Planned Relocation in the Context of Disasters and Climate Change:
A guide for Asia Pacific National Societies
The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) is the world’s largest volunteer-based humanitarian network. Our secretariat supports local Red Cross and Red Crescent action in more than 192 countries, bringing together almost 14 million volunteers for the good of humanity. We act before, during and after disasters and health emergencies to meet the needs and improve the lives of vulnerable people. We do so with impartiality as to nationality, race, gender, religious beliefs, class and political opinions. Guided by Strategy 2030 – our collective plan of action to tackle the major humanitarian and development challenges of this decade – we are committed to saving lives and changing minds. Our strength lies in our volunteer network, our community-based expertise and our independence and neutrality. We work to improve humanitarian standards, as partners in development, and in response to disasters. We persuade decision-makers to act at all times in the interests of vulnerable people. The result: we enable healthy and safe communities, reduce vulnerabilities, strengthen resilience and foster a culture of peace around the world.
**FOREWORD**

*How do you plan to relocate entire communities from their homes?*

*How do you help a community physically pack up their village and relocate?*

*How do you help a person emotionally prepare to leave their home?*

Planning to relocate communities due to disaster and climate change is always a last resort, but it is a reality in a region where millions of people are forced from their homes every year due to disasters and climate change.

Displacement of people has been described as one of the greatest humanitarian challenges of the 21st century, and with increasing frequency and intensity of weather events caused by climate change, displacement is only projected to increase.

In the face of disasters and a changing climate, Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies work tirelessly to keep their communities safe and to save lives through extensive disaster risk reduction, disaster risk management and climate change adaptation programmes.

But in this, the most disaster-prone region in the world, planning to relocate communities through planned relocation may be a solution for people who cannot return home after the floods reside or storm clears.

This new guide, *Planned Relocation in the Context of Disasters and Climate Change: A guide for Asia Pacific National Societies*, is the ‘how’. The Guide provides practical guidance to National Societies to prevent and prepare for displacement, to respond to displacement and to support recovery and the attainment of durable solutions for displaced people.

Planned relocations are also gaining increasing prominence on global and national agendas, the Guide has tools for National Societies to work with their governments to ensure the legal and policy frameworks for planned relocation are strong and relevant.

Grounded in and from the communities in which they work, National Societies are a respected and trusted humanitarian partner, uniquely placed to lead such complex and critical work. I urge Asia Pacific Societies, some of whom are already involved in planned relocation projects, to use this guide and to learn from each other. I cannot underestimate this role for a National Society, working and walking alongside a community as they look to relocate from their homes, which for many people will be one of the most significant events of their lives.

As the sea laps at Pacific Island villages, typhoons tear through South East Asia and floods hit the plains of the Indian subcontinent, we must be prepared for a future in which planned relocation may feature more prominently as a policy tool and operational context.

Alexander Matheou

REGIONAL DIRECTOR FOR ASIA PACIFIC
INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF RED CROSS AND RED CRESCENT SOCIETIES
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Why do we need a guide on planned relocation?
Why do we need a Guide on planned relocation?

Planned relocations are already being implemented across Asia Pacific, both before and after disasters, and in the context of disaster risk reduction, and climate change adaptation as a durable solution to disaster displacement (durable solution).

Asia Pacific National Societies are already supporting communities and authorities to undertake planned relocations. At the same time, planned relocations are gaining increasing prominence in global, regional and national legal and policy frameworks.

Some countries in the region, including Fiji and Solomon Islands have developed or are developing specific policy approaches on planned relocation. In this context, all Asia Pacific National Societies need to be prepared for a future in which planned relocations are increasingly undertaken at the operational and programmatic level across the region, and feature in legal and policy frameworks.

Planned relocation projects are complex. Planned relocation impacts multiple groups or people in different ways at different times. Planned relocations involve many different actors, both state and non-state and take lengthy periods of time to complete. Given these factors, things can go wrong which may negatively impact the well-being of affected people. There are examples of ‘ghost villages’ – villages on relocation sites which have been abandoned because of deficiencies in the planning and implementation.

Use of this Guide will help National Societies minimise the chance that such impacts occur. Done well, planned relocation projects can be an effective form of disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation and may provide a durable solution for displaced communities.

Done poorly, planned relocation projects can be profoundly violate rights, undermine the dignity of the individuals affected, and thus strike at the heart of the Fundamental Principles of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. As such, programme support for planned relocation and relocation projects is fraught with risk to the well-being of the affected population and reputational risk to the National Society and wider Movement.

This Guide is intended to help National Societies ensure their engagement with planned relocation projects maximises the potential for successful outcomes.
Overview of the Guide

What is this Guide for?

This Guide is for planned relocations within countries. Currently, planned relocation in Asia-Pacific occurs within national boundaries and will continue mostly to do so. This is not to say that planned relocation across international borders will not arise in the future in the region.

At a sufficiently severe threshold of climate change, the issue of cross-border relocation may become all too real for some regionally situated low-lying, small island states and their National Societies. While not the subject of this Guide, the stages in the relocation process remain the same, as will many of the issues which are addressed here. Nevertheless, cross-border relocation projects can be expected to add a significant layer of complexity to an already difficult process.

The 2018 IFRC report, *Disasters and Displacement in a Changing Climate: The Role of Asia Pacific National Societies* described the impacts of disasters and climate change on migration, displacement and planned relocation (known collectively as ‘human mobility’) in the Asia Pacific. The report also assessed and described the role and activities of National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies in addressing humanitarian needs connected with human mobility. Whilst the 2018 report focused on migration and displacement, this Guide focuses on the role of National Societies in supporting communities affected by planned relocation.

Who is this Guide for?

This Guide is for Asia Pacific National Societies. National Societies in the region have varied experience supporting planned relocation—some have substantial experience stretching over many years and have highly developed approaches, and others have no experience at all.

Planned relocation in the context of disasters and climate change is increasing and increasingly on international and regional agendas. At the national level, there are signs within Asia Pacific that planned relocation is increasingly attracting the attention of policy makers. National Societies must be prepared for a future in which planned relocation may feature more prominently as a policy tool and operational context.

This Guide is for National Society leadership and programme managers, and for use at both national and community level. By using this Guide, National Societies will be better able to:

- Understand key features of planned relocation as a form of human mobility.
- Understand where planned relocation features in policy frameworks at the global, regional and national levels.
- Understand historical and current approaches to planned relocation across the region.
- Understand National Society engagement in planned relocation to date.
- Understand the various stages of planned relocation, and receive guidance on principled, effective engagement during each stage of planned relocation.

**RESOURCE**

*Disasters and Displacement in a Changing Climate: The Role of Asia Pacific National Societies*

How to use this Guide

This Guide is divided into three parts which provide an overview of what planned relocation is, a historical and current context of planned relation in Asia Pacific and step-by-step guidance to conduct a planned relocation project.

- Part one: An overview of planned relocation
- Part two: The context of planned relocation in Asia Pacific
- Part three: Step-by-step guide to planned relocation
- Checklist: A pull-out checklist for use throughout the planned relocation project

Within each part of the Guide, you will find sections that provide specific guidance and information on the following:

GOOD PRACTICE
Examples of good practice programming by Asia Pacific National Societies.

HOW TO
Useful ‘how to’ advice for implementing your planned relocation programme.

RESOURCE
Links to existing resources to support your planned relocation programming.

REMEMBER
Important reminders of points to consider in your planned relocation programming.

Methodology

A desk-based literature review was undertaken to provide background information, including a review of relevant IFRC guidelines and policies, Emergency Appeal updates, Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) updates, Emergency Plan of Actions and Operation Updates by selected National Societies.

A survey was distributed to all National Societies in the region to determine the extent to which they have experience in supporting planned relocation projects. This was followed up with 22 interviews with National Society representatives and IFRC staff. Travel restrictions due to the COVID-19 pandemic has meant that planned sub-regional workshops and field deployments to validate the draft Guide could not take place. However, in February 2021, virtual workshops took place with National Societies from Asia Pacific where the outline draft was presented, and key concepts and approaches explained and discussed, resulting in further refinement to the Guide.

The Guide also draws upon a number of guidelines produced by IFRC on the critical aspects of programming in support of planned relocation projects.
**Glossary**

**Climate change adaptation** means the process of adjustment to actual or expected climate and its effects.²

**Disaster** describes a serious disruption of the functioning of a community or a society at any scale due to hazardous events interacting with conditions of exposure, vulnerability and capacity, leading to one or more of the following: human, material, economic and environmental losses and impacts.³

**Disaster Displacement** refers to situations where people are forced or obliged to leave their homes or places of habitual residence as a result of a disaster or in order to avoid the impact of an immediate and foreseeable natural hazard. Such displacement results from the fact that affected persons are (i) exposed to (ii) a natural hazard in a situation where (iii) they are too vulnerable and lack the resilience to withstand the impacts of that hazard. It is the effects of natural hazards, including the adverse impacts of climate change, that may overwhelm the resilience or adaptive capacity of an affected community or society, thus leading to a disaster that potentially results in displacement.⁴

**Durable solution to disaster displacement** is achieved when internally disaster displaced people no longer have specific assistance and protection needs that are linked to their displacement and such people can enjoy their human rights without discrimination resulting from their displacement.⁵

**Internally displaced people** are people or groups of people 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 recognized State border.⁶

**No Build Zone** - A location or area where the national authorities have not allowed homes to remain occupied and commercial or other buildings/structures necessary for livelihoods cannot continue to be used. If destroyed or damaged in a disaster, they cannot be rebuilt.

**No Dwelling Zone** - A location or area where the national authorities have only prohibited people from occupying or rebuilding their homes, but commercial or other necessary for livelihoods buildings/structures can be used or rebuilt following a disaster.

**Planned relocation** is the planned process in which persons or groups of persons move or are assisted to move away from their homes or places of temporary residence, are settled in a new location, and provided with the conditions for rebuilding their lives. Planned relocation is carried out under the authority of the State, takes place within national borders, and is undertaken to protect people from risks and impacts related to disasters and environmental change, including the effects of climate change. Such planned relocation may be carried out at the individual, household, and/or community levels.”⁷

---

[right] Nabouwalu, Fiji, December 2020. A family gather what is left of their home and belongings after Tropical Cyclone Yasa hit Fiji as Category 5 storm. Red Cross volunteers were mobilised early to help people prepare and are now reaching affected communities with essential relief items and assessment teams.
An overview of planned relocation
What is a planned relocation?

While it is now widely recognised that planned relocation – often also referred to as relocation or resettlement – is a particular form of human mobility, there is no agreed definition of planned relocation.

A definition in guidance recently developed for states describes it as:

“A planned process in which persons or groups of persons move or are assisted to move away from their homes or places of temporary residence, are settled in a new location, and provided with the conditions for rebuilding their lives. Planned relocation is carried out under the authority of the State, takes place within national borders, and is undertaken to protect people from risks and impacts related to disasters and environmental change, including the effects of climate change. Such planned relocation may be carried out at the individual, household, and/or community levels.”

Another definition also recognises the permanent (or long term) movement of a community (or a significant part of it) from one location to another but emphasises the important but often overlooked socio-cultural and communal aspects.

There is also broad recognition of a core characteristic, namely: the intended permanent movement and establishment elsewhere of people exposed and vulnerable to the existing or anticipated effects of disasters or climate change. This key feature of planned relocation – an intended permanence of movement and establishment – distinguishes it from other forms of planned population movement common in disaster settings, such as life-saving evacuations and stay in temporary shelters or camps.

What is called ‘planned relocation’ in the climate change context is called resettlement in the development context. One reason for the introduction of planned relocation terminology in the climate change context is to reflect that ‘resettlement’ is also the technical name given to the process by which recognised refugees are offered rights of residence in another country as a durable solution to their predicament, and which takes place within the specific context of the international refugee protection regime. Some National Societies such as the New Zealand Red Cross are heavily involved in supporting this form of ‘resettlement’.

**REMEMBER**

**The essential elements of planned relocation**

Irrespective of the definition employed or context, planned relocation is widely recognised to have elements of both:

- **re-location** – the physical movement of people from one place to another; and
- **re-settlement** – the re-establishment of lives and livelihoods post-physical movement.

To be successful, a planned relocation project must address both elements.
Who is affected by planned relocation?

People – the individuals, families and communities who are relocating will always be part of the affected population.

However, depending on the circumstances, other people may also be affected, including:

• host communities.
• people who choose not to relocate.
• people who are indirectly impacted by the relocation. This may be people from non-relocating communities situated nearby, whose livelihoods are disrupted (e.g., business partners, traders or retailers), or who face loss of access to essential services (e.g., health/education) which were situated in the relocating community.

GOOD PRACTICE

Planned relocation of households in Samoa

In some national settings, planned relocation may occur at the household level instead of the community level (which is more common). In such situations, the ‘planned’ element relates more to the support extended to the households choosing to relocate, rather than the decision to relocate. In Samoa, most land is held under customary title and the inhabitants of coastal villages have customary rights of access to inland sites which provide a means of livelihoods and support. Although the Government of Samoa does not have a policy of relocating coastal communities, it has provided information to communities on disaster risk through ongoing community disaster and climate risk management activities, and tar-sealed the roads connecting the coastal and inland sites. This has meant some households in vulnerable coastal areas have decided to relocate to the inland sites where their farm is located, particularly in the wake of the 2009 tsunami. The Samoa Red Cross, after conducting detailed capacity and vulnerability assessments, and in coordination with other WASH-sector partners, has supported vulnerable households by supplying and installing rainwater harvesting systems.
When can planned relocation occur?

Planned relocation can occur before or after a disaster happens. When undertaken before a disaster, sometimes called proactive or anticipatory relocations, the relocation is aimed at reducing the exposure and vulnerability of populations to natural hazards, or helping communities adapt to the anticipated negative impacts of climate change.

When undertaken after a disaster, sometimes called reactive relocations, the relocation is aimed at providing a durable solution to existing disaster displacement.

This distinction is by no means an absolute one. Households and communities being relocated under ‘proactive’ projects may also have experienced disasters in the past. Indeed, it is often precisely because they have experienced disasters in the past, but the underlying hazard to which they are already exposed is expected to recur and/or worsen over time due to climate change, that relocation is now being undertaken.

REMEMBER

From an operational perspective, while the stages of the project remain the same, the issues that may arise during the project cycle will to some extent be shaped by whether the planned relocation arises before or after a disaster. These differences are explored in greater detail in part three of this Guide.

International policy for planned relocation

Planned relocation is specifically recognised in decisions taken by parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change as a measure by which States can enhance action on climate change adaptation. In 2015, the parties established the Task Force on Displacement, of which the IFRC is a member, to “develop recommendations for integrated approaches to avert, minimize and address displacement related to the adverse impacts of climate change” and planned relocation features in its work programme. Planned relocation increasingly features as a recognised policy tool in relevant global policy and normative frameworks such as:

- Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration.
- The Agenda for the Protection of Cross-Border Displaced Persons in the Context of Disasters and Climate Change (The Nansen Protection Agenda).

Being anchored in this overarching global framework, planned relocation will continue to feature – and perhaps increasingly so – as a mobility-related policy response to disasters and climate change in Asia Pacific. Reflecting this reality, planned relocation is also increasingly dealt with in the emergent body of guidance specifically dealing with human mobility (displacement, migration and planned relocation) in this context, such as:

- Peninsula Principles on Climate Displacement within States.
- Words Into Action – Disaster Displacement: How to Reduce Risk, Address Impacts And Strengthen Resilience A companion for implementing the Sendai Framework Target E.

LEFT Rudaki, Direct Rule Districts, northern Tajikistan, 2016. Tajikistan Red Crescent responds after heavy rains, strong winds and mudslides caused significant damage to more than 2,500 households.
PART TWO

Planned relocation in Asia Pacific

Philippines, Iligan, 2012. Philippine Red Cross community health volunteers conduct hygiene promotion sessions at a relocation site in Iligan for people displaced by Typhoon Sendong.
History of planned relocation in Asia Pacific

Relocation – in the broad sense of moving from one place to another in search of new places to live – is nothing new in Asia Pacific. In the Pacific, the oral and written traditions of many peoples are full of stories which recount the movement of ancestors across land and sea. Many Pacific peoples have embedded in their creation myths movement from some other place to where they now call home in distant or mythological time.

In the Pacific, relocation is impossible to divorce from colonialism. Whether it be colonial administrations or trust administrations needing land or labour from Pacific communities, or to cement relationships between disparate territories upon the granting of independence, relocation was common throughout the colonial and trustee era in the Pacific.

In other instances, communities were relocated in the aftermath of disasters, in 1905, habitants of a number of small islands in the south west island region of the western Caroline Islands were relocated to Palau by the German colonial administration following a devastating typhoon. Perhaps the most well-known examples in the 20th century are the relocations in the 1940s of Banabans from Ocean Island to Rabi Island in Fiji by the British Western Pacific High Commission to facilitate continued phosphate mining on the former, and the relocation of Bikinian Marshallese by the United States to other parts of Marshall Islands to facilitate nuclear bomb testing in the wake of World War Two.

Looking at Asia, resettlement has been a feature of government policy for many decades. Prominent has been the policy goal of population redistribution to relieve pressure on scarce resources or to reduce population densities, as occurred in Indonesia, the Philippines, Malaysia and Sri Lanka between the 1960s and 1980s. The numbers of families involved can be very large. For example, Indonesia’s transmigration programme saw approximately 1.7 million families relocated from densely populated island of Java, Bali and Lombok to less densely set of islands between 1969 and 2007.22

The single greatest driver of planned relocation in Asia Pacific in the last seventy years has been large-scale development projects. In Asia Pacific, poor rural populations in India and China have been affected. In China, while estimates vary, the numbers involved a large. One 2014 study estimates that between 1978 – 2006, 22.8 million people were relocated to make way for the construction of dams, with at least a further 4 million people being resettled to ensure that the agricultural practices do not contribute to soil erosion in the catchment area of the Three Gorges Dam.23 Smaller scale development projects relating to tourism, railways and even the formation of National Parks have also led to planned relocation across the region.24

It is estimated that for the period 1947–2000, the total number of people displaced or economically deprived of their livelihood by development projects without physical relocation exceeded 60 million. Of those displaced, less than a third are estimated to have been relocated.25

There is much to be gained from learning from the past so that the problems which have all too frequently plagued development-forced displacement are not repeated in the future.

Being aware of these negative outcomes from development-forced displacement and resettlement projects focuses attention on the need for careful planning and well-designed programmes to minimise the potential for these outcomes to manifest in disaster and climate change-related planned relocation projects.
Planned relocation in Asia Pacific in the context of disasters and climate change

Against the backdrop of planned relocation being an entrenched policy tool in many parts of Asia Pacific, it is unsurprising that it has also featured in the context of disasters and, more recently, as an aspect of climate change adaptation.

As a durable solution to disaster displacement

Under international law, all people displaced by a disaster have the right to choose to settle elsewhere in the country in the aftermath of a disaster, as opposed to returning to their former homes and places or integrating locally in the area in which they have been displaced. Some people choose to exercise this right, for example, by living with family members residing elsewhere. In yet other instances, the decision to relocate and resettle disaster displaced communities is made by national authorities. While the right to choose where to live is not extinguished by such a decision, it is often the case that displaced people have, or feel they have, little realistic option but to be relocated.

In all cases, however, the planned relocation must provide a durable solution to the predicament of the displaced people. According to the Inter Agency Standing Committee, a ‘durable solution’ is “achieved when internally displaced persons no longer have any specific assistance and protection needs that are linked to their displacement and can enjoy their human rights without discrimination on account of their displacement.” This means that there must be a “sustainable integration” of the relocating population at the individual and the community level into their new location.26

In the disaster context, a durable solution to disaster displacement has been to date the most common way in which planned relocation has arisen in the Asia Pacific region.

Programme support for planned relocation projects is already being provided to national authorities by some Asia Pacific National Societies. To date, National Society engagement with planned relocation has mostly been in the post-disaster context, such as with the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami.27 National Societies and wider Movement partners supported relocation projects in Sri Lanka, Indonesia and the Maldives through the construction of new housing for displaced communities. The Philippine Red Cross has supported planned relocation in the wake of several typhoons including Typhoon Bopha (2012) and Typhoon Haiyan (2013), as did the Myanmar Red Cross in the wake of the 2015 floods and landslides. In the Pacific, tsunami-related devastation in 2009 saw the Tonga and Samoa Red Cross Societies assist affected communities, as did the Papua New Guinea Red Cross after volcanic eruptions on Manam Island during 2004 – 2005. More recently, both the Indonesian Red Cross and Philippine Red Cross have had to determine whether and how to support planned relocation as durable solution to disaster displacement following, respectively, the imposition of ‘No Build Zones’ post-earthquakes in Central Sulawesi and Mindanao.

While less common, National Societies are also supporting disaster risk reduction related relocation and resettlement projects across the region. In support of the Living with Floods programme, the Viet Nam Red Cross, in partnership with the Swiss Red Cross, has between 2003-2012 constructed a new village in Ca Mau province comprising some 355 houses, a water supply system, an electricity system, kindergarten, infrastructure and tree planting. Samoa Red Cross has supported both state-initiated and household-initiated disaster risk reduction related planned relocation inland of coastal populations through the supply of rainwater harvesting systems. Sri Lanka Red Cross is currently constructing over 1600 larger, more resilient houses for tea estate workers who are being relocated from basic ‘line housing’ in landslide prone areas of the estates into areas free from landslides.

As at the date of this Guide, no National Society has reported any support for planned relocation projects implemented by national authorities as a climate change adaptation measure. It is, however, reasonable to expect that the need for support will arise in the future.

Thus, while experience differs, across Asia Pacific, National Societies have been a key strategic partner of government when planned relocation emerges as a policy response.
Government planning for planned relocation in Indonesia

The Government of Indonesia is currently considering relocating the capital from Jakarta to a new city, to be built inland, to reduce disaster risk emanating from the combined effects of development-linked subsidence and sea level rise.28 Disaster risk reduction related planned relocation is also common regionally.

Government relocation of communities in Viet Nam

Since the 1990s the Government of Viet Nam has relocated communities in the Mekong Delta exposed to monsoonal flooding. Communities have been relocated to areas with lower exposure and dyke systems to mitigate flooding. Known as ‘Living with Floods’, the programme aims to provide relocation areas and stabilize livelihoods of households in high-risk areas through the construction of ‘relocation clusters’.29 ‘Population redistribution’ remains part of the regional development master plan for the Delta region’s socioeconomic development for the coming decades.30

Planned relocation as a policy tool to reduce and manage disaster risk

‘Relocation’ is firmly anchored in relevant frameworks at global and regional levels. In the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, it recognises displacement as a significant disaster risk. The Sendai Framework stresses that to strengthen disaster risk governance to manage disaster risk – it is important: “to formulate public policies, where applicable, aimed at addressing the issues of prevention or relocation, where possible, of human settlements in disaster risk zones, subject to national law and legal systems.”31

Reducing disaster risk in line with the Sendai Framework is a key concern for the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). The ASEAN Vision 2025 on Disaster Management notes:

If ASEAN does not reduce disaster risks, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction will unlikely achieve its target by 2030, while the Sustainable Development Goals will remain unmet.

Strengthened institutional capacity and policy frameworks for effective implementation of disaster risk reduction to promote greater resilience to disasters forms one of the core components of the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER) Work Programme 2016 – 2020.32

Remember

National Societies as a partner throughout displacement cycle

National Societies often play a role in the full disaster risk management cycle, from first response to providing support during relief and early recovery phases. In large scale disasters, longer-term recovery support may also have been provided involving significant hardware and software programming by the time planned relocation emerges as the favoured durable solution of the national authority.

If a National Society supports a planned relocation project, it will typically be ‘beginning-to-end’ engagement throughout the displacement cycle.

‘Beginning-to-end’ engagement brings challenges, including:

• It places a premium on advance planning while relief and recovery phase operations continue, and often long before any person is physically moved.

• It necessitates close communication and coordination across programme sectors and with multiple stakeholders, both internal and external to the Movement.

• It can place significant pressure on National Society capacity, pressure which will be compounded in the absence of adequate additional funding to support the long-term programming necessary to facilitate successful planned relocation.
In the Pacific The Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific: An Integrated Approach to Address Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management 2017 to 2030 (FRDP) notes:

Addressing human mobility in the context of disasters and climate change is seen as an aspect of the inter-related goals of “strengthened integrated adaptation and risk reduction to enhance resilience to climate change and disasters” and “strengthened disaster preparedness, response and recovery.”

Against this global and regional policy landscape, disaster risk reduction related planned relocation can be expected to increasingly feature throughout the region as disaster risk reduction is more fully integrated in urban and other land-use planning and policy.

Given development projects often displace people most exposed to hazards, any planned relocation project in Asia Pacific should, in compliance with the Sendai Framework, AADMER and FRDP commitments, also feature a disaster risk reduction component with the relocating population re-housed in more resilient shelter and/or in less hazard prone areas.

The urban context

Planned relocation is not something which impacts only on rural populations, or results in relocation from rural to urban areas.

Asia Pacific is increasingly urbanised, with large numbers of the regional urban population are increasingly exposed to disaster risks, including displacement.33 Displacement can occur within a city as families seek to stay together in the wake of a disaster, or move to another part of a disaster affected city because it is regarded as being safer, or will provide greater access to shelter or livelihoods opportunities.

Urban development already drives planned relocation projects. Compulsory land acquisitions which resulted in the forced eviction and relocation of informal settlers from within city limits to make way for road or rail network improvements are common in the region.34 For example, the Kolkata Environmental Improvement Project was established in the late 1990s. The removal of squatters living along the sides of canals to be rehabilitated was regarded as necessary to ‘address environmental degradation and improve the quality of life in Kolkata’ and ultimately, 2,880 households were provided with one-room flats on land purchased by the government.35

It is anticipated that displacement linked to disasters will increasingly begin and end within the same urban environment.36

Planned relocation as a response to climate change in Fiji.

In Asia Pacific, Fiji has the most developed and planned relocation programme in response to climate change. In 2014, after local adaptation measures failed to protect the community from decades of inundation, coastal erosion, and flooding, planned relocation as a means of climate change adaptation became a reality in Fiji when the coastal village of Vunidogoloa relocated 2 km inland to a new site located on the community’s customary land. Since then, a further two villages have been relocated and the Government has indicated that at least a further 45 will need to be relocated soon.37

Fiji’s 2017 National Adaptation Plan includes relocation as an adaptation strategy. Future relocations will occur against the backdrop of Planned Relocation Guidelines published in 2018 and specifically titled as ‘a framework to undertake climate change related relocation’. In September 2019, Fiji announced the establishment of Climate Relocation and Displaced Peoples Trust Fund for Communities and Infrastructure, seeded with funding from a percentage of the revenue from the government’s Environment and Climate Adaptation Levy. In December 2019 Fiji published the companion ‘Displacement Guidelines in the Context of Disasters and Climate Change’.

HOW TO: National Societies and slow-onset climate change processes

National Societies can:

- Conduct advocacy around the need for policy development in relation to planned relocation as a ‘last and least resort’ measure to address the impacts of slow-onset climate change processes as a factor driving current and future displacement.
- Reduce data gaps by including questions relating to slow-onset climate change processes in relevant community level assessments which capture traditional knowledge.

REMEMBER: Well planned EVCA assessments are a useful way of recording the traditional knowledge of communities, and indigenous communities in particular, and integrating this knowledge into the assessment of the risks associated with remaining in their homes.
Addressing data gaps through vulnerability and capacity assessments

There are particular challenges in obtaining reliable data on the number of people displaced or at risk of displacement due to the impacts of slow-onset climate change processes. It is often hard to disentangle degradation of environment from other factors (e.g., perception of risk, socio-economic capacities) which influence the decision of individuals and/or households to move in anticipation of further deterioration in the natural environment due to climate change.

National Societies can play an important role in closing this data gap. The Enhanced Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (EVCA) currently being drafted, reconfigures and enhances Vulnerability Capacity Assessment (VCA) to systematically mainstream climate considerations – among others – into the assessment. It notes displacement as a specific disaster risk. One key point is that data collection and analysis are to be done for each element of risk – including hazards – which means that the EVCA can be specifically focussed, where relevant, on hazards linked to slow-onset, climate change processes of significance to communities in Asia Pacific such as drought, sea-level rise or ocean acidification.

While developed for all types of hazards, National Societies should:

- When preparing to conduct the EVCA, select national sub-regions and target communities who are exposed to hazards linked to slow-onset climate hazards for inclusion in EVCA assessments.
- Identify and include slow-onset processes in descriptions of hazards giving rise to displacement as a disaster risk.
- Include questions sensitive to planned relocation as a durable solution to anticipated displacement due to slow-onset, climate change processes in focus group discussions and interviews.
- Seek to carry out follow-up EVCA assessments to better understand how perceptions of risk, vulnerability and capacities in relation to slow-onset climate change process may have changed over time.

EVCAs take commitment in time and resources. It is imperative that National societies ensure that they have sufficient funding and capacity to undertake these assessments.

Planned relocation and slow-onset climate change hazards in Asia Pacific

While sudden onset disasters resulting in displacement tend to grab headlines and funding, it is well known that disasters linked to slow-onset climate hazards can have significant humanitarian impact and can displace large number of people.

It is important that National Societies and Movement partners, assist national authorities and communities better prepare for displacement risks associated with slow onset hazards. Although displacement risk may in some instances arise over longer-term time frames, steps can be taken now through advocacy and data gathering.

In South Asia, a World Bank study estimates the number of ‘internal climate migrants’ could reach 40 million by 2050, with potentially 20 million being in Bangladesh alone.38

For small island developing states such as the Maldives, Kiribati, and Tuvalu slow onset-processes such as sea-level rise, and sea-surface temperature increases already pose threats to coastal settlements. Sea-level rise and rising annual flood levels threaten under certain greenhouse gas emission scenarios to inundate parts of many large cities in Asia, including Jakarta and Bangkok.39

Drought is also a significant regional issue. A recent volumetric analysis by UNESCAP estimates that 60 per cent of the region’s average annual losses is attributable to drought, with agricultural loss being particularly acute in counties with large agricultural sectors.40

Planned relocation as response to climate change

In the 2010 Cancun Adaptation Framework, planned relocation is recognised as a way to help people adapt to the adverse effects of climate change.

While not directly addressed in AADMER, as a recognised climate change adaptation measure, planned relocation also falls within the ambit of the AADMER work programme 2016 – 2020 of which strengthened institutional capacity and policy frameworks for ‘effective implementation of climate change adaptation’ is a core component. The Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific also recognises the need to address ‘human mobility’ – which includes relocation – in the context of climate change.
Step-by-step guidance for a planned relocation

Fiji, Wailotua, 2018. Fiji Red Cross volunteers and the community of Wailotua Village, practice a village evacuation drill prior to the rainy season which can bring heavy rains and cyclones.
Introduction

Part three of the Guide provides step-by-step guidance for National Societies embarking on a planned relocation. It is important to note, not all relocations will involve whole communities and may occur at the household or even individual level. In relation to each stage, the Guide directs the attention to key tasks aimed at maximising the potential for successful relocation outcomes.

Cross-cutting issues

• **Participation and awareness** – the need to ensure meaningful engagement by affected populations throughout the process.

• **Needs and impacts** – the need to identify, plan and respond to the effects of the relocation on affected populations.

• **Coordination and communication** – the need to ensure cooperation and communication with internal and external stakeholders.

• **Advocacy** – the importance of ensuring that the wishes and needs of affected populations, and particularly the needs of vulnerable and disadvantaged groups within those populations, are taken into account.

• **Monitoring and evaluation** – the importance of robust information gathering and assessments to the integrity and success of the project.

• **Transparency and accountability** – the importance of ensuring that decisions surrounding the planned relocation process are open to scrutiny and challenge.

The planned relocation stages explained

Planned relocation projects are best understood and approached as a process involving distinct phases or stages. Within each stage, there are a number of sub-stages. These can be represented as follows:

### Before planned relocation

- Deciding to support
- Planning to support
- Implementation (pending movement)

### During planned relocation

- Implementation (movement)
- Implementation (establishment)
- Implementation (monitor)

### After planned relocation

- Evaluation
- Integration

REMEMBER

- The steps in this Guide are illustrative of the process as a whole. In some instances, National Society support may be limited to a particular stage (e.g., supporting people pending movement).

- In each stage in this Guide does not imply a hierarchy of importance. It may be necessary to undertake some concurrently, or in a different order. It may not be possible to undertake any particular step until other recommended steps have been taken.

- While this Guide deals with each of the stages, the bulk of suggested steps or issues to consider relate to the ‘before’ stage. This reflects:
  - the importance of considering whether and how to support a planned relocation projects given their inherent complexities, and
  - that there are already IFRC guides which deal with the step-by-step implementation of activities throughout the programme cycle. This Guide augments this existing guidance by identifying key things to bear in mind regardless of the programme sector in question.
Advocacy and auxiliary role

As community-based organisations with good access to decision makers, National Societies are well positioned to engage in advocacy on planned relocation projects to ensure the best outcomes for affected populations. The auxiliary role can give rise to challenges for National Societies when dealing with decisions by national authorities to relocate and resettle at-risk or disaster-affected people, particularly where it is not clear that the planned relocation is truly being undertaken as a last resort or where beneficiary selection is not always strictly needs-based.

GOOD PRACTICE

Auxiliary role and humanitarian advocacy

Samoa Red Cross advocacy for the most vulnerable

People displaced after the 2009 tsunami in Samoa, were entitled to have the Government build their new home or opt to build it themselves with Government providing the necessary tools and materials. The Samoa Red Cross Society used its auxiliary status and recognised role in the country’s disaster management structure to conduct advocacy around the need, regardless of which option was chosen, for beneficiaries of government shelter support to ensure that the design of the new foles (houses) were suitable for people with specific needs in terms of gender, disability or protection. For example, people were made aware that the design of spaces within the structure complied with Sphere standards relating to the number of people in the household. In those households with a physically disabled member, they were made aware of the need to ensure that building design included ramp access.

Papua New Guinea Red Cross advocates for all people affected by planned relocation

In 2018, the volcanic island of Kadovar in Papua New Guinea erupted causing the evacuation of 145 families from 5 villages. Most were eventually housed in Dan Dan Day centre in Madang, the main administrative island. Papua New Guinea Red Cross Society, as a member of the National Disaster Committee and conscious of tensions which had arisen between the evacuated Manam Islanders and host communities, advocated that the host community was not overlooked, so that they also benefitted from programme support.

Advocacy in the Philippines for help for resettled households

In the wake of Typhoon Haiyan, the Philippine Red Cross was able to leverage its close-working relationship with local government to successfully advocate for the needs to be met of households who had self-resettled in their place of former residence situated in a No Dwelling Zone, despite general prohibition by local government on providing humanitarian support.
HOW TO

Advocacy for planned relocations

For National Societies and IFRC, advocacy or humanitarian diplomacy, means using persuasion to seek changes to policies and practices to the benefit of people. The auxiliary role of National Societies provides a unique opportunity to engage in advocacy to effect positive change to the relocation process to improve outcomes for affected populations.

Given the complexity of planned relocation projects, circumstances may arise in which it becomes necessary to consider undertaking advocacy in relation to policies (e.g., not including displaced people who previously held tenure as renters or under customary arrangements as beneficiaries for resettlement) or practices (e.g., not ensuring adequate consultation with women or other social groups not included in traditional community governance structures). Advocacy should be seen as an integral part of National Society engagement and is discussed in Part three, step one of this Guide.

How advocacy is to be conducted will vary with the particular issue and national context. However, in all instances, advocacy will need to be grounded in the Fundamental Principles and IFRC policies (e.g., Movement Policy on Internal Displacement) as well as National Society mandates and positions.

Successful advocacy will require:

• a clear understanding (supported by evidence) of the issue or problem.

• a clear idea of the desired solution.

• a clear understanding of what gives your National Society credibility to seek the desired change (e.g., operational activities/ community links) and any risks (e.g. negative publicity).

• appreciation of how policy change/practice modification happens in your country.

• the development of clear messaging about the need for the desired change and how your National Society can support the national authority in making the change.

• knowledge of who has the power to make the desired change.

Successful advocacy is based on communicating to and connecting with the decision-maker in terms they understand. Depending on the issue, some useful concepts around which to organise advocacy on planned relocation includes:

Engaging Community and Stakeholders

• The planned relocation will proceed more smoothly if affected people are provided with full information and have a meaningful opportunity to participate throughout the process.

• People are more likely to consent to being relocated when they understand that, based on the evidence, there is no other option realistically available to protect them; that the project will be properly planned and implemented; and they will be supported. Relocation sites are less likely to be abandoned.

• The process may involve many actors, both internal and external to government. Poor planning and a lack of coordination will lead to unnecessary delays.

Cost-effectiveness

• Well-planned and properly implemented relocation projects will mean resettled populations will require support for a shorter period of time while waiting to be relocated. They will be better able to develop sustainable livelihoods and require less direct financial support over the long-term.

Reputation

• Planned relocations in the context of disasters and climate change are becoming being increasingly watched to see how they unfold. The local or national authority implementing the planned relocation is less likely to be criticised and instead be regarded as an example of best practice to be emulated at home and abroad if the change is made.

Planned Relocation in the Context of Disasters and Climate Change: A guide for Asia Pacific National Societies

PART THREE Guidance
Voluntary and forced planned relocations

Planned relocations are often described as being either ‘forced’ or ‘voluntary’. However, even where people choose to relocate, this may not be entirely voluntary if they are moving from an area that is not safe for continued habitation.

Rather, voluntary planned relocations should be regarded as existing along something of a spectrum:

‘Voluntary’ – contrary to what the term suggests – does not mean to be able to decide in complete freedom. Rather, voluntariness exists where space to choose between realistic options still exists. ‘Forced’ on the other hand characterizes situations where realistic options to choose from are no longer available. Thus, we can speak of voluntary movements where the element of choice is preponderant, whereas displacement or forced relocation takes place where the space for choice is more limited.41

It is important for National Societies to understand where on this spectrum of ‘voluntariness’ a decision to relocate sits, as it:

• brings into focus the need for clear, accurate and objective information to be provided to enable informed decisions to be made by affected individuals, households and communities.

• helps to better shape the content of humanitarian programming at the household level. This is because different households in a relocating community may possess different choices, with some having alternative realistic options—or self-determined recovery pathways—available which need to be factored into programmes.42

• recognises that there is disruption of the relationship of the person to their ‘place’ and highlights the need to consider programmes which may help restore ‘sense of place’ as an integral aspect of psycho-social support programming.43

Consent is closely aligned to voluntariness. This is because, to be truly voluntary, the relocation must be undertaken with the free, prior and informed consent of the people at risk of being moved, and any host community into which they are to be relocated.

LEFT Pakistan. Punjab, 2014. Villagers prepare to move out with the belongings they could save from their flooded homes in District Jhang in the wake of the recent monsoon floods that have severely hit the provinces of Punjab and Gilgit Baltistan, and the state of Azad Jammu and Kashmir.
resettled. Too often, however, shortcomings in the relocation process leads to a lack of true consent which can cause significant harms to affected populations. Where interactions with affected populations give rise to concern that there may be an issue with consent, National Societies will need to consider how best to engage with humanitarian advocacy with the national authority leading the resettlement project so that these issues may be addressed.

In some instances, people affected by or at risk of being negatively affected by disasters or the impacts of climate change will, if fully informed and meaningfully involved in the risk-assessment process, consent to move to safer location. In other instances, they will not. The reasons for wishing to remain vary, including having a different perception of the risks involved, strong cultural or religious attachment to place, and/or concerns about the risks associated with moving elsewhere.

In some instances, however, it may be the community itself which initiates discussion with national authorities about the need to relocate elsewhere. In such cases, consent in principle may be less of an issue, but it will still be important to consider how humanitarian advocacy can be utilised to ensure both that the community's views about the substantive details of relocation are being taken into account by the national authorities, and that there are appropriate legal and governance arrangements in place.

Approaching the issue from the perspective of consent enables National Societies to:

- recognise the agency of affected people in decisions regarding the proposed relocation.
- better advocate for a process which provides all affected people with accurate information and an opportunity to raise questions and grievances, both before agreeing to take part in any relocation and during the relocation project cycle.
- identify the particular reasons which may cause a person to disagree to being relocated and begin to help address those concerns or better engage in advocacy around the need to support those who choose to stay.

Supporting consent-based planned relocation is important for a number of reasons:

- it facilitates the co-production of knowledge relevant to risk assessment between affected communities (traditional knowledge) and national authorities (social and physical science).
- it promotes human dignity by empowering affected people and communities to make their own choices about their future.
- promotes inclusive and participatory processes.
- provides greater scope for evidence-based advocacy drawn from the lived experiences of affected people and communities.
- leads to better programming by aligning support to the self-identified needs, capacities and expectations of affected populations, including those who choose not to consent to move.
The stages of a planned relocation

STAGE ONE
Before Planned Relocation

STEP 1
Decide whether to support

Task 1
Assess the likelihood of a planned relocation

While the types and scale of humanitarian impacts and needs can to some extent be anticipated prior to a disaster happening, it is only in their aftermath following the completion and evaluation of rapid needs and other emergency assessments, that an accurate picture emerges.

Even so, in some situations it may be reasonably foreseeable that planned relocation may feature as a policy response prior to any formal announcement of such a project being made by national authorities.
GOOD PRACTICE

Early identification of planned relocation in Indonesia

Following an earthquake with a magnitude of 6.2 in West Sulawesi Province on 15 January 2021, the Indonesian Red Cross included the potential for planned relocation in its scenario planning for an Emergency Plan of Action issued 16 January 2021:55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCENARIO</th>
<th>HUMANITARIAN CONSEQUENCE</th>
<th>POTENTIAL RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affected land is rezoned by government as no-build area.</td>
<td>Shelter needs will take a long time to address and internally displaced people will have to remain in evacuation camps for an extended period internally displaced people may be removed from their livelihoods. This may lead to internal migration and long-term psychosocial and livelihood impacts.</td>
<td>Indonesian Red Cross may consider supporting the affected communities through long-term recovery programming.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning to relocate in Bangladesh

In Bangladesh, a riverbank erosion leading to a five km long embankment collapse washed away houses and agricultural lands in Shariatpur District in mid-September 2018.

In the Emergency Plan of Action, the Bangladesh Red Crescent noted the inevitability of planned relocation, and the consequential need to potentially engage in humanitarian advocacy, as part of its needs assessment:56

Being a permanently displaced population, one major issue is the availability of land for new houses as their original lands had been washed away, and it is impossible to manage required land for resettlement without national government’s support.

Under this DREF operation, it is suggested to conduct a detailed assessment on the displaced population and understand their needs. At the same time, the National Society could advocate to the government and provide some support towards resettlement of some families, subject to availability of funds.

This foreseeability may (whether alone or in combination):

- be inherent in the very nature of the disaster, such as occurs with riverbank erosion which has irrevocably destroyed land on which homes are situated and livelihoods generated.
- derive from new hazards emerging post-disaster, such as liquefaction after an earthquake, which renders return or continued habitation impossible.
- be clear from the scale of the disaster that building back safer in the place of former residence is impossible.
- derive from the likelihood that part of the response of the national authorities will be the imposition of a No Build Zone, sometimes called No Go Zones. Whether this has been a policy option pursued in respect of prior similar event will be a relevant factor to consider.

It is important that National Societies consider whether the circumstances raise the possibility that planned relocation will be pursued even if no formal announcement has been made because this will mean:

- planning for due diligence and capacity assessments can begin.
- it allows for the early identification of issues which might cause delays or conflict.
- where concerns arise, it allows greater time for advocacy to influence decisions by national authorities.
Perform a due diligence assessment

Irrespective of the context in which the planned relocation arises, National Societies should assess the relevant circumstances to determine whether to support planned relocation.

The Movement Policy on Internal Displacement provides:

Before taking part in any return or relocation programme, we must first make sure that the displaced persons concerned are informed of the details of the programme, in particular the living conditions and risks. Components of the Movement must also seek to obtain adequate knowledge of the situation in the place of return or relocation so as to avoid supporting any steps that might harm the persons concerned during and after their return.45

The Policy requires that National Societies conduct a due diligence assessment of whether to programmatically support any proposed planned relocation.

At its core, this due diligence assessment requires the National Society be satisfied that the planned relocation project is justified, legal and fair, or put another way – does not harm.

Placing the community’s interest at the heart of this exercise is paramount, and it impacts on all elements of the due diligence assessment. It has been recognised that:

Community-based integrated monitoring and assessments can also foster empowerment, promote human rights protections and encourage transparent decision-making processes— all elements of good governance.46

Consider whether the project is justified

This means considering whether allowing people to remain in their homes, or to return to / rebuild home or to place of former habitual residence gives rise to an unacceptable risk of harm to life or safety.

In some instances, the community itself may be requesting relocation. Typically, however, it is the national authority which raises the issue. In either case, it is critical that the view of the community is ascertained as to the risks associated with remaining in place. This includes mapping what traditional knowledge is possessed by the community in relation to the underlying hazard, whether it be of a sudden or slow-onset nature.

Issues to consider include:

• what is the evidence base?
  » What evidence is there to establish a sufficiently high and/or proximate risk to life and safety?
  » Does the decision-making process make allowance for incorporating traditional knowledge?

• whether the project complies with the last resort principle. This means there is an obligation of the state to consider all reasonable, less intrusive measures which may allow people to remain in, return to or rebuild their homes and live in safety and with dignity. This can include:
  » Improvements to existing shelter, infrastructure and the built environment.
  » Improvements to the natural environment including through ecosystem-based adaptation measures.
  » Livelihood’s diversification and strengthening.
  » Facilitating other mobility-related adaptation strategies such as seasonal, temporary or circular migration.

Consider whether the project is legal

It is important to recognise that moving people permanently under planned relocation projects intersects with rights protected under international human rights law (IHRL), namely:

• the right to choose one’s place of residence which includes a right to remain in one’s chosen place of residence.47

• the right to be free from arbitrary and unlawful interference with privacy, family and home.48

• the right to adequate housing which prohibits forced evictions – evictions without appropriate forms of legal or other protection.49

• the right to take part in cultural life.50

This does not mean that involuntary planned relocation is necessarily prohibited. IHRL permits interference with these rights but only under very strict conditions. Permanent relocation may be justified in exceptional circumstances, namely:
Planned relocation as an option of last and least resort

Movement Policy on Internal Displacement (2009) emphasises the need for planned relocation to be an option of last resort:

Our first choice is to help people stay in their homes, but only as long as their safety, physical integrity and dignity are not jeopardized and staying is in accordance with their wishes.57

Before engaging in any activities aimed at durable solutions, National Societies, the ICRC and IFRC, each in accordance with their respective mandates and with the expertise and resources available to them, must:

• verify by means of an independent assessment that those initiatives will guarantee the safety and protect the dignity of the internally displaced people
• verify that internally displaced people’s decision to participate in such solutions is truly voluntary.58

We seek to empower individuals and communities. We do this by ensuring their participation in the design and implementation of our programmes, by helping them to exercise their rights and by providing access to available services.

The individuals and communities affected by displacement are often in the best position to express their needs and to evaluate the local, national, regional and international response. Understanding their specific needs is the first step towards ensuring that those needs are addressed. We must therefore:

• take into account the needs as expressed by the communities themselves;59

There are in fact two dimensions in this approach:

• at the institutional level (last resort) and informs the decision by a National Society about whether to programmatically support a planned relocation project.
• at the operational level (least resort) and informs the planning and implementation of programme activities.

Our Planning and Implementation Framework (2010) states that planned relocation should only be considered in situations where

• it is done in accordance with the law.
• is proportionate.
• is necessary for a legitimate purpose such as to protect against risks to people’s life, or their safety and health.

The project must also be consistent with other core IHRL principles such as non-discrimination.51

Issues to consider include:

• Is the decision to relocate/resettle explicitly anchored in a clear legal framework at the national level which sets out the rights and responsibilities of both the national authority and the affected population?52 **This is a fundamental question to ask in every instance.** National Societies should be extremely wary about providing support to any planned relocation project where there is no such clear domestic legal framework.

• Does the project comply with international human rights law relating to forced evictions and other international standards/guidance? An important issue to consider here is whether the project complies with the **least resort principle.**53 This means that the planned relocation project should be undertaken for the least number of people necessary to protect lives and safety. For example, ensuring that the boundary of any No Build Zone is determined by reference to robust hazard mapping and assessment helps satisfy this element of the least resort principle. This ensures any planned relocation project complies with IHRL because the least number of people have their rights interfered with, in order to provide a durable solution to existing displacement, or to facilitate disaster risk reduction, disaster risk management and climate change adaptation policy objectives.

• Does the project comply with the core international human right **principle of non-discrimination?** It is important to consider whether the project has been designed or is to be implemented in a non-discriminatory manner. In some instances, this may mean that the relocation project is being used as a pretext to evict minority groups. In other instances, it may mean that minority groups are being excluded from beneficiary lists.
Consider whether the project is fair.

Issues to consider include:

• is there an inclusive process which allows for the full participation by affected people, including minority or disadvantaged people (e.g., people in informal settlements)?

• is there a process in place which provides affected populations with all relevant information, in clear and understandable terms?

• is there a mechanism by which any grievances of affected populations in relation to the decision to relocate can be heard and addressed?

Consider the project context

This means considering whether the project is being undertaken as a durable solution to disaster displacement or as a matter of disaster reduction or climate change adaptation.

While the nature of the planned relocation as a staged process remains unchanged, a durable solution to disaster displacement, disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation represent distinct (but sometimes overlapping) project contexts. It is necessary to take note of the particular context as it influences the matters likely to be more in issue as part of the due diligence assessment.

For example, in the aftermath of a disaster, risks to safety and health if people remained or returned to where they lived previously may be clearly apparent and immediate. These underlying risks may also be clearly apparent, if less immediate, in the context of disaster risk reduction / disaster risk management particularly when such measures based on exposure to recurrent hazards, and/or when the relocating population have experienced repeated displacement episodes because of prior disasters.

In these instances, the state may be more easily able to justify interfering with the right of people to choose where they live through imposition of No Build Zones. Nevertheless, even in durable solution to disaster displacement and disaster risk reduction / disaster risk management contexts, National Societies need to remain vigilant, including to the need for advocacy. In some national settings, there may be dangers of the post-disaster context being used:

• as a pretext to evict landless farmers or members of ethnic or religious minorities.

• to promote changes to land-use planning of valuable coastal land by commercial interests for tourism development.

However, absent such concerns, with proposed planned relocation projects in the durable solution to disaster displacement or disaster risk reduction / disaster risk management contexts, the ‘justified’ element of due diligence assessment may be less the focus for National Societies than ensuring that the legality and fairness criteria are also met.

When relocation is proposed in context of climate change adaptation – and particularly in relation slow-onset climate change hazards (and even where these result in more frequent or intense sudden-onset impacts) – sufficiently acute risks to life and safety or health may not materialise until certain thresholds of climate change are reached, perhaps some years or decades into the future.

The longer-term horizon provides potentially greater scope for disaster risk to be mitigated through other, less intrusive adaptation strategies. In such instances, the necessary justification for States to compel involuntary relocation at a more immediate point in time may be less easily demonstrated than in the post-disaster context. This means that the risk that any involuntary relocation may amount to an arbitrary interference with rights (including the right not to be forcibly evicted) may be relatively higher in a climate change adaptation context than may typically be the case in context of durable solution to disaster displacement or some types of disaster risk reduction / disaster risk management related relocation projects.

In climate change adaptation related projects, the due diligence assessment by National Societies may require greater attention being paid towards being satisfied that:

• planned relocation at the particular point in time being proposed is supported by robust evidence as to the anticipated future impacts of climate change on the site of current residence.

• that it is not technically and/or economically feasible for the state to undertake alternative adaptation measures – including alternative human mobility-based measures such as safe and legal circular or temporary migration– which can increase resilience and allow the proposed relocating people to remain living where they are for longer.

• any planned relocation is, at this point-in-time, consent-based, with suitable support being provided to those who choose to remain.
Does the project involve the displacement of informal settlers?

Some disasters may result in the displacement of inhabitants of informal settlements in urban or peri-urban settings. This can give rise to specific issues challenges. In particular:

- there may be a reluctance by national authorities to rehabilitate the impacted land to allow those people to return, raising an issue around whether relocation is truly a last resort, and not, for example, used as a pretext for land-grabbing.
- the costs associated with moving to and/or remaining in a more formal settlement in the relocation site may be prohibitive such that return to an informal settlement is foreseeable.
- it may be necessary to establish a community-based organisation to ensure participation of affected community.
- there may be a need to ensure suitable land is made available for these people to move to.

Does the project have the potential to create or exacerbate existing tensions within or among affected populations?

In some national settings, there may tensions relating to post-disaster relief and recovery operations. There may be pre-existing tensions within, or conflict between communities, which can be made worse by poorly planned or implemented planned relocation projects. For example, there may be a perception that then needs of some groups or communities are being unfairly prioritised over others, creating a potential for further conflict among affected populations.

In situations where there are or potentially may be tensions between communities, it will be important to:

- obtain up to date situational reports.
- understand the root causes of the tension.
- coordinate with national authorities, and humanitarian partners if required, to develop an appropriate communication and engagement strategy.
- consider whether the tension gives rise to concerns for the safety and security of National Society staff and volunteers, and for appropriate protection – including the suspension of operations is necessary – to be put in place.

**RESOURCE**

*Disaster Preparedness and Response Law Checklist*

The Disaster Preparedness and Response Law checklist is a guidance tool for policy makers to help prepare and strengthen relevant disaster law frameworks to ensure more effective preparedness and response, including a chapter on human mobility linked to disasters and climate change (including planned relocation) and housing land and property rights. There has also been extensive mapping of housing, land and property issues across the region which can also be used to identify, understand and mitigate potential housing, land and property issues in planned projects.


*Housing, land and property mapping*

Consider whether you have sufficient information to make an assessment

In some situations, the due diligence assessment may not be able to be completed until after consultations with affected populations, government and other stakeholders. For example:

Depending on the context, you may need to request the national authority to:

- provide an explanation as to why a decision to relocate and resettle has been made as opposed to pursuing other durable solutions.
- provide a summary of the underlying evidence base behind the decision, including the extent to which traditional knowledge has been considered.
- establish that No Build Zone boundaries are supported by evidence, including by robust hazard-mapping.
- confirm that it has consulted with affected populations, and provided them with all relevant information, and that it is or has taken their concerns into account.
- confirm that an effective complaint mechanism has been established.

Depending on the context, you may need to request affected populations to:

- provide information as to the impacts of previous disasters.
- provide information as to the observed impacts of climate change.
- confirm whether or not they consent to being relocated and resettled.
- confirm that they have been consulted by the national authority.
- confirm that they have been clearly provided with relevant information, in a language they can understand.
- outline the issues which they have raised with the national authority regarding why planned relocation is the preferred option.

Task 3

Seek advice as early as possible

The due diligence assessment requires consideration of many issues. Depending on the expertise within the National Society, including any prior experience of dealing with planned relocation projects, it may be necessary to seek advice from technical advisors at IFRC. If so, this should be done as soon as possible after the commencement of the due diligence assessment.

Given the importance of the legality criterion, National Societies should always:

- consult the IFRC Disaster Law resources to ascertain if a country level study has been generated in respect of their national laws.
- communicate with relevant IFRC technical advisors in specialist areas such as: housing land and property, protection gender and inclusion, and community engagement and accountability.

Where the planned relocation is climate change related, in terms of addressing the ‘justified’ criterion, it may be necessary for National Societies to consult with the Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre specialists.

REMEMBER

Support for planned relocation places a premium on advance planning. In the durable solution to displacement context, it may necessitate ongoing communication and coordination with affected populations, Movement partners and other external stakeholders while relief and recovery phase operations continue, and often long before any person is physically moved.

Planned relocation projects are generally of a long-term nature, and programme activity in support will carry implications for:

- Staffing levels
- Financial support
- Procurement
- Logistics
- Monitoring and evaluation timelines
Task 4

Make a realistic assessment of National Society capacity to support

National Societies should as soon as practicable convene a meeting of focal points (e.g., shelter, livelihoods, WASH, health, PGI) to make a realistic assessment of existing capacity to support a planned relocation project through programme activities.

Task 5

Undertake advocacy when concerns arise

It is important not to see engagement as simply a choice between yes and no – with ‘yes’ necessarily meaning that the National Society commits to programme activity of some kind, and ‘no’ meaning no engagement of any kind whatsoever.

Rather, at the decision stage, **advocacy is a vital form of engagement in itself.** Engagement at this initial stage in the process may mean advocating:

- for changes to existing plans (for example changing a No Build Zone to a No Dwelling Zone) or the boundaries thereto.
- for changes in beneficiary selection criteria.
- around issues relating to site selection.
- to ensure full participation by all affected populations and to give voice to marginalized sections of affected communities.
- for resolution of issues relating to the land where people are to be relocated.

National Societies will need to have clear advocacy strategy including, where appropriate:

- advocating jointly with other humanitarian organisations.
- through the UN Cluster system, where present.

If there are likely to be unmet humanitarian needs without National Society support, some or all of which the National Society determines it has the capacity to meet, the National Society should:

- Make clear to both the national authority and the affected population of its concerns but if permitted will meet some of all of humanitarian needs arising to the extent it is able.

**GOOD PRACTICE**

Advocacy as engagement in Indonesia

The Indonesian Red Cross while deciding not to support relocation projects in the wake of earthquakes and tsunami in Palu in 2018, has engaged in advocacy with humanitarian partners regarding concerns that:

(a) People have been identified by reference to official planning documents and not actual number of shelters on affected land which has significantly underestimated the number of households in need of relocation is a durable solution; and

(b) the relocation sites identified by the local government do not give reasonable access to health and education services and there are problems with sustainable livelihoods generation.

**HOW TO**

Supporting in situations of doubt

National Societies may be informed that a decision to relocate people has already been made by the national authority and support requested, but be unsure that the decision is justified, is sufficiently anchored in the domestic legal framework, or the intended process is in some way deficient or unfair. This will require considering both whether and how to engage with the project. In this situation:

**DO**

- Seek advice from IFRC.
- Consult with other stakeholders to ascertain if the concern is shared.
- Develop an appropriate strategy to engage in advocacy (e.g., alone, through UN system, or with other partners).
- Consider whether failing to provide support to affected populations will result in humanitarian needs being unmet.

**DON’T**

- Ignore the issue.
- Feel pressured to agree to support.
Planning to support

Good planning is critical to the success of any project or programme. However, too often, planned relocation projects suffer from planning deficits. Problems can particularly arise when undertaken in the wake of disasters. The short-term imperative to transition evacuees from emergency shelter or camps into more permanent housing can often be in conflict with the long-term optic needed for planned relocation projects to be successful. There is greater pressure on processes, and this too often leads to shortcomings. In particular:

• resettlement plans may be developed as part of an overall recovery plan in the absence of detailed needs/capacity assessments.

• there may be a lack of documentation relating to land rights and permissions, or conflict between customary and legislative rules around entitlements and usage, meaning operations often begin take place in a state of legal uncertainty.

• there can be truncated consultation with affected communities, leading to problems with truly consent-based relocation.

• beneficiary criteria may be developed which to not fully align with vulnerabilities or needs.

• site selection can be problematic, with sites chosen because they are available not because they are suitable or with too little attention being paid to the need to establish critical infrastructure prior to the physical movement of people to the relocation site.60

• housing may be poorly designed.

• there can be failures in programming, with insufficient coordination and communication between local actors and/or between local and national actors, such that implementation may become disjointed; for example, with shelter and livelihoods components being implemented at different times.

As a humanitarian actor, acting consistently with Movement policy, National Societies should take steps to mitigate against these shortcomings manifesting through:

• ensuring community participation and accountability at all times.

• ensuring protection gender and inclusion concerns are factored onto planning and implementation.

• ensuring communication and cooperation with other stakeholders throughout the project cycle.

• engaging in humanitarian diplomacy where necessary.

REMEMBER

In cases where the need for planned relocation is clear from the outset of the disaster, the need to begin planning may arise during the emergency phase. In other instances, this may not arise until the early recovery/recovery phases. While focus will need to remain on ensuring that the immediate relief/recovery needs of the affected population are met, it is important to begin planning as soon as possible after a planned relocation project is announced, or it is foreseeable that such a project will arise.
Task 1: Make a realistic assessment of government capacity

National Societies must recognise situations where state capacity to respond to a disaster may be weak or limited to early response phases. Even states with relatively large capacity can still be overwhelmed by the scale of the disaster. In either case, it is important that humanitarian neutrality does not become blind to capacity constraints which may need to be filled by the National Society and/or legal gaps, which may need to be addressed.61

Some National Societies have already developed their own guidelines, particularly around shelter and settlements, to fill gaps. For example, the Indonesian Red Cross, has developed shelter guidelines, adopted from many resources including the IFRC, which are being used by the Ministry of Social Welfare for its shelter programme. Depending on the national context, it may be necessary for National Societies to draw up their own guidelines or beneficiary lists.

Task 2: Assess the capacities within your National Society

Planned relocation projects have many moving parts. Many different programme activities across a range of sectors will need to be planned concurrently and implemented in a logical order. National Societies will have differing capacity across the range of relevant programme sectors. Some may have particular expertise in a particular sector or sectors.

It is important to make a realistic assessment of National Society capacity because it:
- enables identification of capacity gaps and constraints.
- provides a foundation for consultation with Partner National Societies.
- provides a basis for identifying a need for programme partnerships with other humanitarian actors.
- enables meaningful and accurate stakeholder analysis.
- avoids over-commitment/under-delivery which can lead to harm to affected populations and cause reputational damage to the National Society and wider Movement.

Task 3: Seek funding

Programme support for planned relocation projects can place significant pressure on National Society capacity, which will be compounded in the absence of adequate additional funding to support the long-term programming necessary to maximise the potential for successful outcomes for affected populations.

National Societies will need to consider the extent to which existing financial resources would support programme activities in support of a planned relocation project. In most cases, consideration will need to be given whether it is appropriate in the circumstances to:
- launch a national appeal.
- seek support from Partner National Societies
- seek support from external donors.
- seek, or seek an extension, to DREF or through other relevant funding mechanism.62

REMEMBER

The capacity of your National Society may be limited. It may be realistic only for your National Society provide support in one programme sector. To the extent that humanitarian needs may be unmet, it will be important to communicate with other stakeholders and engage in humanitarian advocacy as required.
**Task 4**
Understand if the planned relocation happening in an urban context

Remember, urban displacement is a unique operational context. Issues to consider include how resettlement within an urban context:

- impacts upon community-based social networks and associations when relocation is dispersed across multiple sites.
- affects livelihood options.
- may give rise to need for cash-based interventions to support payment of rents/utilities or software support.

**REMEMBER**
It is necessary for a National Society supporting any planned relocation project to make an assessment of the true extent of the affected population in order that all needs resulting from the project can be factored into programme planning.

**Task 5**
Include support for planned relocation in all relevant planning documentation

Having determined that the planned relocation project is justified, legal and fair it is necessary to ensure that this is reflected in all relevant documentation.

In particular:

- budgets will need to be developed to cover programme activities over a longer-term.
- funds to cover costs associated with post-relocation evaluation and integration should be specifically set aside.
- the operational strategy may need to be updated to include support for planned relocation.
- Emergency Plans of Action and DREF bulletins (and all updates) will need to include hard and soft support programmes relevant to the planned relocation project, with appropriate long-term timelines factored in.

**Task 6**
Identify the affected population

Planned relocation projects come in various forms. As noted in part one of this Guide, while the people relocating will always be affected, other people could also be impacted by the project, depending on the particular circumstances.

At one end of the spectrum, the project may involve a few households moving elsewhere on their own land which involves minimal interference with existing livelihoods strategies. In these types of projects, the affected population may comprise principally of the relocating people. At the other end of the spectrum are projects involving a whole community or even multiple communities to multiple relocation sites on land owned by others or proximate to other communities, and which involve significant disruption to livelihoods. In such projects, the affected population may also comprise:

- members of any host community.
- people who choose not to relocate.
- people who suffer impacts from the relocation process such as members of nearby communities who lose access to essential services or businesses owners negatively impacted by changes in pattern of commerce.

**RESOURCE**

The Enhanced Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (EVCA)

The EVCA specifically recognises the urban context as a distinct setting in which displacement arises as a disaster risk. It provides for new tools giving guidance on how to conduct city-wide risk assessments and urban profiling which will be helpful for National Societies.®
Task 7

Identify the needs, vulnerabilities and capacities of affected populations

Consider whether there is need to obtain further information

Remember, the context in which the planned relocation project arises will influence the range and depth of information available.

For example, in most durable solution to disaster displacement related projects, rapid damage and needs assessments will have already been conducted by the National Society as well as by national authorities and, potentially, other humanitarian organisations involved in relief and early-recovery phase operations. While there may well be a wealth of information available, it is important not to assume existing assessments will have necessarily gathered information relevant to the long-term timeframe needed for the planning and implementation of programmes supporting the intended beneficiaries of planned relocation projects. For example, the circumstances of affected populations may have changed over time. Planned relocation may not have emerged as the durable solution at the time the assessments were carried out so that there has been no assessment of host communities or other affected population. Existing assessments therefore need to be assessed to evaluate the extent to which they provide adequate information as to the needs, vulnerabilities and capacities of all affected populations relevant to this type of project.

In disaster risk reduction or climate change adaptation related projects, given planned relocation is at the centre of policy development from the outset, it is more likely that the national authorities will have undertaken some assessment of the needs, vulnerabilities and capacities of affected populations which have been specifically tailored to the intended planned relocation project. Nevertheless, it is also necessary in these contexts to evaluate these assessments to determine if they are sufficient to enable planning of appropriate programme activities.

HOW TO

Choose the assessment tools most suited to obtaining the relevant information.

There are a variety of assessment tools, both internal and external to the Movement. For example:

- In relation to shelter issues: the IFRC Rapid Tenure Assessment Guide provides an outline of key issues to address in the housing, land and property assessment process, including in relation to relocation as a durable solution to disaster displacement.81
- In relation to livelihoods issues, Annex 3 of the IFRC Livelihoods Guidelines provides a list of Movement assessment tools.82
- In relation to protection, gender and inclusion, annexes 1 and 2 of the IFRC Minimum Standards for Protection Gender and Inclusion in Emergencies provide, respectively, sample questions on disability and household characteristics.83
Task 8
Select members of the community for relocation

Identification of the members of the community who will relocate will be a critical component of planning. In most instances, the national authority will provide general selection criteria. Plans need to be made for the identification, verification and then registration of beneficiaries. This may include:

- identifying respected members of the community.
- meeting with existing community leadership structures.
- establishing a new community-based organisation.
- interviewing neighbours.

Task 9
Plan programme activities across relevant sectors

As already noted, planned relocation projects will potentially involve many programme sectors. Those most commonly engaged include shelter, livelihoods, WASH, health, community engagement and accountability, protection, gender and inclusion, and PMER. It will be necessary to begin planning the activities necessary in each of the sectors involved in supporting the planned relocation project.

Remember:
- It will be necessary for these activities to be integrated into a coherent timeline.
- When planning programme activities, ensure that a human-rights based approach is adopted. International human rights law (IHLR) provides guidance as to the content of supporting humanitarian programming. The concepts of non-discrimination and adequacy play particularly important roles:
  - The non-discrimination principle is central to all IHRL and is at the core of protection, gender and inclusion aspects of programming.
  - An ‘adequacy-oriented’ approach to programming means that lives and livelihoods should at the least be restored through programming to a sufficient extent to allow people being relocated and other affected people to enjoy the same level of rights as before. In some instances, livelihoods may need to be strengthened and/or diversified to facilitate an equivalent level of enjoyment and shelter should, where necessary, always be built back better/safer.

**REMEMBER**

The selection criteria provided by the government may be problematic. For example, they may not:

- recognise the needs of particularly vulnerable groups.
- recognise loss of informally held tenure.

Any concerns should be discussed with the relevant IFRC advisor, prior to engaging in advocacy.

In some instances, particularly in durable solutions to disaster displacement related projects, housing units on relocation sites may be of insufficient number to provide new homes for all of those displaced, and it is therefore critical to have transparent selection process which incorporates a mechanism for non-selected people to lodge a complaint and have that fairly considered.
HOW TO

Key human rights norms and standards relevant to programme planning

Non-discrimination

- Marginalised groups in society can meaningfully participate in decisions which will impact on their enjoyment of rights.
- The particular needs and vulnerabilities of groups such as female-headed households, lactating women, the aged, children, LGBTQI people, people living with and affected by HIV, and people with disabilities are factored into programme planning and implementation.

Adequacy

Adequacy of humanitarian goods and services requires that they are (i) available, (ii) accessible, (iii) acceptable, and (iv) adaptable:

(i) Availability means that these goods and services are provided to the affected population in sufficient quantity and quality.

(ii) Accessibility requires that these goods and services (a) are provided to all according to their needs and without discrimination, (b) are within safe reach and can be physically accessed by everyone, including people with specific needs, and (c) are known to the beneficiaries.

(iii) Acceptability refers to the requirement that goods and services provided are respectful of the culture of individuals, minorities, peoples and communities, and sensitive to gender and age requirements; and

(iv) Adaptability requires that these goods and services be provided in ways flexible enough to adapt to the change of needs in the different phases of emergency relief, recovery and, in the case of internally displaced people, return, local integration or settlement elsewhere in the country.84

RESOURCE

Housing, land and property rights mapping

IFRC Disaster Law has housing, land and property rights mapping in 11 Asia Pacific countries:85 Bangladesh, Cook Islands, Fiji, Indonesia, Mongolia, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu.

The mapping and accompanying fact sheets highlight housing, land and property to be aware of to ensure equitable assistance and avoid doing any harm. The fact sheets can be used as a tool for longer-term policy development and as an advocacy guide.

bit.ly/3jOMWOj
Task 10
Ensure the early identification of housing, land and property issues

Housing, land and property rights are a subset of international human rights law. Issues relating to the enjoyment of housing, land and property rights are one of the most common problems affecting planned relocation projects. It is therefore important that any housing, land and property issues are identified as soon as possible in order to reduce the risk that the project is delayed and/or creates tension and conflict.

Furthermore, in contrast to many sectors, housing may be managed or administered by multiple government agencies or ministries, with a different ministry having responsibility for shelter/housing in emergency and relief phases. This can create complications and cause delay to the project, for example, if there are problems in communication between the various ministries or agencies involved, or where the ministry in charge of the planned relocation project is not involved in meetings during earlier phases when housing, land and property issues may be first raised.

Early identification of housing, land and property issues will enable National Societies to plan:

• appropriate advocacy strategies.
• programme activities aimed at resolving the particular housing, land and property issue or meeting the humanitarian needs of affected populations pending their resolution.

A central concept in housing, land and property is the concept of security of tenure. This describes tenure of land and/or housing “which enables a secure home and enables one to live in security peace and dignity”. Tenure takes a variety of forms, and includes: including rental (public and private) accommodation, cooperative housing, lease, owner-occupation, emergency housing and informal settlements, including occupation of land or property. Such tenure types are applicable in statutory, customary or religious systems. The urban context features overlapping ownership patterns common to customary landholding systems and contains the most diverse forms of tenure.64

Housing

Some common housing-related issues to watch out for include:

• an inability to establish prior security of tenure to qualify for humanitarian assistance to meet immediate or recovery needs;65
• changes in tenure, where people are resettled from freehold into leasehold tenured arrangements.
• gaps in the title regime such that potential beneficiaries cannot prove status as formal landholders;66
• differing tenures in different relocation sites (for example, freehold tenure versus usufruct (licence to occupy) entitlements.
• beneficiary criteria for housing in relocation site not taking account of all housing-related needs, such as the non-recognition of housing needs of:
  • renters or squatters;
    » households who occupy homes under customary tenure arrangements; or
  » multiple households formerly occupying a single destroyed dwelling.
• the costs associated with moving to and/or remaining in formal settlement in the relocation site are such that people will be completed to return to informal settlement sites.

Land

Land issues fall into two broad categories: land availability and land suitability.

Issues of land availability often relate to the question of who owns the land where the proposed relocation site is situated. Issues relating to land availability have often proven to be the most intractable problem affecting the successful implementation of a planned relocation project. For this reason, obtaining clear information about who owns the land on which it is proposed to relocate people is one of the first things a National Society should seek prior to engagement in any planned relocation project.

If owned by the relocating person, household, or community, while the project will remain a complex operation, it will generally be less complicated than those instances where land is owned by the state – for example, it may not be necessary to have land transfers and the issuing of new certificates of title to beneficiaries if they are relocating within their own
land. In countries with relatively high rates of publicly owned land, the process will be more complicated, but land issues may tend to be more of land suitability, rather than availability. More complicated still are cases where a proposed resettlement site is on land that is not owned by those relocating nor the state but is owned by other individuals or groups. In these cases, if not otherwise donated, the land has to be purchased directly from the owner or made available through a process of compulsory acquisition or reclassification by the state. This is typically a lengthy and complicated procedure, for which there must be clear legal authority. Even where such authority exists, the capacity of the state to in fact compulsorily purchase land may be weak.

Another land availability issue which commonly arises results from a disconnect between recognised/formal structures of landholding and informal structures, which can mean that otherwise proximate and suitable relocation sites situated on communal land are discounted or treated differently as regards compensation. Given relocation onto communal land will often involve the least disruption, it may be necessary to engage in advocacy on this issue. In such circumstances, the National Society will need to work closely with IFRC housing, land and property experts.

Finally, in some contexts and particularly large-scale disasters, there can be difficulty managing estimates of the numbers of people who require resettlement with estimates of the land required for resettlement. This may result in the government acquiring too much land for resettlement, because the estimates of the numbers requiring resettlement kept changing, often because of the long lead times involved in acquiring land for resettlement and those concerned obtained land through other means. This can then lead then put pressure on housing donors to prioritise government resettlement sites.

Issues of land suitability relate to the characteristics of the site itself in terms and can include concerns relating to:

-affording continued access to previous livelihoods options.
- soil quality, proximity to health, education, police and other essential services.
- availability of water, sanitation and power.
- exposure to other hazards.
- conflict/tension with other groups.

The location of the site itself can present potential suitability problems, where the site is only accessible via passage over land owned by others. If so, this will require negotiating a rite of passage with the owners of that territory. This can be a complicated process.

**Property**

**Property issues which can arise include:**

- Loss of access to commercial assets by both relocating people and non-relocating people.
- Non-payment of residential and commercial rents.

**REMEMBER**

Land-related issues shape the role of National Societies in important ways:

- Where availability is the issue, programme support for displaced people and communities pending their eventual relocation will likely need to continue for longer and be factored into funding applications and operational plans/budgets.
- Where availability issues arise, it is important that affected populations are kept fully informed in order to avoid raising expectations around timeframes which cannot be met.
- Where suitability issues are left unresolved prior to the physical relocation of the beneficiaries, there is increased risk that the site will be abandoned.
- Will require that affected populations be given opportunity to participate in discussions concerning land-related issues.
- May require detailed consideration about how to support alternative self-determined recovery pathways.
- May shape the direction of humanitarian advocacy in that, depending on the structure of land ownership, National Societies may be required to engage with public officials regarding formal systems of land tenure and/or with customary authority figures in relation to customary or traditional systems of land tenure.
Early Identification of housing, land and property issues in Bangladesh

During the first two weeks of September 2018, heavy rains and flooding caused the Padma River in Shariatpur district, Bangladesh to dramatically rise, causing riverbanks to collapse along a 5km stretch of the river, washing away homes. In the two most affected areas, an estimated 8,710 families or approximately 43,550 people were rendered homeless and displaced. Severe erosion affected 7km of the river overall, and in addition to the loss of houses, all the roads, bridges, culverts, and other critical infrastructure in the areas were washed away. At least 200 businesses and 200 shops in two separate bazaar areas were eroded. On 13 September 2018, an emergency coordination meeting took place between Bangladesh Red Crescent Society, IFRC and partner National Societies at which a joint needs assessment was agreed to. The team conducted a rapid assessment from 14 to 16 September in Shariatpur District. As a result of this assessment, Bangladesh Red Crescent noted that ‘being a permanently displaced population, one major issue is the availability of land for new houses as their original lands had been washed away, and it is impossible to manage required land for resettlement without national government’s support.’ It recommended that under the DREF operation a more detailed needs assessment was carried out. That assessment, carried out jointly by Bangladesh Red Crescent and IFRC revealed a number of housing, land and property issues including limitations in Bangladesh Red Crescent’s definition of displacement which resulted in the needs of some of the displaced not being met, and the potential difficulties of some of those displaced in proving an entitlement to compensation in relation to eroded land. A range of immediate, short term and long-term programme recommendations were made, including to ‘provide clear counterpart assistance for the resettlement programme.’

RESOURCES

Rapid Tenure Assessment Guidelines for Post-Disaster Response Planning (IFRC 2015)
bit.ly/3AN4fVL

LEFT Bangladesh, Shariatpur, Nov 2018. More than 40,000 people lost their houses and farms in Shariatpur when the Padma River banks broke. A man stands outside the Bangladesh Red Crescent centre where the Red is providing shelter toolkits, tarpaulins and cash grants.
Task 11

Develop a plan for communicating regularly with key stakeholders throughout project or programme cycle

Planning mechanisms to ensure adequate communication with all key stakeholders occurs across the project/programme cycle is fundamental to maximising the potential for successful planned relocation outcomes.

Communication with relocating communities

Depending on the circumstances, it may be necessary to consult with the community to:

• confirm that the views of community representatives are in fact representative of the views of the community.
• map community capacities and assets.
• identify any need to seek changes to official beneficiary selection criteria.
• identify and verify beneficiaries.
• identify and put in place appropriate informal customary grievance/dispute resolution procedures for dealing with issues arising within families or between community members on issues relating to the relocation project.

Communication with beneficiaries

Beneficiaries will need to be consulted around a range of issues thought the design and implementation stages, for example, in relation to their needs, vulnerabilities and capacities, site selection, shelter design, livelihoods and any specific protection needs.

It is particularly important to plan for timely and regular communication with beneficiaries in order to:

• develop trust, particularly where the National Society has had no prior presence in the community.
• provide all relevant information as it come to hand.
• manage expectations around timeframes and outcomes.
• be informed about changes in beneficiary circumstances, including changes in attitude/willingness to be relocated/resettled.
• facilitate access to informal community and formal state procedures for dispute resolution.
• monitor and evaluate programme activities.

Communication with national authorities

National Societies will be typically incorporated into the national disaster management structure and act as auxiliary to government. This Guide has already identified how this unique relationship can be used for advocacy, which is a form of communication. Given planned relocation projects are typically state-led processes, communication with the implementing ministry/department/agency is important:

• to develop an effective working relationship.
• to conduct advocacy on behalf of affected populations, as required.
• to promote transparency and accountability, for example:
  » by making publicly available details of the relocation plan.
  » by making publicly available beneficiary selection criteria.
  » ensuring a timely, effective grievance mechanism exist for resolving complaints between the affected population and the implementing ministry/department/agency.

REMEMBER

Being grounded in communities, and having a community-based approach to programming, provides National Societies with a solid basis to begin to consider supporting a planned relocation project. Building strong, long-term relationships with affected populations during recovery phase operations is important not just for successful implementation of recovery-oriented programmes, but also provides an important foundation on which to develop community consultation and participation which is necessary to ensure successful planned relocation outcomes.
Solomon Islands, Kolombranga Island, May 2013. Solomon Islands Red Cross branch officer to community members about the rising sea levels during the high tides and the sea wall they have built to protect their village from the rising sea.
Communication with other affected populations

Depending on the circumstances, consultation with other affected populations may be necessary to:

• identify and respond to concerns of host communities.
• identify the needs and capacities of people who choose not to take part in the relocation /resettlement project in favour of other durable solutions including:
  » Local integration into area of displacement.
  » Self-determined recovery pathways in other locations.
• To identify impacts of relocation on livelihoods.

Communication with internal Movement stakeholders

Internal stakeholders include IFRC and Partner National Societies. Communication will be essential to ensure strategic priorities are aligned and to understand technical, financial and human capacities.

Communication with external stakeholders

The National Society will in many instances not be the only humanitarian organisation present in the country which is supporting the national authority with the planned relocation project. Other stakeholders may need to be consulted about a range of issues including to:

• understand their interests and capacities.
• develop programme partnerships.
• ensure non-duplication of beneficiary selection or programme activities.
• ascertain progress on activities relating to the project.
• identify details of other planned relocation projects being undertaken which may give rise to grievances or tension between different beneficiary groups.
• engage in joint advocacy.

The National Society may have donors supporting the project financially. They will need to be regularly updated as to progress.

GOOD PRACTICE

Community participation, engagement and accountability in the Philippines

The Philippine Red Cross is supporting relocation and resettlement of people displaced by Typhoon Haiyan. The project is complicated in that only half of the land comprising the settlement site has been bought and donated to the Red Cross. The other half has been provided by the local government but is designated ‘agricultural’ land. The beneficiaries receiving the donated land will be able to own the land on which their houses are built, whereas those receiving houses on the land supplied by the local government will only have a 50-year license to occupy. Philippine Red Cross ensured that the relocating community were fully aware of this difficulty from the outset and, after consultation with the community, agreed that the fairest way to distinguish between the two different groups of beneficiaries was to select by lot. It continues to engage in advocacy with the local government to convince the Department of Agriculture to re-classify the land is residential land and for this land to also be donated. This participatory approach, which involved the community from the outset, as has meant that Philippine Red Cross has been able to manage this complexity and reduce the risk of tensions between the two groups.

A people-centred shelter project in Sri Lanka

The Sri Lanka Red Cross Society has taken a beneficiary approach to shelter construction as part of the disaster risk reduction related relocation of tea estate workers. The workers agreed to and selected plots through a raffle system. An owner-driven methodology has been adopted. The selected beneficiaries have been made aware about involvement in the construction process from the beginning of the project. Beneficiaries have been engaged in site clearing and foundation excavation under guidance from the Sri Lanka Red Cross’ technical team. The beneficiary or his/her family members are provided with construction training which includes basic technical aspects which are to be checked during construction works and how to do quality check construction materials. During this training, the beneficiaries had different types of house plans explained, from which they are able to choose one suitable to their site.
Task 12

Ensure planning allows for meaningful consultation and participation of affected populations throughout project stages

Because of their intended permanent nature, planned relocation projects require extensive procedural safeguards. Key procedural safeguards include:

- providing affected populations with all relevant information in clear and understandable terms.
- providing opportunity for genuine consultation with affected populations.
- the existence of a fair and impartial mechanism for addressing grievances.70

These are important parts of procedural fairness and help ensure genuine participation throughout the project cycle. Planned relocation projects with these components are:

- less likely to amount to a forced eviction.
- more likely to be regarded as successful by the relocated community.71

Consider whether existing community structures facilitate or impede meaningful participation by all

Securing meaningful participation for all can be complex for achieve. Communities are comprised of different, overlapping structures which may either facilitate or impede meaningful participation by all. These include:72

- community leadership structures (formal administrative structures or informal religious or traditional leaders).
- community social structures (mothers’ groups, youth groups).
- community religious structures (church groups, monasteries and mosques).
- community services structures (water and sanitation committees, funeral savings groups, farmers groups, savings and credit groups).

Existing governance arrangements within relocating communities may be dominated by community leadership structures, the composition of which is inadequate to ensure that meaningful participation is enjoyed by all people who are to be relocated and resettled. In such circumstances, it is important for National Societies to consider what alternative steps need to be taken to ensure people marginalised from participation by existing community governance arrangements are given opportunity to have their views and concerns heard and taken into account. This may include:

- Establishing a new community-based organisation.
- Consulting with existing community social structures.

Particular care will need to be taken where the relocation impacts upon indigenous communities. Additional safeguards may be necessary to ensure that participation is meaningful and consent to the planned relocation is free and informed.73

Facilitating participation throughout the project cycle: Establishing community based organisations

Community participation throughout project cycle is essential. It may be necessary for specific community-based organisations to be established and it is important that National Societies consider whether and how they can be integrated into planning, or to assist with implementation of the relocation plan.

REMEMBER

Moving to a new site of intended permanent residence can be a traumatic and daunting prospect. It will typically involve transition to a different type of housing and may involve a new livelihood strategy. New skills will need to be learned. Community-based organisations can help facilitate this transition.
**GOOD PRACTICE**

**Use of community-based organisations**

The Philippine Red Cross has established two community-based organisations to assist with different stages of a planned relocation project it is supporting involving 128 families post-Typhoon Haiyan. The first assisted with beneficiary identification at the planning stage. This was formed by approaching the Barangay Chair who was asked to identify respected elders from the community who formed the Barangay Recovery Committee. This committee assisted with adapting beneficiary selection criteria drawn from the Shelter Cluster Guide to the local community.

The second community-based organisation was involved at the implementation stage. The relocation site was located some distance from the existing gridline. Philippine Red Cross partnered with another community-based organisation to install solar panels on the roof of each shelter to provide electricity to homes and also to run the community water pump. A community association was established to help maintain solar panels in workable condition. The association agreed to collect an agreed monthly fee to pay for the maintenance from households and to coordinate with the local government regarding maintenance works.

---

**RESOURCE**

**A Red Cross Red Crescent Guide to Community Engagement and Accountability: Improving Communication, Engagement and Accountability in All We Do (IFRC, 2016)**

**REMEMBER**

Consistent with the least resort approach to programming, the livelihoods component should seek to support diversified livelihoods strategies. Displaced or at-risk individuals or households will possess different bundles of livelihood assets, which may mean that different livelihood strategies can be pursued, including those which will mean they do not require resettlement in a relocation site with other community members.

The particular content of livelihoods programming is context dependent and will depend on any identified land suitability issues and the location of the relocation site relative to the site of former residence. For example, there may be minimal impact on livelihoods where relocation is to another site on land owned by the relocating community and where existing assets and strategies are preserved intact. In other instances, relocation (such as the relocation inland of coastal populations) may involve serious disruption to existing livelihoods and require diversification assistance. The location site may preserve existing livelihood activities such as crop production, but protection may require the construction of new roads between the relocation site and relevant marketplaces or other sites of commerce.
PART THREE Guidance

Planned Relocation in the Context of Disasters and Climate Change:
A guide for Asia Pacific National Societies
**Task 13**

**Plan for settlements, not shelter**

Shelter-related activities alone will not provide a durable solution to disaster displacement, reduce disaster risks nor cause successful adaptation to the impacts of climate change. To be successful, a relocation site will need to provide not just shelter, but also a means to maintain or develop new livelihoods strategies, give access to utilities and to education, health and other essential services. It must provide protection and empower those resettled to make their own choices about their recovery pathway.

Ensuring sustainable livelihoods will be central to the success of any planned relocation project. It needs to have as one of its core objectives the restoration/retention and improvement of the livelihoods of affected populations. In all instances, it is important that a livelihoods assessment and analysis is conducted which describes identifies and analyses the main changes to livelihood activities which will arise with the relocation of the affected people to the proposed relocation site. It will be important to map existing livelihood assets, resources, activities and coping strategies in the place of original residence to act as a baseline with which to measure impacts on livelihoods by the proposed planned relocation project. The assessment should strive to capture the impact of the proposed relocation on the physical, human, natural, financial and social assets and resources of the relocating population, as well as impacts of the protection, strengthening, and diversification of the livelihoods of the relocating population on any host community.

**Task 14**

**Engage in community mapping**

Community mapping is an essential component of planning programme activities aimed at maximising the potential for successful planned relocation outcomes. Community mapping will help identify and understand existing community structures (discussed below) and community assets/capacities which can be incorporated into programme design. These include community capacities which can be used:

- for shelter design and/or construction: capacities in areas relevant to housing construction as well as traditional knowledge can help create a sense of ownership and empower long-term residence by beneficiaries.
- to restore livelihoods: to identify community livelihoods networks and impacts of relocation on livelihoods groups.
- to rebuild sense of place through place-based programming: capacities in areas such as community theatre or storytelling can be used to help communities feel more ‘at home’ in the relocation site.

**RESOURCE**

- IFRC, Guidelines for Livelihoods Programming (2010)
  - bit.ly/3zSxZ30
- IFRC Post-Disaster Settlement Planning Guidelines (2012)
  - bit.ly/3tYmwgt

**LEFT** Lebidohe, Timor Leste, 2013.

Cruz Vermelha Timor Leste teaches school children about preparing for disasters.
**Task 15**

**Plan for sustained recovery through place-based programming**

Whether experienced or anticipated, disasters which necessitate planned relocation are destructive not just of the built and natural / ecological infrastructure, they are also destructive of attachment to the space and place of ‘home’.

To be a truly ‘durable’ solution to existing or anticipated disaster displacement, or a sustainable adaptation to adverse climate change impacts, a **planned relocation project must be supported by programming aimed more than physical safety and livelihoods.** Essential though these are, programmes should incorporate activities with an emotional or psychological component aimed at re-establishing in the relocation site the severed link to ‘place’.

Place-based programming is a form of community-based mental health and psycho-social support which aims to achieve this by ensuring that the relocation site can “evoke positive feelings of trust, safety, belonging, and rootedness that encourage people to invest in a locality.”74

There are five elements to place-based programming namely: ecological, cultural, human capital, solution focused, and problem-solving elements.75 The aim of place-based programming is to bring or recreate these elements in the relocation site to ultimately re-establish a sense of place.

Well-designed place-based programming:

- helps overcome resistance to move or remain in a relocation site.
- reduces trauma.
- increases resilience and well-being.
- reduces the risk that relocated populations feel emotionally compelled to return to hazard prone and dangerous sites of former residence.

**GOOD PRACTICE**

**Place-based programming in Sri Lanka**

In the wake of the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami, several communities in Sri Lanka were scattered into different temporary camps. Place-based programming was used to bring women together, to provide a platform where they could meet to process their shared experience and preserve their pre-existing social networks.

One of the women stated that she could teach the other women lacemaking and, for very little money, the American Red Cross in partnership with the Sri Lanka Red Cross Society organised a lacemaking machine and lace to be provided.

At first, the woman used the meetings to process their experience and no lacemaking took place. Gradually, the women began to use the time to learn lacemaking and were able to sell what they made in Colombo. This approach achieved multiple ends: it preserved social capital of the community by maintaining pre-existing networks; it had a therapeutic effect by allowing the women a space to process their own shared experiences of the tsunami in an appropriate and safe space; and also developed and diversified the livelihood option available to them.88
The place-based programming process can be summarised as follows:  

Place-based programming can become operationalised by National Societies:

- acknowledging ‘sense of place’ is real.
- facilitating participatory focus group discussions with people to learn from them about what it means to move, and how to retain their sense of place in the relocation site.
- encouraging relocating communities to “develop rituals for moving not just themselves, but their history as well.”
- undertaking community mapping to understand the cultural assets of the community.
- incorporating place-based programming into shelter design, livelihoods and other relevant programming, in consultation with relocating people, using language of co-creation and co-design.
- encouraging displaced people to tell stories about their ‘place’, such as a favourite tree, or for youths, a place where favourite sports were played.
- where possible, such as in disaster risk reduction, disaster risk management and climate change adaptation related relocation projects, encouraging people to take pictures of their current ‘place’.

**Ancestral remains**

The burial site of ancestors is one of the most important connections many communities have with land and shapes sense of place. In some instances, it may be necessary to facilitate the relocation of ancestral remains themselves. This was identified by the community as a particular issue during the relocation of Vunidogoloa Village in Fiji. For the relocating community, a major challenge was “coming to terms with the traumatic decision to exhume the remains of their ancestors and move them to a new burial location... [Elders] didn’t want to leave the cemetery where it was, to be washed away, so the church arranged for the burial site to be moved.”

**Sense of place and indigenous populations**

Planned relocation and resettlement can be profoundly traumatic and have particularly negative effect on the economies and culture of indigenous and hunter-gatherer communities which are not easily protected by planned relocations/resettlement elsewhere. For such groups, there is a strong relationship between place and identity. Traditional beliefs and practices may also influence the concept of ‘home’ with relocated communities retaining a strong attachment to their former place of residence.
Task 16
Plan for monitoring, evaluation and reporting over a long-term horizon

Planned relocation projects, while complex operations, are like any other project in terms of the need to ensure continuous monitoring, evaluation and reporting throughout the project/programme cycle. However, when developing a monitoring and evaluation plan in the context of planned relocation projects, it is important to ensure that the intended permanence of the project is taken into account. This means:

- Having a timeline for data collection of sufficient duration which allows for the possibility that issues may not emerge until many months if not years after handover.
- Developing indicators which can capture long-term impacts across the range of programme sectors being engaged.
- Including indicators relevant to all affected populations for whom programme activities have been provided.
- Ensuring budgets contain ring-fenced funding to be used for evaluation over long-term horizons, such as at 12, 24 months, and 36 months post-handover intervals.

GOOD PRACTICE
Place-based programming for ancestral remains in Indonesia

Following the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami, members of a Muslim community were resistant to relocating to an inland area and leaving their mosque. The Indonesian Red Cross supported by the Turkish Red Crescent and the American Red Cross engaged in community consultation which revealed that the community would be more open to being relocated if their ancestors were also relocated to the new site. In close consultation with respected elders of the community, a culturally appropriate ritual was identified, and the cemetery moved to the location of the new mosque. As a result, their sense of ‘place’ was re-established, and the community agreed to relocate to the new site.

GOOD PRACTICE
Place-based programming with indigenous groups in the Philippines

The Philippine Red Cross is providing shelter support as part of a disaster risk reduction related relocation of an indigenous community from one part of their ancestral land to another. The relocating households derived ownership of the land located in their ancestral domain, based on communal rights. They were concerned that giving individual certificates to the shelter provided by the National Society may affect their identities as holders of ancestral rights to land. Philippine Red Cross therefore coordinated with the tribal elders as well as the barangay leader of the new resettlement site, to make sure that the relocated households understood that they retained this relationship to the land, and their sense of place was not disrupted by new formal shelter arrangements in the new resettlement area.
STEP 3
Implementation – Pending movement of people

It is not proposed to provide detailed guidance here as to the step-by-step implementation of programmes activities across the range of sectors likely to be engaged in support of planned relocation projects. This is because such guidance from IFRC already exists.

Rather, what this section will do is to identify key issues to be aware of, to ensure the effective implementation of activities undertaken in advance of the physical movement of people across the different sectors engaged.
Task 1

Prioritise internal and external coordination and communication

Coordination with internal and external stakeholders is critical to identify issues which might cause delays and/or conflicts to find timely and effective solutions.

Task 2

Monitor the process and the context

Planned relocation projects can take a long time to plan and implement. Many months or years can elapse between the decision being made to support of planned relocation project that is justified, legal and fair and the physical movement of the beneficiary population. It is important to routinely collect information during this stage to:

• to check compliance with the operational plan.
• to measure performance against standards.
• to identify trends or patterns.

Types of monitoring relevant to this stage include:

• Context (situation) monitoring – which tracks the setting in which the project/programme operates, how it affects identified risks and assumptions, as well as unexpected considerations that may arise. This type of monitoring could include:
  » changes in government.
  » changes in staff in implementing ministry/department or agency.
  » changes in the security situation.
  » changes in attitude of the affected population towards relocation, particularly beneficiary and host communities.

• Process (activity) monitoring – which tracks how activities are delivered.

• Financial monitoring – which tracks and accounts for costs. Given the delays which can occur, it is important to engage in financial monitoring, particularly when support is being provided to relocating populations pending relocation.

• Compliance monitoring – which ensures compliance with donor regulations and expected results, grant and contract requirements, national and local governmental regulations and laws, and human rights or other ethical standards.
Task 3
Engage with the reality: support self-resettlement

Planned relocation/resettlement takes time; the process can last many months, if not years. In the meantime, some displaced people may feel compelled due to delay, socio-economic pressure and/or attachment to home to return to live in their place of former residence notwithstanding an official decision that it is unsafe to do so or the imposition of an No Build Zone.

Supporting self-resettled households carries the potential to create tensions with authorities who typically deem such returns illegal and may prohibit shelter and other assistance being provided in such circumstances. National Societies should look to engage in advocacy to gain consent to provide assistance, where necessary with support from IFRC or from the relevant UN Cluster, where engaged or with a standing presence.

Task 4
Support communities pending relocation

Assistance may need to be provided to displaced populations for extended periods of time pending their ultimate relocation. In some instances, particularly where there are issues over identification and obtaining of land to use as a resettlement site, displaced households and communities can be housed in ‘temporary’ camps or centres for many years. In other instances, the sheer scale of the project may require a need to support relocating populations for many years.

Being relocated away from ‘home’ to somewhere else will typically be a traumatic experience and if undertaken post-disaster may compound existing trauma arising from the disaster itself. The relocation process can be uncertain. Affected populations should be offered psycho-social support and will benefit from community engagement and accountability activities.

REMEMBER

It will be important to consider whether it is necessary to provide support to communities pending relocation whether or not your National Society is directly supporting the relocation project itself.

Self-determined recovery pathways must be viable.

Where entire communities are being relocated/resettled, relocation as a community must remain, where possible, the basic form in order to preserve family relationships and avoid social disarticulation.

Merely giving a choice between community and individual relocation without considering viability increases the risk of poor outcomes.92
GOOD PRACTICE

Supporting self-resettlement in the Philippines

In the aftermath of Typhoon Haiyan, the government imposed a 40 meter No Build Zone. After concerns were raised around the zone extension, this was downgraded to a No Dwelling Zone which meant that commercial and livelihoods infrastructure, but not residential structures, could be rehabilitated or built in the zone. This, combined with delays in identifying relocation sites, meant that people drifted back to the former places of residence. While some local governments allowed support to these people to be provided, other local government units did not. The Philippine Red Cross engaged in advocacy and obtained the agreement from the local government units to provide software support to those who had returned. The Philippine Red Cross facilitated the access to local government units services by informing the Barangay community about the types of assistance that were available to them from the local government units and linking the Barangay community with the relevant ministry or departments.

Supporting self-resettlement in Papua New Guinea

In Papua New Guinea, some Manam Islanders who had been evacuated in 2004–2005 due to volcanic eruptions on the island, self-resettled on Manam after some years in ‘temporary’ care centres on the Madang mainland. This was despite the Papua New Guinea Government maintaining that Manam should not be re-inhabited. When fresh eruptions on Manam Island occurred in 2019, the Papua New Guinea Red Cross supported national authority agencies conducting needs assessments, which identified immediate needs for food and water. The Madang Branch of the Papua New Guinea Red Cross then coordinated with the Provincial Disaster Centre to respond to the needs of affected population.

Task 5

Consider how to support self-determined recovery pathways

The relocation and resettlement of displaced or at-risk communities to a single relocation site makes sense in operational terms: it allows for economies of scale for providing hardware support such as shelter and livelihoods infrastructure and provides an efficient way of delivering software support. From a community’s perspective, a single-site project protects social capital by preserving family unity and maintaining local networks and associations.

However, the reality is that within an affected community, different households have different capacities to recover. One aspect of this is that some individuals and households may have other viable recovery options besides participation in any planned relocation project which, on a voluntary and informed basis, they wish to pursue. There may be kin elsewhere who can provide shelter, livelihood opportunity and other necessary support. The person or household may own other houses or land which can provide alternative options. This is already a feature of displacement in Asia Pacific which needs to be factored into programming.

This element of the least resort principle is often overlooked and requires that the relocation/resettlement should be undertaken for the least number of people necessary to protect lives and safety. In terms of programming, this means promoting self-determined recovery pathways to durable solutions. In circumstances where person has identified a viable alternative recovery pathway, support ought to be considered. This approach is better because:

- It respects the voluntary and informed choices of the displaced or at-risk individuals/households.
- Being self-determined, is more likely to lead to a durable solution.

Enhanced Vulnerability and Capacity Assessments should therefore include questions which can identify what other recovery pathways are potentially available and consideration given to what needs may arise should such an option be pursued and how this may be supported programmatically.

Individual alternatives must be viable by reference to the following suggested criteria:

- Safety – the alternative pathway must be hazard safe and socially safe (e.g. security of tenure, no conflict with neighbours/hosts).
- Dignity and comfort – the alternative pathway must provide access to adequate shelter, WASH, access to education, health services, etc.
- Transition – the alternative pathway empowers self-reliance and avoids locking resettled people into aid dependency.
STAGE TWO

During Relocation
STEP 1

Implementation – Movement

This stage is about the physical movement of the relocating people. In many instances, this will be undertaken by the national authorities. Even if not directly engaged, there is a role for National Societies to play in ensuring that this part of the process is carried out in a safe and dignified manner.

Task 1

Consider the type of relocation

Regardless of the context in which planned relocation occurs, relocation can take different forms. Some will involve the movement of people from a single community to a single, nearby site. Others will be to a site far away. At the other end of the spectrum are relocations where people from an affected community are dispersed across multiple sites, or where different communities are relocated into a single site. Yet others, may involve the relocation of rural communities to an urban environment.

It is important to take account of the type of relocation being undertaken because this will enable better identification of potential issues which may undermine the safety and dignity of the people being relocated. Once these have been identified, this will allow your National Society to:

• Ascertain whether these issues have been identified by the national authority and that appropriate measures to deal with them are contained within the operational plan, and if not, to engage in advocacy for their inclusion.

• Make appropriate plans for the implementation of any necessary measures which are unable to be undertaken by the national authority and not being implemented by another organisation.

Task 2

Ensure adequate arrangements have been made for the protection of vulnerable people

The movement of people may give rise to risks to marginalised groups or people with vulnerabilities due to factors such as age, gender, sexual orientation, disability, and health. It is critical that appropriate measures are in place to enable the safe, dignified and inclusive movement of people. For example:

• Information about when and how the movement is to occur is provided in all relevant languages and in a variety of formats to ensure that people with different impairments can access the information.

• The movement is carried out in a manner which is mindful of the frailties of elderly people, of people with health concerns (e.g. by ensuring access to necessary medication for the duration of the move) and the needs of people with mobility restrictions (e.g. by ensuring means of transportation are accessible to people with different disability types).

• Specific attention is given to the safety of any unaccompanied children, women and girls, female-headed households and any other at-risk group.

• Adequate food, water and non-food items, including hygiene kits, are provided, particularly where the journey will take a lengthy period of time. Lengthy journey times should also be accompanied by adequate comfort breaks.

LEFT India; Baluwakoat, Pithoragarh district, Uttarakhand; 9 July 2013.

Indian Red Cross Society has distributed family packs and kitchen sets, to people affected by the Uttarakhand floods. Pictured is a woman at a temporary disaster shelter in Pithoragarh district.
**Task 3**

**Ensure family unity is maintained at all times**

The physical movement away from home will be inherently traumatic for the people being relocated. It is important to ensure that family group is moved together to enable members to support each other during this time.

It is also important to ensure that children do not become separated from parents during movement and upon arrival at destination site.

**Task 4**

**Consider the need to incorporate a break in the journey to acknowledge the significance of moving from home**

In all instances, but particularly in the context of planned relocation being undertaken as a matter of disaster risk reduction or as climate change adaptation where the relocating people still may be residing in their homes up to the date of movement, being moved away from a former place of home will be a profound moment in their lives, both individually and as a community. It may be important to them to mark the occasion by stopping at some point in the journey (for example, at the edge of their traditional lands or at the last place where their former homes can be seen) to mark the occasion in a culturally appropriate manner. It is necessary to consult with the community in advance of movement to ascertain their wishes and ensure that a break is made in the journey, as required.

**Task 5**

**Ensure arrangements have been made for the transportation of culturally significant community property or ancestral remains**

It is an essential component of place-based programming that sense of place is restored in the destination site. It is important that any property or ancestral remains identified in community consultations as being necessary to transport to the destination site to restore sense of place is in fact also moved.

**Task 6**

**Ensure arrangements have been made for the transportation of personal property**

Relocations may involve not just the movement of people, but of their personal property. In some contexts, for example planned relocation as a durable solution to disaster displacement, it may be that most personal possession have been destroyed in the disaster. In other contexts, there may be a large amount involved. Regardless of the context, it is necessary to ensure that personal property is also moved to the destination site.

While in some situations the movement of personal property may be staged, with some arriving after people have been moved, particular attention should be paid in every project to ensuring that certain important types of property are present at the new home prior to or with the arrival of the relocating people. Such property includes:

- Culturally significant and other property essential for resorting sense of place (for example, woven mats).
- Livelihoods generating property.
- Property necessary to ensure health and dignity needs are met.
STEP 2

Implementation – Establishment

This stage relates to the roll out of the various ongoing hardware and software support activities which have been identified at the planning stage as being necessary to promote the well-being of the affected populations.

Step-by-step guidance as to the implementation of programme activities can be found in the existing IFRC guides already detailed in this Guide.

Task 1

Maintain coordination and communication with other stakeholders and affected populations

Where hardware and/or software support continues after people being relocated have arrived at a destination site, coordination with the national authority, any other stakeholders, the relocated population and, where relevant, a host community will be important identify any ongoing issues across programme sectors.

REMEMBER

The establishment phase may need to last for a lengthy period of time.

It may not be possible to commence some software support until this stage, for example:

- how to use new forms of cooking or heating, or pay bills associated with improved housing.
- how to maintain new forms of shelter.
- how to grow new crop types or manage new types of land.
- how to operate and maintain new infrastructure.

Where possible, try to engage members of any host community in providing software support.

LEFT Kiribati, Tebikenikoora village, May 2013. The sea wall around the village has collapsed 6 years ago and was not replaced so far. The sea water is now in-land making any agriculture impossible and has also contaminated the well. The government supplies water through a pipe, but it's not enough for the community.
STEP 3

Implementation – Monitor

It is important to gather information regarding the impacts of the various activities against the various baselines assessments that should have been carried out prior to implementation. This requires the full participation of the affected population. Monitoring is important to ensure that:

- Programme objectives are being met.
- Programming activities remain relevant to the needs of affected populations.
- Unforeseen issues can be identified and responded to.

Key guides include:

- Guidelines for Livelihoods Programming (2010).95
- Project/Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Guide (2011).96
- Post-Disaster Settlement Planning Guidelines (2012).97
- A Red Cross Red Crescent Guide to Community Engagement and Accountability (CEA) (2016).100
- Child Protection in Disasters and Emergencies.102

Further detailed operational guidance on specific programme sectors can also be found in the Sphere Handbook.103

LEFT Myanmar, Mon state. Flooding in August and September 2019 affected more than 76,000 people in Mon state – the worst hit state by numbers affected. By the end of September, the immediate threat to lives was no longer present, but significant needs remained among the most vulnerable such as support for food, water, hygiene and sanitation, health and shelter. Myanmar Red Cross Society staff and volunteers distributed in-kind donations, mainly from local donors and the private sector.
**Task 1**

**Ensure all relevant monitoring continues, adjusted to reflect the movement of people**

Undertaking monitoring during the post-movement implementation stage is in an important way of promoting participation and accountability. Monitoring will require ongoing engagement with the relocated people and other affected populations to collect information through observation, interviews and formal/informal feedback.

The various forms of monitoring, including those already noted—situational, process, financial and compliance—will need to continue but will need to be adjusted to reflect the fact that people have now been relocated.

Situational monitoring may be particularly important at this point. Unlike previous monitoring contexts, now that people have been physically moved, the on-the-ground reality may differ from that envisaged and planned for in the pre-movement stages. For example:

- There might be unforeseen complications with:
  - shelter – design or build deficits may emerge only once people begin living in new houses; there may be difficulty adapting to new obligations such as paying rent.
  - livelihoods – seasonal conditions, market price fluctuations and other external factors affecting livelihoods may become more challenging; access to markets, training or support services may not meet actual needs.
- The presence of the relocated population in the relocation site may lead to conflict within the community, or with host communities.

Where hardware and/or software programming continues to be provided during the establishment stage, other monitoring may now include:

- Process (activity) monitoring – how activities are now being delivered to relocated people and other affected populations.
- Financial monitoring – the costs associated with any additional activities needed to respond to problems which emerge.
- Compliance monitoring – grant and contract requirements may need to be re-examined in light of additional activities.

**Task 2**

**Review and adjust (as required) ongoing hardware and software support**

The monitoring process may review deficiencies in current hardware and/or software support in terms of generating the expected results. Programmes will need to be adjusted if the overall goal of the project is to be met.

Remember – at this stage, it may be necessary to engage in advocacy with the national authority to address issues arising.

**Task 3**

**Consider whether it is necessary to undertake a formal evaluation**

In some contexts, National Societies may provide hardware and/or software support over an extended period of time. If this circumstance, it may be necessary to conduct an evaluation of the programme to make any necessary adjustments to improve performance for the remainder of the programme.

**HOW TO**

Details of how to conduct monitoring of the impacts of programme activities in the various programme sectors engaged in supporting a planned relocation project can be found in IFRC Sector specific guides, i.e. WASH, shelter, CEA etc.
Given the need for evaluation of programme activities to be undertaken at regular intervals over a longer time post-handover, it is essential that funding applications and processes specifically include such activities, funds are ringfenced for this purpose in budgets, and such activities are included in operational plans.
**STEP 1**

**Evaluation**

Being embedded in communities, National Societies will often have a continued presence among affected populations long after many other humanitarian actors have left. This continued presence gives National Societies a unique position to evaluate programme activities over longer time frames.

Long-term evaluation of programme activities in support planned relocation is essential because issues may not surface until many months, or even years after the handover of new housing to beneficiaries. In the context of a planned relocation project occurring in the aftermath of a disaster, it is not possible to make any assessment of whether relocation has amounted to a truly ‘durable’ solution unless evaluation is done at regular intervals over a sufficiently extended time.

**Task 1**

**Implement monitoring and evaluation plan**

At this stage of the project, National Societies will need to implement the monitoring and evaluation plan beyond the establishment phase. Examples of types of monitoring activities relevant to this stage include:

- Results monitoring – which tracks effects and impacts.
- Beneficiary monitoring – which tracks beneficiary perceptions of a project/programme, including overall experience of change.

**GOOD PRACTICE**

**Learning by doing and evaluation in Samoa**

Following the devastating 2009 tsunami which resulted in the relocation of affected coastal communities, Samoa Red Cross learnt how to work to international standards such as the Sphere Standards. In partnership with IFRC, Samoa Red Cross held meetings and lessons learned workshops with other Pacific National Societies in learning in areas such as WASH, shelter and cash programming. As a result of the learnings from the tsunami, Samoa Red Cross became the rainwater harvesting lead for the Pacific and have been able to undertake ongoing programme support for people relocating to reduce their disaster risk.
**STEP 2**

**Integration**

Given the complexity of planned relocation projects, and the potential for problems to emerge, they in fact provide an operational context in which new skills to be gained or approaches validated, even for those National Societies with experience in supporting these projects.

It is important that new understandings, approaches and skills are integrated into future programme activities as this:

- leads to better, more responsive programming.
- helps cement the reputation of the National Society and wider Movement as a key strategic partner in planned relocation projects.

**Task 1**

**Hold a lessons learned workshop**

We learn by doing. It is common for programme activities of any type to encounter challenges in planning and/or implementation, even more so when the context or programme activity is a relatively new one. At the conclusion of the programme, it is important to hold a workshop within the National Society to discuss what went well and what did not, and identify the lessons to be learned so that they may be incorporated into the planning and implementation of future programme activity.

**Task 2**

**Share your knowledge and experience with other National Societies**

The strength of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement lies in our extensive network of branches and volunteers across Asia Pacific and the world. Given the unprecedented humanitarian challenges posed by climate change confront all countries in Asia Pacific in some way, the lessons learned by one National Society from its programme support for planned relocation are likely to be valuable to other National Societies across the region.

Once the lessons learned process has been completed, it is important that the National Society seek support from IFRC to facilitate peer-to-peer learning with other National Societies. Engaging in such a process is an important part of meeting Transformation 4 of the Movement's Strategy 2030 – “working effectively as a distributed network” – one of the seven transformations recognised in the Strategy as being essential to meet the challenges identified as being “the most pressing existing and emerging risks that confront our network”. These challenges include climate and environmental crisis.

**RESOURCE**


**LEFT** School building destroyed by Cyclone Pam in the Greenhill village, northern part of Tanna island, Vanuatu.
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THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF THE INTERNATIONAL RED CROSS AND RED CRESCENT MOVEMENT

**Humanity**

The International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, born of a desire to bring assistance without discrimination to the wounded on the battlefield, endeavours, in its international and national capacity, to prevent and alleviate human suffering wherever it may be found. Its purpose is to protect life and health and to ensure respect for the human being. It promotes mutual understanding, friendship, cooperation and lasting peace amongst all peoples.

**Impartiality**

It makes no discrimination as to nationality, race, religious beliefs, class or political opinions. It endeavours to relieve the suffering of individuals, being guided solely by their needs, and to give priority to the most urgent cases of distress.

**Neutrality**

In order to enjoy the confidence of all, the Movement may not take sides in hostilities or engage at any time in controversies of a political, racial, religious or ideological nature.

**Voluntary service**

It is a voluntary relief movement not prompted in any manner by desire for gain.

**Unity**

There can be only one Red Cross or Red Crescent Society in any one country. It must be open to all. It must carry on its humanitarian work throughout its territory.

**Independence**

The Movement is independent. The National Societies, while auxiliaries in the humanitarian services of their governments and subject to the laws of their respective countries, must always maintain their autonomy so that they may be able at all times to act in accordance with the principles of the Movement.

**Universality**

The International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, in which all societies have equal status and share equal responsibilities and duties in helping each other, is worldwide.