised by ensuring that one of the key respondents was an NGO and that people with relevant programmatic background and connection to local communities were interviewed, so that a certain degree of operational practice could be included.
Conceptual Framework

This chapter follows the two dominating doctrines in the mitigation and preparedness for disaster displacement, namely a protection and policy approach and a risk-reduction approach. First, an understanding of conceptual disparity and the applicability of existing protection frameworks will be investigated, in the context of cross-border disaster displacement. Secondly, the interrelations between displacement and disaster risk will be identified. Lastly, the role of disaster risk reduction in mitigating, preventing and adapting to displacement will be described.

3.1 Protection Frameworks

In this section, the international protection frameworks will be investigated. The complex linkages between existing protection frameworks and their applicability for cross-border displacement in the context of disasters and climate change will be presented.

3.1.1 Applicable Protection Frameworks

When Essam El-Hinnawi first came up with the definition of “environmental refugee” in 1985, it was used to describe people displaced by environmental impacts (Maldonado, 2012). Despite the intentions of the term being an attempt to create an internationally recognised definition for those individuals (Morinière, 2009) it was met with much dispute. While some argue that climate can displace people across borders, expanding the ‘1951 Convention’ into fitting this category of individuals was the first initial thought (Lazarus, 1981; El-Hinnawi 1985; Myers, 1996). Today other scholars argue that the status of refugees could become diluted if the definition was expanded and are thus suggesting new legal frameworks (Biermann & Boas 2008; Conisbee & Simms, 2003; Docherty & Giannini, 2009). A third group argue that this conceptualisation itself is counter-productive, vaguely defined and impossible to quantify, due to the emphasis put on environment as a push-factor, which “places the blame on the biophysical world (...) homogenizes the displaced population and takes away human responsibility” (Black, 2001; Boano et al., 2007; Oliver-Smith and Shen, 2009 in Maldonado, 2012 pp. 84). The statement imposes that environment as a driver is an oversimplification for why people become displaced or choose to migrate (Bates, 2002). However, today, two decades later, there is still no consensus on definitions in this field of study, let alone any legal protection standards that can ensure that humanitarian needs for assistance and protection for this group of people are met (Gemenne, 2015; Maldonado, 2012; Wilkinson et al., 2016).
The first way of categorising population movement was when the ‘1951 Convention’ was developed as a result of the large influx of refugees during and after the Second World War and in its conventional definition, a refugee is any person who:

“owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country” (Article 1A Refugee Convention).

The 1951 Convention and its amendment the ‘1967 Protocol’ have set the benchmark for supplementing regional protection frameworks, such as the ‘1974 OUA Refugee Convention’, the ‘1984 Cartagena Declaration’, and the development of a common asylum system in the European Union. It remains the only global instrument and hard law dealing with the status and rights of refugees (UNHCR, 2011). In 1998, the UN Commission on human rights set out to fill its grey areas and gaps especially for people internally displaced and this resulted in the ‘1998 Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement’ (UNHCR, 1998) which is the second categorisation of human mobility.

The sheer purpose of international refugee law is to protect the rights of those who cannot return to their home of origin. But the crucial difference between the GPID and the 1951 Convention, is that individuals forcibly displaced from their homes, without having crossed a border, are not considered refugees but internally displaced (Durieux, 2017). Secondly, refugees are categorised according to the elements of persecution. Although IDPs might flee due to similar causes, they may in contrast also be displaced by “natural or human-made disasters”. Moreover, whereas the status of a refugee ends when he or she returns to their home country or integrate into their host countries, there is no absolute consensus of when displacement ends (Ginnetti, 2015).

---

1 It later influenced the development of the 2012 Kampala Convention, which is the first legally binding instrument that covers both elements of persecution as well as disasters.
2 Applying to the Latin American context.
3 Also referred as GPID. In that an internally displaced person is defined as; “persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognised State border” (UNHCR, 1998).
4 This element of environment has proved significant when debating on new legal instrument or amendments of existing ones.
A third way of categorising population movement, is migration. While both the convention and the GPID are based on the principles of forced movement, migration is considered as voluntary of nature, and comprising an element of choice. However, the differences are agitated and the discrepancies between forced or voluntary are complex, interlaced, and at times even overlapping (IOM, 2014).  

Hence, what the literature illustrates is that there is a dispute in both how to label individuals externally displaced due to disasters, and to know to which international framework they belong. Based on humanitarian law, human right principles must underpin all humanitarian action and follow a rights-based approach. Additionally, States hold the first of foremost responsibility to protect their citizens. Yet international protection regimes continue to exclude or fail to focus on environmentally displaced persons (Cohen and Bradley, 2010) and there is an imminent need for a framework that can ensure protection of those individuals. Moreover, as Moncrieffe and Eyben (2004) argues there is a need for proper categorisation as “labels are important, because they impose boundaries and define categories” (in Maldonado, 2012 p. 84). Without those, people forcibly displaced across borders due to disasters, will continue to land in a legal limbo where no specific formation frameworks are in place to tailor their needs or protection (Kālin, 2017).

Taking the disparity into consideration, simplification and consistency on terminology has been necessary for the purpose of this research. IDMC (2015) defines displacement as something that includes all forced population movements, regardless of time (short term or long term) and distance (internal or cross-border). Furthermore, IOM’s (2014) working definition on environmental migrants also includes an element of forcible displacement resulting from the impacts of a disaster situation. People forcibly displaced by disasters across borders, will therefore be referred to as ‘cross-border’ or ‘externally disaster displaced’. Whenever an element of choice is present, they will be referred as ‘environmental migrants’.

3.1.2 Closing the Policy Gap

Various suggestions have been made for how the protection frameworks can accommodate people forcibly displaced by disasters. Literature regarding the legal aspects strongly suggests three main changes in legal and institutional frameworks.

---

5 IOM modified El-Hinnawi’s definition of “environmental refugee” and came up with the term, ‘environmental migrant’, which is a person / groups of persons who are obliged to leave their homes both on a temporary or permanent base, due to progressive changes in the environment that threatens their lives or livelihoods and who move either internally or across borders (Brown, 2007; IOM, 2014).
These include, to expand the conventional definition in regard to environment, climate or disasters as a part of persecution, to create a separate protocol, or to create a new legal instrument (Docherty & Giannini, 2009). At the same time, it is also evident that those suggestions hold a lot of obstacles. First of all, they initially require a large body of decision-makers, political will, time and resources. Furthermore, Zetter (2011) argues that the international environment is constantly changing, making it even more challenging to establish long lasting solutions. Thirdly, there is a fear that the status of current refugees, according to the ‘1951 Convention’, could risk becoming diluted. Although the GDIP have served as a potential model for amendments on several occasions, expanding this instrument could likewise risk that IDPs would be left aside and their rights run the risk of implosion (Sgro, 2009).

A second suggestion involves that of creating a new specifically tailored international convention which recognises asylum obtained from environmental causes (Sgro, 2009). This would be done in order to allow for more cross-border mobility.

A third suggestion, is to go through regional frameworks and follow a state-led and bottom up approach. This was suggested by the Nansen Initiative⁶ and has been accepted by well over 120 nations. The principle involves cooperation between relevant stakeholders, interested states and regions and comprises both the protection and risk reduction approach (the Nansen Initiative, 2015).

The last suggestion, has been to include a global governance protocol to the UNFCCC on climate forced migration and approach the issue of disaster displacement from a CCA perspective (Gibb and Ford, 2012). This suggestion is receiving both criticism and appraisals. Some of the counter-arguments for including it into the CCA perspective, is that hazards such as earthquakes or volcanic eruptions are not directly influenced by climate change but can still cause large displacements. Secondly, the UNFCCC was initially developed based on other incentives, such as reducing GHGs and including displacement and migration into the CCA jargon, can therefore seem arbitrary.

The protection approach and various policies have been presented and it is acknowledged that the extent and scope of protection issues in regard to displacement is immense. Due to issues of research scope, the research will establish a baseline for understanding and solely analyse the most imperative recommendations.

⁶ Later modified into the Platform on Disaster Displacement and the Protection of Cross-Border Displaced Persons in the Context of Disasters and Climate Change - also known as the Protection Agenda.
3.2 Identifying the Drivers

In this section, key terms and definitions regarding disaster, risk and displacement will be introduced. In order to fully grasp how disaster can lead to displacement, a multi-causal understanding of population movement is stressed.

3.2.1 Disaster Risk

There is no doubt that the future holds an increase in frequency, intensity and unpredictability of future sudden-onset hazards and disasters (IDMC, 2015). It is also acknowledged, that this increase of disasters will mean that a rising number of people for one reason or the other will become displaced or will choose to migrate (IPCC, 2014). According to IDMC’s historical displacement model (Ginnetti, 2015), the annual global displacement figures have quadrupled over the past four decades. Even though population growth accounts for some of this upsurge in displacement, the risk of displacement is estimated to increase twice as fast as the world’s population is growing. Disaster displacement is therefore likely to become both more frequent, and permanent (IDMC, 2015).

Nevertheless, displacement cannot be perceived as a mono-causal thing, and in order to fully understand and grasp the drivers of displacement, one must first unpack the fundamental constitutions of a “disaster”. As defined by UNISDR (2009, pp 9) a disaster is a “serious disruption of the functioning of a community or a society involving widespread human, material, economic or environmental losses and impacts, which exceeds the ability of the affected community or society to cope using its own resources”. Three components are to be paid attention to, being, a disaster disrupts the functioning of a community, it causes loss and impact, and exceeds the affected communities’ abilities to cope.

The combination of the probability of an event and its negative consequences are defined as risk, and all risks are determined by values one wishes to protect, such as home. As Becker (2014) argues, all definitions of risk must explicitly or implicitly entail the uncertainties of what could happen, how likely is it to happen and what the consequences would be. Therefore, risk must be grasped in relation to a preferred expected outcome. Thus, to mitigate risks we have to analyse the current situation, define a preferred expected scenario, analyse potential deviations from the preferred scenario and design and implement a set of activities to maintain the development trajectory along this preferred expected scenario (Becker 2014; Hassel & Abrahamsson 2015; Tehler, 2015). For example, in the context of displacement, the disaster risk is (among others) the loss of home.
The full understanding of disaster risk therefore reflects the concept of disasters and the outcomes of risk as “the potential disaster losses, in lives, health, status, livelihoods, assets and services, which could occur to a particular community or society over some specified future time period” (UNISDR, 2009, pp 9) and can be measured in the following way:

Risk = Hazard x Exposure x Vulnerability (Ginnetti, 2015)

Hazard in this context is a variety of geological and meteorological events, caused both by natural occurrences as well as human activity and may cause loss of life, injury or other health impacts. Exposure should be understood as the number of people or types of assets in an area that are subject to potential losses (UNISDR, 2009). Vulnerability on the other hand, is more dynamic term that involves “the characteristics and circumstances of a community, system or asset that make it susceptible to the damaging effects of a hazard” (UNISDR, 2009, pp 30). This susceptibility is the most difficult of the three components of disaster risk to measure (Ginnetti, 2015) as vulnerability often constitutes complex social systems and the enabling environment, making it difficult to track and quantify all factors that ultimately define someone being beyond the capacity to respond (Coppola, 2011). Hence, disaster risk is a relationship between different causal factors and should be understood as a human-environment system in its full capacity. How the given risk factors are able to be revealed, affects the way that the disaster will manifest, and identifying the drivers of risk is crucial in order to address ways in how they can be reduced.

3.2.2 Displacement Risk

As stated by IDMC (Ginnetti, 2015, pp 8), “displacement includes all forced population movements resulting from the immediate threat or actual impacts of a disaster situation regardless of the length of time displaced, distance moved from place of origin and subsequent patterns of movement, including back in the place of origin or re-settlement elsewhere”.

Furthermore, displacement is considered as a direct impact of disaster, as it is the damaging consequences and exposure to hazards that ultimately necessitates people to leave their homes (Ginnetti, 2015; IOM; 2010). With increasing frequency and magnitude of disaster occurrences, some places could become difficult to reside in, and in such cases migration and displacement could become permanent. Therefore, many of the measures aimed at reducing disaster risk will in general also ultimately reduce the risk of displacement. The basic risk equation can therefore be transferred as a displacement risk equation:

Displacement risk = Hazard x Exposure x Vulnerability (Ginnetti, 2015)
The reason why displacement is so multi-causal, is the fact that underlying risk drivers, are constructed in multi-layers of interrelated factors. Territorial and environmental challenges, socially constructed problems and skewed development such as poverty, inequality and ill-adapted societies can both exacerbate existing vulnerabilities, be the cause of vulnerabilities as well as being a direct consequence (UNISDR, 2015). The accumulation of disaster risk and disaster loss should therefore be reflected in operation of various drivers and an understanding of different levels of vulnerability of different people and groups is necessary (UNISDR, 2015).

Nevertheless, newer trends illustrate a clear tendency in addressing root causes and understanding how the inclusion of systemic factors influencing vulnerability in program management can reduce disaster risk and vice-versa (IOM, 2010). In a special report, the IPCC concluded this and stated that disaster risk is in fact determined by exposure and vulnerability, and that risk therefore needs to be identified and mitigated in order to reduce vulnerability (IPCC, 2014).

This re-conceptualisation of disasters signifies a shift from what Ginnetti states as a “retrospective, post-disaster approach to an anticipatory way of thinking about and confronting disasters” (Ginnetti, 2015, pp 8). By acknowledging that humans have the ability to act and the power to change things, that also means that we have a potential to promote tools that reduces risks before they unfold into disasters, such as DRR. Ultimately, the understanding of how vulnerability and other tipping points can trigger displacement, can help to promote these synergies between DRR and the integration of development initiatives (IPCC, 2014). By coordinating efforts and establishing coherent standards and objectives, we can take advantage of the momentum of population movement and make the necessary first steps to implement better resilience of individuals and preparedness for dealing with future disasters and consequently, displacement (IPCC, 2014).
3.3 Disaster Risk Management in the Context of Displacement

This final section, comprises the disaster risk management principles of mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery, and introduces the commodities of DRR. The risk reduction approach is used as a benchmark for operationalising the reduction of displacement risk.

3.3.1 From Emergency Management to Disaster Risk Reduction

UNISDR, defines disaster risk management (DRM) as: “the systematic process of using administrative directives, organisations, and operational skills and capacities to implement strategies, policies and improved coping capacities in order to lessen the adverse impacts of hazards and the possibility of disaster” (UNISDR, 2009, pp 10).

However, DRM as we know it today, did not emerge overnight. It is the product of a number of international agreements and policy frameworks evolving over decades, guiding global and national initiatives to reduce disaster losses (UNDRO 1980, in UNISDR, 2015). Yet the magnitude and level of political interest that followed after the disaster in the Indian Ocean, is considered to have spurred the finalisation and adaptation of the Hyogo Framework for Action: 2005-2015 (UNISDR, 2015)\(^7\).

The way emergencies have traditionally been responded to, has to a large extent set the structure for today’s doctrine and dogma in disaster management. However, at a certain point it became clear that emergency management was in fact only one component of a much broader approach also including risk reduction, recovery and re-building after the disasters (Coppola, 2011). What was considered as the turning point of the first reform on DRM, came when Nevada del Ruiz Volcano erupted in Colombia in 1985 that killed 20,000 people. The government had warned the population, but was faulted by failures in risk identification, early warning, preparedness, evacuation and response (Zeiderman and Ramirez Elizalde, 2010 in UNISDR, 2015).

\(^7\) With its 5 top priorities, the HFA emphasises that the reduction of vulnerabilities and the strengthening of resilience of nations and communities should be done through prevention, preparedness, response and recovery and that DRR should be integrated with sustainable development.
The National System for Disaster Prevention and Response was founded as a result, and introduced the risk governance model. DRM, and later DRR, has since been embraced and adopted as a policy goal and incorporated into the country’s civil defence organisation (Coppola, 2011 and UNISDR 2015).

According to the resulting disaster management cycle, four functions for comprehensive disaster management have been presented⁸. Mitigation and preparedness involve reducing the likelihoods of hazard or consequences and equipping people to cope prior to the event, whereas response and recovery are the functions occurring post disaster and aim to reduce the impacts and return victims’ lives back to normal (Alexander, 2002, in Coppola, 2011). While DRM represents the complete architecture in managing disasters, DRR stems from specific risk considerations and is used to look beyond the emergency function through a comprehensive risk reduction approach and recognition of the ongoing nature and driver of risks⁹ (UNISDR, 2015). DRM and DRR are often used interchangeably, but despite their similarities they do hold significant differences as they have emerged from different contexts.

3.3.2 Commodities of DRR
Since the 1990s, the DRM sector has increased by two orders of magnitude grown in both size and salience. But with the syncretic evolution of the sector and an increase of smaller-scale extensive events, cracks and fissures have been revealed in the way DRM has been approached, which for a number of reasons has not been effective in addressing DRR (UNISDR, 2015, pp 120). Latest reviews of the HFA progress shed some light on a “divorce between discourse and practice and a continued focus on disaster management and corrective risk management rather than on addressing underlying risk drivers” (UNISDR, 2015 pp 121). In the case of displacement, this notion of understanding the correlation between risk drivers and risk reduction is paradigmatic.

The reason is that DRR can bridge general disaster management with longstanding development efforts such as sustainable development, targeting poverty reduction, ecosystem decline, weak governance and other official development plans addressed as the MDGs.

---

⁸ See Appendix 1 for a graphic representation
⁹ Disaster risk reduction is defined as: “concept and practice of reducing disaster risks through systematic efforts to analyze and manage the causal factors of disasters, including through reduced exposure to hazards, lessened vulnerability of people and property, wise management of land and the environment, and improved preparedness for adverse events” (UNISDR, 2009).
Investing in the post-crisis phase is known as the “window of opportunity” (Humanitarian Practice Network, 2017), as communities, authorities and different funding mechanisms often have a desire and motivation to “build back better” while the disaster is still on everyone’s radar (Kellet and Peters, 2014). The better the humanitarian community is at identifying crisis and the needs for mobilisation, the more timely, effective and sustainable the assistance and protection will be.

Thus, by taking appropriate DRR measures, displacement could potentially be avoided or mitigated. Displacement risk can be reduced through systematic efforts in analysing, measuring and tracking risk factors through comprehensive risk assessments, contingency planning and by reducing the impacts of hazards, through wise land and environmental management and hazard proofing riverbanks and locations prone to landslides or floods. Capacitating people in adequately following building standards and avoiding locating on vulnerable lands can lessen the vulnerabilities towards earthquakes and storms (Wamsler, 2014). Finally, by promoting risk awareness, educating the population and introducing stock piling, evacuation routes and shelters, the risk of trapped populations would be reduced. DRR activities can furthermore facilitate and the return, relocation or integration of the affected displaced populations and the empowerment of people to resist, absorb and recover from shocks (IOM, 2010).

Initially these are just some of a wider range of preparedness measures that could ultimately lessen vulnerability of people and property, and close the gap between development initiatives and the humanitarian response. This research does not deal with which measures that potentially would be more positive than others, but solely acknowledges the importance of them.

3.4. Summary

To summarise, main existing protection frameworks have been presented, and legal and conceptual gaps for cross-border displacement in the context of disaster have been identified. Various suggestions for closing these gaps have been mentioned. The multi-causal nature of disaster risk was addressed as a composition between hazard, exposure and vulnerabilities. As displacement is considered an impact of a disaster, disaster risk and displacement risk can hence relate to the same factors and be treated according to the same risk equation. Furthermore, the nature of disaster risk management has been presented. While DRM is the broader process encompassing various functions, the emerging functions of DRR are tailored at addressing root causes and reducing underlying risk factors and existing vulnerabilities. Hence, the presented policy approach, the risk reduction approach and the multiple-drivers for displacement, is what introduces and guides the interpretation and analysis of collected data.
Results and Discussion

This chapter is structured in four sections in which the respondents’ conceptual understanding of the key terminology, gaps and limitations in institutional and operational protection frameworks, and the trans-boundary willingness to address the issues collaboratively is analysed and discussed. Mitigation and preparedness strategies for displacement will be analysed by applying the principles of DRM, mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery.

4.1 The Conceptual Understandings of Population Movement

In this section, the conceptual understanding will be addressed and the findings will be discussed. The approach is to firstly present the quantitative data resulting from the questionnaire and thereafter the qualitative input of the interviews. By the end of the section all findings will be summarised and discussed.

4.1.1 Refugee, displaced person or migrant?

When investigating the conceptual understanding of ‘displacement’ and ‘refugee’ the questionnaire respondents were asked to mark their general understanding of central terms, by choosing the option that correlated the most to their personal understanding. The responses showed several discrepancies, presented as two pie charts, Figure 1 and Figure 2. While 88 percent of the respondents selected ‘refugee’ as someone equivalent to the official ‘1951 definition’, only 68 percent consider ‘a displaced person’ in compliance to the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement.

![Figure 1. Quantitative Dataset: Refugee](image1)

![Figure 2. Quantitative Dataset: Displacement](image2)
The qualitative data displays a similar image, where 100 percent of the respondents connected the term ‘refugee’ to a “specific category” and/or “legal standards”. Furthermore, one-fourth articulated that a refugee is defined as a person who must have crossed an international border and not because of climate or environment reasons. However, one respondent noted that “you have kind of the legal and then you have the common understanding” expressing different public meanings besides its legal character. Nevertheless, what was clear was that while every refugee is considered a displaced person, not every displaced person can be a refugee. One key respondents stressed this, by stating,

“I think, my problem is that there is a notion that there are refugees on one side and then everyone else is a migrant, and I think that this is both empirically and conceptually problematic (..) These are very contested concepts and there is very little agreement”.

When the respondents had to describe the term ‘displacement’, the picture was less consistent. The most significant disparity was between one-third of the respondents stating that “displacement is a concept that is used for all types of forced movement of people”, and one-third affirming that displacement is “mostly internal”. One respondent stated that a displaced person is “someone who moves from their home”. Another connotation for displacement was “leaving in anticipation of a risk”, which was confirmed by one-fourth of the respondents. This type of movement includes evacuation, shelter and “displacement as a life-saving measure”. Additionally, the notion that most displacement starts internally but can become cross-border was present. This was argued as impetus for having a “focus on the ground” rather than looking externally, as IDPs and “trapped populations” were argued as a catalyst for potential cross-border displacement. Only two respondents made direct linkages with the GPIID and one respondent noted;

“I do not think there is any definition. I think different agencies and different experts have viewed this within different contexts so it is quite a broad question and I am not sure exactly how to answer it”.

What two-thirds of the respondents articulated as a source for conceptual disparity, was the obscure boundaries between ‘forced’ or ‘voluntary’ and to what extent an ‘element of choice’ drives migration or displacement. One respondent explains that “when migration becomes forced we call it displacement”, expressing that displacement and migration carry complementary characteristics as both concepts comprise short and long-term considerations of where the best options for well-being might be.
95 percent of the respondents in the quantitative dataset, and 100 percent in the qualitative dataset, agreed that the dimension of climate influences people’s decision to move. The quantitative data is displayed in Figure 3. However, they also agreed that presenting climate as a driver was problematic, as climate is context specific and difficult to unpack. One respondent stated that “what climate change does is it affects a person’s livelihood so when the person affected cannot sustain his traditional livelihood he tries to look for other options. When he fails he tries to migrate. Then he becomes an economic migrant”.

![Bar chart](image)

**Do you see a clear link between the impact of climate change and the number of people being displaced?**

- Yes: 95%
- No: 0%
- Don’t know: 5%

Differentiating between ‘economic migrant’ and ‘climate migrant’ proved even more arbitrary and the way those terms were used amongst the professionals varied greatly. Whereas some expressed a certain level of confidence by categorising people as climate or environmental migrants, others articulated that presenting one as a climate migrant would be a complete failure of understanding the full range of drivers, interrelations and factors that influence movement. As argued by a respondent, “it is hard to distinguish that the person X is a migrant for economic reasons and this person Y is a migrant for climate reasons” as the reason for why people decide to move is multifaceted so “if you said that there is a ‘climate induced migrant’ out there, you will probably get into some trouble trying to find that climate induced migrant”. Furthermore, it was emphasised that some individuals might not even themselves be fully aware of multi-causal nature of their movement, but will simply say that they could not sustain their livelihoods, or that they lost their home, “he would not say that this is due to climate change, maybe the person does not even understand climate change. But it was climate change that affected his or her livelihood and ultimately led to migration”.

Figure 3. Quantitative Dataset: Climate Change Linkages
4.1.2 A controversial conceptualisation

The questionnaire respondents were further asked to mark their attitude and opinion toward the term ‘environmental refugee’. As Figure 4 shows, the majority does not acknowledge that there is a group of people that can be identified as such. One respondent stated in the comment section that “it can serve as a kind of shorthand that lay people understand, but from a legal and research perspective it is not that useful”.

The qualitative data complimented these notions. While ‘environmental refugee’ is a useful term to make people understand the phenomena, it can be counter-productive in other circumstances and is rarely applicable. 80 percent of the respondents expressed reluctance to use it, and one even referred to it as “banned from their vocabulary”. One key respondent argued that the term is not only inaccurate, but can also be directly misleading, “when people talk about climate refugees they think about people coming from Africa to Europe basically which is not a very good reality. They basically stay in their country most of the time and if they move, they move within neighbouring countries”. What two-thirds did agree on however, was that the term proved useful in fuelling the interest of research and policy-makers, and for raising awareness of the issue. Furthermore, it was articulated that it is a clear term that most people can understand without having to dive into literature and policy frameworks. One key respondent emphasised the ambiguity by stating that,

“This is such a complex territory and people are using it interchangeably. People are not very clear when they say migration, what are they really referring to, when they say displacement, what is that? When they say refugees what are they referring to? And there is no agreement.”
4.1.3 Synthesis: Power dynamics in shaping terminology

When analysing these findings, it was revealed that while the term ‘refugee’ is more or less set in stone, ‘cross-border displacement’ is connected to a high degree of terminological ambiguity. The refugee convention is a long-standing protection engine, and it is therefore no surprise that it seems rather easy to categorise a person hereafter. However, displacement is a phenomenon highly driven by complex and interrelated factors for voluntary versus forced movement, internal versus external, and permanent versus temporary. Hence, it is difficult to categorise this group of individuals accordingly (Gemenne, 2015). For instance, if a hurricane temporarily displaced people to shelter homes, they will still be accounted for as displaced – although the displacement was a life-saving measure (Ginnetti, 2015). In this particular context, it therefore might seem arbitrary to refer to displacement as something that should be prevented. On a contrary note, if people are forced to leave their homes in order to save their lives, is it then not a loss, which cannot be considered a positive adaptation measure. These are just two examples of how it can be difficult to classify displacement and what it entails.

Subsequently, as argued by Dun and Gemenne (2008) attempts to justify environment as a push-factor might have caused an even wider divide between disciplines. By taking on an environmental determinist perspective early on (Maldonado, 2012), the multitude of stressors in population flows have not been recognised in displacement strategies, and the development of appropriate terminology and policies has been delayed. On that same token, refugees and migrants continue to be perceived as something negative in public opinion and the media. That is why appropriate labels are important. Not only because there is a need to classify and quantify people in order to protect them, but secondly because labelling reflects power relations and the way that this category of individuals will be perceived and approached is very dependent on the way they are portrayed (Maldonado, 2012). While terminologies have to be fixed at the very beginning in order to properly assign a particular categorisation of the individuals, conceptualisation is more than that. Conceptualisation is about building a shared understanding between disciplines, decision-makers and beneficiaries, and make them come together to shape a context-specific consensus that reflects the actual reality on the ground, while removing the notion of “us” and “them”.

---

10 Newer attempts of addressing displacement risk has been approached by defining the movements as ‘disaster displacement’, and ‘people displaced in the context of disaster’. By acknowledging disaster as composition of different factors, underlying root causes will receive the necessary attention and this is one step in the right direction.
4.2 Gaps and Limitations in Protection Frameworks

4.2.1. Comprehensiveness in existing definitions

Figure 5 illustrates the recognised pitfalls and comprehensiveness of current working definitions in the quantitative dataset. Additionally, it was noted, that formulating the question as ‘climate-induced displacement’ in itself was inaccurate.

In the qualitative data collection, 70 percent of the respondents confirmed that there is a legal protection gap due to the limitations in existing frameworks. Furthermore, they were noted as not being “up-to-speed” and that “there are no cases or very few where the person displaced solely by a disaster would be protected through these conventions”. One respondent articulated without hesitation that the current definitions “are totally inadequate”. Furthermore, it was strongly emphasised that for displacement across borders, “there are very few instruments, and usually responses have been improvised and ad-hoc”. Hence, the general attitude was that there is a need for a category that relates to the characteristics of disaster displacement. Despite initiatives to fill the legal policy gaps, a majority of the professionals still consider current definitions to be undefined and inadequate, and as a slippery pillar upon which to build protection policies.

4.2.2 Opinions towards various protection approaches

Based on recommendations for policy amendments, opinions on the various protection approaches were investigated. Respondents in the quantitative data collection were asked to mark the option that they felt should have highest priority and as Figure 6 illustrates, developing a separate protocol was selected as the most suitable option. However, it was also noted that ‘cross-border’ should not be part of the definition.
In contrast to the quantitative dataset where 11 percent marked ‘expansion of the GPID’, none in the qualitative dataset articulated this as an option. Additionally, 50 percent of the respondents claimed that any conventional expansion or re-definition was a clear non-starter in terms of feasibility, and that there was a fear that “this could undermine the existing status of refugees and dilute their categories”. Furthermore, clarity of roles and responsibilities in the international community were expressed as too unsettled and that the suggestion of creating a new global framework was more “an academic idea and was never brought in by states”. Opening those negotiations and constructing universal binding agreements was clearly stated as “we do not want that” and that “a convention on environmental migrants is highly unlikely to happen”.

The second topic was the establishment of pathways and enabling migration by opening access and different temporary and long-term protection agreements. It was clear that this would only be a partial solution to the problem, and once again depending on states. One key respondent expressed that “it is really a politically driven agenda that does not serve the people that are most affected”. Another respondent confirmed this statement by noting that “at the end of the day this is politics and at the moment the politics are not right for it”. Section 4.2.4 will further elaborate on the willingness and obligations of states to collaborate.
In the case of Bangladesh, success was however noted by circular migration agreements because “the government wants people to go out and work in different countries and send remittances home,” meaning that as long as there is a cost-benefit relationship, negotiations can be active\textsuperscript{11}.

In regard to including the category into the UNFCCC, two respondents noted that this is created around a set of principles, norms and objectives. The refugee convention is set up in a different way, meaning that “the incentives are different” (..) The more this issue gets wrapped up in climate change and the obligations under the UNFCCC I feel we will go nowhere fast”. The long-standing political reluctance to reduce GHG and acknowledge climate change, was identified as the main argument for why these two fields should not be merged. Moreover, it was articulated that getting states to agree on a general consensus on climate change has been difficult enough. Finally, a few respondents noted that no matter how strong the intentions are regarding policy documents and producing global agreements, it does not change the concrete situations and existing vulnerabilities for the people affected on the ground.

4.2.3 Identified action-points for protection

In an open question the questionnaire respondents were asked to identify a single priority of focus. The responses given were: developing a new legal framework, focusing on regional policy development, integrating already developed practises for cross-border disaster-displacement in national and sub-national local policies, addressing root causes to reduce push-factors, and agreeing on standard definitions in order to measure, identify/classify and count people systematically. Moreover, basing initiatives on a set of principles rather than actual binding frameworks was addressed as a strength.

The qualitative data illustrated that while this is starting to be addressed on the bilateral level, there is no multi-lateral vehicle apart from the Nansen Initiative, and that those two action points should be synced. As one-third of the respondents acknowledged, “it is not an either or (..) you can perfectly have a regional process and mutual obligation amongst states and at the same time have a global discourse”. Action points where hence suggested to consist of rough global outlines, and then tailoring obligations and binding points to the regional and national context. Furthermore, it was emphasised that there is currently limited readiness for an international agreement at this stage and that “this is what states want at the moment”.

\textsuperscript{11} In the case of Bangladesh it was also noted that contracts are being negotiated in relation with certain quotas regarding migration.
50 percent of the respondents agreed on regional frameworks and dialogue between neighbouring countries as this would “respond to the regional realities of displacement”. Promoting existing tools, and going towards a slow state-led process with soft laws, was strongly articulated. Capacity development and planning on the national and local level was identified in one-fourth of the responses. Bottom-up approaches were further encouraged as approaches to develop national and sub-national plans, and “drafting PoAs and SRPs to fill the gaps”.

4.2.4 The willingness to collaborate

As illustrated in Figure 7 the willingness to collaborate between nations/regions, the score was rather neutral with an average score of 5.63:

From the qualitative data, it was clear that one-third of the respondents stated that there is a willingness to address the issue, “hence the development of the Nansen Initiative”. However, while this willingness has increased during the five past years in particular, it was also noted that the willingness to take on more obligations and responsibilities remain low as “many states are already overwhelmed with the whole refugee crisis” and that there is currently no appetite or acceptance for discussing humanitarian corridors and long-term migration, integration or expansions of treaties and conventions. This is due to “a continuous fight with states that do not fulfil their obligations”, noted by one-third of the respondents. Furthermore, it was noted that frameworks already out there are not being implemented despite the fact that governments have a very clear displacement phenomenon on their doorstep, but are reluctant to act on the policies and laws. Ultimately the issue is “perceived as too much” and adding another component, such as climate change, will be full of uncertainties for what states exactly will hold themselves accountable to. Two respondents further noted that the willingness is primarily focused on “making sure that people stay where they live”.

Figure 7. Quantitative Dataset: Willingness to Collaborate - Nations
When it came to the collaboration of organisations, the quantitative dataset showed a slight tendency of increased willingness, but it remained rather neutral with an average score of 5.89, as illustrated in Figure 8.

The same was evident in the qualitative data were one respondent noted that “the organisations are collaborating, because they are all working to a common objective, but actually it is the responsibility of the states because they make the decisions”. In a context of Bangladesh, one respondent stated that,

“You can hide your head in the sand and say you do not recognise the problem or you can say, well there is a problem we need to deal with it. So, academics and NGOs are quite willing to recognise the problem and work with each other across borders. Governments are not willing to recognise the problem and therefore not willing to work with each other.”

4.2.5 Synthesis: Building on existing practice

Analysing these findings show that any new conventions or expansion of existing ones would be idle at this point, as there is little willingness among states to take on more obligations. Even with well-established international laws and non-binding agreements, some states still struggle to hold themselves accountable for providing protection for their citizens (the Nansen Initiative, 2015), regardless whether they have already planned for this in their laws or not. It seems as if the more obligations there are, the less likely anything is going to happen and one suggested solution was therefore to base agreements on a set of principles and let states have the sovereignty to use it. Promoting the tools that countries already have by going through state-led, regional and national approaches that governments can then adapt to their policies and legislations is more feasible and furthermore it would respond to the context and regional realities (Warner et. al, 2014). Moreover, being context specific will correspond to the fact that much movement is done between neighbouring countries. This can then be supplemented by soft, global outlines and a memorandum of agreement as cross-border displacement remains uncoordinated and should continue to be a priority.
However, policies do not change the realities on the ground, and despite the preferred scenario of opening more mobility routes for people displaced due to disasters, it is unlikely to happen and even then, it will still not be a complete solution. The reason is that none of the policies address issues of skewed development and drivers for displacement in the first place, such as vulnerable populations. Furthermore, trapped populations and migration is rarely captured in adaptation planning or capacity development, let alone incorporated into international policies, which was argued by several respondents.

Lastly, as discussed in section 4.1, the tendency of connecting the issue to only an environmental discourse, has conflicted the initiatives and shows a clear sign of working in silos. There was a widespread agreement that as soon as the issue gets too wrapped up in UNFCCC it becomes a CCA issue and that is just way more difficult for people to negotiate around, showing exactly how the divide between disciplines is still persistent. Recognising the problem and its urgency might seem to have been going through a lot of progress recently, as the topic is gaining more attention. However, there is fear if the good work is not kept up, the momentum would slip.

4.3 Limitations and Advantages in Trans-Boundary Collaboration

4.3.1 Disparity, different mandates and a “scramble for resources”

As Figure 9 illustrates, ‘disparity and asymmetry between countries’, ‘unclear roles and responsibilities between agents’ and ‘lack of institutional capacity and resources’ were selected as main barriers for collaboration.
The qualitative data however, shows a slightly different picture, where almost 50 percent of the respondents identified a ‘lack of mandate’ as the main hindrance. One-third of the respondents articulated that this was due to the complex and multi-sectorial nature of the issue, and that the system struggles to cooperate because it is not clear “who is in charge of the process and responsible for a coordinated approach”. Shortfalls in knowledge-sharing, and a tendency to work in silos, was identified. Subsequently, there is a need to be “aware of what the other is doing because that is not happening much”.

Moreover, the silo approach was confirmed when one respondent expressed that you will only get the expertise and strategy that is represented at the meetings, meaning that it is not only a lack of mandate that is an issue, but also the representation of stakeholders and how they intersect. One key respondent explains:

“This is very multi-sectoral. It is a climate change issue, it is a human rights issue, it is a migration issue, it is a development issue, very often a disaster reduction issue, it is sometimes a refugee issue. So, a lot of agencies and tools and policies needs to come together, and people tend to work in silos, but while they do that they do not talk to each other.”

40 percent of the respondents expressed that institutional capacity prevails as an issue, as there is “a scramble for resources” in the sense that “there is certainly not a shortage of needs to serve, but resources to serve those needs effectively, are limited”.

Asymmetrical structure of a country, and disparity in terms of size, economy, politics or culture was articulated as a hindrance by one-third of the respondents in the quantitative dataset, as countries with high levels of asymmetry in both size and interest will often exercise low levels of regional collaboration. By the same token, a general history of discrimination against migrants and people displaced was pointed to have caused a lack of trust, xenophobia and a negative perception of immigrants, which led to political sensitivity in dealing with the issue.

4.3.2 Advantages: Inter-agency collaboration, willingness and similar realities

Complementary to the section above, the findings suggesting which factors facilitate collaboration proved to be in sync with the limitations. As Figure 10 illustrates, aspects that facilitate collaboration were highlighted as regional institutions, inter-agency collaboration and similar situations and conditions of countries.
The enabling factors addressed in the quantitative dataset are correlated with the qualitative dataset where nearly 50 percent of the respondents mentioned good inter-agency collaboration and dialogue as a facilitating factor for collaboration. Additionally, leadership around these issues tend to foster more dialogue. Involving different actors in the process can sometimes help to find solutions, complement different strengths and capacities and hence “building broader” in terms of initiatives and cooperation as “there is no one agency that can deal with everything on its own”.

Symmetry between countries in terms of economy and culture was emphasised by one-third of the respondents. One example based on the 1980 civil war in Central America was illustrated. “Everyone had refugees from some of the countries, so the refugees from El Salvador were in Nicaragua, and you had refugees from Nicaragua in Honduras and in Mexico. This created a very strong regional understanding and built up some very strong regional institutions”. The legacy from the 1980s prevailed when hurricane Mitch hit in 1998. All of the countries were affected, but the response networks formed after the civil wars meant that they had “built up a regional understanding based on trust and memory generated in the aftermath of the conflict” similar to the situation in Europe after the World War II, “because after the Second World War, it was very clear, never again”. This indicates how places that experience similar realities and have memories of the impacts of such realities, are more willing to collaborate and engage in finding durable solutions.

4.3.3 Synthesis: Cognitive dissonance and partnerships
Analysis of these findings shows that there is a clear asymmetry between the quantitative and qualitative data regarding limitations for collaboration. In contrast professionals seemed to agree on what the facilitating factors were.
This can indicate, that while there is a shared understanding of what can enable collaboration, there are inconsistent ideas of what can limit it. By not having a shared understanding of the obstacles, it might be even more difficult to join forces and reach a consensus. When establishing partnerships and working with various actors, it is essential to recognise the diversity of motives, mandates and steps for negotiation and not forget to also build capacity for collaboration, and not just as a result of it. When many different actors are involved, it should not be discounted that they might come with different incentives and agendas. Therefore, a proper stakeholder mapping which can map out shared goals, the resources and capacities or the lack of, and a memorandum of agreement seems relevant. Moreover, clear definitions of what role each partner has as well as identifying key decision makers seems needed (Ubels et al, 2010; Schulz et al., 2005).

Furthermore, the analysis showed that historical legacy is an important factor for successful collaboration, as nations will be more willing to cooperate if their memory of a shared experience is still fresh and clear. Additionally, organisational memory accounts significantly, and if organisations experience high staff turnover, leadership roles and responsibilities may be lost or diluted. Finally, resources were seen as a large constraint as to why collaboration can be challenging, since there is an element of competition involved in the frantic scramble for resources (UNISDR, 2015).
4.4. Disaster Risk Management in the context of Displacement

In this final part of the research, the respondents of the qualitative dataset were asked to state their opinion regarding “building resilience against displacement risk” by choosing the option that correlated the most to their personal understanding. This was in order to quantify which operational considerations and programmatic attempts were selected as most suitable. As Figure 11 illustrates, most professionals selected *avoiding displacement*, which in its elaborated question format included the reduction of vulnerabilities through development, capacity and skill building, risk reduction and risk awareness by mapping and education. The second option *prepare for displacement* indicated monitoring and tracking of population movement and thus creating safe migration pathways and channels, when displacement is unavoidable. Some of the respondents noted that building resilience against displacement is a combination of the two, which was articulated in the comment section of “other”.
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**Figure 11. Quantitative dataset: Resilience for Displacement Risk**

4.4.1 Monitoring Risk

In the qualitative data, 50 percent of the respondents strongly emphasised that mechanisms for tracking, quantifying and monitoring patterns of displacement needed to be more dynamic. One-third elaborated on this by noting that while any compelling data only represents a “*static snapshot meaning how many people are there in a place at a moment in time*”. The actual dynamics of population movement were articulated as poorly captured and therefore compromises the reality on ground. One key respondent noted that “*the in-flows and the out-flows are much more challenging and those are just as necessary if not more important to capture*”. Furthermore, one-third of the respondents articulated that data models and methodologies vary between actors and that a lack of categorisation makes it difficult to quantify “*who is in the frame and who is outside*”. Consequently, “*you do not know if you are distinguishing between an IDP or a member of the community who never left*”.
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Moreover, one key respondent explains that the number of people displaced per event is a really bad matrix, as it does not account for temporary displacement, such as shelter, and other life-saving measures. Additionally, “you want time series data that shows how each situation behaves at a time”. This means that tracking tools should not only be able to capture the dynamics of population movement better, but risk assessment tools should also be more context and place specific. With both in place, cross-referencing can enable a better and more coherent grasp of how different hazards cause different types of displacement, for instance, “do you have a rapid spike and then it declines back to zero or does it persist?”. 

4.4.2. Managing Risk

In the qualitative dataset, reducing the exposure to a hazard, or the impacts of a hazard were articulated as two leading ways of managing risk. One-fourth of the respondents stated that the exposure to risk can be avoided or transferred, by planned re-location or by averting people settling in areas prone to hazards. However, one respondent noted that planned relocation “does not have a really good history of success” as “people do not like being forced to go somewhere”. Hence, as argued by 80 percent of the respondents, focus should be on reducing the impacts of a hazard instead, and consequently mitigating the drivers of forced movement so that people can stay where they are. By capacitating people to withstand shocks “there is no limit to what can be done”.

Another respondent reflected on the aspect of vulnerability by explaining that, “if they have a strong house which can withstand wind speed of 120km or 150km per hour, then they do not need to go to the cyclone centre. It is because they are poor, and they cannot afford a strong house – that is why they are displaced”. Subsequently, existing vulnerabilities was argued as much more packed in cases where communities are stuck in areas exposed to high risks and may not be able to move at all, and that in fact “the most vulnerable are not those that cross borders and do not find sufficient protection abroad, it is those who cannot actually get out of the areas that are affected”. Correspondingly, a key respondent noted that,

“we are focusing a lot on the legal regime, but we are not necessarily looking at the main and the most recurrent issues, the problem of access to resources or opportunities for those who are trapped in areas affected by disasters”.
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DRR initiatives as reinforcing infrastructure and housing, and developing tools that can help people withstand hazards were suggested. Secondly, soft approaches such as risk education, knowledge transfer and strengthening of livelihoods, as well as re-training for alternative livelihoods were addressed, and to ensure access to basic services such as health clinics, WASH facilities and education. One respondent noted that focus should especially be on the second generations, stating, “the adults you have to help them cope and adapt – the kids you do not. The kids you empower and capacitate them”. One respondent stressed that people are the agents of change, and that enabling people to decide what to do is much better. “If they have to go, we will help them go and empower them to make those decisions with better information knowledge, skills and capacities”.

4.4.3. Preparing and Responding to Risk
The next trend in the qualitative data was to address the preparedness for displacement and the response to risk. Migration was mentioned as a way of coping with disasters and one respondent noted that if you are not able to sustain your livelihood, but also not able to use regular migration channels, “then migrating illegally to the bordering area might sound appealing to some of the people,” and that those are the people that will often be put at risk due to irregular migration channels. Promoting safe migration was emphasised as important, together with risk awareness and “to see migration as a potential adaptation. Not a problem, but as a solution” and ensure that migration is safe, organised, regular and risk-free. A respondent elaborated on this by mentioning how recognising future migrants, will ultimately help to invest in skill-building of those individuals so they are not forced to move, but rather choose it as an option if they have to.

Secondly it was noticed in the qualitative data, that initiatives generally are still very reactive because organisations and the international community have established humanitarian action in such a way. One key respondent noted that many organisations and actors have a tendency to “wait until the crisis is there and then you go in”. However, one-third of the respondents noted a clear shift in the humanitarian system and an acknowledgment that you cannot respond only in crisis mode, but that “there still needs to be some thinking about the future”.

43
4.4.4 Adapting to Risk

The last trend in the qualitative data, was to look at displacement and migration from the climate change perspective. One-fourth of the respondents kept coming back to this and arguing that there are several stages in adapting to displacement including the recognition of mal-adaptation which are “things that we are doing that we should not be doing which makes us more vulnerable”. Secondly, was the recognition of climate change and its potential impacts which adds another risk that need to be mitigated. Lastly was the notion of “transformational adaptation” which was noted by two respondents, and articulated as transforming society to cope with the risks and adapt to them. Subsequently this was argued as the main reason for why displacement belongs under the climate change terminology, as migration can be seen as a way of adapting to the climate. However, “it does not mean that displacement is always bad, it is very often a safe living measure but we should be very careful about presenting it as adapting to the climate”. CCA has tended to view “migration as a failure of adaptation, that is a failure of development” and this was again stated by one-third of the respondents.

4.4.5 Synthesis: Anticipating, Recognising and Learning

Analysing these findings, it is clear that the multiple ways of dealing with displacement risk reside within different functions of the disaster management cycle. The monitoring of risk consists of proper risk assessments as well as context and situation specific hazard mapping. If done coherently, this can ultimately serve as a great foundation for both mitigating and anticipating displacement risk, as well as preparing for it (Ginnetti, 2015). Additional tools, such as contingency plans, ERPs or HAPs can be developed based on the information retrieved during these processes. Secondly, displacement risks can be managed by either relocating the people at risk, or reducing the risks at where they reside (Luchi, 2010; IOM, 2013). However, both approaches carry significant challenges. The first is constrained by the fact people usually do not like the idea of being relocated and they prefer to stay where they are. The latter, is inhibited by factors relating to resources. For instance, hard risk reduction measures can at times be costly and in situations where there is abject poverty, fragile states or low institutional capacity, it might not be a possible solution (Boyer and McKinnon, 2015). Hence, soft approaches and capacity building across levels can potentially fill the gaps and might be the better option (IOM, 2013; IOM, 2009). Nevertheless, it needs to be kept in mind that the values one wishes to protect in the case of displacement is the loss of home. By educating people in how to anticipate and recognise risks but not providing them with the ability to limit the impacts meanwhile would be inadequate.
In the context of displacement response in the case of displacement will primarily take shape as immediate humanitarian assistance, such as supporting, receiving and coordinating people at borders or in risk-prone areas (IFRC, 2012). Furthermore, it includes camp management, and advocating for various migration solutions. This type of response should be considered as an option for the inevitable cases where no other option besides border crossing is possible, but it also needs to be acknowledged that it is a reactive rather than proactive measure. Subsequently, the pro-activeness is something that the humanitarian community has struggled with and is starting to recognise and change. Besides, the organisations who first engaged in this topic, came with the mandate of a ‘care and maintenance’ type of system by providing immediate assistance, establishing camps and then maintaining those camps. There tends to be a thinking that disaster displacement is always short but what you see is that a significant amount of people stays in displacement for long periods of time. On top, future forecasts suggest longer and more intense patterns of displacement. However, it is time to adjust the thinking and change from a relief-oriented to a recovery-driven operational perspective (Webster and Khanna, 2015).

This means that more effort needs to be put into ensuring people’s livelihoods and introducing alternative livelihoods, as well as strengthening infrastructure and job markets, and addressing the humanitarian-development-nexus. That way, people have a better chance of becoming self-reliant and bounce back after disruptions. Finally, an essential element in improving societal resilience is the ability to transform experiential learning from a committed memory of previous disasters into transformative learning (Elkjær, 2009; Wenger, 2009).
Recommendations

The following recommendations are suggested in order to manage the trans-boundary and inter-agency collaboration for successfully mitigating displacement risk in the country of origin and within regions. The recommendations are geared towards agencies and governments concerned with displacement, as well as future researchers.

5.1 Synergising partners and stakeholders

In order to break the tendency of working in silos as well as the discourse and differences between disciplines, the first recommendation is to conduct solid stakeholder and partnership mapping. This should clearly spell out who is in charge of the process, which capacities and resources that are present as well as the lack of them, and a division of roles and responsibilities. It could be a soft memorandum of agreement, and should furthermore include a shared and common understanding of central terminology and definitions. Additionally, by continuing with regular meetings such as established by the platform on disaster displacement will ensure that partners are constantly updated and knowledgeable on what the others are doing. With regular meetings, strong organisational and inter-governmental bonds, as well as knowledge as to whom you are working with will strengthen the collaboration. Furthermore, there should be more linkages and involvement of beneficiaries and inclusion of the population in place in the decision-making. Building capacity and addressing root causes must not be done in isolation from those it is all about. Working on the obligations and accountability of states should be tackled by developing global outlines and supplement those with regional, national and sub-national binding points. Secondly, there is need to mainstream and promote more investments in the pre-disaster stages and especially in the field of DRR. By making the international community aware of the potential benefits in shifting the focus from reactive to proactive, more work could be done to prevent disasters. The competitiveness that arise due to a scramble for resources, can be mitigated by one hand promoting more inter-agency collaboration through, for instance, pool funding or alternative financial methods. Although pool funding can be a constrain for especially smaller organisations, it also has the benefit of building broader and making different organisations with different mandates coming together through a shared objective.
5.2 Focusing on context, beneficiaries and needs

The second recommendation is to have more focus on the beneficiaries and people displaced, by conducting coherent vulnerability and needs assessments in areas that could face potential displacement. Especially a focus on the ground is necessary, and amongst trapped populations that are not even able to decide for potential migration. Hence, prevention of displacement, and mitigation of the risks is necessary.

By recognising existing vulnerabilities or levels of resilience, it would be possible to target initiatives and projects on reducing identified risks. As noted, context and situations vary greatly and due to this there is a necessity in focusing on regions and appraising the similarities or asymmetrical structure of countries when designing policies or risk reduction activities. That being said, some basic indicators and categories to measure, monitor and evaluate impacts should be established, and accounted for. This is also the reason why beneficiaries should be more present at the meetings, and data collection should be done in order to identify individuals. Every situation is different, and every person displaced is displaced for a unique set of reasons. Besides strengthening their capacities and resilience to respond to disasters, development initiatives and poverty reduction should be highly prioritised. Through development, individuals will be able to strengthen their resilience in terms of jobs, self-reliance and alternative livelihoods and recover after disasters. Good infrastructure networks, and a rapid return to normality is crucial, as sustainable jobs and the ability to sustain your household is what drives migration or forced movement. Initiatives could be to secure harbours and ports in areas where fishing is main economic reliance, establishing emergency shelters for livestock, and secure crops through stockpiling.

5.3 Future research

There are still some substantial gaps when it comes to research on the topic of disaster displacement. One recommendation for the research of disaster displacement, is to investigate ways to measure and categorise people displaced. A profiling tool and function to be used at borders or other areas receiving people displaced and to ask questions such as why they have moved, how far they have moved, and what led them to the decision of moving. By doing this systematically and continuously it will be possible to map out some drivers of displacement as well as trends and patterns in human mobility. Furthermore, there is a need for researching on particular indicators in mitigating displacement risk and how program officers and managers can know whether their interventions have been successful in mitigating displacement or not.
So far it is only possible to measure the level of preparedness or reductions of risks, but no actual displacement tracking measurements or indicators are in place, nor are monitoring and evaluation tools. Lastly, it should be a priority to write about, document and highlight case studies that can show the benefits of migration and to build the evidence case with people on the ground. Furthermore, to do pilot studies would help governments and the public to see the value in considering migration from both a positive line while acknowledging the negative implications and hence addressing ways in which to manage those.
Conclusions

The research intended to investigate if cross-border displacement is adequately addressed in institutional and operational frameworks, and how trans-boundary and regional cooperation plays a role in mitigating displacement risk in the country of origin or within regions. This was approached by interviewing fourteen relevant actors, conducting a questionnaire and assessing the literature. By following the structure of four research objectives, the policy-approach and risk reduction perspective were investigated. Furthermore, a conceptual understanding of central terms and drivers of displacement have been addressed. To conclude, the study brings out several factors that can be inhibiting factors for successfully mitigating displacement risk.

Firstly, it can be concluded that despite significant work and increasing attention on the topic, cross-border displacement continues to be treated through ad-hoc and improvised responses. The divide between different disciplines and discourses has not only created a tendency to work in silos, but has furthermore caused a terminological disparity where various actors have discordant definitions and understandings of similar terms. With no methodology to appropriately quantify, categorise or measure people displaced, holistic data is lacking. Furthermore, inappropriate categorisation of individuals can create discrepancy between insider/outsider and fuel political and public incentive to embark on the topic.

Secondly, it was concluded that an aversion for states to fulfil obligations and act according to a rights-based approach, inhibits the willingness and possibilities for creating any globally binding conventions, frameworks or agreements. Furthermore, it was acknowledged that the best chances to manage disaster displacement on the policy level would be to create soft global outlines and supplement those with national and sub-national binding points.

Thirdly, collaboration on the inter-agency level was concluded to have improved, but is still prone to a significant tendency of competing over resources and failing at proficient knowledge sharing, leadership and division of roles and responsibilities. Additionally, asymmetrical structures of countries and understanding of each other’s situations, were identified as limiting factors for trans-boundary collaboration. The cognitive memory and shared understanding of both historical events and structural similarities has been identified as a key factor in successful collaboration on both the organisation and inter-agency level, as well as between countries.
Lastly, it was stressed that while the policy approach has been on the agenda for decades, the identification and reduction of root causes in the context of disaster displacement is rather underrepresented in international decision-making. Putting more focus on trapped populations and vulnerabilities through strengthening development, reducing poverty and treating cross-cutting issues is essential for both risk reduction and building of resilience, capacity and stronger societies.

It also has to be noted that the policy approach and the risk reduction perspective are not two separate processes, but should be approached in a holistic and coextending manner. Working on both ends, by developing suitable soft laws to guide forced mobility while identifying and reducing the drivers for displacement will together increase the chances of preventing, preparing and adapting to displacement risk.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Disaster Management Cycle

The Figures below, illustrate the original disaster management cycle developed by Baird et al., (1975) and current interpretations (Alexander, 2002). It is clear that while both cycles acknowledge various functions in disaster management, the original is illustrated as a rather linear process, with one stage leading to another, whereas the interpretation to the right is illustrated as a non-linear process based on overlapping functions rather than stages. This confirms that a disaster is, and should be approached, as a dynamic and flexible process, where the interventions don’t have to happen in a specified order or sequence (Coppola, 2011).

![Disaster Management Cycles](image)

Appendix 2: Qualitative Dataset / Interview Guide

**Introducing questions:**
- Name, position, years in that position, speciality

**Part 1: Investigate the Conceptual Understanding of Displacement and Refugees**
1. What is your understanding of displacement?
   - Can displacement be cross-border or only internal?
2. What is your understanding of a refugee?
3. In what ways do they differ and what are the similarities? (Displaced Persons and Refugees)
4. Why do people move? What are the main driver and trends in human mobility?
   - Do you see a link between climate change and migration / displacement? In what way?
5. What is your definition of Environmental Migration and Environmental Refugees?

**Part 2: Identify and assess gaps or limitations in current frameworks / conventions / protocols**
1. Do you think the current definitions are comprehensive in conceptualizing climate-induced migration? *Why / why not?*
2. What are the key challenges in addressing climate-induced migration?
3. What policy reflections can help to manage climate-induced migration? *Refining definition, create separate protocol or develop new instrument?*
4. Where do you think the biggest focus should be?
5. Is it a global issue, or a national/regional issue?

**Part 3: Investigate the trans boundary willingness to address the phenomenon collaboratively**
1. What is your impression of the willingness to collaborate between nations/regions?
2. What is your impression of the willingness to collaborate between organisations?
3. Why do you believe it is like that? (is this good or bad?)
4. What is limiting the willingness for collaboration?
5. What is facilitating the willingness collaboration?

**Part 4: Build on Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience**
1. What is your definition for resilience against displacement risk?
2. Is it possible to monitor displacement and human mobility? *How?*
3. What are the challenges in developing an early warning system for displacement issues?
4. What are the challenges for adaption measures such as reducing the underlying risks or enhancing people’s coping mechanisms?
5. How can organisations contribute to facilitating this?
Appendix 3: Coding of Qualitative Data

The image below shows a screen grab of the coding process. All themes were divided into colours and given separate sheets. The filter function was used to analyse the responses.

Appendix Figure 2. Coding of qualitative data

In some cases, the open-coding was supplemented by a matrix as illustrated below, which was developed in order to visualises patterns and quantities of responses better.

Appendix Figure 3. Supplementary coding matrix
Appendix 4: Quantitative Dataset / Questionnaire

Illustrated below is a cover note to Introduce the Questionnaire

Dear Sir / Madam
My name is Monica Evelyn Sepka and I am a Master student in 'Disaster Risk Management and Climate Change Adaptation', at Lund University, Sweden. As part of my final dissertation I am conducting a research study on the topic of "Integrating human mobility within Disaster Risk Reduction for Cross-Border Displacement".

The primary benefit and purpose with the current survey is to:
1: Investigate the conceptual understanding of 'Displacement', 'Refugees' and 'Environment'.
2: Identify key challenges or limitations in existing protection frameworks.
3: Investigate the trans-boundary and organisational willingness to address the phenomenon collaboratively.
4: To build a set of recommendations based on Disaster Risk Reduction principles.

The tasks involved will be multiple choice questions and open-ended questions. All information and data obtained will be strictly confidential and anonymous. Data will be analyzed by using coding sheets for frequent responses and numbering. The results will be merged with other datasets and presented during the dissertation defense, which is open to the public. Participating in this survey is completely voluntary with the possibility to withdraw at any time. If you wish to request the results of this study or if you have any further questions, then please do not hesitate to contact me on: monica.sepka.527@student.lu.se

I have read this statement and agree to participate in the survey under the conditions presented.

A screen-grab of the online questionnaire format is showed below
The following pages will show the questionnaire questions and a demographic overview of the respondents. Sections are made accordingly to the process of the questionnaire.

Section I. This first section will cover (respondent’s) personal information and background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>What is your age?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-34 years old</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44 years old</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54 years old</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55-64 years old</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18-24 years old</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65-74 years old</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75 years or more</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>What is your gender?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Which geographical region do you come from?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Or, what do you consider home?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Middle East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>What is the highest level of education you completed?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>What is your current position?</td>
<td></td>
<td>This field is optional:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>How familiar are you with the connection between ‘Disasters’ and ‘Displacement’?</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>Multiple answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Knowledge / Somewhat / Expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, how have you obtained this knowledge?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From studies and academia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section II. This section will cover (respondent’s) conceptual understanding of displacement and refugee concepts and existing protection frameworks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Displacement</td>
<td>Who do you consider to be a 'displaced person'?</td>
<td>Please choose the option that correlates the most to your personal understanding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Displacement refers to all kinds of involuntary but yet temporarily population movement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A displaced person has not crossed an international border to find sanctuary but have remained inside their home countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A person who, for compelling reasons (including the environment) that adversely affect their lives or living conditions, are obliged to leave their habitual homes, or choose to do so, either temporarily or permanent and might or might not cross border</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All people that have fled ultimately apply to the fundamental grindstones from the International Human Rights and the International Humanitarian Law and are thus defined in that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I do not have much knowledge about it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I prefer not to answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>Who do you consider to be a 'refugee'?</td>
<td>Please choose the option the correlates the most to your personal understanding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A refugee is the same as an asylum seeker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A person who have fled due to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, and is outside the country of his or her nationality and unable to return</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A person who, for compelling reasons of sudden or progressive changes (including the environment) that adversely affect their lives or living conditions, are obliged to leave their habitual homes, or choose to do so, either temporarily or permanent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All people that have fled ultimately apply to the fundamental grindstones from the International Human Rights and the International Humanitarian Law and are thus defined in that</td>
<td>I do not have much knowledge about it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I prefer not to answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate and Displacement</td>
<td>Do you see a clear link between the impact of climate change and the number of people being displaced?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open question</td>
<td>Why / why not?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-border displacement</td>
<td>Can a person be displaced across international borders, without being a refugee?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Refugee</td>
<td>Please indicate your stand towards the clarity and functionality of the term 'Environmental Refugee'?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the concept is complex and there is not a clearly identified group of people that can be defined as such</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think there is a well-functioning definition for 'environmental refugees'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not think there is a clear definition for 'environmental refugee' but it is necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not think there is a definition for 'environmental refugee' but it is also not necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not have much knowledge about it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensiveness</td>
<td>Do you think that current definitions concerning human mobility are comprehensive in conceptualizing 'climate-induced, cross-border displacement'?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Changes</td>
<td>What global policy changes can help to manage climate-induced displacement across borders?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refining the definition of 'refugee' and including climate as a cause for involuntary movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refining the definition of an 'Internally Displaced Person' to include cross-border displacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a separate protocol only concerning 'climate-induced displacement'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a whole new instrument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not have much knowledge about it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section III. This section will cover the trans boundary willingness to address and collaborate on the phenomenon and “how to build resilience for / or reducing the risk for displacement”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willingness</td>
<td>What is your opinion of the trans-boundary willingness to address the phenomenon and collaborate between nations/regions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness</td>
<td>What is your opinion of the willingness to address the phenomenon and collaborate between organisation(s)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits collaboration</td>
<td>What is the/a factor(s) limiting the collaboration?</td>
<td>Choose as many as you like:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of willingness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lack of mandate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disparity and asymmetry between countries, culture, politics, size or economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional capacity and lack of resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of agreements between agents about their roles and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excessive number of instruments / bodies / clusters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I do not have much knowledge about it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I prefer not to answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating collaboration</td>
<td>What is the/a factor(s) facilitating collaboration?</td>
<td>Choose as many as you like:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The willingness to collaborate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When countries are in a similar situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Symmetry between countries, culture, politics, size or economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong regional institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong global forces and doctrines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter-agency collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I do not have much knowledge about it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I prefer not to answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open question</td>
<td>Would you like to give a few words on cooperation, willingness and limitations/facilitations between organisation and nations/regions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement monitoring</td>
<td>Are you familiar with any possibilities for monitoring displacement and involuntary population movement?</td>
<td>If yes, could you recommend any possibilities for monitoring displacement and involuntary population movement? (Optional field):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resilience for Displacement Risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your opinion on the sentence “building resilience against displacement risk”?</th>
<th>Please choose the option that correlates the most to your personal understanding:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It means to avoid displacement in the first place by making people less vulnerable through for instance: development, capacity and skill building, risk reduction, risk awareness and hazard mapping.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It means to prepare for unavoidable displacement by monitoring, and creating safe migration and safe pathways and to open more channels for movement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I disagree with the sentence. Displacement should be avoided by closing of borders and resistance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement might start as a negative phenomenon but can be turned into a positive one with many potentials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer not to answer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you know concrete examples of displacement as positive phenomena?</th>
<th>If yes, please list a few risk reduction measures that you believe should be prioritized in order to facilitate proper mitigation of displacement (optional field):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Closing of the questionnaire

- Is there anything you would like to add that I have not asked you about or that you think is important, any final remarks, comments or considerations?

Answer goes here...

- Thank you very much for your participation!

If you are interested in participating in a follow-up interview, please provide your e-mail and/or Skype address and name below, and I will contact you soon.

Answer goes here...
## Appendix 5: Questionnaire Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK</th>
<th>SHARED WITH:</th>
<th>VISITS</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>AVR. TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>7 Anonymous</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(kept 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linkedin Groups</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>Linkedin Groups and own linked</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>List of 25 course participants</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>6 Linkedin Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Anonymous</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14:51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>6 Linkedin Groups</td>
<td>69 / 104</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14:58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Own LinkedIn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Contact persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>