Abstract

As the issues of Climate Change Induced Displacement (CCID) have become increasingly more apparent in recent years, the recognition and protection of those affected are still inadequate. The United Nations (UN) and the European Union (EU) has been two profoundly influential organizations shaping the global discussion and policy regarding the impacts of climate change, yet little research has been conducted on their responses to the forced displacement of persons due to climate change. This thesis makes two novel research contributions. The theoretical contribution of this thesis is providing a classification of positions regarding CCID, through two themes, namely; the Problem Presentation and Advocated Solution. These themes are then applied to the EU and UN, which is the empirical contribution of this thesis. A framing analysis was conducted on a selection of materials from the two organizations, ranging from 2008 to 2018, with the aim to present CCID as an continuously evolving and current issue. The analysis concluded that while both organization advocated a Status Quo solution (meaning that no international legal framework should be altered or created for dealing with CCID) they differed in whether they described the movement of those affected by CCID as forced, voluntary, neither or both.
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1. Introduction

According to the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (iDMC) there were an estimated 18,780,000 new displacements due to natural disasters in 2017 (iDMC 2017). In 2010 there were an estimated 42 million new displacements in total. Current predictions, most prominently quoted by Norman Myers and Jennifer Kent, expect a range from 200 to 250 million additional climate change related displacements by the year 2050 (Myers & Kent 1995:18). This would make the crisis of displaced persons due to climate change the greatest refugee crisis throughout history, in terms of the number of people affected (Biermann & Boas 2010:62,68; Myers & Kent 1995:18). The effects of climate change on displacement will be felt in all parts of the world, yet initiatives for dealing with the associated issues are still absent to a large extent (Williams 2008; Kolmannskog 2010; Biermann & Boas 2010; Myers & Kent 1995). Scholars, Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and other actors are calling for these issues to be addressed in the international arena, but many international organizations are surprisingly tenuous and incoherent in their responses (Williams 2008; Black 2001; Docherty & Giannini 2009; Hartmann 2010). Since the effects of climate change will pose a significant challenge in the following years, and since research regarding its impacts on displacement is currently in its initial phase, it is crucial to further contribute to the development of an understanding of the issue.

This paper will use the term Climate Change Induced Displacements (CCIDs) when referring to those being affected by forced displacement due to climate change. This group is often referred to by scholars and organizations as Climate Change Refugees (CCRs) or Environmental Refugees (ERs) (Fornale & Doebbler 2017:329). The CCIDs addressed in this paper will only refer to those who are displaced across borders, and not those who are displaced within their country of origin.

Although the effects of climate change on displacement are becoming increasingly more difficult to ignore, there is still a lack of a legal and political international framework for assessing and dealing with the situation of CCIDs (Williams 2008:504). International law and policy do not address whether and under which circumstances CCIDs “shall be admitted to another country, what rights they have during their stay, and under what conditions they may be returned or find another lasting solution” (The Nansen Initiative 2015a:22).
In recent years, scholars have been slowly emerging with proposals on how to deal with these issues (Williams 2008:503). Previous attempts to recognize and attribute legal status to CCIDs have been channelled through 1951 Refugee Convention, which has consistently been used as a point of reference to determine and discuss the status of displaced persons (Williams 2008:507). However, the 1951 Refugee Convention states that the term refugee is exclusively applicable to a person who:

[...] owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it (UNHCR 1951).

Thus, the Convention would not be applicable to the situation of CCIDs. Protection under the Convention is also limited to those persecuted of states and persons, which would make fleeing climate change an insufficient cause for legal refugee status. Efforts to alter or reinterpret the Convention to include CCIDs have also been contested due to possible implications for traditional refugees (Williams 2008; Kolmannskog 2010; Hartmann 2010; Biermann 2010).

This paper will attempt to explore the different definitions of the problem of CCID and the advocated solutions from two international organizations, namely the United Nations (UN) and the European Union (EU). These organizations has proven themselves to be two profoundly influential organizations, perhaps the most influential, within both the climate change and displacement field (UN DESA 2015a; EP 2018; EC 2008). The challenge for the organizations, however, lies in combining the two phenomena, and addressing the impacts of climate change on displacement (Reuben 2017; Myrstad & Kolmannskog 2009; Myers & Kent 1995; Williams 2008). The EU and UN are two particularly interesting cases for an analysis, due to their influence in these fields, and the lack of equal engagement regarding CCID. The thesis will address the problematics of this issue more generally, as well as discuss how the organization views the problem and what solutions they propose. Subsequently the aim of this thesis is to classify positions on CCID distinguished from the scholarly debate regarding the organizations Problem Definition and Advocated Solution.
1.1 Research Question and Delimitations

The research question of this thesis is formulated as follows:

*How do the United Nations and the European Union currently define the problem of Climate Change Induced Displacement, and what kind of solutions do they advocate for dealing with this issue?*

Given the time frame of this thesis, several delimitations had to be made. This thesis will only be accounting for certain actors within the EU and the UN. This was not a conscious exclusion of actors, but a response to which actors were dealing with and addressing the issue. Another delimitation had to be made regarding the timeline of material analyzed. A choice was made to only review official documents made by the UN and the EU from the last ten years, since the research question is focused on how the organizations currently present the problem. Further comments on this selection will be provided in the section dealing with methodology and material of this thesis.

1.2 Organization of the thesis

Following the introduction, the thesis will account for the theoretical and analytical framework through which the analysis was conducted. In this section, the thesis will provide an overview of the previous research on problem definitions and advocated solutions for CCIDs, following a review of the key concepts used in the thesis. The thesis will then proceed to present the research design, including a discussion on the case selection of the study, methodology and material, and the validity and reliability of the method. Following that, an analysis of the two selected organizations will be conducted, built upon the previous sections and continuing with the concepts and classifications introduced in the analytical framework. This section will be organized by presenting the materials chronologically within the span of 2008 to 2018 under the two aspects of *Advocated Solution* and *Problem Definition*. The reason for organizing the analysis in this manner was to describe the evolution of the ways in which the organizations addresses this issue, as well as for structure. Subsequently in the last section of the thesis, a conclusion will be provided, summarizing the results and the discussion of the thesis.
2. Theory

This section will deal with the previous research on the subject, the analytical framework and key concepts used in this thesis. The analytical framework will be centered around the themes of 1) Problem Definitions and 2) Advocated Solutions for dealing with CCID. The analytical framework provided in this thesis can then be used to study empirical material. A further explanation as to what this refers will be provided below.

2.1 Previous Research

This section of the thesis accounts for some of the previous academic literature on the subject. This section includes an account of the different conceptualizations and policy proposals distinguished from the scholarly debate.

2.1.1. Conceptualizations of CCIDs from the scholarly debate

While the recognition of CCIDs has increased in academic research, there is still little consensus on how this group should be defined and how the issue should be handled (Kolmannskog 2010). There are several factors contributing to the challenge of defining the issues for CCIDs, one of them being the lack of reliable data. The acquisition of datasets will pose a challenge for the future development of both defining the group and assessing protection available to CCIDs (McLeman 2013:606). The United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA) with their Statistical Division (UNSD) collects information on international migration from national governments and reports from several UN agencies, in an attempt to acquire such data (McLeman 2013). However, there are several challenges with this form of data collection, including the use of different definitions and standards of measurement between different states and agencies, of which the UNSD are dependent (McLeman 2013:606; UNSD 2004). Without reliable data for determining the severity of the issue, it is difficult to pinpoint the group in question and to gain awareness of the issues that the group faces (McLeman 2013).

Only more recently, a discussion on forced community relocation and resettlement has entered the academic debate (Williams 2008:504). While the connection between climate change and environmental vulnerability has been well established and evidenced through increased desertification, rising sea levels, and an increase in extreme weather patterns, research regarding the direct impacts on communities and individuals is still limited
A difficulty in researching this form of displacement is how to define the group in question. Scholars remain divided regarding whether CCIDs should be regarded as Climate Change Refugees (CCRs), Environmental Refugees (ERs), Environmentally Displaced People (EDP) and a variety of other definitions. Angela Williams, author of “Turning the tide: Recognizing climate change refugees in international law”, which is one of the most cited articles on the subject, states that the term “refugee” has previously only been applicable to those persecuted based on for example race, religion or sexuality as grounds for discrimination and thus not applicable to CCIDs (Williams 2008:504). She acknowledges that the essence of the idea, however, remains the same for CCIDs and describes it as “the forced relocation of individuals due to external (and largely unmanageable) factors” (Williams 2008:504). As previously stated, attributing the term refugee to describe CCIDs comes with great criticism regarding the implications that the refugee definition entails (Hartmann 2010:238). Some argue that the conceptualization of these people as climate refugees or ERs could undermine the rights and protections of traditional refugees as defined by the 1951 UN Refugee Convention (Hartmann 2010:238). There are also arguments stating that that while climate change is likely to cause displacement, the extent of it depends on the adaptation measures of states and the international community, not the environmental changes alone (Hartman 2010:238). The severity of the issue would then not depend on climate change, but the lack of policies and measures in place for dealing with and adapting to the issue (Hartman 2010:238). In addition to this, some argue that environmental degradation normally coexists as cause for displacement alongside poverty, resource distribution, conflicts in the affected regions, social and economic factors, demographic development and other factors (European Parliament 2011). It can also be argued that while climate change is an issue in itself, it will most likely also act as a multiplier of other issues that people might be facing, such as armed conflict and/or poverty (Hartmann 2010; Williams 2008). However, many scholars use the definition of refugees while still recognizing the complexity of said definition (Williams 2008; Kolmannskog 2010; Kolmannskog 2012).

Some assessments in the current discussion regarding CCIDs have addressed the larger phenomenon of ERs, a term first introduced in a report by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) as early as 1985 (Biermann & Boas 2010:62). ERs, in this report, was defined as:
Another widely used definition of ERs was first introduced by Myers and Kent and describe ERs as persons who “no longer gain a secure livelihood in their traditional homelands because of what are primarily environmental factors of unusual scope” (Biermann & Boas 2010:62). These environmental factors could include drought, desertification, deforestation, soil erosion, water shortages and climate change as well as natural disasters such as cyclones, storm surges and floods (Biermann & Boas 2010:62; Black 2001:1; Myers & Kent 1995). While CCIDs would be included in this definition, this is a broad definition without distinct limitations, which makes it problematic as a foundation for research and policy development (Biermann & Boas 2010:62).

Migrants, another definition sometimes used to describe CCIDs, are defined by the United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR) as persons who “choose to move not because of a direct threat of persecution or death, but mainly to improve their lives by finding work, or in some cases for education, family reunion, or other reasons” (UNHCR 2016a). This would indicate that the movement of CCIDs, if they are to be conceptualized as “migrants”, is predominantly voluntary, an indication that many scholars contest (Williams 2008; Kolmannskog 2010; Biermann & Boas 2010).

2.1.2 Proposed Solutions in the Scholarly Debate
There are three significant stances in the scholarly debate regarding policy and protection for cross-border disaster displaced persons among researchers, namely 1) that CCIDs already meet the refugee definition as defined by the 1951 Refugee Convention, 2) that an additional regime should be created separate from the 1951 Refugee Convention for dealing with CCIDs, and 3) that the 1951 Refugee Convention should be kept as it is and that existing mechanisms on mainly non-international levels should be used in dealing with CCIDs. These will now be discussed in further detail.

Firstly, there are those who argue that CCIDs are already applicants for protection under the 1951 Refugee Convention, without amendments to the current Convention (Cooper 1998;
Williams 2008; Kolmannskog 2012). Some advocates for this stance argue that by recognizing that CCIDs are fleeing not just because of changes in the environment, but essentially because of their government, they would already be sufficient applicants under the current Convention (Cooper 1998:502). The argument here is that the requirement of “persecution” as an act of a government against individuals, would indeed be applicable to the lack of protection from the governments of CCIDs (Cooper 1998:502). It is argued that governments not only induce environmental degradation, but fail to put adaptation measures in place, thus making displaced persons vulnerable to these disasters (Cooper 1998:520). Negligence of the governments in addressing and dealing with the vulnerability of people being exposed to the effects of climate change could, according to these advocates, also be a form of persecution (Williams 2008:508). It could also be argued that government-induced environmental degradation is a form of persecution in itself, and that this persecution is taking place because of the concerned groups’ “membership in a social group”, which is one of the criterias of the 1951 Convention (Williams 2008:508; UN General Assembly 1951). Certain marginalized groups in society, such as ethnic minorities, are often more vulnerable and exposed to disasters, and would because of this receive less protection and assistance during and following a disaster (Kolmannskog 2012:1076). Advocates for this stance might also argue that persecution and lack of protection are essentially related concepts and that a “lack of protection could be considered prosecution in certain cases” (Kolmannskog 2012:1076).

Secondly, there are several scholars that argue for the creation of one or several new treaties for dealing with CCIDs (Kolmannskog 2012:1078; Biermann & Boas 2010:75; Falstrom 2001:10). Some scholars, among them Biermann and Boas, argue that instead of adapting the 1951 Refugee Convention to be applicable to CCIDs, a new “sui generis” regime for the recognition and protection of CCIDs should be established (Biermann & Boas 2010:75). Biermann and Boas propose several principles for this new regime that suggest a “Protocol on Recognition, Protection and Resettlement of Climate Refugees (‘Climate Refugee Protocol’)” to the UNFCCC (Biermann & Boas 2010:76). While the authors recognize that such an implementation of a new legal framework would indeed require adjustments in the existing institutional framework, they state that this is practically and legally unproblematic, since it would not undermine the traditional refugee rights under the 1951 Refugee
Convention (Biermann & Boas 2010:75). Falstrom (2001:10) also advocates that a new convention, separate from the 1951 Refugee Convention should be implemented, which she names “The Convention on the Protection of Environmentally Displaced Persons”. This convention would, according to Falstrom, be possible through an application of the existing United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman and Degrading Treatment or Punishment (UNCAT) (Falstrom 2001:10), without having to make amendments to the 1951 Refugee Convention. Falstrom writes that the UNCAT “prohibits a State party from returning any individual to a State where it is likely he or she will suffer torture” (Falstrom 2001:9). She states that this would elude the requirement of “persecution” as formulated by the 1951 Refugee Convention, since UNCAT does not specifically mention what this torture would have to entail (Falstrom 2001:9). Climate change, according to Falstrom, would then be cause for torture as stated by UNCAT (Falstrom 2001).

Thirdly, perhaps the most common stance held by scholars, is that the 1951 Refugee Convention should be left as it is, and that it is simply not applicable to the situation of CCIDs (Kolmannskog 2012:1075). Scholars advocating this stance recognize that traditional approaches for recognizing and dealing with issues of for example migration or refugees are not best suited for dealing with the situation of CCIDs (Williams 2008:514). Some advocates for this stance argue that a regional collaboration would be preferable over an international agreement (Williams 2008:503). Those arguing this position often refers to positive actions made by states, NGOs and other actors, and favours these actions instead of the implementation or amendment of an existing international framework (Williams 2008:503). Some of those arguing this position also state that climate change and its direct environmental impacts cannot be blamed for the human displacement alone, but that it coexists with other societal and structural factors in place (Hartmann 2010:237).

Although the issues of CCIDs has been slowly emerging in the scholarly debate, the academic literature has yet to conduct a systematic study and classification of the different problem definitions and advocated solutions from international organizations. The theoretical research contribution of this thesis is therefore an to attempt to provide such a classification by distinguishing arguments and statements made by the organizations of EU and UN.
2.2 Analytical Framework

This section will make a theoretical contribution with two analytical schemes classifying the positions of the organizations in terms of their Problem Definition (how the organization conceptualizes and defines the problem of CCIDs) and Advocated Solution (what solutions the organizations proposes for dealing with the issues of CCIDs). Later in the analysis section, the thesis will be applying the presented analytical scheme to a selection of materials from the EU and UN, which will be the empirical contribution of this thesis.

An explanation of the concepts used in this thesis is warranted. This thesis will, as stated previously, use the conceptualization of the group in question as Climate Change Induced Displacements (CCIDs) (Fornale & Doebbler 2017:329). As one of the main aims of this thesis is to examine conceptualizations of CCIDs, referencing continuously to this group as one thing or the other might seem contradictory. This conceptualization was chosen due to its neutrality in the use of the concept of displacement, since other conceptualizations such as refugees or migrants, are more extensively criticized by scholars (Williams 2008; Hartman 2010; Biermann & Boas 2010; Eckersley 2001). It is important to note, that while using this conceptualization, the thesis does not make a normative stance regarding the definitions of said group, but simply attempts to account for the debate regarding these different conceptualizations. However, since CCID is the subject matter of this analysis, the thesis is inherently obliged to choose and use one definition of said group. For ease of reading, it is also important to note that this thesis will differentiate between Displacement and Displacements (CCID and CCIDs) as the former will refer to the situation, and the latter the people affected by the situation.

The definition of “protection” used in this analysis will be drawn from the Nansen Initiative and refer to all forms of positive action conducted by states and organizations to assist CCIDs, for example by providing temporary residence in another state (The Nansen Initiative 2015a:7).

A classification scheme to further analyze these concepts and policy solutions was made into the aspects of Problem Definition (how the organizations conceptualize CCIDs and present the problem) and Advocated Solution (what solution the organization advocates for the protection of CCIDs) distinguished from the texts of the two organizations. The selected
variables used when examining the Problem Definitions of the organizations will be whether they describe their movement as 1) Forced Displacement, 2) Voluntary Displacement, or 3) Forced and Voluntary Displacement.

The Forced Displacement category is applied to instances where the organization argues that the movement of CCIDs is predominantly forced, i.e. not voluntary. Subsequently the term Forced Displacement refers to situations in which people have been forcibly removed from their residential habitat due to “a disaster or in order to avoid the impact of an immediate and foreseeable natural hazard” (The Nansen Initiative 2015a:16). Organizations who conceptualize CCIDs as refugees fall under this category.

Voluntary Displacement refers to a range of population movements, the key element being that the organization views the movement of CCIDs to be predominantly by their own choice (The Nansen Initiative 2015a:17). Voluntary Displacements is used as synonymous to migrants. The category of Forced and Voluntary Displacement is used when the organization argues that the movement of CCIDs is of either both voluntary and forced nature, or refers to the group without clarifying whether the movement is forced or voluntary. If the organization only refers to CCID as displacement, or CCIDs as displacements, the analysis applies the categories based on context. Displacement will not be coded into any category, as it can refer to either Forced Displacement, Voluntary Displacement, neither or both. Below follows a scheme to clarify what each classification entails:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Definition</th>
<th>Operationalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forced Displacement</td>
<td>The organization argues that the displacement of CCIDs is of a forced nature. This category includes organizations who conceptualize CCIDs as refugees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Displacement</td>
<td>The organization argues that the displacement of CCIDs is of a voluntary nature. This category includes organizations who conceptualize CCIDs as migrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced and Voluntary Displacement</td>
<td>The organization argues that the displacement of CCIDs is of a both voluntary and forced nature, or does not clarify whether the movement of CCIDs is of a forced or voluntary nature.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Advocated Solution of the organization is divided into the categories of; 1) Status Quo, 2) New Regime, and 3) Reinterpret Convention. These three positions have been distinguished
from the different sides in the academic debate on the subject (Kolmannskog 2012; Williams 2008; Biermann & Boas 2010) and was accounted for more extensively in the section dealing with the previous research. The Status Quo solution will refer to instances when the organization argues that the 1951 Refugee Convention should not be altered to deal with the situation of CCIDs. This position often entails that the organization supports regional and/or national efforts for dealing with these issues instead of creating or altering existing international legal frameworks. The category of New Regime will refer to instances where the organization does not think that the 1951 Refugee Convention should be altered, but that a new convention should be created for dealing with this issue. The third position, Reinterpret Convention, will be applied in situations where the organization advocates that CCIDs already fall under the existing 1951 Refugee Convention, and that the solution is to reinterpret the Convention to include CCIDs in its jurisdiction. Below follows a scheme for the coding of each position:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocated Solution</th>
<th>Operationalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status Quo</td>
<td>The organization argues that no amendments should be made to the 1951 Refugee Convention. This could be combined with the argument that existing actors on regional and/or national levels should deal with the protection of CCIDs, instead of creating or reinterpreting an existing international agreement like the Convention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Regime</td>
<td>The organization argues that no amendments should be made to the 1951 Refugee Convention, but that a new regime or convention should be created for dealing the protection of CCIDs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinterpret Convention</td>
<td>The organization argues that CCIDs already fall under the 1951 Refugee Convention, and by reinterpreting the convention, sufficient protection for the group can be provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Research Design
This section will present the research design of this thesis. It will account for the method used to conduct this study, case selection and the validity and reliability of the method.

3.1 Case Selection
The cases of the EU and UN were chosen through the method of strategic selection, due to their importance in dealings with migration and climate change (Halperin & Heath 2017:218;
Esaiasson et al. 2017:155). Since the aim of the study is to examine international politics on CCIDs, it seemed appropriate to choose two international organizations who have had a significant impact, perhaps the most extensive impact, on international politics in that area. The UN as an international organization has been profoundly influential in setting the agenda in the international debate regarding the implications of climate change. Perhaps most prominently through its agencies of United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the United Nation Refugee Agency (UNHCR), the UN has increasingly dealt with climate change and its impacts (UNHCR 2009; 2015a; 2015b). The EU, another major international player in the climate change arena, has prided itself in its commitment to international efforts to tackle climate change, through for example their European Climate Change Programme (ECCP). Although the jurisdiction of the EU is smaller than of the UN, the EU has proven to be an influential and energetic actor in its own right (EC 2008:2), through for example its influence in the annual UNFCCC Conference of the Parties (COP) meetings. Turning to issues of migration, according to UN DESA Europe exceeded any other continent in receiving migrants in 2015 (UN DESA 2015a). In 2015 they approximately received 76 million migrants, compared to the US who received 56 million (UN DESA 2015a). UN DESA also stated that Europe alone added 1.3 million international migrants a year between 2000 and 2015 (UN DESA 2015b:1). Since the EU has received the most migrants throughout a number of the years, and since the UN would have been the actor mitigating the migration across the world, the organizations are perhaps the two most important actors in these issues (UN DESA 2015a; 2015b:1). An insight into how the EU and UN view the problem of CCID might therefore also lead to interesting discoveries regarding how the issue is viewed in the global debate. Would it for example be likely for other actors to adopt less restrictive policies than the EU or UN regarding CCID during the timespan of 2008–2018, since the two organizations has stood for the most extensive policies in both climate change adaptation and migration?

3.2. Methodology and Material

The method used in this study is a comparative case study through a framing analysis. As the thesis has already accounted for the case selection, this section will move on to deal with the methodology and the materials used in this study.
Framing is a concept and method widely used across several disciplines, such as social and political sciences, sociology and psychology. Framing in this paper will be understood as the frames through which the problem is presented and understood in communications and the frames through which the organization presents policy solutions (Entman 1993:52). In contexts similar to this, Chong and Druckman describe framing as a process that focuses on the dynamics of how speakers (in this case the two organizations) choose specific frames in communication (Chong & Druckman 2007:101). They claim that a frame in “communication or media frame refers to the words, images, phrases and presentation styles that a speaker uses” when providing information on an issue or event to an audience (Chong & Druckman 2007:100). The frame that the speaker chooses would then reveal what the speaker sees as relevant in presenting the topic (Chong & Druckman 2007:101).

The framing analysis of this thesis will be understood as the frames through which the UN and the EU 1) define the problem, and 2) advocates solutions. The classification of the stances was conducted by examining concepts and important citations in the official documents, webpages and texts of the organizations, and categorizing these into the positions introduced in the analytical framework.

Halperin and Heath, two prominent scholars in political science methods, writes that an important function of a comparative case study is the descriptive one (Halperin & Heath 2017:213). This thesis will therefore attempt to thoroughly describe all positions and relevant information. Halperin and Heath further state that two prominent criteria of a good case study are 1) internal validity (that the study says something interesting and meaningful about the case that is being studied), and external validity (that the study says something general and that it engages with wider academic debates that might be applicable to other contexts) (Halperin & Heath 2017:214). This thesis will attempt to meet these criteria by filling the research gap discussed in the section dealing with previous research, and by attempting to prove the relevance of the issue of CCID as discussed in the introduction and in previous sections.

Materials used in this study are the official reports and policy documents from the UN and the EU, as well as certain extracts from their official web pages. These will be examined through framing and through the categories distinguished in the previous section dealing with
the analytical framework. The materials examined are eleven reports and texts from the EU and fourteen reports and texts from the UN. Since issues with CCIDs are relatively new on the agenda and that policy reports are continuously updated, a selection was made to only include documents that were published in the last ten years. This choice was also consistent with the research question of this thesis, since it is focused on the current positions of the organizations. The 1951 Refugee Convention and the UNEP report from 1985 were included in the literature as they continue to be relevant today, and are strictly speaking not the material used in this study.

Although this thesis will analyze the EU and the UN as two coherent organizations, it is important to note that there might be discrepancies between the actors within these organizations. Another acknowledgement is that this study will mainly focus on the UNHCR, UNFCCC and Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) within the UN and the European Commission (EC) and European Parliament (EP) within the EU. As previously stated, this selection was not a conscious exclusion of other actors within these organizations, but simply a selection due to the available material on the issue.

3.3. Validity and Reliability

The concepts of validity and reliability are essential in determining the credibility of a study (Noble & Smith 2015:34). While the two concepts are most associated with quantitative research, they can also be applied to qualitative research, and the concepts are often replaced by or used together with the term “trustworthiness” (Cypress 2017:254). Validity refers to whether or not the chosen measuring instrument measures what it is supposed to measure (Johnson, Reynolds & Mycoff 2016:138). In other words, validity refers to “the degree of correspondence between the measure and the concept it is thought to measure” (Johnson, Reynolds & Mycoff 2016:138). Professor Lawrence Leung describes validity in qualitative research as meaning the “appropriateness” of the tools, processes and data (Leung 2015:325). This, according to Leung, refers to:

[w]hether the research question is valid for the desired outcome, the choice of methodology is appropriate for answering the research question, the design is valid for the methodology, the sampling and data analysis is appropriate, and finally the results and conclusions are valid for the sample and context. (Leung 2015:325)
Reliability refers to the consistency of results coming from a procedure or measurement method (Johnson, Reynolds & Mycoff 2016:135). A reliable method would produce the same results, if another researcher were to re-do the analysis with the exact same instruments, observations and data (Johnson, Reynolds & Mycoff 2016:136).

Assessing the validity and reliability in the context of this paper or in any qualitative political science study is seldom to everyone’s satisfaction (Johnson, Reynolds & Mycoff 2016:145). Consistency throughout an analysis and thoroughly accounting for all choices made is therefore of crucial importance to attempt to avoid such scepticism, something that this thesis will attempt to do (Johnson, Reynolds & Mycoff 2016:145).

To enhance the validity of this thesis, i.e. to make sure that the measuring techniques concur with what is supposed to be examined, two analytical schedules were set up. The purpose of doing so was to clarify the meaning of each analytical concept by a selection of categorizations, so that the academic research and the stances of the organizations could adequately be divided into these different categories. The operational variables were distinguished from the scholarly debate and later this thesis will attempt to apply these categorizations on the problem presentation and advocated solution of each organization. Another measure to enhance the validity of the thesis was a choice to only include documents and texts written from the last ten years. This seemed an appropriate delimitation since the aim and research question of this thesis is focused on the current Problem Definition and Advocated Solution of the organizations.

In addressing the reliability of the study, it was quickly apparent that opinions on assessing reliability in qualitative research varies greatly (Cypress 2017; Leung 2015). Scholars are divided in whether reliability and validity are applicable concepts to qualitative research methods, since these often are abstract and hard to measure with numerical values (Cypress 2017:255). Measuring whether the operationalization has sufficient reliability is therefore complicated in this type of analysis (Cypress 2017:255). To avoid such complications with reliability, this thesis has attempted to provide a clear analytical schedule and explicit explanations to all components within the schedule. In the event that the selected material will fit in to several or no categories, or in the event that it is not clear, it will be accounted for and discussed. The categories for the Problem Definition were adjusted to incorporate the
definitions of “refugees” and “migrants”, in case the organizations would not mention explicitly whether the movement was forced or voluntary, to enhance the reliability of the method.

4. Analysis

This section of the thesis will attempt to give an account of the different conceptualizations of CCIDs used and defined by the international organizations of the EU and the UN, and subsequently discuss how the conceptualization of CCIDs might affect the policy addressing them as well as the protection available to them. This will be analyzed in relation to the classification made in the section dealing with the analytical framework, and consequently the aim is to show either concurrence or discrepancies between the Problem Definition and Advocated Solution of the organizations.

4.1 European Union

4.1.1 Problem Definition

In 2008 the European Commission (EC) submitted a paper with recommendations to the European Council in which they conceptualized CCID as Environmentally Induced Migration (EIM) (EC 2008:4). In the report the EC referred to the displacement of CCID as “migration” and therefore aligning with the category of Voluntary Displacement in their Problem Definition (EC 2008:4). They asserted that EIM should be a crucial focus point on the EU agenda, and that Europe must expect substantially increased migratory pressure due to climate change (EC 2008:4). Following the paper, the Council of the European Union urged the EC to present a further analysis on the impact of climate change on migration (Council of the European Union 2009:63). In 2011 the EC wrote a report following the Stockholm Programme by the Council in which they referred to CCID as EIM and again called for the issues of the group to be addressed in the global political discussion (EC 2011). In the same year the European Parliament (EP) wrote a report also referring to the group of CCIDs as EIMs as well as climate and environmental related displacement, using both the conceptualization of CCIDs as migrants and as displacements (EP 2011:7). The EP concluded that any policy regarding impacts that climate change will have on regions or migration patterns must be based on a “clear understanding and a clear typology of the
phenomenon of environmentally induced migration” (EP 2011:14; Reuben 2017). However, they failed to provide such an understanding or typology themselves.

In his State of the Union 2015 speech, Jean-Claude Juncker, the President of the EC also recognized the issues of CCIDs and stated that “climate change is one of the root causes of a new migration phenomenon. Climate refugees will become a new challenge – if we do not act swiftly” (Reuben 2017). Then using the terminology of CCIDs as both “migrants” and “refugees”, which would imply that the Problem Definition of the organization would fall under the category of Forced and Voluntary Displacement.

In 2018, the EC conceptualized CCIDs as EDP and defined the group as people who are subject to “forced migration as a result of sudden, drastic environmental changes”, a definition derived from the European Migration Network (EMN) (EC 2018a). Interestingly enough, the organization conceptualizes the situation of CCID as “forced migration” (EC 2018a). In doing so, the conceptualization of CCID by the EC would fall under the category of Forced and Voluntary Displacement due to their use of both the term “forced” and the term “migration” (EC 2018a). In the same report, the EC rejected the terminology of EDPs as refugees and called it a misuse of the term, since they stated that CCIDs are not refugees in the “strict sense of Art. 1A of the Geneva Refugee Convention and Protocol, although their migration is forced” (EC 2018a). Somewhat interestingly, they made this statement while presenting their definition of an EDP as synonymous to an “environmentally-driven migrant” and an “environmental refugee” on the same page (EC 2018a). In a report from the EP from 2018, CCIDs was referred to as CCRs while at the same time contesting the definition of CCIDs as being refugees (EP 2018:5). The definition of CCRs used in the report was derived from Docherty and Giannini, and states that a “climate refugee definition” (EP 2018:5) should include the following parts:

[...] forced migration, temporary or permanent relocation, movement across the borders, disruption consistent with climate change, sudden or gradual environmental disruption, and a more than likely standard for human contribution to the disruption (EP 2018:5; Docherty & Giannini 2009:372).

In recent documents, the Problem Definition of the EU seems to be aligning most accurately with the conceptualization of CCIDs as being affected by Forced Displacement, although mainly contesting the conceptualization of CCIDs as refugees. Subsequently, the EU would
appear to have changed their Problem Definition through the last ten years. In 2008 the EU aligned with the category of Voluntary Displacement. Later on in the timespan the EU seemed to be moving further towards the category of Forced and Voluntary Displacement. In the most recent documents, the union would appear to most accurately align with the category of Forced Displacement. Hence, the EU seems to recognize the issue of CCID, as well as the problem of defining the people affected by CCID. They do not seem to, however, provide a clear and consistent understanding as to what the group should be specifically defined as and why.

4.1.2 Advocated Solution
In the EC report from 2008 they recommended that the organization should consider “environmentally-triggered additional migratory stress in the further development of a comprehensive European migration policy” and that this should be done in liaison with all relevant international bodies (EC 2008:10). Although they stated that the already burdened international security architecture would be put under increasing pressure by additional migratory policies, they noted that it is necessary to address CCID in global politics (EC 2008:4). While they did indicate some international cooperation for dealing with this issue in the report, they did not present a suggestion for an outline of such cooperation. Thus, in this document, they were not apparently aligning with any of the distinguished positions for Advocated Solutions.

The EP wrote a report in 2011 in which they assessed to what extent the EU, within the current EU policy framework, could respond to the issues of environmentally induced migration (EP 2011:14). In the report the EP stated that although this had at the time been increasingly brought up in the international discussion on climate change, it remained unclear whether the then current instruments were appropriate and adaptable to the situation of CCIDs (EP 2011:37). In this report it was noted that it seemed impossible to interpret existing EU legislation to incorporate CCIDs within the protection regime for refugees (Reuben 2017; EP 2011). The same report also stated that it is unlikely that a creation of a new specific legal framework for dealing with CCIDs is to materialize within the EU (EP 2011:10). This would dismiss the two categorizations of New Regime and Reinterpret Convention, and could possibly align with the position of Status Quo from the previously
distinguished *Advocated Solutions* in this thesis. However, they did not clearly align with any category. More recently, in 2018, the EP submitted a report in which they advocated:

> [...] a system that instead recognises the idea of climate change displacement at international level, while leaving the details regarding the form of agreement and degree of engagement to regional groupings, appears as possibly more responsive and appropriate to the problem. A regional system may better employ notions of subsidiarity that more accurately reflect the reality of state behaviour rather than installing a top-down legal framework (EP 2018:5).

This advocated solution of the EP would accurately align with a *Status Quo* solution, seeing as they seem to prefer regional and national efforts, as opposed to an international cooperation or a Convention. Furthermore, the report from the EP also referred to the Commission's Directorate-General for Environment who argued that:

> [...] migration patterns to the EU are already being affected by climate change, and that ‘climate refugees’ may not only be individuals coming to the EU but also EU citizens moving within Member States (EP 2018:9).

In this context, the EP argued that CCIDs could fall under the regulations on the free movement of persons, that is built into EU law (EP 2018:9). Policy for and solutions to the issues of those coming from outside of the EU would then not be covered, but those moving between states within the union would (EP 2018:9). To conclude the report, the EP stated that it is possible for the issue to be brought up in customary international law through further research on the specific form of displacement attributed to CCIDs and through various regional agreements (EP 2018:10). While the report recognized that this is perhaps a “far-reaching proposition at present”, it noted a presently occurring development of climate change related body of law in individual states and some regional collaborations (EP 2018:10). They also recognized that it would be through such practices that customary international law could evolve (EP 2018:10). This could possibly indicate that the position of the EU regarding their *Advocated Solution* could change in the future towards advocating a *New Regime* solution. However, they do not seem to advocate this solution at present.

Returning to the overall assessment of the *Advocated Solution* of the EU, the solution that the organization advocates would once again fall under the *Status Quo* category, since the
organization does not advocate for changes or reinterpretations of the Convention, but calls for regional systems and efforts.

### 4.2. United Nations

#### 4.2.1. Problem Definition

As mentioned in the introduction, the 1951 Refugee Convention from the UN states that term *refugee* is applicable to any person who:

> [...] owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it (UNHCR 1951).

On the other hand, “migrants” are defined by the UNHCR as those who “choose to move not because of a direct threat of persecution or death, but mainly to improve their lives by finding work, or in some cases for education, family reunion, or other reasons” (UNHCR 2016a). Hence, as the CCIDs are not fleeing due to direct impacts of humans or states nor are voluntarily migrating to in some way improve their quality of life, they would not be categorized under either definition provided by UNHCR.

Interestingly enough, the UNEP conceptualized Environmental Refugees (ERs) (then using the term “refugees”) as early as 1985, defining the group as:

> [...] people who have been forced to leave their traditional habitat, temporarily or permanently, because of a marked environmental disruption (natural and/or triggered by people) that jeopardized their existence and/or seriously affected the quality of their life (Biermann 2010:62; UNEP 1985).

Following this definition, the position of the UN would be in concurrence with defining the problem of CCIDs as *Forced Displacement*. However, the organization seems to have averted from this stance in later years.

In 2016 the UNHCR argued that displacement linked to climate no longer could be viewed as a future hypothetical, but “a current reality” (UNHCR 2016c). They estimated that 21.5 million people had been forcibly displaced by sudden and slow onset disasters due to climate change each year since 2008 (UNHCR 2016c). The UN was then explicitly using the term
“forcibly displaced” to describe the situation of CCIDs (UNHCR 2016c). In this text, the organization dismissed the term “climate refugee” because of the implications for traditional refugees in international law, yet consistently referred to the movement of those affected in accordance with Forced Displacement, in mentioning CCIDs as being “forcibly displaced” (UNHCR 2016c). In the same report, the UN referred to protection measures for “migrants” as being applicable to CCIDs (UNHCR 2016c), which would fall under the Voluntary Displacement category. Recently the UNHCR supports the conceptualization of EDP, climate-related displacement, or disaster displacement when referring to CCIDs (Biermann & Boas 2010:66; UNHCR 2015a; 2015b; 2017a). Thus, returning to the categorizations, the UN are being somewhat consistent in using the definition of displacement, as opposed to refugee or migrant, but discussing the situation of CCIDs as both Forced and Voluntary Displacement. They describe, in a report from 2017, that the situation of CCIDs should be addressed in cases of both slow and sudden onset disasters (UNHCR 2017a:7).

During the recent 2018 UNFCCC Conference of the Parties (COP24) summit in Katowice, Poland, that was in session in December 2018, Patricia Espinosa, the current Executive Secretary of the UNFCCC, said that the effects of climate change impacts will be felt all over the world, and that in this issue, people all over the world are connected (UNFCCC 2018). Before the summit the UNFCCC Task Force on Displacement (TFD) released a report in which they continuously referred to CCIDs as climate change related displacement and stated that the TFD “recognizes displacement in both sudden and slow onset events” of climate change (UNFCCC-TFD 2018:5). The report from the UNFCCC TFD also stated that “migration” and “displacement” would be understood as synonymous in the context of CCIDs, then defining CCID as a form of migration, although not exclusively (UNFCCC TFD 2018:10). The TFD, however, makes an interesting distinction in referring to CCID as “migration” in the context of slow onset disasters, and the term “forced displacement” in case of sudden onset disasters (UNFCCC TFD 2018). Another interesting discovery from this text is that the TFD recognizes that failure to address and assist with the voluntary adaptive migration of CCIDs, might very well lead to “forced displacement” (UNFCCC TFD 2018:15), thus making an interesting link connecting Forced Displacement and Voluntary Displacement. The latest position of the UN subsequently aligns with the Problem Definition of CCIDs as being affected by both Forced and Voluntary Displacement due to their use of
the terms “forced displacement” and “migration” in describing the situation of CCID (UNFCCC TFD 2018).

4.2.2. Advocated Solution

In a report from 2009, the UNHCR stated that although CCIDs will generally not be covered by the 1951 Refugee Convention, there are some cases in which it would be applicable to the situation of CCIDs (UNHCR 2009:9). In situations where victims of natural disasters flee due to their government consciously withholding or obstructing assistance to effectively punish or marginalize them on one of the five grounds stated by the 1951 Convention, it might be applicable to the situation of CCIDs (UNHCR 2009:9). Returning to the classifications provided in the analytical framework, this policy stance would fall under the Reinterpret Convention category. They argue, however, that such cases are likely to be few and that any initiative to modify the Convention would essentially risk a renegotiation of the Convention, “which, in the current situation, may undermine the international refugee protection regime altogether” (UNHCR 2009:10). In the same report from 2009 they write that persons not covered by the 1951 Refugee Convention would instead be protected by the non-refoulement principle and additional human rights law provisions which are applicable to aliens (UNHCR 2009:10). Still, UNHCR recognizes that this principle does not provide for a right to enter or a right to stay (UNHCR 2009:10). The advocated solutions from the 2009 report would therefore be applicable to both the Reinterpret Convention and the Status Quo category, since they are not obvious applicants for either category, and/or can be applied to both.

In 2015 UNHCR submitted a report in which they returned to possible solutions for dealing with CCIDs. While they were adamant in that CCIDs will generally not meet the criteria for the refugee definition under the 1951 Convention, they recognized that the concerned group are indeed in need of international assistance and protection, as long as it would not interfere with the current instruments of the Convention (UNHCR 2015b). In the report, they were distancing themselves from advocating a Reinterpret Convention solution. In the same report, the UNHCR stated that instead of amendments to existing legal international framework they support the Platform on Disaster Displacement (PDD) following the Nansen Initiative launched in 2012 (UNHCR 2015a). In another report from the same year, the organization
stated that they were not calling for a new binding international convention that would deal with CCIDs (UNHCR 2015b). Instead they support:

[...] an approach that focuses on the integration of effective practices by States and (sub-) regional organizations into their own normative frameworks and practices in accordance with their specific situations and challenges (UNHCR 2015b:7).

The Advocated Solution of the organization would then again fall under the categorization of advocating a Status Quo solution. UNHCR stated in another report from 2015 that the organization endorses the Agenda for the Protection of Cross-Border Displaced Persons in the Context of Disasters and Climate Change, which is a document from the Nansen Initiative including recommendations to states and organizations regarding CCID and CCIDs (The Nansen Initiative 2015a; The Nansen Initiative 2015b; Gaynor 2015; UNHCR 2015b:9). In this report the UNHCR states that the challenges of CCID are indeed a concern for the UN, but that the objective of the Protection Agenda is not to draft a convention or to create a soft law instrument, but to give recommendations to organizations and states (UNHCR 2015b:10). Following the analytical framework, this position subsequently aligns with the advocated solution of Status Quo, since they are indicating regional and national efforts to address CCID as opposed to an international framework (The Nansen Initiative 2015b).

In 2016 UNHCR published the 2017–2021 Strategic Directions in which they included commitments to assist and protect CCIDs (UNHCR 2016b:7; 2017a:4). In this report and in later publications they stated that an important obligation of the UNHCR should be to contribute to the advancing of legal policy and protection of CCIDs (UNHCR 2016b:18; UNHCR 2017a:4). They also recognized that in certain cases, where climate change related events are related to violent or armed conflict, protection of CCIDs might fall under the 1951 Refugee Convention as stated in the 2017 Legal Considerations (UNHCR 2017a:7; UNHCR 2017c). UNHCR claimed that they are above all operationally engaged in situations where climate change, disaster displacement and violent conflict are interlinked (UNHCR 2017a:7), and are not usually explicitly engaged in situations where climate change acts as sole cause for displacement. However, they recognized that this might not always be the case and referred to when UNHCR together with Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for
Human Rights (OHCHR) provided disaster relief after the 2010 Haiti earthquake, as an example of UN involvement in the protection of CCIDs (UNHCR 2017a:7).

Thus, the most recent Advocated Solution of the UN would arguably fall under the Status Quo category, since instead of promoting changes in the current Convention, or promoting a new one, they advocate for regional and/or national efforts (UNHCR 2015a; 2015b; 2016b; 2017a).

Previous to the recent COP24 summit, it was announced that displacement due to climate change would be addressed during the proceedings (UNFCCC 2018). COP24 was in session from the 3rd of December to the 14th of December of 2018 (UNFCCC 2018). If an agreement were to be incorporated, it would be the first UN global agreement on a common approach to international migration caused by climate change (UNFCCC 2018). The UNFCCC Task Force on Displacement (TFD) preceding to the summit of COP24, examined policy and practice at the “subnational, national, regional and international levels” regarding displacement due to climate change (UNFCCC 2018). The TFD was to identify the policy and institutional frameworks in place, and what alterations might be needed in the future to avert and address displacement with climate change (UNFCCC 2018). An unprecedented incident in UN history was that that the TFD also included encouragement to committees under the UNFCCC to consider this form of displacement (UNFCCC 2018).

Recommendations to COP24 from the TFD included advisement on the COP19 Warsaw International Mechanism for loss and damage associated with climate change impacts, “integrated approaches to avert, minimize and address displacement related to the adverse impacts of climate change” and the encouragement of further mapping of risks associated with climate change effects (UNFCCC-TFD 2018:7). Although these recommendations show an unprecedented engagement of the UN addressing CCIDs, they do not address specifics in either the Problem Definition or Advocated Solution of the organization (UNFCCC-TFD:2018). Also, implications and consequences of the COP24 summit are still difficult to predict since it has only recently been in session, and will perhaps become more apparent in time.
4.3 Comparative Analysis

The analysis concluded that the Problem Definition of the EU aligned with the category of Forced Displacement. This differed from the Problem Definition of the UN, which was concluded to include both Forced and Voluntary Displacement. While it is interesting that two of the most important actors in the climate change arena differs in their view on how to define the problem of CCID, it might come down to essential features of the organizations. Although both organizations are comprised by member states, the UN is currently made up by 193 member states (UN n.d.) whereas the EU is made up by 28 (EU n.d.). The size of the organizations may very well impact the attitudes of the organizations. The UN would perhaps be more inclined to position themselves more neutrally in issues regarding CCID than the EU, since they are comprised by more than sixth times the number of member states than the EU and thus having to take more opinions into consideration. It is also worthy to note that the permanent members of the UN Security Council - China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States - have veto right, which means that they can reject proposals from the UN (Conlon 1998). This might also ultimately lead to the UN having to be less extreme in how they handle sensitive issues such as CCID.

The Advocated Solution for the two organizations was, as previously mentioned, concluded to be the same. Both organizations aligned with the presented category of advocating a Status Quo solution. However, the organizations differed to some extent in how their Status Quo solution was formulated. Although the EU referred to regional collaborations at the present, they seemed to advocate some sort of international customary law in the future, which would perhaps indicate that the organization would align with another category later on. The UN also seemed to advocate a solution that would help protect and assist CCIDs, yet their solution greatly discouraged any amendment to or creation of a convention. The position of the UN would then perhaps even more accurately than the EU, align with advocating a Status Quo solution.

This leads to an interesting discovery in that while the Problem Definition varied between the two organizations, the Advocated Solution was concluded to be the same. As previously mentioned, this could be explained by the difference in size and structure of the organizations. It is also worthy to note that while the UN could be viewed as an international
organization (UN n.d.), the institutional design of EU is perhaps most comparable to a federal state or a regional collaboration (Fossum & Jachtenfuchs 2017).

5. Conclusion

How do the United Nations and the European Union currently define the problem of Climate Change Induced Displacement, and what kind of solutions do they advocate for dealing with this issue?

This thesis has attempted to answer the research question posed above. The analysis concluded that both organizations of the EU and the UN recognize that the problem of CCID will pose a considerable global challenge in the future, but differed in their views on how to define the problem and what solutions to advocate. Furthermore, the analysis showed that these problem definitions and advocated solutions of the organizations has changed over the course of the last ten years. The current Problem Definition of the UN for describing the situation of CCID was concluded to be that of both Forced and Voluntary Displacement.

When examining the EU, the analysis showed that the Problem Definition used was that the displacement of CCIDs aligned with the Forced Displacement category. The Advocated Solution of both organizations was concluded to align with the Status Quo category. While it was not concluded to be a definite explanation, it was discussed whether this could depend on the size and/or structure of the organizations. However, further research on the subject would have to be conducted to resolve those questions.

Further questions that arose in conducting this analysis was whether an analysis of the EU and the UN could reveal anything about how other actors would position themselves in the issue of CCID. In the section regarding the case selection of this thesis, it was noted that the EU send more aid overseas, more development assistance, and receive more migrants than any other state or actor (Barnato 2015; UN DESA 2015a; 2015b). It was also noted that the UN would have been the mitigator in those instances. It might therefore seem unlikely that other states and actors would have adopted less restrictive Problem Definitions and Advocated Solutions between 2008 and 2018 for dealing with CCID than the EU. As the EU then would have been a leading actor in both climate change and migration, and since the UN
would be the organization mitigating these actions, it could be deemed likely that they would be leading actors when the issues are combined as well.

The theoretical contribution derived from this thesis was the analytical scheme presented in the analytical framework for systematically classifying positions for Problem Presentation and Advocated Solution. This analytical scheme could be used on other similar empirical cases as well. The empirical contribution was applying the analytical framework upon the two most important empirical actors in the issue of CCID, namely the EU and UN, to gain a further understanding of the issues that CCIDs face.
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