Climate-Induced Human Mobility in Policy
A Comparative Analysis of Problem Representations in Policy of Two Small-Island Cases

Nora Söderberg

Autumn 2019
Bachelor Thesis in Development Studies
Department of Political Science
Uppsala University
Supervisor: Joakim Palme
Words: 13551
Abstract
This thesis is a descriptive study of problem representations of climate-induced human mobility in policy. Two cases which are severely impacted by climate change have been selected for the analysis: Kiribati and Andaman and Nicobar Islands. Policies of these cases are analysed through a qualitative text analysis following the methodological approach “What’s the Problem Represented to Be?”. A particular focus is given to the issue of “planned relocations” as this is a form of human movement that is, per definition, driven by policy. The analysis found negative representations of human mobility to be present in both cases, but also positive representations in the case of Kiribati. Planned relocations were represented as something necessary and difficult by both the cases, but a substantial difference concerned the intended length of such movements. Lastly, this study highlights the need for further research on policy engagement in climate-induced human mobility.
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1. Introduction
Climate change is a global phenomenon with local implications and manifestations (IPCC, 2014;1139). This means that people are differently exposed to climate change impacts in different parts of the world, resulting in different conditions for development. The UNs Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) describes how climate change is undermining the abilities of all countries to achieve sustainable development. However, in some countries, the very survival of society is at risk (United Nations, 2015;5). “Small Island Developing States” (SIDS) constitute a particular point of concern, as they may become entirely inundated due to sea level rise (IPCC, 2014;1617). This scenario raises questions regarding where the affected human population should move instead; how such movement should be undertaken; and who is responsible for implementing it. The SDGs address human mobility as a development issue, located within economic, social and environmental aspects. They also highlight the importance of international cooperation in order to ensure “safe, orderly and regular migration involving full respect for human rights” (UN, 2015;8). As a development issue, this is tackled through official policy.

In terms of policy, human mobility is almost exclusively handled on national and sub-national level (Sassen, 2005). Departing from the IPCCs predictions of climate change as threatening the existence of whole nations (IPCC, 2014), a crucial question is whether any national or sub-national units contain policy in line with this risk. A related question regards what official policy can do. When policy is formulated by national or sub-national units, which are fixed to a certain territory and that territory may become entirely inundated; what can policy do? Climate change and human mobility, as well as their interactions, are challenging traditional assumptions in international relation, such as those concerning states and the interstate-system. They also pose difficulties to policymaking.

The relationship between policy and climate-induced human mobility has been scarcely studied in previous research (Gemenne, 2011;548), thus constituting a research gap. This paper locates itself within this research gap by analysing how official policy engages with problem representations of climate-induced human mobility in two small-island cases. The paper will analyse whether states incorporate climate-induced human mobility in policy at all, and if so; how this incorporation is done. Policy is in this paper seen as engaging with the issues it aims to handle.
1.1 Purpose and Research Question

This thesis is a study of problem representations of climate-induced human mobility in policy. It analyses how national and district-level governing bodies are engaging with climate-induced human mobility through problem representations in policy. Expressed differently, the aim is to identify and characterise policy on climate-induced human mobility. The aim is explorative and descriptive in its character, but also contains analytical ambitions. This aim has guided the selection of cases, material and the methodological choices of this study. In order to answer the research question, a qualitative text analysis of policy documents will be performed, following Carol Lee Bacchi’s method called “What’s the Problem Represented to Be?” (Bacchi, 2018). A particular focus will be given to the issue of “planned relocations” as this is a form of human movement that is, per definition, driven by policy (Georgetown University & UNHCR, 2015). In order to grasp how there may be different ways of representing climate-induced human mobility, the analysis will compare policy from governing authorities of two cases: Kiribati and Andaman and Nicobar Islands (henceforth referred to as ANI). Both have been selected based on current and predicted climate change impacts, where these cases are identified as highly impacted and vulnerable (IPCC, 2014).

Noteworthy, is that this paper does not aim to study whether climate-induced human mobility is happening or not. There exists a vast amount of literature focused on this issue, which this paper largely builds upon (see section 2.2). It is not my aim to take part in the debate on the severity and scale of climate-induced mobility, as that is beyond the scope of a bachelor thesis paper. What I aim to achieve, is rather a description of how policy has been formulated. The research question is formulated as follows:

*How do governing authorities in climate change inflicted island territories represent the problem of climate-induced human mobility in policy?*

2. Theory & Background

This section shortly summarizes the background and context for climate-induced human mobility as phenomenon and field of research. It also introduces some theoretical stances, which may prove relevant for reaching an understanding of policy representations. First, some previous lines of research regarding climate-induced human mobility are outlined. These provide a base for this study to build upon. Secondly, some theoretical stances on policy and
political power are presented. These will facilitate and to some extent guide the analysis in answering the research question. They are also viewed as a form of overarching theoretical context, in which this paper is located. Thirdly, some key concepts on human mobility are presented and defined. These will be used in order to categorize different forms of human mobility in the analysis. Fourthly, the wider context of policy frameworks on climate-induced human mobility is summarized. Lastly, the analytical framework is described. This last section clarifies how the theoretical and conceptual factors will be used in the analysis. Doing so, the last section also presents the analytical questions.

2.1 Previous Research

“In a context where global environmental stress and degradation have accelerated and unprecedented numbers of the world’s population are seeing migration as an option, the need for research in this area is considerable” (Hugo, 1996;105). The relationship between human mobility and environmental degradation was not given considerable scholarly attention until the mid-1970s when a group of researchers presented their studies of instances where people had moved away from their homes due to environmental change. They came from research fields of geography and population movements and did not make claims on whether the environmental change was natural or anthropogenic (Stojanov et al, 2014). In the years that have passed since these studies were published, human mobility in response to environmental factors and climate change have not declined. Neither has the need for research on the topic, although there have been more scholarly attention directed towards this issue during the last couple of decades (ibid). The majority of the studies concerned with climate-related human mobility could be said to loosely follow three lines of research. The first one is concerned with terminology and conceptualisations; how to name and conceptualise the people who move due to climate-related factors. The second line of research aims to systematically model the phenomenon of climate-induced movement, in order to grasp the size of the issue. Finally, the third category is made up by in-depth case studies of people and communities who are highly vulnerable to climate change and who currently are, or are predicted to become, concerned with moving due to climate change.

Research focused on the conceptualisation of climate-induced human mobility relates to the legal frameworks for this type of mobility – or lack thereof. There is a wide range of suggested frameworks for the conceptualisation of “climate refugees”, “environmental
migrants” and a focus on the voluntary-involuntary spectrum of migration (IOM, 2008;13). One such conceptualisation comes from Ransan-Cooper et al (2015), who argue that people who move from their homes due to climate change can be viewed as victims, security threats, adaptive agents and/or political subjects.

The second line of research aims to systematically model the extent of human mobility occurring in response to climate change. Methods and techniques to do so have developed in the 2010s, but are nowhere near a full conceptualisation (McLeman, 2012;600). There is no monitoring which captures all climate-related human mobility; neither cross-border migration nor internal movements (Nansen initiative, 2015). It is however widely recognized that the vast majority of climate-induced human mobility occurs within states (McLeman, 2012;602). Current attempts to model these movements include innovative methods such as tracking of phone calls (Li et al, 2019). Such methods may contribute with important data, if however able to detect only limited situations of mobility, often in the aftermath of known sudden-onset disasters. When it comes to cross-border migration following climate change, a few isolated incidents have been recorded (Nansen initiative, 2015;13f). As described by McLeman, the attempts to model climate change-related migration are new processes and there are no clear frameworks for how this should be done (McLeman, 2012).

Apart from the terminological debates and the large-scale mappings of climate-induced movements, research have been interested in the people who experience this type of mobility, or are expected to do so in a near future. This third line of research focuses on perceptions and different forms of coping strategies among people and communities who are highly vulnerable to climate change. These have been studied through in-depth case studies, for example in the Maldives where people have been asked about their views on planned relocations (Stojanov et al, 2017).

Less literature have focused on policy and governance in relation to climate-induced mobility (Mortreux et al, 2018;124), which is the focus of this paper. The previously mentioned lines of research have however included some contributions. One such comes from Stämpfli (2017), who studied frames within India’s climate policy. Departing from the first line of research focused on conceptualisations and terminology, Stämpfli found that the Indian government framed environmental migrants as a challenge, as opposed to a result of a positive adaptation strategy. The second line of research contributes to the policy-side of
climate-induced human mobility in motivating the very existence of policy. Similarly, the third line of research is important in how policy engages with people’s perceptions of climate change and climate-induced human mobility. This paper largely builds upon these previous studies although focusing on the specific issue of problem representations in policy.

2.2 Policy and Political Power: Relevant Theories

As global phenomenon, climate change and human mobility, as well as their interactions, are relevant to analyse from the perspective of international relations. Moreover, it is deemed relevant in this study to apply a critical theoretical lens to the analysis. Critical theory in international relations takes into account how the political organization of the world is not a given, but something which has an origin and which may be subject to change over time and space (Cox, 1981; 129). Robert W. Cox, who was prominent in formulating this theoretical approach, described international relations as a field of research which is “concerned with the interrelationships among states in an epoch in which states, and most commonly nation-states, are the principal aggregations of political power” (Cox, 1981; 126). However, in an increasingly globalized world, this description becomes complicated by non-state actors gaining political power (see for example Ruggie, 1993; Sassen, 2005). States are now interacting with a variety of actors in the political sphere. In this context, the role of official policy is of interest as it continues to have impacts, yet exists in a changing political reality.

With regards to the role of policy, it is worth mentioning that the methodological approach which is used in this paper, contains certain assumptions of what policy is. WPR views policy as a way of conceptualising social relations (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016; 7). It also assumes policy to be heavily impacted by certain problem representations (ibid). Bacchi has written that “the public, of which we are members, is governed, not through policies, but through problematisations – how ‘problems’ are constituted” (Bacchi, 2012; 22). The emphasis on problem representations as impacting policy and governance, is suitable for the critical approach of this study. By assuming that problematisations have impacts on the political sphere, this approach encourages thorough analysis of the assumptions which underlie problem representations, as well as considerations of alternative representations. This is much in line with the view of political power and the political arena as subject to change.
Saskia Sassen has written various pieces on how globalization is transforming the state and the inter-state system of the world through transnational processes. In one article from 2005, she brings up how this transformation impacts migration policy, arguing that national policy can only partly address and regulate the complex dynamics of current migration flows (Sassen, 2005;42). Sassen suggests the need for states to take on a new and more international, multilateral role in migration policy. Policymaking on a global scale is, according to Sassen, currently taking place in policy areas such as climate change and economic issues, while less concerned with human mobility (ibid;43f). The fact that human mobility is an international phenomena, yet is handled through national policy motivates analysing how policy engages with issues of human mobility.

Arguably, the political organization of the world is shaped not only by a variety of actors, but also forces (Clark, 2014). The issue of climate change brings up the question of physical, non-human forces in shaping governance and the political sphere. While climate change is generally understood as the prime example of how human forces are impacting and changing the earth, this relationship could be turned around. Climate change impacts, such as sea level rise, affects humans and human societies. This question is brought forward by the concept of the Anthropocene, which highlights the interactions of human and non-human forces in shaping the world and the political sphere (ibid). Grosz has written: "(w)hat we understand as the history of politics – the regulations, actions and movements of individuals and collectives relative to other individuals and collectives – is possible only because geo-power has already elaborated an encounter between forms of life and forms of the earth" (Grosz, in Yusoff et al, 2012;975). The concept of the Anthropocene may facilitate an understanding of how human and non-human forces interact in shaping governance and the political sphere. While this paper will not analyse the actual physical impacts of climate change, it assumes physical factors to be present and impact official policy.

2.3 Key Concepts

This section briefly introduces and defines some key concepts relating to human mobility. The definitions are based on previous research and will guide the analysis in understanding representations of different forms of human mobility in policy.
2.3.1 Conceptions of Human Mobility

Various categorizations and issues are of relevance in understanding human mobility. According to Gemenne (in Agustoni & Maretti) any instance of human mobility can be understood through three criteria: “the more (or less) voluntary or forced nature of the migration”, “whether the migration was intended to be temporary or permanent” and “whether the migration is reactive or proactive” (Gemenne, in Agustoni & Maretti, 2019;133). To this conceptualisation may be added a category of internal vs external mobility (Stämpfli, 2017;12). These categorizations may however be nuanced. Many scholars have argued for viewing migration in a voluntary-involuntary continuum ranging from one extreme where migration is entirely voluntary and a second extreme where migrants would face death if they remained in their current place of residency (see e.g. Hugo, 1996;108). Moreover, recent studies have highlighted the multi-causality of current human mobility (Nansen Initiative, 2015;13). In this context the term “mixed flows” is useful. The working definition of this term, presented by IOM is as follows: “complex population migratory movements that include refugees, asylum seekers, economic migrants and other migrants” (IOM, 2004;42). This conceptualisation can be contrasted to movements that consists entirely of one category of migrants.

2.3.2 Conceptions of Climate-induced Human Mobility

The vast majority of climate-induced human mobility occurs within states, a trend which is likely to persist even as climate change impacts are expected to increase (McLeman, 2012;602). Stämpfli has argued that “(e)nvironmental migration is nowadays increasingly seen as a positive adaptation strategy that leads to increased resilience of affected people…” (2017;18). However, according to Stämpfli, this discourse is not widely recognized by policymakers, which still tend to favour negative framings of environmental migrants. Government responses are often focused on controlling irregular migratory flows and implementing policies aimed at reducing migration pressure (ibid;18).

A central concept with regards to climate change and its impacts on human societies is vulnerability. Previous scholarship has to some extent assumed a linear causality between increased climate change impacts leading to increased patterns of human mobility. This has not been the case in past examples of climate-induced human mobility, which have rather shown movements to be heavy influenced by several intertwined factors. Notably, economic,
political and social aspects are interacting with the physical environmental conditions. Together, these are forming different forms of coping strategies, including, but not limited to mobility (McLeman, 2012;605). This relates to the distinction between voluntary and forced movement. In climate-induced human mobility this is particularly difficult to distinguish, since movements may follow from slow-onset hazards and other long-term impacts on human life and resilience (Nansen Initiative, 2015;13). With regards to this, the notions of mixed movement, multicausality and the conceptualisation of movements as part of a voluntary-involuntary continuum are relevant.

### 2.3.3 Conceptions of Planned Relocations

Policy-driven human mobility has historically been implemented in different settings and for different purposes (Mortreux et al, 2018). Due to climate change, planned relocations are expected to increasingly be seen as viable coping strategies for people, communities and states. Despite these acknowledgements, research on planned relocations is scarce and there is an absence of legal frameworks, on national as well as international level. In recent years, there have been some developments, including a UNHCR-guidance on how planned relocations should be undertaken through inclusion of the affected population (Georgetown University & UNHCR, 2015). With regards to previously mentioned distinction between voluntary and forced migration (Gemenne in Agustoni & Maretti, 2019) the distinction is “somewhat artificial” in the case of planned relocations (Georgetown University & UNHCR, 2015;6). They will always be induced by forces beyond the control of the people living in the affected area. The process of relocating people and communities is a sensitive and costly one, with inherent risks for the affected population (ibid).

Historically, policy-driven movements of people have not been limited to the impacts and risks stemming from climate change. Governments have been documented to resettle persons and communities based on “perceived public interest and for their own private good” (Mortreux et al, 2018;123). In practice, relocations have often been performed due to large-scale infrastructure projects, such as roads and dams. When planned relocations are now increasingly seen as an adaptation strategy to climate change, there are concerns as to whether this will legitimise resettling populations for whichever reasons (ibid). The UNHCR has highlighted that while personal gain may indeed influence relocation polices, problems arise already when people start perceiving such motifs – regardless of whether they exist. These
perceptions may impact people’s willingness to cooperate in relocation processes, which in turn may increase risks and difficulties. The reason for such perceptions is often related to a lack of trust in governmental institutions (Georgetown University & UNHCR, 2015) and to historical processes of social unrest (Mortreux et al, 2018;125). India constitutes a relevant example as: “land acquisition and resettlement are highly sensitive politically with a long history of violent resettlement processes linked to development projects” (Mortreux et al, 2018;125). Furthermore, negative perceptions among populations may impact authorities’ decisions on whether to undertake planned relocations or not (ibid).

There are differing views regarding when and where planned relocations should be implemented. According to the UNHCR guidance, it should be viewed as a measure of last resort (Georgetown University & UNHCR, 2015). By contrast, Mortreux et al suggest that existing research on planned relocations has focused on evaluating risks and benefits of intervening, while overlooking the implications of non-intervention. In their article from 2018, they investigated three instances of government action and inaction in West Bengal, India. They found that recognition in the communities of the need for public interventions was not necessarily followed by government actions (Mortreux et al, 2018). According to the Nansen Initiative, permanent planned relocation due to climate change or disasters may be relevant in three scenarios. The first two consists of resettlements within the same state, as a preventative measure or a durable solution where people are relocated to a new place within the country of origin. The Nansen Initiative highlights how the preventative relocation deserves attention as it may prevent worse forms of movement, such as “cross-border displacement or dangerous, undocumented migration” (Nansen Initiative, 2015;18). The third and last scenario when planned relocation may be relevant, is relocation to another country. This scenario is relevant “..in the extreme event that natural hazards or environmental degradation render large parts of or an entire country unfit for habitation (e.g., low-lying island states)” (ibid;18).

Regardless of which position one takes in this debate, planned relocation is a costly process and pose significant challenges, not only to the affected population but also to the broader society. This is true regardless of the level of economic development in the affected area. It is however often less costly than the different rebuilding operations which follow after a disaster has happened (Georgetown University & UNHCR, 2015;6).
2.4 Policy Frameworks in Wider Context

Since policy is formulated on several levels, the cases which will be analysed in this paper are affected not only by their own policy but by frameworks in a wider context. The wider context is here understood as any overarching frameworks or policies that the cases are obliged to follow. For Kiribati, this mainly concerns international frameworks, such as those adopted by the UN. For Andaman and Nicobar Islands, the wider context consists not only of international frameworks but also of national policy frameworks in India.

Turning to the global policy-side of climate-induced human mobility, a crucial point of departure is the Cancun Adaptation Framework from the Conference of the Parties’ (COP) 16th meeting, held in 2010. This framework introduced several mechanisms for addressing climate-induced migration. Two of the most important ones are the Nairobi work program and the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) process (UNFCCC, 2010). The Nairobi work programme assists the Parties of the convention through knowledge support, with a particular focus on Least Developed Countries and SIDS. The NAP process was introduced in order to make Parties identify and formulate medium- and long-term adaptation needs to climate change, as well as developing strategies to address these (UNFCCC, 2019). Human mobility is part of these adaptation needs and strategies (The Advisory Group on Climate Change and Human Mobility, 2014;4). However, no frameworks exist for handling instances when climate-induced movements take place internationally. Climate change is not included in the UN convention on refugees as reason for granting of asylum (United Nations, 1951) and only limited unilateral attempts to provide temporary visas for environmental migrants have been pursued (Nansen, initiative, 2015;26).

In India the national disaster management act provide the overarching framework for handling instances of natural, and human-made disasters. This act makes clear that large parts of the responsibility for handling disasters is assigned to the district state level, both concerning preparedness and response measures. Under this act, each district state is obliged to issue a disaster management plan (Government of India, 2005). On the human mobility-side of policy, the government of India contains a number of policies on immigration, such as several acts concerning illegal migrants, and border security (Government of India, 1983; ibid, 1968). As this is deemed outside the scope of this paper, no analysis of these documents will be performed. They are mentioned here in relation to the larger context of human mobility.
policies in India, which are largely focused on controlling immigration, including movements stemming from environmental factors (Stojanov et al, 2017).

2.5 Analytical Framework

Departing from the descriptive and analytical aim of this paper, the analysis will be performed in two steps. The first step will identify and characterise policies and problem representations, while the second step will analyse these further, following the methodological approach of WPR. This section explains the analytical tools which will be used in the first step of the analysis, while the second step is further described in the methodological sections.

The characteristics of climate-induced human mobility, within the policy documents, will be systematically documented according to four analytical questions and a number of indicators. The questions and indicators will facilitate answering the research question and have been developed following the theoretical stances and key concepts described in previous sections. Thus, the analytical framework builds on previous research and forms a set of analytical tools. These tools will guide me in my documentation of relevant pieces of the texts and could be used by others in order to repeat the analysis. In concrete terms, the four questions “will be asked to the texts” (Esaiasson et al, 2017;212). The first two questions will mainly target the background sections of the policy documents, while the latter two will be answered by the actual policy formulations.

The first question targets the presence and the representations of different forms of human mobility in policy. This question will be used to capture what forms of movements are present in the policy documents, as well as how these movements are represented. To achieve this, Gemenne’s categorization of human mobility will be used, with one additional category derived from Stämpfli (see section 2.3.1). This results in a framework where human movements may be classified according to four categories with opposing alternatives. Human mobility is classified as: voluntary or involuntary; temporary or permanent; reactive or proactive and lastly; external or internal. Following this framework, any instances of observed, predicted and potential human movements that are mentioned in the policy will be documented. This framework will be used in order to answer the first analytical question: how is human mobility represented?
The second analytical question concerns the reasons for human mobility and is therefore concerned with factors that are described as impacting movements. Whenever a reason for human mobility is mentioned in the policy documents, this will be documented and categorized according to the classifications: “physical”; “social” or “interlinked” factors. These broad and overlapping categories are motivated by the conceptualisation of a “multi-causality” in current human mobility (Nansen Initiative, 2015) and IOM’s working definition of “mixed flows” (IOM, 2004;42). Furthermore, this categorisation is inspired by the Anthropocene concept’s understanding of human and non-human forces as interacting with each other (Clark, 2014). These categories will be used in answering the question: what reasons for human mobility are represented?

The third analytical question focuses on policy formulations. As already stated, the specific form of human mobility called “planned relocation” is of particular relevance to this paper, due to the fact that it is, per definition, driven by policy. I will thus document all instances when policy-driven movements are part of the presented policies. Furthermore, these movements will be categorized following Gemenne’s second categorization, of permanent versus temporary movements (Gemenne, in Agustoni & Maretti, 2019). The conceptions of planned relocation as process and political decision will also be relevant in answering this question (see section 2.3.3). In order to identify and characterize any other policies related to human mobility, a third category is included which is called “other policies on human mobility”. These three categories will facilitate answering the question: how are policy suggestions represented?

The fourth and last analytical question concerns the actors involved in formulating, implementing, evaluating or coordinating policy. This question is motivated by the critical theoretical approach of this paper, which highlights the importance of actors in policy-making and governance. As already stated, critical theory views political power as being constituted and created by multiple actors, including, but not limited to, states (Cox, 1981; Ruggie, 1993). It can thus be assumed that policy will be influenced by the actors involved in formulating and implementing it. From this assumption, all actors which are mentioned in the policy documents could be relevant for the analysis. However, due to the limited size of this paper and the focus being on official policy, this analytical question is limited to state actors. Moreover, it is limited to two categorisations of state actors. The first is called “larger organizational unit” and will identify when the documents refer to state actors which the case
is part of. The second is called “other nation-states” and will identify when the documents refer to other nation-states. Whenever policy involves any of these actors it will be documented, in order to answer the question: *which state actors are involved in policy?*

### 3. Research Design

This section present the methodological choices that have been deemed best suited to answer the research question. The research design of the paper is a comparative case-study of two cases: Andaman & Nicobar Islands (ANI) and Kiribati, which have been chosen based on a most-likely-case-selection. The selected material consists of policy documents from the two cases’ respective governing authorities. To analyse the selected material in line with the research aim, the analysis will follow two steps. Firstly, the content of the policy documents that relate to climate-induced human mobility will be systematically documented according to the four questions summarized in previous section. Secondly, a qualitative text analysis following the methodological approach “What’s the problem represented to be?” (henceforth referred to as WPR) will be performed. Both the research design and the method have been selected with the paper’s research question as point of departure and guiding principle. The descriptive aim of the paper may provide a deeper understanding of the selected cases, which are relevant due to their being in the forefront of climate change-impacts. The paper may also result in recommendations for future research.

#### 3.1 Operationalisation

As already stated, the analysis of this paper will be conducted in two steps. The first step will be studied through a systematized reading of the policy documents, following the analytical questions developed in section 2.5. Relevant parts of the texts will be documented and categorized according to these questions and their indicators. The following table (page 15) will facilitate such reading and provide the framework for documentation of important pieces. After performing a pilot study on part of the empirical material, where different forms of human mobility were classified according to the four categorizations derived from Gemenne and Stämpfli (see section 2.3), some categorizations proved less fruitful than others. The question of whether the movement was “intended to be temporary or permanent” (Gemenne in Agustoni & Maretti, 2019;133) was not possible to detect from the texts, other than concerning policy-driven movements. Thus, this category has been excluded from the first question, but is included in the third question, where “evacuations” are temporary and
“planned relocations” are permanent. Similarly, the distinction between “reactive” and “proactive” movements was difficult to distinguish for all forms of movements and is thus not included among the indicators. Lastly, the distinction between voluntary and involuntary movements was deemed relevant for the analysis of non-policy-guided movements, while not applicable to planned relocations and evacuations. This is in line with the theoretical understanding of planned relocations as being caused by factors beyond the control of the affected population (Georgetown University & UNHCR, 2015).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How is human mobility represented? (observed, predicted &amp; potential instances of human mobility)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Internal migration as adaptation strategy</td>
<td>Movement is internal AND (at least partly) voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Internal displacement</td>
<td>Movement is internal AND involuntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 External migration as adaptation strategy</td>
<td>Movement is external AND (at least partly) voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 External displacement</td>
<td>Movement is external AND involuntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Planned relocation</td>
<td>Movement is policy-driven AND internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What reasons for human mobility are represented? Which factors influence?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Physical factors</td>
<td>Physical factors are described as impacting human mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Social factors</td>
<td>Social factors are described as impacting human mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Interlinked factors</td>
<td>Interlinked (social &amp; physical) factors are described as impacting human mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How are policy suggestions represented?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Evacuations</td>
<td>Movement is policy-driven AND short-terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Planned relocations</td>
<td>Movement is policy-driven AND long-terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Other policies on human mobility</td>
<td>Any other policies relating to human movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Which state actors are involved in policy? (formulation, implementation, evaluation, coordination)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Larger organizational unit</td>
<td>Policy involves cooperation with larger territorial unit which the case is part of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Other nation-states</td>
<td>Policy involves cooperation with other nation-states</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Summary of the operationalisation, consisting of analytical questions, indicators and the criteria for documenting a certain part of a text in a certain indicator.
3.2 What is the Problem Represented to Be?

Moving on from whether climate-induced human mobility is represented at all in policy, the second part of the analysis aims to capture how this representation is done. This second part of the analysis will be guided by Carol Lee Bacchi’s method for critical text analysis, called “What’s the problem represented to be?” or WPR. According to Esaiasson et al, a starting point for text analysis is that all formulations of content is interesting because of the effects it is assumed to have (Esaiasson et al, 2017;212). Policy is well worth analysing according to this interpretation, as the very aim of policy is to have effects. However, following Bacchi, policy also gains relevance in its interaction with “ways of thinking” in society (Bachi, 2018).

Following Carol Bacchi’s conceptualisation of the term, “problem representations” are in this paper understood as ways of thinking about a certain issue. This interpretation motivates using Bacchi’s WPR assumes that suggestions for how to solve a certain problem indicates our perception of what constitutes the problem itself. By analysing policy, which by definition are proposals of some sort of change, one can start to make sense of the underlying problem representation (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016;16).

WPR is often discussed in relation to discourse analysis and is sometimes described as a form of it. Carol Lee Bacchi, who formulated the WPR method, does not agree with this understanding. She emphasizes how WPR indeed engages with discourse but that it does so in a Foucauldian way, viewing discourse, as well as problem representations as “forms of knowledge” or “ways of thinking” (Bacchi, 2018). Furthermore, Bacchi views policy to be a part of this. Arguably, this interaction happens in two ways. Firstly, specific policy proposals may be seen as a result of the problem representations that exist in society. Secondly, policy contributes to forming certain problem representations through formulating possible solutions (Bacchi, 2012;22). This understanding motivates the view of policy as “engaging” with problem representations of climate-induced human mobility.

3.2.1 Application of WPR in this Paper

As already stated, the analysis in this paper will be performed in two steps. Firstly, the policy documents will be systematically gone through and the existence of certain problem representations will be documented, according to the analytical framework specified in section 2.4. Secondly, the material that results from this documentation will be analysed
further, guided by a set of questions provided by the WPR approach. Due to the limited scope of this paper only three out of the six original questions posed by Bacchi will be included in the analysis. The following questions are the ones that will be used in this paper. They depart from Bacchi’s original questions but have been somewhat modified to fit the paper.

1. What is the problem of climate-induced human mobility represented to be?
2. What assumptions underlie this representation of climate-induced human mobility?
3. What is left unproblematic in this problem representation? Where are the silences?
   Can climate-induced human mobility be conceptualized differently?

The first question will be used to clarify the implicit problem representations of climate-induced human mobility within the analysed material. The second WPR-question will guide a critical reflection on assumptions which underlie this representation. One such assumption concerns the reason(s) for policy to tackle the specific issue at all. In other words, why does policy care about climate-induced human mobility? In order to answer this question, the theoretical underpinnings of the paper will prove relevant. The last WPR-question facilitates an analysis of what is not included in the policy documents (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016). Arguably, it can be expected that a multitude of factors are not included and/or “left unproblematic” in the problem representations, but not all of those factors are worth including in the analysis. Thus, this question is largely dependent on the researcher’s own knowledge and interpretation.

3.2.2 Methodological Considerations

It is worth mentioning that WPR assumes certain theoretical stances which this study does not necessarily agree with. As stated in the theoretical section of this paper, WPR views governance to be a result of certain forms of human knowledge and social relations. Due to this paper’s concern with climate change, it could be relevant to account, not only for social relations, but for non-human forces in contributing to shape policy and governance. Relating back to the question of how policy engages with different factors, it could also be of interest to investigate how policy impacts the physical environment and the feedback this gives rise to (see for example Stämpfli, 2018). Due to the limited scope of this paper, such analysis will however not be performed.
3.3 Selection of Cases

Departing from this paper’s aim to study how policy engages with climate-induced human mobility, two cases have been selected for analysis: the Indian district-state Andaman & Nicobar Islands (henceforth referred to as ANI) and the Pacific nation-state Kiribati. In this case selection, two considerations are worth some attention. Firstly, the cases have been selected based on a most-likely logic. This is seen as beneficial for analysing whether policy engages with climate-induced human mobility at all. Secondly, the choice to analyse two cases is deemed fruitful for the analysis, since it facilitates comparison between them. Moreover, the cases function on different levels of governance, where one of the cases is a nation-state while the other is a district-state within a larger nation-state.

The two cases have been selected based on their likelihood of containing policies on climate-induced human mobility. Official policy is decided and implemented by governing bodies on local, regional and/or national level and applies to a certain territory which this governing body has the legislative and/or implementing rule of (Ruggie, 1993). While predictions of climate change impacts inevitably come with some uncertainty, there is a general understanding that different areas will experience impacts in different ways and with different severity (see for example IPCC, 2014). According to Piguet et al, sea level rise is expected to be the aspect of climate change which leads to most long-term forced human mobility. Moreover, they highlight how this is not a distant future but a current threat when it comes to small island states (Piguet et al, 2011;12). Since climate-induced human mobility is not a classical policy field (Mortreux et al) and since policy is generally lacking in comparison to research on climate change impacts (IPCC, 2014;1137) the expectation of this paper is that climate-induced human mobility is not included in policy everywhere. Thus, the case selection of two small island states is motivated from a most-likely logic, where these are among the most likely to be engaging with climate-induced human mobility in their policy.

A second point of importance for the case selection, is the choice to analyse two cases, as opposed to focusing only on one. By comparing policy from two cases, the analysis may capture how policy representations of climate-induced mobility may differ in different contexts. Moreover, it is expected that the part of the analysis that focuses on Carol Bacchi’s WPR-questions could benefit from having two cases to compare to each other. Particularly, the question of “what is left unproblematic in the problem representation” will benefit from
comparing two cases with each other. What is left unproblematic in one case, may be included in the other case’s problem representation. Such difference would facilitate comparison and further reflection on why certain problems are represented in one case but not in the other. A description of this sort would be in line with the explorative and descriptive aim of the paper, thus the choice to study two cases seems motivated.

The choice to study Kiribati and ANI specifically, and not any other small island states, is based on a few considerations. Kiribati and ANI are, although relatively similar in geography and size, not seen as most similar cases. They are expected to have some similarities and some differences, which is expected to show also in their policy. One obvious difference is their level of governance, where ANI is a district state in India and Kiribati a nation-state in the pacific. This difference is deemed relevant with regards to the question of what policy can do, when the territory it applies to is threatened by climate change impacts. Having established the interest to study one nation-state and one sub-national state unit, ANI was seen as relevant due to its location in India, which has a history of relocation processes (see section 2.3.3). The choice is also inspired by Stämpfli’s work from 2017, which investigated the framing of environmental migration in India, by analysing policy from five different district states. ANI was not one of them, but was mentioned in the conclusion of the paper as a recommendation for future research to investigate (Stämpfli, 2017;47). The choice of Kiribati as the second case, is motivated by it being a nation-state which is commonly referred to in international frameworks and in the general debate on climate change (see for example IPCC, 2014). Kiribati was also the first country to receive a climate change adaptation project supported by the World Bank, which indicates engagement with international actors (Donner & Webber, 2014).

3.4 Selection of Material

Since the purpose of this paper is to analyse policy on climate-induced mobility in two specific cases, the amount of suitable material was limited to official policy documents of those cases. Moreover, it was limited to policy documents which are expected to contain policies on climate-induced human mobility. In the selection of material, comparability between the cases has been a major concern and has guided the selection.
The Disaster Management Plan of ANI (henceforth referred to as ANI:s DM plan) was finalized in 2016 by the Directorate of Disaster Management in the ANI Administration. It is the official policy on district-state level to tackle disasters and is thus deemed relevant for the analysis. It is worth noting than ANI – being a district state in India - is largely affected by national policy and law. Any differences between Andaman & Nicobar Islands and Kiribati may thus be explained partly by India’s national policy. However, this should not necessarily be seen as an issue, but is part of the aim of the paper to investigate policy and governance on two levels. Moreover, India’s National Disaster Management Act leaves much responsibility regarding design and implementation of disaster management to district levels (Mortreux et al, 2018;130). Thus, it is relevant in the Indian context to study disaster management policy on district-state level.

The revised version of the “Kiribati Joint Implementation Plan for Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management” (KJIP) was carried out with the assistance of the NAP Global Networks which is a network aiming to assist developing countries in advancing their NAP processes. The government of Kiribati views this document as its official National Adaptation Plan under the Cancun Adaptation Framework (Government of Kiribati, 2019;63). Since the CAP is crucial in the development of international frameworks for climate-change as a driver of human mobility, the use of the KJIP is well motivated. The KJIP can be located within the broader National Development Plan of Kiribati, where climate change adaptation and disaster risk management is seen as a cross-cutting problem which needs to be mainstreamed across all six policy areas which the development plan tackles (Government of Kiribati, 2019;61).

Due to ANI:s DM plan being longer than Kiribati’s KJIP, a second policy document from Kiribati will be analysed: the Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (henceforth referred to as INDC) to the Paris agreement. Noteworthy is that this document is focused on climate change and not disaster management, as the other two documents. This could be seen as problematic for the comparability of the cases. However, the INDC of Kiribati is largely focused on adaptation, as opposed to mitigation, since Kiribati “has no obligations under the UNFCCC to reduce its emissions” (Government of Kiribati, 2015;3) and since adaptation is a pressing issue for the country (ibid).

Moreover, it is worth mentioning two documents which could have been relevant to analyse, but which will not be included due to the limited scope of this paper. Before the formulation
of the KJIP, the official document for handling disasters in Kiribati was the National Disaster Risk Management Plan (NDRMP) from 2012. The NDRMP was not chosen for the analysis of this paper, due to the KJIP being much more up to date. However, for certain policy areas the KJIP refers to the NDRMP for specific descriptions of policy actions. Of relevance for the present analysis is the existence of at least 11 distinct actions regarding evacuations of people (Government of Kiribati, 2012). These are included in the NDRMP while not in the KJIP.

Since no proper study of the NDRMP will be performed, these policies will not be included in the analysis, but are mentioned here to give an idea of what further policies may exist. In ANI:s case, it could have been relevant to also analyse their State Action Plan on Climate Change, not least in relation to the comparability of the two cases. The KJIP of Kiribati is a joint plan for climate change and disaster risk management, while ANI:s DM plan concerns only disaster management.

In sum, two policy documents from Kiribati will be analysed and one document from ANI. Both of the documents from Kiribati include climate change policies, while ANI:s DM plan does not. These factors should be kept in mind with regards to the results and any possible differences between the cases. Given more time and space, I would have included a larger selection of material, in order to achieve a more accurate analysis. Nevertheless, the KJIP and ANI:s DM plan are the official and most recent policy documents regarding disaster management for both cases. Thus, the selection of material is suitable considering the limited scope of this paper.

### 3.5 Reliability and Validity

A central assumption in this paper is that problem representations are possible to detect from the chosen policy documents, either in a directly literal way or through further analysis, guided by the methodological questions presented by the WPR approach. The assumption is central and necessary in order to use WPR as a method and should also be considered in relation to the results of the paper. The framework for the first part of this paper’s analysis has been developed following previous research and theoretical understandings of human mobility. The operationalisation of the analytical framework presents the criteria for measuring problem representations and is seen as strengthening the paper’s validity. With regards to the second part of the analysis, the WPR approach provides both a theoretical
understanding and an operationalisation for further analysis of problem representations. Thus, the validity rests on previous research and methodology for both parts of the analysis.

The question of reliability is relevant to reflect critically upon in all qualitative text analyses, due to the unavoidable impact of interpretation, prior knowledge and assumptions. As the author of this paper, I am inevitably a part of it, not only through producing text, but through my own interpretation and my expectation(s) on what to find in the analysis. By anchoring the interpretative part of the analysis in theory, the interpretation is not only my own but is grounded in previous research and in established conceptualisations of human mobility. Moreover, the questions that will be asked to the texts, as well as their indicators, constitute a set of tools, which make it easier for another researcher to repeat the analysis.

4. Analysis
This section is divided into two parts, where the first describes the findings following the analytical framework specified in section 2.5 and the second part provides further analysis of those findings. The second part is guided by the three WPR-questions which have been selected for the analysis.

4.1 Literal Content of the Policy Documents
This section presents the results of the first part of the analysis, which is concerned with the existence of policy and formulations. The results are structured according to the four questions that have been asked to the texts and the indicators, as specified in section 3.1. The results from each case is summarised one by one, under the headline of each indicator. Due to different amount of information on different indicators, the results are summarized in somewhat different ways. As already stated, the first two questions are answered mainly by findings from the background sections of the policy documents. These background sections constitute a relatively small part of the texts in total. Thus, the answers to the first two questions are based on a smaller amount of material than the following two questions, which are answered by findings from actual policies. For the last two questions, it has been deemed relevant for the analysis to account for the amount of policies on each indicator. When a large number of policies have been identified, the number is presented in approximate terms, as “more than” a certain number. This approximation has been done with margins, in order to
account for possible faults in counting. Lastly in this section, a summary of the findings is presented in a table (page 29).

4.1.1 How is Human Mobility Represented?

The indicators for this question are: internal movement as adaptation strategy, internal displacement, planned relocations, external movements as adaptation strategy and external displacement. Due to difficulty in separating the representations of internal displacement and internal movement as adaptation strategy (indicators 1.1 and 1.2) within Kiribati’s policy documents, these are summarized together as “internal movements”.

*Internal movements (both as adaptation and displacement)*

The Kiribati joint implementation plan on climate change (KJIP) and the Kiribati INDC to the Paris agreement both highlight problems with internal movements. These problems are described as internal movements following adaptation and movements following displacement. Both “migration” and “displacement” are described as leading to the same phenomena of urbanization, which in turn is described as leading to strained freshwater resources (Government of Kiribati, 2019;22; ibid, 2015;15).

The Disaster Management plan of ANI makes no reference to internal movements as adaptation strategy. Displacement is described as leading to rapid urbanization which is straining resources and putting pressure on civic amenities (ANI administration, 2016;17).

*Planned relocations*

The government of Kiribati makes limited reference to relocations in their documents. Apart from actual policy measures (which are presented in section 4.1.3), the KJIP mentions “increasing conflicts among private landowners if private buildings have to be relocated” (Government of Kiribati, 2019;50). This could be interpreted as a form of planned relocation if assuming that relocation of private buildings imply relocation also of people. This is not entirely clear from the context. However, if assuming people to be involved as well, it is most likely a permanent (or at least long-term) relocation. I draw this conclusion because I assume that buildings will not be moved in temporary relocations since this is a costly process.
The district authority of ANI identifies relocations to be necessary due to cyclones and increasing flood events, which may lead to loss of human life if people are not evacuated (ANI administration, 2016;18, 30). However, the plan also identifies problems with relocations. It predicts that the moving of coastal populations inland would lead to deforestation. It also mentions gender-related risks of moving people to temporary shelters and camps, where sexual and physical abuse is described as a threat to girls (ibid;187).

External movements
In the KJIP, external movements are referred to both as an opportunity and as a necessary result of limited job opportunities at home. The KJIP describes how skilled nationals are forced to migrate abroad in search of jobs (Government of Kiribati, 2019;26) but also how work abroad may generate higher pay and remittances sent home (ibid;28). However, also when external movement is described as an opportunity, the KJIP highlights problems of how this opportunity is limited, particularly for women and young persons (ibid;48).

The DM plan of ANI makes no reference to external movements.

4.1.2 What Reasons for Human Mobility are Represented?

Physical factors
The Government of Kiribati highlights physical features as impacting people and livelihoods in both of the policy documents of analysis. It is described how most islands are no more than two or three metres above sea level (Government of Kiribati, 2019;21) and that inundation is a real threat (ibid;56). Sea level rise, compounded by storm surge, is predicted to lead to forced migration (Government of Kiribati, 2015;16).

Similar impacts from sea level rise are mentioned in ANI:s DM plan, where inundation and the risk of flooding are predicted to lead to the displacement of people (ANI administration, 2016;17). Moreover, it is mentioned that disasters may require relocations of communities (ibid;172).

Social factors
There is a high population growth rate in Kiribati and a large proportion of young people. These factors are described as leading to both internal migration and displacement. As
mentioned in previous section, urbanization is seen as a problem in Kiribati and South Tarawa is described as a magnet for internal migration from outer islands. This is highly due to the opportunities for cash employment that exists there and not in other parts of the country (Government of Kiribati, 2015;4). Lack of job opportunities is also causing people to migrate abroad (Government of Kiribati, 2015;26).

In the disaster management plan of ANI, no social factors are mentioned as impacting human mobility in and of themselves.

*Interlinked factors*

The KJIP expresses how climate change and climate variability are expected to heighten existing socioeconomic pressures and lead to movements (Government of Kiribati, 2019;32).

With regards to ANI, similar trends are mentioned, for example in the following statement: “conflicts are expected to flare around diminishing resources - especially water - and add to the staggering numbers of people on the move and needing help (environmental refugees)” (ANI administration, 2016;17).

### 4.1.3 How are Policy Suggestions Represented?

*Evacuations*

Of the two policy documents chosen for analysis of Kiribati, neither have extensive plans for evacuations of people. In the section of the KJIP that is called “Vulnerability and Impacts” it is stated that “(t)he safety and emergency response capacities of Kiribati are limited” (Government of Kiribati, 2019;45). This statement is explained partly by the geographical and demographic composition of the country, which make many areas difficult to access (ibid). However, it is stated that certain issues relating to evacuation plans will be addressed through the implementation of the National Disaster Management Plan (NDRMP) from 2012 (ibid). As previously mentioned, this document is not part of the selected material, thus, it will not be analysed. In the KJIP, policies for evacuation are included in three distinct actions. The first two are broad policies regarding the establishment of evacuation centres and evacuation plans (Government of Kiribati, 2019;152f). The third is located within the policy regarding increasing services to disabled and other vulnerable people, and addresses shelter availability in times of emergency (ibid;154).
The disaster management plan of ANI has a large focus on evacuations, with over fifty distinct actions for evacuations described. These range from disaster preparedness measures, such as establishing plans for evacuation routes, to policies applying to ongoing evacuations, such as who to contact and follow orders from, to post-disaster measures such as spreading information on what has happened. Furthermore, there are over twenty-five actions regarding where to host people who have been evacuated, such as shelters and evacuation centres (ANI administration, 2016). Many evacuation policies incorporate geographical aspects. For example, one preparedness measure includes containing maps of all inhabited islands (ibid;66) and a response measure is to prioritise coastal areas in immediate evacuations (ibid;209).

**Planned relocations**

Permanent relocations of people and communities are addressed by the Government of Kiribati in the INDC, where they outline six actions for strengthening Kiribati’s capability to meet the challenge of climate change. The fourth is called “population and resettlement” and aims to “reduce the vulnerability of Kiribati to increasing physical risks caused by climate change by establishing host country agreements to government-sponsored and self-sponsored emigration to resettle I-Kiribati [Kiribati citizens] overseas and assist the inevitable migration of the population, due to climate change as and when this eventually arrives” (Government of Kiribati, 2015;19, explanation in brackets added by me). Furthermore, the KJIP addresses the issue of compensation for people who lose their land due to climate change impacts. One action to be undertaken in such cases is “land swapping” of land which is owned by the state (Government of Kiribati, 2019;146).

The district authority of ANI mentions relocations in a descriptive way several times, for example stating that long term strategies include reconstruction and relocation (180). There is one specific policy for relocation, which contains seven distinct actions for undertaking relocations. These include “gaining consent of the affected population”, “land acquisition” and “obtaining legal clearances for relocation” (ANI administration, 2016;182). It is emphasized how “.need-based considerations and not extraneous factors drive relocation of people” (ibid;182).
Other policies relating to human mobility

Apart from policies concerning relocation and evacuation, the KJIP contains one policy regarding external movements, formulated as an action to “generate further employment opportunities in international markets” (Government of Kiribati, 2019:151). This policy contains eight sub-actions, including integration of labour mobility goals into trade agreements. Furthermore, this policy has two indicators, including increasing the number of Kiribati citizens which are employed in other nation-states (ibid).

In the Disaster Management plan of ANI, no policies relating to human mobility, other than the ones already presented, have been identified.

4.1.4 Which Actors are Involved in Policy?

Larger organizational unit

Kiribati’s policy documents contain no mentioning of a larger organizational unit, in terms of state actors.

ANI on the other hand, refers to the national government of India and various national agencies, in over thirty distinct policies. These policies are largely focused on how information should be shared over different governing levels and among national institutions. It is emphasized how the very existence of a disaster management plan on district level is made possible by the national disaster management act. A reoccurring theme is also how the district state may request assistance from national agencies if needed. One example is presented here: "in any disaster response, the cutting edge would always be the District Administration. However, when Districts are overwhelmed in any situation then support necessarily has to come from the Union Territory and National Level" (ANI administration, 2016:55).

Other nation-states

For each policy-action in the KJIP, the actors involved in that specific action are presented. Other nation-states are included in over thirty distinct actions, notably Australia, the United States, Japan, New Zealand and the EU (Government of Kiribati, 2019). Apart from this direct inclusion of other nation-state actors, the policy documents highlight information-sharing networks at international level as important for Kiribati. In the INDC, it is described
how other SIDS, such as Palau and the British Virgin Islands have provided Kiribati with important lessons (Government of Kiribati, 2015;25). Lastly, the INDC emphasizes how Kiribati depends on external sources to support the implementation of the KJIP (ibid; 27).

The ANI disaster management plan describes other nation-states as contributing with information on disasters, seismic activity and similar knowledge-cooperating measures. Two distinct policies on this has been identified (ANI administration, 2016).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions and Indicators</th>
<th>Kiribati</th>
<th>ANI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How is human mobility represented?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Internal movements</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 External migration as adaptation strategy</td>
<td>Negative AND Positive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 External displacement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Planned relocation</td>
<td>Negative AND Necessary</td>
<td>Negative AND Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What reasons for human mobility are represented?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Physical factors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Social factors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Interlinked factors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How are policy suggestions represented?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Evacuations</td>
<td>3 policy actions (&gt;11 in NDMP)</td>
<td>&gt;50 policy actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Planned relocations</td>
<td>2 policies</td>
<td>1 policy: 7 actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Other policies on human mobility</td>
<td>1 policy: 8 actions: 2 indicators</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Which state actors are involved in policy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Larger organizational unit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>&gt;30 policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Other nation-states</td>
<td>&gt;50 policies</td>
<td>2 policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Summary of the findings presented in section 4.1
4.2 WPR-Analysis

In this section, the three WPR-questions that have been chosen for the analysis are discussed in relation to the findings in the policy documents. The findings that were presented in the previous section show how the cases contain both similarities and differences with regards to policies and problem representations. Furthermore, some policies and problem representations are only present in one of the cases. Such findings are important for answering the third WPR-question regarding what is left unproblematic.

4.2.1 Problem Representation

The first WPR-question resembles the first question that was asked to the policy document; “how is human mobility represented?”. Thus, it may be answered partly through the results presented in section 4.1.1. Following the analytical logic of WPR, important representations of problems are visible also in the formulations of solutions, thus policies. However, all the questions that were asked to the texts will be used as they all contribute with findings on the problem representation. The understanding of problem representations as engaging with policy should be kept in mind with regards to the analysis. In both of the studied cases, climate-induced human mobility is described as containing several negative consequences. In the policy of Kiribati, positive consequences are also included.

Starting off with non-policy-guided internal movements, both cases describe this form of mobility in relation to strained resources and overpopulation in urban areas, which is threatening lives and livelihoods of people. Neither case make any clear distinction between “internal movement as adaptation” and “internal displacement”. The KJIP mentions both forms of movements as containing the same negative consequences, while ANIs DM plan only refers to displacement. The negative consequences are described as applying to people who are conducting the movement, as well as people who are already living in the urban, densely populated areas. Both ANI and Kiribati highlight how vulnerable groups, such as people living in poverty and/or with disabilities, are the ones experiencing the most acute impacts by climate change. Moreover, the different levels of vulnerability are accompanied by different exposure stemming from geographical aspects. Both cases highlight rural communities and outer islands as particularly exposed. A difference between the cases is that ANI:s DM plan describes overpopulation and urbanisation as threatening state institutions.
Thus, the problem representation of climate-induced human mobility includes not only how human lives and livelihoods are impacted, but also state institutions.

With regards to external movements, the results are highly different between the cases. ANI contains no policy or description of external movements at all. Kiribati contains both descriptions and policy which highlight as well positive as negative consequences of moving abroad. While external labour migration is described as an opportunity to earn a higher pay and to work in other sectors than those existing in Kiribati, this description is accompanied by descriptions of issues. For example, it is described how women and young people have less opportunities to migrate abroad (Government of Kiribati, 2019;28&48). External movements are thus described in relation to the consequences they may have for the population of Kiribati. At one point in the KJIP, it also refers to a consequence which applies to the economy of the country. When people work abroad it may generate remittances which are sent home (ibid;28). This is understood as a positive consequence. Moreover, the fact that the KJIP contains a distinct policy aiming to increase the number of Kiribati citizens employed overseas (ibid;151) indicates that this possibility is indeed seen in a positive light and that it is given priority in policy.

Continuing on the policy-side but moving on to the issue of planned relocations, both cases contained policies on such, however with differing scope and focus points. The analysis of the selected material shows ANI to contain more policies on human mobility in total than Kiribati. This is true both when counting the number of distinct policies and when comparing the focus on human mobility relative to other policy areas in the documents. The vast majority of human mobility-related policies in ANI:s DM plan concerns temporary evacuations. By contrast, Kiribati contain few policies on temporary evacuations within the country, but has a larger focus on long-term movements than ANI. This is visible in Kiribati’s INDC in the goal of establishing agreements with other countries in order to facilitate emigration from Kiribati (Government of Kiribati, 2015;19). The policy regarding “land swapping” (Government of Kiribati, 2019;146) is a second example of policy which is understood to aim for long-term movements, rather than temporary evacuations.

The different focus on long-term versus temporary, short-term movements could be explained by different representations of what constitutes the problem. Possibly, it also relates to which problem the policy aims to tackle, and which not. Kiribati’s KJIP and INDC include
descriptions of the worst possible scenario; the risk of being entirely inundated. The ANI DM plan does not contain such descriptions. With regards to extremely severe impacts from disasters and/or climate change, ANI rather refers to the national government of India. As stated with regards to actors, ANI refers to the national government and other national agencies in over 30 policies. Kiribati makes no reference to a larger organizational state unit, probably because no such unit exists. On the other hand, the KJIP has extensive information on how other nation-states are involved in the formulation and implementation of policy. These differences will be further analysed in following sections.

4.2.2 Underlying Assumptions

The second WPR-question regards the underlying assumptions for representing climate-induced human mobility in a certain way. This question may be answered by a combination of the results derived from all of the four questions that have been asked to the texts. Arguably, there are a multitude of assumptions which could be seen as underlying the representations of climate-induced human mobility in the policy documents. Describing all of those is beyond the scope of this paper. Most probably, different persons would also identify different underlying assumptions of the same problem representation, since this question builds on interpretation. Thus, a few assumptions that are deemed relevant for the analysis have been selected. This selection is based on the theoretical underpinnings of the paper and the understanding of climate-induced human mobility as a development issue. The analysis uses the SDGs conceptualisation of development as located within economic, social and environmental aspects. Moreover, this paper includes a fourth aspect: the political. These four aspects are used to detangle four underlying assumptions of the problem representation of climate-induced human mobility. The underlying assumptions are important in understanding why policy engages with climate-induced human mobility at all. While it is not the aim of this paper to explain policy, but to describe it, some reflections on reasons are brought forward in this section.

One underlying assumption of the representation of climate-induced human mobility concern the social aspect of development issues. Overpopulation, strained resources and conflicts are described as negative based on their impacts on human lives. The UN declaration of human rights provides a basic framework for how human lives should be valued (United Nations, 1948) and has become generally accepted as something which governing authorities should
take into account. Thus, the value of human lives may be part of the answer to the question of why policy Human rights and the valuing of human lives may be seen as an underlying assumption to the negative representation of internal human mobility in the policy documents.

A second assumption concerns the economic aspect of development issues. In the representation of external mobility in Kiribati’s policy, human mobility is seen as containing positive consequences for people and the broader society in generating economic value. People are described as benefiting from the possibility of earning a higher salary and the Kiribati economy is understood to benefit from remittances which are sent home. The underlying assumption for this representation concerns monetary value as something positive. This assumption could be derived from the economic system of the world, in which money is understood as beneficial for as well individual persons as societies and states (Sassen, 2005).

A third assumption concerns the physical environment. In the policy documents, climate-induced human mobility is represented as something which is, or will become necessary. It is represented as inevitable. The underlying assumption for this representation is that the physical environment will impact people and communities in ways that make it difficult, or impossible, for them to stay in their original place of residency. The third assumption is, thus, that the physical environment impacts humans. This assumption could be understood through the theoretical concept of the Anthropocene, in which human and non-human forces are interacting and impacting each other in both directions.

A fourth assumption which underlies the problem representation, concerns the political sphere and the organisational order of the world. As described in the theoretical section of this paper, policy on human mobility is mainly located at the national level, thus departing from assumptions on what the national level is. The different representations of external and internal movements would not be possible without clearly defined territorial boundaries. Thus, the different problem representations of external and internal human mobility in Kiribati’s policy are dependent on assumptions of the nation-state and the inter-state system. Moreover, the formulation of policy includes assumptions of which territory, as well as which population, the policy applies to. With this follows assumptions of which population and territory it does not apply to.
4.2.3 Factors Left Unproblematic

Similar to the previous question, the third WPR-question which is included in this paper is largely dependent on interpretation and on me as a researcher. Considerations of what is left unproblematic in the representation of climate-induced human mobility could be interpreted in very different ways. Arguably, any factors which are not explicitly included in a policy and which are even remotely relevant for the problem may be seen as a factor that is left unproblematic. Thus, an issue in the analysis of this question is to judge what is relevant and what is not. With regards to this, the comparative design of this paper is beneficial. According to Bacchi, the question of what is left unproblematic involves both “careful scrutiny of possible gaps or limitations in this representation of the ‘problem’” and “inventive imagining of potential alternatives” (Bacchi, 2012:22). The second part is benefitted from comparing two cases, with two different problem representations.

From the findings of this paper, it may be stated that long-term movements stemming from climate change are left largely unproblematic in ANI:s DM plan. This statement is given some strength due to the comparative design of this paper, where findings from ANI have been compared to those of Kiribati. On the other hand, short-term evacuations of people are largely represented in ANI:s DM plan, while less so in Kiribati’s policy. This lack of extensive policy is touched upon in Kiribati’s KJIP, when highlighting that emergency evacuations may be needed, but that Kiribati has limited capacities to perform such. As described in section 4.1.3, these limited capacities are partly due to geographical factors such as the inaccessibility of many areas. They could also be related to the fourth underlying assumption specified in previous section, concerning the organisational order of the world.

When policy is formulated by a territorially bound state and applies to a certain population and a certain territory, the capacities of policy are limited to these conditions. Arguably, a factor that is left unproblematic in Kiribati’s policy is that the capacities of policy are limited by Kiribati being a nation-state. By contrast, a factor that is left unproblematic in ANI:s DM plan, is that ANI:s location within a larger nation-state affects how policy is formulated in ANI. Just like Kiribati, ANI has limited capacities in policy-making and implementation, but is a district-state within a larger nation-state, which means that there is a higher level of governance to lean on. The fact that ANI:s DM plan repeatedly refers to the national
government of India and national agencies for assistance in cases of extreme environmental impacts, supports this argument.

A last point of importance, is that none of the cases contain policies for the extreme scenario of complete inundation. Both cases mention the risk of inundation in their background sections and Kiribati’s policies aims to target this issue in the long term, but neither Kiribati, nor ANI, present policies which sufficiently could govern the population in such scenario. Thus, the risk of complete inundation is left partly unproblematic by both cases. By ANI, it is left almost entirely unproblematic.

4.3 Discussion of Limitations

Due to the small size of this paper, I cannot claim that the lack of certain policies in the studied material means that no such policies exist for the case at all. The limited findings of evacuation policies in the analysis of Kiribati is partly explained by such policies being included in a document which was not part of the analysis. Similarly, the lack of reference to external movements in ANI:s DM plan could be due to such policies existing in another document, and possibly due to being a policy issue handled by the national government. The findings of this paper should be understood, and judged, in relation to the analysed material. As stated in section 3.4. ANI:s DM plan and Kiribati’s KJIP both constitute the official and most up-to-date disaster management plans of the respective cases. This is true despite the documents’ different names, and the fact that Kiribati’s KJIP includes both disaster management and climate change policies. The two documents are deemed comparable due to their function as official disaster management policies. However, the addition of Kiribati’s INDC to the selection of material can be questioned with regards to comparability. This choice is motivated in section 3.4, but after having performed the analysis, I question the relevance of this material.

A second concern worth highlighting yet again, is the WPR understanding of policy as a form of social relation. This study has a somewhat different understanding of policy, inspired by the WPR approach, but also by critical theory and the concept of the Anthropocene (see section 2.2). Climate change, although widely accepted as human-induced, has physical impacts which are beyond human control and which affect human life and society (Clark, 2014). The findings of this study suggest that not only society, but also policy, is impacted by
physical factors stemming from climate change. Through the concept of the Anthropocene, this may be understood as an interaction of human and non-human forces (ibid). My interpretation of the WPR approach, is that its approach to governance and policy as constituted by problem representations, cannot capture this interaction. Physical factors which exist regardless of human representation of them are not accounted for in the WPR approach. This is seen as a limitation of WPR as a method, as well as to the WPR-inspired analysis of this paper.

5. Conclusion

To formulate a policy means formulating a suggested solution to a specific problem. It also means formulating an understanding, or representation, of what the problem really is (Bacchi, 2012). The aim of this study was to achieve a description of how two governing bodies formulate solutions and representations of climate-induced human mobility. This was analysed through the research question: how do governing authorities in climate change inflicted island territories represent the problem of climate-induced human mobility in policy? The analysis identified different problem representations for different forms of human mobility and for the two different cases. Internal movements were represented as containing negative implications and consequences in both cases, while external movements were represented as something positive by Kiribati and not included at all in ANI:s policy. The problem of policy-guided movements was represented as something necessary, yet difficult, by both the cases. However, a substantial difference was the intended length of such movements, where ANI focused almost exclusively on short-term evacuations and Kiribati focused mainly on long-term relocations. None of the cases contained a sufficient set of policies for governing the extreme scenario of complete inundation.

To not formulate a policy, could be interpreted as not recognizing that there exists a problem. However, it could also be interpreted in relation to the capabilities and limitations of official policy. Guided by the methodological approach of this paper, the analysis reflected upon possible reasons for policy to represent problems in certain ways and for not representing certain factors as problematic. These reflections indicate that formulation of policy is impacted, not only by the ways of thinking about problems, but by the understanding of which solutions are available in a specific context. This is in line with the conceptualisation of policy as engaging with the issues it aims to handle.
The findings of this paper contribute to the scarcely studied issue of how policy engages with climate-induced human mobility. Departing from the various predictions of sea level rise, climate-induced human mobility is likely to become an increasingly pressing issue for policy to engage with. Moreover, this paper questions the capabilities of policy, when formulated and implemented on national and sub-national level. Just as Saskia Sassen has argued for economic globalization as altering the international terrain in which states operate, climate change and human mobility are contributing to shaking the organizational world order of nation-states. Lastly, this paper highlights the need for further research in order to understand the engagement of official policy and climate-induced human mobility. This type of research will become increasingly relevant as climate change continues to impact human societies and governance.
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