Cross-cutting Processes:
Examples

→ There is a need for culturally situated trauma-informed practices informed by inclusion of lived experience (e.g. Tuvaluan migration to New Zealand) and local service provider perspective and expertise.

→ Responses should index to index to local cultural, systems, socioeconomic, geographic factors, integrated through a social justice lens (e.g., Human Rights-Based Approach, Greenhouse Development Rights).

→ Bring specific attention to those most at risk – Indigenous peoples (e.g., Canada, Australia), women (e.g., Indigenous, East Africa, global North), children, and others who face intersecting forms of discrimination and marginalization, including identities around race, religion, country of origin, and 2SLGBTQIA+.

→ Identify existing initiatives and organizations working in similar areas and aligning language, strategies, and combining efforts. This will include identifying relevant global actors (e.g., UNDESA, UNDP, UNHCR, UNFCCC, WHO, IOM) and local initiatives (NAZCA). Align with existing modes of provider practice (e.g., North America, EU).

→ There is a need for high-income countries to provide funding to low-income countries as the climate change related consequences borne by low-income countries tend to be direct results of actions taken by high-income countries (e.g., Africa).

→ Planning needs to take into account both responding to gradual change and modelling responses to rapidly emerging crises. (e.g., Canada)

→ Environmental and climate justice lenses should be applied to strategies and plans in order to prevent further migration from new locations, i.e., limit exposure to disaster, including natural disasters and man-made issues such as contaminated water, air, and soil.

→ Develop data infrastructures and research funding to support risk modelling that includes homeless populations. Develop cross disciplinary institutes that will also train the next generation of scientists who will be well-equipped to work in this area.