

Building adaptive capacity to climate change in tropical coastal communities

Joshua E. Cinner^{1*}, W. Neil Adger², Edward H. Allison³, Michele L. Barnes^{1,4}, Katrina Brown², Philippa J. Cohen^{1,5}, Stefan Gelcich^{6,7}, Christina C. Hicks⁸, Terry P. Hughes¹, Jacqueline Lau¹, Nadine A. Marshall⁹ and Tiffany H. Morrison¹

To minimize the impacts of climate change on human wellbeing, governments, development agencies, and civil society organizations have made substantial investments in improving people's capacity to adapt to change. Yet to date, these investments have tended to focus on a very narrow understanding of adaptive capacity. Here, we propose an approach to build adaptive capacity across five domains: the assets that people can draw upon in times of need; the flexibility to change strategies; the ability to organize and act collectively; learning to recognize and respond to change; and the agency to determine whether to change or not.

Tropical coastal communities that depend heavily on natural resources are on the front line of climate change. Fisheries and agricultural productivity is likely to be decreased^{1–3}, and the built infrastructure that supports them will be especially vulnerable to sea-level rise⁴. An increasing frequency and intensity of coral bleaching events due to global warming has already significantly affected coral-reef-dependent coastal communities⁵. The human effect of such changes varies from place to place and even from person to person, depending on the local manifestations of climate change (that is, the exposure), the degree to which people depend on affected resources (that is, their sensitivity), and on their capacity to adapt to or take advantage of the changes they experience (that is, their adaptive capacity)⁶.

In light of profound climate change impacts that have already affected both people and the ecosystems they depend on, there is an urgent need to bolster the capacity of tropical coastal communities to adapt. Indeed, many local and national governments, development agencies, and non-governmental organizations are engaged in efforts to build adaptive capacity, yet there is little guidance on how this capacity might be developed. Adaptive capacity refers to the conditions that enable people to anticipate and respond to change, to minimize the consequences, to recover, and take advantage of new opportunities⁷. Earlier research identified key underlying determinants of adaptive capacity as the availability of capital (for example, financial, social and human) in times of need^{8–10}. Yet recent evidence suggests that adaptive capacity is not simply about having the necessary resources at hand, but also about the willingness and capability to convert resources into effective adaptive action^{11,12}.

Here, we synthesize research across a range of disciplines to highlight how adaptive capacity could be built across five key domains (Fig. 1). These are: (1) the assets that people can draw upon in times of need; (2) the flexibility to change strategies; (3) the ability to

organize and act collectively; (4) learning to recognize and respond to change; and (5) the agency to determine whether to change or not^{11,13–17}. Below, we discuss these five domains of adaptive capacity and highlight strategies for their development. As a focal lens for these issues, our synthesis primarily uses examples from tropical coastal communities because they are at the coalface of significant climate change impacts, and are already receiving substantial adaptation investments. However, we believe that many of our points relate to building adaptive capacity more broadly. Although tropical coastal communities can develop capacity at multiple scales, we primarily focus on the individual, household, and community scales, which are typically the focus of many community development and aid programs that attempt to build adaptive capacity. Critically, many strategies for building adaptive capacity have the potential to interact with other social and ecological dynamics in ways that create unintended and maladaptive changes to the flow of social and ecological goods and services.

Assets

Assets are the financial, technological, and service (for example, health care) resources that people have access to. Assets can be individually owned or public goods. People are generally better able to adapt when they have assets to draw on during times of change^{18,19}. For example, coastal societies experiencing a shift in the ranges of important fish species^{1,2} might draw upon financial assets (savings or credit) to purchase bigger boats and freezers to store fish during longer journeys, in order to fish further afield. Likewise, people who fish might adapt to altered compositions of fish assemblages by purchasing new fishing gear that selectively targets the species that have increased in abundance^{20,21}.

For tropical coastal communities, building assets could involve: (1) improving productivity through using new technologies and improving efficiencies; and (2) increasing opportunities to access

¹Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for Coral Reef Studies, James Cook University, Townsville, Queensland, Australia. ²Geography, College of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK. ³School of Marine and Environmental Affairs, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA. ⁴Botany Department, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI, USA. ⁵WorldFish, Penang, Malaysia. ⁶Center of Applied Ecology and Sustainability (CAPES), Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile. ⁷Center for the Study of Multiple-Drivers on Marine Socio-Ecological Systems, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile. ⁸Lancaster Environment Centre, Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK. ⁹Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, James Cook University, Townsville, Queensland, Australia. *e-mail: joshua.cinner@jcu.edu.au




Fig. 1 | Five domains of adaptive capacity to climate change: assets, flexibility, social organization, learning, and agency. The five domains are interlinked; feedbacks and interactions can occur among any of the domains, not just the neighbouring ones graphically represented by connecting arrows.

affordable capital, credit, and insurance^{22–24}. Some coastal residents also benefit from social investments (for example, health-care) that help to prevent a decline of existing assets (for example, household assets critical to sustaining livelihoods)^{22,24}. For example, malaria is a cause of morbidity and mortality in many tropical coastal areas, and households affected by death or illness of household members may find their attempts to secure their livelihoods thwarted by having to meet the costs of recurrent illnesses, often having to sell productive assets (land, livestock, and fishing gear) to cope. This then erodes their capacity to adapt to future shocks and adverse trends²³. Interventions to address malaria (for example, by improving availability of insecticide-treated bed-nets, or improving availability of anti-malarial drugs and emergency care), could therefore help such households escape these poverty traps²² and build the household assets that could, in the long term, help them adapt to a changing climate. This illustrates the complex and multi-scale interactions between planned and autonomous adaptive action to multiple stressors.

Attempts to build or secure assets can focus on individuals (for example, providing micro-credit loans) or community-scale public goods (such as infrastructure or information dissemination). However, investments in public goods may fail to reach the most vulnerable if certain social mechanisms (such as caste systems, gender inequality, and so on) prevent some people from accessing the benefits^{13,25,26}. In these situations, attempts to build adaptive capacity can strongly differentiate society, and it is critical to be aware of the power asymmetries and political dimensions that underpin the potential impacts of intervention.

Although it is often assumed that the wealthy are better able to adapt to change than the poor^{18,27}, building assets that enhance people's ability to exploit natural resources may actually increase the vulnerability of coastal communities to climate change by undermining the long-term sustainability of coastal ecosystems. This represents both temporal and social trade-offs inherent in adaptation strategies, which must be heeded when designing interventions to enhance adaptive capacity. For example, in Tanzania, fishers who were more likely to intensify fishing effort in response to lower catches (thereby increasing exploitation) were those who had assets, but lacked flexibility to change livelihood strategies²⁸. Wealthier fishers were thus more likely to catalyse a 'social-ecological trap', whereby lower yields increased fishing exploitation, which in turn further decreased yields²⁸. Likewise, investments in basic infrastructure such as roads may increase people's assets by improving market accessibility, while serving as a catalyst for other types of development (for example, access to education, healthcare and markets)²⁹ that can provide greater flexibility and agency to manage climate shocks³⁰. However, access to markets is also a key driver of

overexploitation³¹ and habitat destruction³², and may increase social-ecological vulnerability²⁰.

Flexibility

The flexibility domain of adaptive capacity reflects opportunities for switching between adaptation strategies and captures the diversity of potential adaptation options available. Organizations and individuals with more flexibility are better able to adapt to climatic impacts. In coastal communities reliant on natural resources, flexibility within people's current occupations (for example, fishing or marine-based tourism) can enable them to minimize losses or even take advantage of climate-related changes, such as shifting species abundance, species range^{1,20}, or habitat destruction. Flexibility allows people to change fishing strategies and the location of fishing grounds and tourism operations. For example, fishers in Peru were able to rapidly change from gill and seine nets aboard their fishing boats to trawl nets in response to an abundance of shrimp that appeared with the extreme marine heat wave associated with the 1997–1998 El Niño²³. Flexibility also entails the capacity to shift into different occupational sectors (for example, agriculture and non-natural resource-based enterprises), either temporarily or permanently, in response to climate change impacts (for example, reductions in fisheries yields or eco-tourism revenue). At a larger scale, the flexibility of organizations and institutions (that is, both formal and informal rules and norms) to adjust rules, boundaries, partners, and membership helps to manage shocks and perturbations associated with climate change^{23,33,34}. For example, in coastal cities in Queensland, Australia, local governments have implemented policies to facilitate the re-building of housing and infrastructure at higher levels after flooding³⁴.

Building flexibility in tropical coastal communities will require a number of strategies. At a large scale, organizations and institutions can build flexibility through processes of ongoing monitoring and review, with regular formal revision. At the individual scale, removing social and legal barriers that can constrain key adaptation actions, such as switching to new fishing gears³⁵, could foster flexibility. Building the flexibility to change the location of fishing grounds or tourism operations will not only require the removal of barriers to fishing in different locations, but will also require developing ecological knowledge about new places³⁶, and the capacity to reach them (that is, potentially larger boats). Efforts to build the flexibility to shift occupations primarily focuses on developing alternative income or subsistence livelihoods that are often implemented in conjunction with interventions to reduce poverty³⁷. For example, in North Sulawesi, Indonesia, the introduction of seaweed farming as an alternative to fishing improved villagers' material assets³⁸.

There are often interactions between flexibility and other domains of adaptive capacity that potentially create other adaptation trade-offs. For example, as coastal communities become wealthier (that is, have more assets), they often exhibit lower livelihood flexibility³⁹. As with the building of assets, the building of flexibility also has potential ecological consequences. For instance, since different fishing gear selectively targets different sizes and species of fish, there can be ecological consequences of adopting fishing gear that preferentially targets specific species, for example, those that play a critical role in the maintenance and recovery of coral reef ecosystems⁴⁰. In addition, increasing people's spatial flexibility to adapt to climate change may have negative ecological consequences (such as boom and bust episodes for high-demand fish species)⁴¹. Increased mobility may also be at odds with property-rights-based fisheries management or marine spatial planning initiatives that aim to promote sustainability and reduce conflict by defining and limiting where certain activities can occur⁴². Specifically, fisheries management strategies such as Territorial Use Rights for Fishers (TURFs) that define and limit entry into fishing grounds may limit other aspects of flexibility, such as the ability of fishers to move their fishing activities along the coast⁴². Diversification of livelihood activities can also create unintended ecological consequences. For example, investments in alternative livelihoods in aquaculture lead directly to pollution loading and contribute to salinity intrusion, thereby disrupting ecosystem services and the wellbeing of others^{43,44}.

There are a number of challenges to building flexibility. Alternative livelihood projects often fail for social and cultural reasons⁴⁵. For example, the extent that fishers create a sense of themselves around their occupation (occupational identity) or their place of residence (place attachment) can limit whether they are able to re-imagine themselves in other roles or places if the need to change arises^{46,47}. Additionally, diversification is not always an option for households that are trapped in deep poverty because there can be insurmountable costs and risks associated with trying something new^{24,48}. In these cases, building the flexibility component of adaptive capacity requires that costs and risks are buffered with provision of skills and access to capital^{49,50}.

Social organization

Social organization is the domain of adaptive capacity that captures the ways in which society is organized to enable (or inhibit) cooperation, collective action, and knowledge sharing^{16,51}. Formal and informal relationships between individuals, communities, and organizations can help people deal with change by providing social support and access to knowledge and resources¹⁶. Critically, social organization is by nature multi-scale, containing individual, collective, and organizational dimensions¹⁶. For example, preparing for or recovering from high-intensity storms often requires individual people to help one another and state agencies to coordinate short-term recovery and long-term resilience strategies⁵². Likewise, networks that promote information exchange and cooperation can help communities adapt to changes such as increasingly variable fish catch or weather patterns⁵³.

Trust and social cohesion within communities (referred to as bonding social capital) can play a key role in whether or not people will support each other in times of crisis, or agree on coordinated action to confront climate-induced threats⁵⁴. Governments, development agencies, and civil society organizations can build bonding social capital by creating opportunities for sustained interaction among groups through community events, recreational activities, and spiritual gatherings⁵⁵. Building connections across communities (bridging social capital), and to people or organizations operating at larger scales, (for example, international NGOs and financial organizations; linking social capital) can help to secure access to resources, scientific information, and technological innovations that facilitate adaptation⁵⁶. For example, when climate change impacts

are so severe that people must change livelihoods, bridging connections can provide crucial information about new job opportunities⁵⁷. Likewise, linking social capital can provide access to novel sources of information and resources, and give people a voice in adaptation planning and policy occurring at higher levels⁵⁴. Bridging and linking social capital can be fostered by creating shared values and interpretation of experience through dialogue and engagement, through reducing disparities in income and wealth, and by enabling a sense of involvement in working towards collective goals⁵⁸. Such efforts can include developing or strengthening institutions for collective action, such as co-management^{59,60}. Indeed, collaborative management processes have been shown to improve adaptive capacity by strengthening links among people responsible for disaster planning in Trinidad and Tobago⁶¹, and among fishers in Chile⁶².

Bonding, bridging, and linking social capital facilitate different types of adaptation. For example, strong bonding ties can be crucial for survival in the face of extreme natural disasters and conflict⁶³, while bridging and linking ties can help national and regional adaptation policies to reflect the goals and objectives of local communities. Robust adaptive capacity depends on having a balance of different types of social capital, where having too much of one type can actually inhibit adaptation. For example, strong cohesive groups can become locked into a particular way of thinking that prevents learning about change or adaptation options⁶⁴. Likewise, when only local elites have bridging and linking connections, the wider community may lack access to the assets needed to effectively respond to change¹⁷. Consequently, efforts to build social capital need to consider whether and how different types of social capital are available to people, and how social organization interacts with the other components of adaptive capacity.

Empirical examples of building the social organization dimension of adaptive capacity are limited, but emerging evidence suggests that practical efforts can include: (1) establishment and strengthening of networks across scales (for example, community, provincial, and national)⁶⁵; (2) community currency, or time banking systems, where individuals are incentivized to volunteer⁶⁶ — this not only creates novel connections in the community, but can also result in material and mental health benefits among participants⁶⁷; and (3) creation of interaction arenas where people can work together towards shared goals, build trust, and develop social cohesion⁶⁷. Such arenas occur through community meetings and the facilitation of other social events, as well as through town and community planning that creates physical interaction spaces.

Learning

Learning reflects people's capacity to generate, absorb, and process new information about climate change, adaptation options, and ways to live with, and manage, uncertainty^{23,33,68}. Learning can be experimental or experiential, and occurs within and across multiple organizational, spatial, and temporal scales⁶⁹. For example, in response to climate change, fishers will have to learn about new fishing grounds, gears, weather patterns, technologies, species, and in some cases, new ways of making a living.

Building the learning domain of adaptive capacity to climate change will require supporting processes that enable people to frame or reframe problems by recognizing change, attributing this change to its causes, and assessing potential responses^{18,70}. This may involve supporting formal education⁷¹, as well as informal forums for learning.

Provision of access to critical information, such as market prices and weather forecasts, is central to building the learning domain of adaptive capacity in coastal communities. For example, early warning systems can help fishers assess potential risks, reduce lost or unproductive fishing days, and ultimately reduce deaths²³. Likewise, seasonal forecasts can help coastal farmers to choose crops with the best yields under new climatic conditions⁷, and future rainfall

projections can help local governments manage areas vulnerable to flooding³⁴. Learning to adapt to climate change also requires investment in peer-to-peer networks (also referred to as communities of practice)⁷² that allow people to share experiences of ecological surprise from other locations and other knowledge systems (for example, expert, local, and indigenous). Such peer-to-peer networks have not only facilitated learning, but also empowered people to develop novel adaptation strategies⁷³. For example, the Locally Managed Marine Areas network connects and shares experiences among coastal communities across the Indo-Pacific, blending scientific and local ecological knowledge systems to implement a range of community-based fisheries management strategies⁷⁴.

Learning may emerge in a locally generated or self-organized form triggered by crisis, or because of an active adaptive co-management strategy. Learning provides depth in understanding and occurs across timescales, where instrumental single-loop learning occurs within short-to-medium periods, and deeper double-loop learning occurs over longer time scales. Instrumental single-loop learning only informs and changes the most immediate technical operations (for example, turning on the air conditioner in a heat-wave), while deeper double-loop learning may change governance procedures at the organizational level (for example, local green infrastructure planning), and even overarching values and norms at the policy and paradigmatic levels (for example, reduction of carbon emissions at a societal level)⁷⁵. Both single and double-loop learning are challenging to orchestrate as they tightly couple with other domains of adaptive capacity, and building this domain can have knock-on effects. For example, supporting formal education opportunities can indirectly reduce poverty and improve health⁷¹. Yet, learning may only enable adaptation when other domains of adaptive capacity, such as agency, flexibility, and social organization, are sufficiently developed.

Agency

Effective adaptation to environmental change not only requires that people have assets, flexibility, learning, and social organization, but also that they have the power and freedom to mobilize these components of adaptive capacity to actively shape their future. Agency, our fifth domain of adaptive capacity, generally refers to the ability of people — individually or collectively — to have free choice in responding to environmental change^{11,12}. It is dependent upon people's belief in their own ability to perform and manage prospective situations and control events that affect them, encompassing aspects of empowerment, motivation, and cognition^{14,76}.

Agency plays a pivotal role in activating the other domains of adaptive capacity. For example, the availability, access to, and interpretation of information about the impacts of climate change on fisheries (which are key aspects of learning) are insufficient to enact adaptation unless fishers are willing or able to use this information to support the adaptation process⁷⁷. People have little incentive to adapt unless they believe that their actions can produce desired outcomes or forestall undesired ones⁷⁸. As such, agency is the basis for creating visions of alternative futures when large-scale changes are necessary. For example, fishers in Chile have created a new alternative vision for biodiversity conservation in which they have conservation rights within TURFs⁷⁹. However, agency can also be the source of resistance and opposition to adaptation efforts, particularly when it encroaches upon key cultural values such as place attachment and occupational identity⁸⁰.

Building agency for adaptive capacity to climate change involves three key types of actions. (1) Incorporating local or customary knowledge, skills, and management into both science and policy^{36,81}. For example, climatologists and communities have used indigenous knowledge to develop climate history and baseline data, to formulate research questions and develop locally acceptable climate adaptations⁸¹. (2) Empowering people through participatory

processes such as adaptive co-management^{33,82}. For example, in the Philippines, people became actively involved in climate adaptation because decentralization devolved management authority to the municipality level⁸³. Finally, (3) removing barriers that may inhibit people's ability to exercise agency^{14,15}. For example, reduction of regulatory and economic barriers that restrict small-scale water storage has been associated with increased household agency over water security in small island developing states⁸⁴.

Frontiers in building adaptive capacity to climate change

Scientific frontiers for the building of adaptive capacity relate to trade-offs between the different domains of capacity, issues of justice and distribution, and management of complex feedbacks. First, where are the important trade-offs in adaptive capacity, and where are investments likely to have greatest benefits? Current models and concepts of adaptive capacity do not resolve critical issues of optimal investment across the different domains of adaptive capacity to influence adaptation. They also fail to determine how investments in adaptive capacity may differ by type, for example, investment in adaptation to long-term environmental stresses from climatic changes will differ considerably to investment in adaptation to short-term weather-related shocks. Future research should address these issues through resolving two dimensions: the substitutability of elements of adaptive capacity and the existence of trade-offs, for example through inadvertently reducing one domain of adaptive capacity through investing in others.

The examples reviewed here suggest that there is limited substitutability between domains of adaptive capacity with respect to shocks and long-term change: investment in assets does not provide the same capacity to adapt as increasing social and individual learning or managing risk. The concept of limited substitution means that adaptive capacity may be restricted by the weakest of its underlying determinants — the so-called weakest link hypothesis^{85,86}. However, the weakest link idea has not been tested, and would require longitudinal and control studies to assess such trade-off effects⁸⁷.

A further question for trade-off analysis is whether building specific domains of adaptive capacity may actually crowd out or undermine other domains. For example, collective action and civic volunteerism can be crowded out by the provision of certain types of government services (that is, building assets)⁵⁸. Measuring and monitoring the effectiveness of different types of adaptive-capacity-building programs will be critical to informing these debates⁸⁸, where a portfolio approach that builds capacity across domains would minimize the risks of significant trade-offs.

A second critical frontier is the intersection between social justice and the building of adaptive capacity. Better understanding of how social justice affects and is affected by efforts to build adaptive capacity will be crucial to avoiding unintended and even perverse outcomes. For example, rebuilding community-scale infrastructure after a disaster most often exacerbates existing inequalities — making already vulnerable people even more vulnerable and undermining their capacity to adapt in the future. Yet rebuilding infrastructure offers opportunities for progressive planning that redresses past injustices^{68,89,90}. Likewise, building aspects of adaptive capacity through removing social and cultural institutions that form barriers to adaptation (for example, customary taboos that restrict where and when people can fish) often has the perverse effect of undermining culturally important beliefs and practices that help to form a basis for agency⁹¹. The issue of social justice and adaptation is particularly relevant because of the politics that drive how adaptation and recovery efforts and investments are targeted towards specific populations, places, and capacities. The differential response of US hurricane relief in Texas and Puerto Rico in 2017 highlights how recovery investments can be driven at least as much by politics as need.

Place attachment and occupational identity are two further examples where building adaptive capacity towards new occupations or living in new regions can isolate or influence resource users and impact on their capacity to adapt over the longer term⁹². Future research directions include developing insights into where identity and place attachment are important to maintain in order to ensure that system resilience occurs across scales. Communities may need strategies to maintain identity (individual or system identity) or remain in place. Policymakers should guide such interventions according to the principle of leaving no one behind, now embedded in the Sustainable Development Goals. Correspondingly, strategies that are 'pro-poor' and focused on sustainable adaptation⁹³ highlight the difficulties associated with reaching the poorest and most vulnerable populations. Often the factors that keep people poor keep them vulnerable, so addressing root causes of poverty in some cases will support adaptive capacity. Efforts to build adaptive capacity will also frequently need to move beyond the local, but at the same time recognize that enhancing capacities of one community may have unintended consequences or undermine capacities at another scale.

The third frontier involves better understanding key linkages and feedbacks to inform improved adaptation outcomes^{33,54}. These linkages and feedbacks occur between scales, between domains of adaptive capacity, and between social and ecological dynamics. Larger-scale social dynamics such as demographics and governance may set a social or political context that enables or inhibits adaptation at smaller scales⁹⁴. Additionally, adaptation actions or capacity building in one location or at one scale may undermine the adaptive capacity of other geographies, people, and scales. These issues may be particularly relevant in tropical coastal areas where high rates of migration, ecological change, and shifting governance of natural resources exacerbate issues of resource control and conflict^{94,95}. Consequently, investigating the multi-scale nature of adaptation and the larger-scale conditions that enable or inhibit local-scale adaptive capacity should be a high-priority research area. Additionally, certain adaptation responses (such as changing fishing strategies) interact with ecological dynamics in ways that affect the flows of ecosystem goods and services, with knock-on impacts for human wellbeing. Scenarios, modelling, and empirical research into threshold relationships⁹⁶ and feedbacks both between domains of adaptive capacity and between social and ecological systems^{97,98} will be critical to identifying how to minimize the negative and unintended consequences of building adaptive capacity, and will also help identify where critical trade-offs exist.

In the wake of major climate-induced threats to coastal systems such as the global coral-reef bleaching event associated with the 2015–2016 El Niño⁵, many coastal communities around the world are now adapting to the aftermath of multiple interacting stresses on their coastal environments. The need to build adaptive capacity to help these communities anticipate and deal with these changes will only continue to escalate. To date, ad hoc and localized documentation and monitoring of efforts to build adaptive capacity has rendered it difficult to assess success. Yet parties to the 2015 Paris Agreement underscored the realization that adaptation is no longer just a local issue but “a global challenge faced by all”⁹⁹. Assessment of past and on-going efforts to build adaptive capacity across the five domains we identify here will be critical to effective adaptation to this global challenge across multiple scales and places.

Received: 16 November 2016; Accepted: 15 December 2017;
Published online: 29 January 2018

References

- Cheung, W. W. L. et al Large-scale redistribution of maximum fisheries catch potential in the global ocean under climate change. *Global Change Biol.* **16**, 24–35 (2010).
Models how climate change is likely to impact global fisheries yields, highlighting how many tropical countries will suffer losses.
- Sumaila, U. R., Cheung, W. W. L., Lam, V. W. Y., Pauly, D. & Herrick, S. Climate change impacts on the biophysics and economics of world fisheries. *Nat. Clim. Change* **1**, 449–456 (2011).
- Mora, C. et al. Suitable days for plant growth disappear under projected climate change: Potential human and biotic vulnerability. *Plos Biology* **13**, e1002167 (2015).
- Nicholls, R. J. & Cazenave, A. Sea-level rise and its impact on coastal zones. *Science* **328**, 1517–1520 (2010).
- Hughes, T. P. et al. Global warming and recurrent mass bleaching of corals. *Nature* **543**, 373–377 (2017).
- Adger, W. N. Vulnerability. *Global Environ. Change* **16**, 268–281 (2006).
Synthesises current understanding about the concept of vulnerability.
- Grothmann, T. & Patt, A. Adaptive capacity and human cognition: the process of individual adaptation to climate change. *Global Environ. Change* **15**, 199–213 (2005).
- Hinkel, J. “Indicators of vulnerability and adaptive capacity”: Towards a clarification of the science–policy interface. *Global Environ. Change* **21**, 198–208 (2011).
- Smit, B. & Wandel, J. Adaptation, adaptive capacity and vulnerability. *Global Environ. Change* **16**, 282–292 (2006).
- Yohe, G. & Tol, R. S. J. Indicators for social and economic coping capacity — moving toward a working definition of adaptive capacity. *Global Environ. Change* **12**, 25–40 (2002).
- Brown, K. & Westaway, E. Agency, capacity, and resilience to environmental change: Lessons from human development, well-being, and disasters. *Ann. Rev. Environ. Res.* **36**, 321–342 (2011).
- Coulthard, S. Can we be both resilient and well, and what choices do people have? Incorporating agency into the resilience debate from a fisheries perspective. *Ecol. Soc.* **17**, 4 (2012).
- Sen, A. *Development as Freedom* (Oxford Paperbacks, Oxford, 2001).
- Bandura, A. Exercise of human agency through collective efficacy. *Current Directions Psychol. Sci.* **9**, 75–78 (2000).
- Alkire, S. Subjective quantitative studies of human agency. *Soc. Indicators Res.* **74**, 217–260 (2005).
- Adger, W. N. Social capital, collective action, and adaptation to climate change. *Econ. Geogr.* **79**, 387–404 (2003).
- Pelling, M. & High, C. Understanding adaptation: what can social capital offer assessments of adaptive capacity? *Global Environ. Change* **15**, 308–319 (2005).
- Brooks, N., Adger, W. N. & Kelly, M. The determinants of vulnerability and adaptive capacity at the national level and the implications for adaptation. *Global Environ. Change* **15**, 151–163 (2005).
- Fenichel, E. P. et al. Wealth reallocation and sustainability under climate change. *Nat. Clim. Change* **6**, 237–244 (2016).
- Cinner, J. E. et al. Evaluating social and ecological vulnerability of coral reef fisheries to climate change. *Plos One* **8**, e74321 (2013).
- Pratchett, M. S. et al. Effects of climate-induced coral bleaching on coral-reef fishes — Ecological and economic consequences. *Oceanogr. Marine Biol.* **46**, 251–296 (2008).
- Adato, M., Carter, M. R. & May, J. Exploring poverty traps and social exclusion in South Africa using qualitative and quantitative data. *J. Dev. Stud.* **42**, 226–247 (2006).
- Badjeck, M.-C., Allison, E. H., Halls, A. S. & Dulvy, N. K. Impacts of climate variability and change on fishery-based livelihoods. *Marine Policy* **34**, 375–383 (2010).
- Barrett, C. & Carter, M. Can't get ahead for falling behind: new directions for development policy to escape poverty and relief traps. *Choices* **17**, 35–38 (2001).
- Sen, A. *Poverty and Famines: an Essay on Entitlements and Deprivation* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1981).
- Ribot, J. C. & Peluso, N. L. A theory of access. *Rural Sociol.* **68**, 153–181 (2003).
- Allison, E. H. et al. Vulnerability of national economies to the impacts of climate change on fisheries. *Fish. Fish.* **10**, 173–196 (2009).
- Cinner, J. E. Social-ecological traps in reef fisheries. *Global Environ. Change* **21**, 835–839 (2011).
- Njenga, P. & Davis, A. Drawing the road map to rural poverty reduction. *Transport Rev.* **23**, 217–241 (2003).
- Lemos, M. C., Lo, Y. J., Nelson, D. R., Eakin, H. & Bedran-Martins, A. M. Linking development to climate adaptation: Leveraging generic and specific capacities to reduce vulnerability to drought in NE Brazil. *Global Environ. Change* **39**, 170–179 (2016).
- Brewer, T., Cinner, J., Green, A. & Pandolfi, J. Thresholds and multiple scale interaction of environment, resource use, and market proximity on reef fishery resources in the Solomon Islands. *Biol. Conservation* **142**, 1797–1807 (2009).
- Ibsch, P. L. et al. A global map of roadless areas and their conservation status. *Science* **354**, 1423–1427 (2016).

33. Folke, C., Hahn, T., Olsson, P. & Norberg, J. Adaptive governance of social-ecological systems. *Ann. Rev. Environ. Res.* **30**, 441–473 (2005).
Reviews current understanding of social, organizational and institutional dimensions of adaptive social-ecological systems.
34. Bell, J. & Morrison, T. A comparative analysis of the transformation of governance systems: Land-use planning for flood risk. *J. Environ. Policy Planning* **17**, 516–534 (2015).
35. Aguilera, S. E. et al. Managing small-scale commercial fisheries for adaptive capacity: Insights from dynamic social-ecological drivers of change in Monterey Bay. *Plos One* **10**, e0118992 (2015).
36. Berkes, F., Colding, J. & Folke, C. Rediscovery of traditional ecological knowledge as adaptive management. *Ecol. Appl.* **10**, 1251–1262 (2000).
37. Krishna, A. Pathways out of and into poverty in 36 villages of Andhra Pradesh, India. *World Dev.* **34**, 271–288 (2006).
Documents poverty trap dynamics over time to show how households get entrapped in, and emerge from, poverty.
38. Stevanen, L., Crawford, B., Pollnac, R. & Lowe, C. Weeding through assumptions of livelihood approaches in ICM: Seaweed farming in the Philippines and Indonesia. *Ocean Coastal Management* **48**, 297–313 (2005).
39. Cinner, J. E. & Bodin, O. Livelihood diversification in tropical coastal communities: A network-based approach to analyzing 'Livelihood Landscapes'. *Plos One* **5**, 8 (2010).
40. Cinner, J. E. et al. Gear-based fisheries management as a potential adaptive response to climate change and coral mortality. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **46**, 724–732 (2009).
41. Berkes, F. et al. Ecology — globalization, roving bandits, and marine resources. *Science* **311**, 1557–1558 (2006).
42. Gelcich, S. et al. Navigating transformations in governance of Chilean marine coastal resources. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **107**, 16794–16799 (2010).
43. Adger, W. N., Kelly, P. M., Winkels, A., Huy, L. Q. & Locke, C. Migration, remittances, livelihood trajectories, and social resilience. *Ambio* **31**, 358–366 (2002).
44. Szabo, S. et al. Soil salinity, household wealth and food insecurity in tropical deltas: evidence from south-west coast of Bangladesh. *Sust. Sci.* **11**, 411–421 (2016).
45. Hill, N. A. O., Rowcliffe, J. M., Koldewey, H. J. & Milner-Gulland, E. J. The interaction between seaweed farming as an alternative occupation and fisher numbers in the Central Philippines. *Conservation Biol.* **26**, 324–334 (2012).
46. Marshall, N. A. et al. *A Framework for Social Adaptation to Climate Change: Sustaining Tropical Coastal Communities and Industries* (IUCN, Gland, 2010).
47. Smajl, A. et al. Responding to rising sea levels in the Mekong Delta. *Nat. Clim. Change* **5**, 167–174 (2015).
Identifies effective adaptation strategies according to an ensemble of soft and hard options.
48. Cohen, P. J. et al. Understanding adaptive capacity and capacity to innovate in social-ecological systems: Applying a gender lens. *Ambio* **45**, S309–S321 (2016).
49. Krishna, A., Kritjanson, P., Radeny, M. & Nindo, W. Escaping poverty and becoming poor in 20 Kenyan villages. *J. Human Dev.* **5**, 211–226 (2004).
50. Boko, M. et al. In *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability* (eds Parry, M. et al.) 433–467 (IPCC, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2007).
51. Pelling, M., High, C., Dearing, J. & Smith, D. Shadow spaces for social learning: a relational understanding of adaptive capacity to climate change within organisations. *Environ. Planning A* **40**, 867–884 (2008).
52. Aldrich, D. P. *Building Resilience: Social Capital in Post-Disaster Recovery* (University of Chicago Press, Cambridge, 2012).
53. Barnes, M. L., Lynham, J., Kalberg, K. & Leung, P. Social networks and environmental outcomes. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **113**, 6466–6471 (2016).
54. Barnes, M. L. et al. The social structural foundations of adaptation and transformation in social-ecological systems. *Ecol. Soc.* **22**, 4 (2017).
55. Mathbor, G. M. Enhancement of community preparedness for natural disasters — The role of social work in building social capital for sustainable disaster relief and management. *Int. Soc. Work* **50**, 357–369 (2007).
56. Ratner, B. D. et al. Governance of aquatic agricultural systems: Analyzing representation, power, and accountability. *Ecol. Soc.* **18**, 59 (2013).
57. Granovetter, M. S. The strength of weak ties. *Am. J. Sociol.* **78**, 1360–1380 (1973).
58. Putnam, R. D. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (Simon and Schuster, New York, 2001).
59. Wagner, C. L. & Fernandez-Gimenez, M. E. Does community-based collaborative resource management increase social capital? *Soc. Nat. Res.* **21**, 324–344 (2008).
60. Barnes-Mauthe, M., Arita, S., Allen, S. D., Gray, S. A. & Leung, P. The influence of ethnic diversity on social network structure in a common-pool resource system: Implications for collaborative management. *Ecol. Soc.* **18**, 23 (2013).
61. Tompkins, E. L. & Adger, W. N. Does adaptive management of natural resources enhance resilience to climate change? *Ecol. Soc.* **9**, 10 (2004).
62. Marin, A., Bodin, O., Gelcich, S. & Crona, B. Social capital in post-disaster recovery trajectories: Insights from a longitudinal study of tsunami-impacted small-scale fisher organizations in Chile. *Global Environ. Change* **35**, 450–462 (2015).
63. Pelling, M. *Natural Disaster and Development in a Globalizing World* (Routledge, Abingdon, 2003).
64. Bodin, O. & Crona, B. I. The role of social networks in natural resource governance: What relational patterns make a difference? *Global Environ. Change* **19**, 366–374 (2009).
65. Blythe, J. B. G., Cohen, P., Moveni, M. & Kwatela, A. *Five Principles for Network Success in Solomon Islands* (Penang Malaysia WorldFish Program, 2017).
66. Lietaer, B. Complementary currencies in Japan today: History, originality and relevance. *Int. J. Commun. Currency Res.* **8**, 1–23 (2004).
67. Aldrich, D. P. & Meyer, M. A. Social capital and community resilience. *Am. Behav. Sci.* **59**, 254–269 (2015).
68. Adger, W. N., Arnell, N. W. & Tompkins, E. L. Successful adaptation to climate change across scales. *Global Environ. Change* **15**, 77–86 (2005).
69. Berkhout, F., Hertin, J. & Gann, D. M. Learning to adapt: organisational adaptation to climate change impacts. *Climatic Change* **78**, 135–156 (2006).
70. Fazeey, I. et al. Adaptive capacity and learning to learn as leverage for social-ecological resilience. *Frontiers Ecol. Environ.* **5**, 375–380 (2007).
71. Lutz, W., Muttarak, R. & Striessnig, E. Universal education is key to enhanced climate adaptation. *Science* **346**, 1061–1062 (2014).
72. Pahl-Wostl, C. et al. Social learning and water resources management. *Ecol. Soc.* **12**, 5 (2007).
73. Funfgeld, H. Facilitating local climate change adaptation through transnational municipal networks. *Current Opinion Environ. Sust.* **12**, 67–73 (2015).
74. *Building Vibrant, Empowered and Resilient Communities* (Locally Managed Marine Area Network, 2009); <http://go.nature.com/2IEWVqQ>
75. Argyris, C. Single-loop and double-loop models in research on decision making. *Administrative Science Q.* **21**, 363–375 (1976).
76. Bandura, A. In *Advances in Psychological Science: Personal, Social and Cultural Aspects* Vol. 1. (eds Adair, J. G., Belanger, D. & Dion, K. L.) 51–71 (Psychology Press, Hove, 1998).
77. Olsson, P. et al. Shooting the rapids: Navigating transitions to adaptive governance of social-ecological systems. *Ecol. Soc.* **11**, 18 (2006).
78. Ajzen, I. The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behav. Human Decision Processes* **50**, 179–211 (1991).
79. Gelcich, S. & Donlan, C. J. Incentivizing biodiversity conservation in artisanal fishing communities through territorial user rights and business model innovation. *Conservation Biol.* **29**, 1076–1085 (2015).
80. Brown, K. *Resilience, Development and Global Change* (Routledge, Abingdon, 2016).
81. Riedlinger, D. & Berkes, F. Contributions of traditional knowledge to understanding climate change in the Canadian Arctic. *Polar Record* **37**, 315–328 (2001).
82. Armitage, D. R. et al. Adaptive co-management for social-ecological complexity. *Frontiers Ecol. Environ.* **7**, 95–102 (2009).
83. Cuevas, S. C., Peterson, A., Robinson, C. & Morrison, T. H. Institutional capacity for long-term climate change adaptation: evidence from land use planning in Albay, Philippines. *Regional Environ. Change* **16**, 2045–2058 (2016).
84. Elliott, M. et al. Multiple household water sources and their use in remote communities with evidence from Pacific Island countries. *Water Resour. Res.* **53**, 9106–9117 (2017).
85. Adger, W. N. et al. Are there social limits to adaptation to climate change? *Climatic Change* **93**, 335–354 (2009).
86. Tol, R. S. J., & Yohe, G. W. The weakest link hypothesis for adaptive capacity: An empirical test. *Global Environ. Change* **17**, 218–227 (2007).
Empirically examines how adaptive capacity may be limited by the weakest component of its underlying determinants.
87. Fawcett, D., Pearce, T., Ford, J. D. & Archer, L. Operationalizing longitudinal approaches to climate change vulnerability assessment. *Global Environ. Change* **45**, 79–88 (2017).
88. Engle, N. L. Adaptive capacity and its assessment. *Global Environ. Change* **21**, 647–656 (2011).
89. Thomas, D. & Twyman, C. Equity and justice in climate change adaptation amongst natural-resource-dependent societies. *Global Environ. Change* **15**, 115–124 (2005).
90. McSweeney, K. & Coomes, O. T. Climate-related disaster opens a window of opportunity for rural poor in northeastern Honduras. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **108**, 5203–5208 (2011).
91. Daw, T. M. et al. Evaluating taboo trade-offs in ecosystems services and human well-being. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **112**, 6949–6954 (2015).
92. Marshall, N. A., Park, S. E., Adger, W. N., Brown, K. & Howden, S. M. Transformational capacity and the influence of place and identity. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **7**, 034022 (2012).
93. Brown, K. Sustainable adaptation: An oxymoron? *Clim. Dev.* **3**, 21–31 (2011).
94. Morrison, T. H. Evolving polycentric governance of the Great Barrier Reef. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **114**, E3013–E3021 (2017).

95. Alcala, A. C. & Russ, G. R. No-take marine reserves and reef fisheries management in the Philippines: A new people power revolution. *Ambio* **35**, 245–254 (2006).
96. Barrett, C. B. & Constanas, M. A. Toward a theory of resilience for international development applications. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **111**, 14625–14630 (2014).
97. Enfors, E. Social-ecological traps and transformations in dryland agro-ecosystems: Using water system innovations to change the trajectory of development. *Global Environ. Change* **23**, 51–60 (2013).
98. Hughes, T. P. et al. Coral reefs in the Anthropocene. *Nature* **546**, 82–90 (2017).
99. *Paris Agreement: Article 7 FCCC/CP/2015/10/Add1* (UNFCCC, 2015).

Acknowledgements

Thanks to T. McClanahan for input on an early iteration of this concept. S.G. thanks Conicyt Basal 002 and NC120086. Funding was provided by the Australian Research

Council's Centre for Excellence Program (CE140100020), an Australian Research Fellowship to J.C., a Future Fellowship to J.C., an Australian Laureate Fellowship to T.H., Pew Fellowships in Marine Conservation to J.C. and S.G., and an NSF Fellowship to M.B. (#1513354). This work contributes to the CGIAR Research Program on Fish Agrifood Systems (FISH).

Author contributions

J.E.C. conceived of the concept and led the writing. W.A., E.A., M.B., K.B., P.C., S.G., C.H., T.H., J.L., N.M., and T.M. substantively contributed ideas and writing.

Additional information

Reprints and permissions information is available at www.nature.com/reprints.

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to J.E.C.

Publisher's note: Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.