Building adaptive capacity to climate change in tropical coastal communities

Prepared as a perspective for Nature Climate Change

***Joshua E. Cinner[1], W. Neil Adger[2], Edward H. Allison[3], Michele L. Barnes[1, 4], Katrina Brown[2], Philippa J. Cohen[1,5], Stefan Gelcich[6, 7], Christina C. Hicks[8], Terry P. Hughes[1], Jacqueline Lau[1], Nadine A. Marshall[9], Tiffany H. Morrison[1]**

[1]Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for Coral Reef Studies, James Cook University, Townsville, QLD 4811 Australia

[2] Geography, College of Life and Environmental Sciences University of Exeter, Exeter, EX4 4RJ, UK

[3]School of Marine and Environmental Affairs, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98105, USA

[4]Botany Department, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA

[5]WorldFish, Penang, Malaysia

[6]Center of Applied Ecology and Sustainability (CAPES), Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile, Santiago, Chile

[7]Center for the Study of Multiple-Drivers on Marine Socio-Ecological Systems, Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile, Santiago, Chile

[8] Lancaster Environment Centre, Lancaster University, Lancaster, LA5 9PT, UK

[9]Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, based at James Cook University, Townsville, QLD 4811 Australia

* Joshua Cinner, Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for Coral Reef Studies, James Cook University, Townsville, QLD 4811 Australia email: Joshua.cinner@jcu.edu.au Ph:

Preface:

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 recognise and respond to change; and the agency to determine whether to change or not.

Main text:

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, 2, 3] , and the built infrastructure that supports them will be especially vulnerable to sea level rise[4]. An increasing frequency and intensity of coral bleaching events due to global warming has already significantly affected coral-reef dependent coastal communities[5]. 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 (i.e. the exposure), the degree to which people depend on affected resources (i.e. their sensitivity), and on their capacity to adapt to or take advantage of the changes they experience (i.e. 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 opportunities[7]. Earlier research identified key underlying determinants of adaptive capacity as the availability of capital (e.g., financial, social, human) in times of need[8, 9, 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, 14, 15, 16, 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 (i.e. health care) resources to which people have access to, which 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, fishers 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 affordable capital, credit, and insurance[22, 23, 24]. Some coastal residents also benefit from social investments (e.g., healthcare) that help to prevent a decline of existing assets (e.g. 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

97 and adverse trends[23]. Interventions to address Malaria (e.g. by improving availability of
98 insecticide-treated bed-nets, or improving availability of anti-malarial drugs and emergency
99 care), could therefore help such households escape these 'poverty traps'[22] and build the
100 household assets that could, in the long term, help them adapt to a changing climate. This
101 illustrates the complex and multi-scale interactions between planned and autonomous
102 adaptive action to multiple stressors.
103
104 Attempts to build or secure assets can focus on individuals (for example, providing micro-
105 credit loans) or community-scale public goods (such as infrastructure or information
106 dissemination). However, investments in public goods may fail to reach the most vulnerable
107 if certain social mechanisms (such as caste systems, gender inequality, etc.) prevent some
108 people from accessing the benefits[13, 25, 26]. In these situations, attempts to build adaptive
109 capacity can strongly differentiate society, and it is critical to be aware of the power
110 asymmetries and political dimensions that underpin the potential impacts of intervention.
111
112 Although it is often assumed that the wealthy are better able to adapt to change than the
113 poor[18, 27], building assets that enhance people's ability to exploit natural resources may
114 actually increase the vulnerability of coastal communities to climate change by undermining
115 the long-term sustainability of coastal ecosystems. This represents both temporal and social
116 trade-offs inherent in adaptation strategies, which must be heeded when designing
117 interventions to enhance adaptive capacity. For example, in Tanzania, fishers who were more
118 likely to intensify fishing effort in response to lower catches (thereby increasing exploitation)
119 were those who had assets, but lacked flexibility to change livelihood strategies[28]. Wealthier
120 fishers were thus more likely to catalyse a 'social-ecological trap', whereby lower yields
121 increased fishing exploitation, which in turn further decreased yields[28]. Likewise, investments
122 in basic infrastructure such as roads may increase people's assets by improving market
123 accessibility, while serving as a catalyst for other types of development (e.g., access to
124 education, healthcare, and markets)[29] that can provide greater flexibility and agency to
125 manage climate shocks[30]. However, access to markets is also a key driver of
126 overexploitation[31] and habitat destruction[32], and may increase social-ecological
127 vulnerability[20].
128

Flexibility

The flexibility domain of adaptive capacity reflects opportunities for switching between adaptation strategies and captures the diversity of potential adaptation options available. Organisations 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 (e.g., 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 1997-98 El Niño[23]. Flexibility also entails the capacity to shift into different occupational sectors (e.g., agriculture and non-natural resource based enterprises), either temporarily or permanently, in response to climate change impacts (e.g., reductions in fisheries yields or eco-tourism revenue). At a larger scale, the flexibility of organizations and institutions (i.e. 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 flooding[34].

Building flexibility in tropical coastal communities will require a number of strategies. At a larger scale, organizations and institutions can build flexibility through processes of ongoing monitoring and review, with regular formal revision. At the individual scale, flexibility could be fostered by removing social and legal barriers that can constrain key adaptation actions, such as switching to new fishing gears[35]. 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 also require developing ecological knowledge about new places[36], the capacity to reach them (i.e. 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 poverty[37]. For

example, in North Sulawesi, Indonesia, the introduction of seaweed farming as an alternative to fishing improved villagers' material assets[38].

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 (i.e., have more assets), they often exhibit lower livelihood flexibility[39]. As with the building of assets, the building of flexibility also has potential ecological consequences. For instance, since different fishing gears selectively target different sizes and species of fish, there can be ecological consequences of adopting fishing gears that preferentially target specific species, e.g., those that play a critical role in the maintenance and recovery of coral reef ecosystems[40]. 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 occur[42]. 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 coast[42]. 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 well-being of others[43, 44].

There are a number of challenges to building flexibility. Alternative livelihood projects often fail for social and cultural reasons[45]. 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 the 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 resources[16]. Critically, social organization is by nature multi-scale, containing individual, collective, and organizational dimensions[16]. 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 strategies[52]. Likewise, networks that promote information exchange and cooperation can help communities adapt to changes such as increasingly variable fish catch or weather patterns[53].

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 threats[54]. 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 gatherings[55]. Building connections across communities (bridging social capital), and to people or organizations operating at larger scales, (e.g., international NGOs and financial organizations; linking social capital) can help to secure access to resources, scientific information, and technological innovations that facilitate adaptation[56]. For example, when climate change impacts are so severe that people must change livelihoods, bridging connections can provide crucial information about new job opportunities[57]. 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 levels[54]. 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 goals[58]. 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 Tobago[61], and among fishers in Chile[62].

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 conflict[63], 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 options[64]. Likewise, when only local elites have bridging and linking connections, the wider community may lack access to the assets needed to effectively respond to change[17]. 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 (e.g. community, provincial, and national)[65]; 2) community currency, or time banking systems, where individuals are incentivised to volunteer[66]. This not only creates novel connections in the community, but also material and mental health benefits among participants[67]; and 3) creation of interaction arenas where people can work together towards shared goals, build trust, and develop social cohesion[67]. Such arenas occur through community meetings and the facilitation of other social events, as well as through town/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 organisational, spatial, and temporal scales[69]. For example, in response to climate change,

255 fishers will have to learn about new fishing grounds, gears, weather patterns, technologies,
256 species, and in some cases, new ways of making a living.
257
258 Building the learning domain of adaptive capacity to climate change will require supporting
259 processes that enable people to frame or reframe problems by recognizing change,
260 attributing this change to its causes, and assessing potential responses[18, 70]. This may involve
261 supporting formal education[71], as well as informal forums for learning.
262
263 Provision of access to critical information, such as market prices and weather forecasts, is
264 central to building the learning domain of adaptive capacity in coastal communities. For
265 example, early warning systems can help fishers assess potential risks, reduce lost or
266 unproductive fishing days, and ultimately reduce deaths[23]. Likewise, seasonal forecasts can
267 help coastal farmers to choose crops with the best yields under new climatic conditions[7], and
268 future rainfall projections can help local governments manage areas vulnerable to flooding[34].
269 Learning to adapt to climate change also requires investment in peer-to-peer networks (also
270 referred to as communities of practice)[72] that allow people to share experiences of ecological
271 surprise from other locations and other knowledge systems (e.g., expert, local, indigenous).
272 Such peer-to-peer networks have not only facilitated learning, but also empowered people
273 to develop novel adaptation strategies[73]. For example, the Locally Managed Marine Areas
274 network connects and shares experiences among coastal communities across the Indo-
275 Pacific, blending scientific and local ecological knowledge systems to implement a range of
276 community-based fisheries management strategies[74].
277
278 Learning may emerge in a locally generated or self-organized form triggered by crisis, or
279 because of an active adaptive co-management strategy. Learning provides depth in
280 understanding and occurs across time scales, where instrumental single-loop learning occurs
281 within short-to medium periods, and deeper double-loop learning occurs over longer time
282 scales. Instrumental single-loop learning only informs and changes the most immediate
283 technical operations (e.g. turning on the air conditioner in a heatwave), while deeper double-
284 loop learning may change governance procedures at the organizational level (e.g. local green
285 infrastructure planning), and even overarching values and norms at the policy and
286 paradigmatic levels (e.g. 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 health[71]. Yet, learning may only enable adaptation when other domains of adaptive capacity, such as agency, flexibility, and social organization, are sufficient.

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 adaption unless fishers are willing or able to use this information to support the adaptation process[77]. People have little incentive to adapt unless they believe that their actions can produce desired outcomes or forestall undesired ones[78]. 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 TURFs[79]. However, agency can also be the source of resistance and opposition to adaptation efforts, particularly when they encroach upon key cultural values such as place attachment and occupational identity[80].

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 adaptations[81]; 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 level[83]; and 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 States[84].

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 the complexity of 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 analysis and 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 effects[87].

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 (i.e. building assets)[58]. Measuring and monitoring the effectiveness of different types of adaptive capacity building programs will be critical to informing these debates[88], where a portfolio approach that builds capacity across domains would minimise 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 (e.g., 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 agency[91]. 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 term[92]. 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 adaptation[93] 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 recognise 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 scales[94]. Additionally, adaptation actions or capacity building in one location or 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 multiscale 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 to human wellbeing. Scenarios, modelling, and empirical research into threshold relationships[96] 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 2015-16 El Niño[5], 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 localised 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 realisation that

adaptation is no longer just a local issue but "a global challenge faced by all"[99]. Assessment of past and ongoing 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.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to T. McClanahan for input on an early iteration of this concept. SG thanks Conicyt Basal 002 and NC120086. Funding was provided by the Australian Research Council's Centre or Excellence Program (CE140100020), an Australian Research Fellowship to JC, a Future Fellowship to JC, an Australian Laureate Fellowship to TH, a Pew Fellowship in Marine Conservation to JC and SG, and an NSF Fellowship to MB (#1513354). This work contributes to the CGIAR Research Program on Fish Agrifood Systems (FISH).

Author Contributions

JC conceived of the concept and led the writing. WA, EA, MB, KB, PC, SG, CH, TH, JL, NM, and TM substantively contributed ideas and writing.

References

1. Cheung WWL, Lam VWY, Sarmiento JL, Kearney K, Watson R, Zeller D*, et al.* Large-scale redistribution of maximum fisheries catch potential in the global ocean under climate change. *Global Change Biology* 2010, **16**(1)**:** 24-35. **Models how climate change is likely to impact global fisheries yields, highlighting how many tropical countries will suffer losses**

2. Sumaila UR, Cheung WWL, Lam VWY, Pauly D, Herrick S. Climate change impacts on the biophysics and economics of world fisheries. *Nat Clim Change* 2011, **1**(9)**:** 449-456

3. Mora C, Caldwell IR, Caldwell JM, Fisher MR, Genco BM, Running SW. Suitable days for plant growth disappear under projected climate change: Potential human and biotic vulnerability. *Plos Biology* 2015, **13**(6)**:** e1002167

4. Nicholls RJ, Cazenave A. Sea-level rise and its impact on coastal zones. *Science* 2010, **328**(5985)**:** 1517-1520

5. Hughes TP, Kerry JT, Alvarez-Noriega M, Alvarez-Romero JG, Anderson KD, Baird AH*, et al.* Global warming and recurrent mass bleaching of corals. *Nature* 2017, **543**(7645)**:** 373-377

6. Adger WN. Vulnerability. *Global Environmental Change* 2006, **16**(3)**:** 268-281. **Synthesises current understanding about the concept of vulnerability**

7. Grothmann T, Patt A. Adaptive capacity and human cognition: the process of individual adaptation to climate change. *Global Environmental Change* 2005, **15**(3)**:** 199-213

8. Hinkel J. "Indicators of vulnerability and adaptive capacity": Towards a clarification of the science-policy interface. *Global Environmental Change* 2011, **21**(1)**:** 198-208

9. Smit B, Wandel J. Adaptation, adaptive capacity and vulnerability. *Global Environmental Change* 2006, **16**(3)**:** 282-292

10. Yohe G, Tol RSJ. Indicators for social and economic coping capacity - moving toward a working definition of adaptive capacity. *Global Environmental Change* 2002, **12**(1)**:** 25-40

11. Brown K, Westaway E. Agency, capacity, and resilience to environmental change: Lessons from human development, well-being, and disasters. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 2011, **36:** 321-342

12. 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* 2012, **17**(1)**:** 4

13. Sen A. *Development as freedom*. Oxford Paperbacks, 2001.

14. Bandura A. Exercise of human agency through collective efficacy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 2000, **9**(3)**:** 75-78

15. Alkire S. Subjective quantitative studies of human agency. *Social Indicators Research* 2005, **74**(1)**:** 217-260

16. Adger WN. Social capital, collective action, and adaptation to climate change. *Economic Geography* 2003, **79**(4)**:** 387-404

17. Pelling M, High C. Understanding adaptation: what can social capital offer assessments of adaptive capacity? *Global Environmental Change* 2005, **15**(4)**:** 308-319

18. Brooks N, Adger WN, Kelly M. The determinants of vulnerability and adaptive capacity at the national level and the implications for adaptation. *Global Environmental Change* 2005, **15**(2)**:** 151-163

19. Fenichel EP, Levin SA, Mccay B, Martin KS, Abbott JK, Pinsky ML. Wealth reallocation and sustainability under climate change. *Nat Clim Change* 2016, **6**(3)**:** 237-244

20. Cinner JE, Huchery C, Darling ES, Humphries AT, Graham NAJ, Hicks CC*, et al.* Evaluating social and ecological vulnerability of coral reef fisheries to climate change. *Plos One* 2013, **8**(9)**:** e74321

21. Pratchett MS, Munday PL, Wilson SK, Graham NAJ, Cinner JE, Bellwood DR*, et al.* Effects of climate-induced coral bleaching on coral-reef fishes - Ecological and economic consequences. *Oceanography and Marine Biology* 2008, **46:** 251-296

22. Adato M, Carter MR, May J. Exploring poverty traps and social exclusion in South Africa using qualitative and quantitative data. *Journal of Development Studies* 2006, **42**(2)**:** 226-247

23. Badjeck M-C, Allison EH, Halls AS, Dulvy NK. Impacts of climate variability and change on fishery-based livelihoods. *Marine Policy* 2010, **34**(3)**:** 375-383

24. Barrett C, Carter M. Can't get ahead for falling behind: new directions for development policy to escape poverty and relief traps. *Choices* 2001, **17**(4)**:** 35-38

25. Sen A. *Poverty and famines: An essay on entitlements and deprivation*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1981.

26. Ribot JC, Peluso NL. A theory of access. *Rural Sociology* 2003, **68**(2)**:** 153-181

27. Allison EH, Perry AL, Badjeck M-C, Neil Adger W, Brown K, Conway D*, et al.* Vulnerability of national economies to the impacts of climate change on fisheries. *Fish and Fisheries* 2009, **10**(2)**:** 173-196

28. Cinner JE. Social-ecological traps in reef fisheries. *Global Environmental Change* 2011, **21**(3)**:** 835-839

29. Njenga P, Davis A. Drawing the road map to rural poverty reduction. *Transport Reviews* 2003, **23**(2)**:** 217-241

30. Lemos MC, Lo YJ, Nelson DR, Eakin H, Bedran-Martins AM. Linking development to climate adaptation: Leveraging generic and specific capacities to reduce vulnerability to drought in NE Brazil. *Global Environmental Change* 2016, **39:** 170-179

31. 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. *Biological Conservation* 2009, **142**(8)**:** 1797-1807

32. Ibisch PL, Hoffmann MT, Kreft S, Pe'er G, Kati V, Biber-Freudenberger L*, et al.* A global map of roadless areas and their conservation status. *Science* 2016, **354**(6318)**:** 1423-1427

33. Folke C, Hahn T, Olsson P, Norberg J. Adaptive governance of social-ecological systems. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 2005, **30:** 441-473. **Reviews current understanding of social, organisational 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. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning* 2015, **17**(4)**:** 516-534

35. Aguilera SE, Cole J, Finkbeiner EM, Le Cornu E, Ban NC, Carr MH*, et al.* Managing small-scale commercial fisheries for adaptive capacity: Insights from dynamic social-ecological drivers of change in Monterey Bay. *Plos One* 2015, **10**(3)**:** e0118992

564 36. Berkes F, Colding J, Folke C. Rediscovery of traditional ecological knowledge as
565 adaptive management. *Ecological Applications* 2000, **10**(5)**:** 1251-1262
566

567 37. Krishna A. Pathways out of and into poverty in 36 villages of Andhra Pradesh, India.
568 *World Development* 2006, **34**(2)**:** 271-288. **Documents poverty trap dynamics over**
569 **time to show how households get entrapped in, and emerge from, poverty**
570

571 38. Sievanen L, Crawford B, Pollnac R, Lowe C. Weeding through assumptions of
572 livelihood approaches in ICM: Seaweed farming in the Philippines and Indonesia.
573 *Ocean and Coastal Management* 2005, **48**(3)**:** 297-313
574

575 39. Cinner JE, Bodin O. Livelihood Diversification in Tropical Coastal Communities: A
576 Network-Based Approach to Analyzing 'Livelihood Landscapes'. *Plos One* 2010, **5**(8)**:**
577

578 40. Cinner JE, McClanahan TR, Graham NAJ, Pratchett MS, Wilson SK, Raina JB. Gear-
579 based fisheries management as a potential adaptive response to climate change and
580 coral mortality. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 2009, **46**(3)**:** 724-732
581

582 41. Berkes F, Hughes TP, Steneck RS, Wilson JA, Bellwood DR, Crona B*, et al.* Ecology -
583 Globalization, roving bandits, and marine resources. *Science* 2006, **311**(5767)**:** 1557-
584 1558
585

586 42. Gelcich S, Hughes TP, Olsson P, Folke C, Defeo O, Fernandez M*, et al.* Navigating
587 transformations in governance of Chilean marine coastal resources. *P Natl Acad Sci*
588 *USA* 2010, **107**(39)**:** 16794-16799
589

590 43. Adger WN, Kelly PM, Winkels A, Huy LQ, Locke C. Migration, remittances, livelihood
591 trajectories, and social resilience. *Ambio* 2002, **31**(4)**:** 358-366
592

593 44. Szabo S, Hossain MS, Adger WN, Matthews Z, Ahmed S, Lazar AN*, et al.* Soil salinity,
594 household wealth and food insecurity in tropical deltas: evidence from south-west
595 coast of Bangladesh. *Sustainability Science* 2016, **11**(3)**:** 411-421
596

597 45. Hill NAO, Rowcliffe JM, Koldewey HJ, Milner-Gulland EJ. The interaction between
598 seaweed farming as an alternative occupation and fisher numbers in the Central
599 Philippines. *Conservation Biology* 2012, **26**(2)**:** 324-334
600

601 46. Marshall NA, Marshall N, Marshall P, Tamelander J, Obura D, Malleret-King D*, et al.*
602 *A framework for social adaptation to climate change: sustaining tropical coastal*
603 *communitites [sic] and industries*. IUCN: Gland, 2010.
604
605 47. Smajgl A, Toan TQ, Nhan DK, Ward J, Trung NH, Tri LQ*, et al.* Responding to rising
606 sea levels in the Mekong Delta. *Nat Clim Change* 2015, **5**(2)**:** 167-U167. **Identifies**
607 **effective adaptation strategies according to an ensemble of soft and hard options.**
608
609 48. Cohen PJ, Lawless S, Dyer M, Morgan M, Saeni E, Teioli H*, et al.* Understanding
610 adaptive capacity and capacity to innovate in social-ecological systems: Applying a
611 gender lens. *Ambio* 2016, **45:** S309-S321
612
613 49. Krishna A, Kritjanson P, Radeny M, Nindo W. Escaping poverty and becoming poor in
614 20 Kenyan villages. *Journal of Human Development* 2004, **5**(2)**:** 211-226
615
616 50. Boko M, Niang I, Nyong A, Vogel C, Githeko A, Medany M*, et al.* Africa. In: Parry M,
617 Canziani O, Palutiko J, van der Linden P, Hanson C (eds). *Climate Change 2007:*
618 *Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the*
619 *Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*.
620 Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK,, 2007, pp 433-467.
621
622 51. Pelling M, High C, Dearing J, Smith D. Shadow spaces for social learning: a relational
623 understanding of adaptive capacity to climate change within organisations.
624 *Environment and Planning A* 2008, **40**(4)**:** 867-884
625
626 52. Aldrich DP. *Building resilience: Social capital in post-disaster recovery*. University of
627 Chicago Press, 2012.
628
629 53. Barnes ML, Lynham J, Kalberg K, Leung P. Social networks and environmental
630 outcomes. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* 2016, **113**(23)**:** 6466-6471
631
632 54. Barnes ML, Bodin Ö, Guerrero A, Mcallister R, Alexander SM, Robins G. Theorizing
633 the social structural foundations of adaptation and transformation in social-
634 ecological systems. *Available at SSRN: https://ssrncom/abstract=2932575* 2017**:**
635
636 55. Mathbor GM. Enhancement of community preparedness for natural disasters - The
637 role of social work in building social capital for sustainable disaster relief and
638 management. *International Social Work* 2007, **50**(3)**:** 357-369
639

56. Ratner BD, Cohen P, Barman B, Mam K, Nagoli J, Allison EH. Governance of aquatic agricultural systems: Analyzing representation, power, and accountability. *Ecol Soc* 2013, **18**(4)**:** 59

57. Granovetter MS. The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology* 1973, **78**(6)**:** 1360-1380

58. Putnam RD. *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon and Schuster: New York, NY, USA, 2001.

59. Wagner CL, Fernandez-Gimenez ME. Does community-based collaborative resource management increase social capital? *Society and Natural Resources* 2008, **21**(4)**:** 324-344

60. Barnes-Mauthe M, Arita S, Allen SD, Gray SA, Leung P. The influence of ethnic diversity on social network structure in a common-pool resource system: Implications for collaborative management. *Ecol Soc* 2013, **18**(1)**:** 23

61. Tompkins EL, Adger WN. Does adaptive management of natural resources enhance resilience to climate change? *Ecol Soc* 2004, **9**(2)**:** 10

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 Environmental Change* 2015, **35:** 450-462

63. Pelling M. *Natural disaster and development in a globalizing world*. Routledge, 2003.

64. Bodin Ö, Crona BI. The role of social networks in natural resource governance: What relational patterns make a difference? *Global Environmental Change* 2009, **19**(3)**:** 366-374

65. Blythe JB, G.; Cohen, P.; Moveni, M.; Kwatelae,A. Five principles for network success in Solomon Islands. *Penang Malaysia: WorldFish Program Brief* 2017**:**

66. Lietaer B. Complementary currencies in Japan today: History, originality and relevance. *International Journal of Community Currency Research* 2004, **8**(1)**:** 1-23

67. Aldrich DP, Meyer MA. Social capital and community resilience. *American Behavioral Scientist* 2015, **59**(2)**:** 254-269

68. Adger WN, Arnell NW, Tompkins EL. Successful adaptation to climate change across scales. *Global Environmental Change* 2005, **15**(2)**:** 77-86

69. Berkhout F, Hertin J, Gann DM. Learning to adapt: organisational adaptation to climate change impacts. *Climatic change* 2006, **78**(1)**:** 135-156

70. Fazey I, Fazey J, Fischer J, Sherren K, Warren J, Noss R*, et al.* Adaptive capacity and learning to learn as leverage for social-ecological resilience. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 2007, **5**(7)**:** 375-380

71. Lutz W, Muttarak R, Striessnig E. Universal education is key to enhanced climate adaptation. *Science* 2014, **346**(6213)**:** 1061-1062

72. Pahl-Wostl C, Craps M, Dewulf A, Mostert E, Tabara D, Taillieu T. Social learning and water resources management. *Ecol Soc* 2007, **12**(2)**:** 5

73. Funfgeld H. Facilitating local climate change adaptation through transnational municipal networks. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 2015, **12:** 67-73

74. LMMA. Locally managed marine area network. 2009 [cited August 2010]Available from: http://www.lmmanetwork.org/

75. Argyris C. Single-loop and double-loop models in research on decision making. *Administrative science quarterly* 1976**:** 363-375

76. Bandura A. Personal and collective efficacy in human adaptation and change. In: Adair JG, Belanger D, Dion KL (eds). *Advances in psychological science: Vol. 1. Personal, social and cultural aspects* Psychology Press: Hove, UK, 1998, pp 51-71.

77. Olsson P, Gunderson LH, Carpenter SR, Ryan P, Lebel L, Folke C*, et al.* Shooting the rapids: Navigating transitions to adaptive governance of social-ecological systems. *Ecol Soc* 2006, **11**(1)**:** 18

78. Ajzen I. The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 1991, **50**(2)**:** 179-211

79. Gelcich S, Donlan CJ. Incentivizing biodiversity conservation in artisanal fishing communities through territorial user rights and business model innovation. *Conservation Biology* 2015, **29**(4)**:** 1076-1085

80. Brown K. *Resilience, development and global change*. Routledge: London, 2016

81. Riedlinger D, Berkes F. Contributions of traditional knowledge to understanding climate change in the Canadian Arctic. *Polar Record* 2001, **37**(203)**:** 315-328

82. Armitage DR, Plummer R, Berkes F, Arthur RI, Charles AT, Davidson-Hunt IJ*, et al.* Adaptive co-management for social-ecological complexity. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 2009, **7**(2)**:** 95-102

83. Cuevas SC, Peterson A, Robinson C, Morrison TH. Institutional capacity for long-term climate change adaptation: evidence from land use planning in Albay, Philippines. *Regional Environmental Change* 2016, **16**(7)**:** 2045-2058

84. Elliott M, MacDonald MC, Chan T, Kearton A, Shields KF, Bartram JK*, et al.* Multiple Household Water Sources and Their Use in Remote Communities With Evidence From Pacific Island Countries. *Water Resources Research***:** n/a-n/a

85. Adger WN, Dessai S, Goulden M, Hulme M, Lorenzoni I, Nelson DR*, et al.* Are there social limits to adaptation to climate change? *Climatic Change* 2009, **93**(3-4)**:** 335-354

86. Tol RSJ, Yohe GW. The weakest link hypothesis for adaptive capacity: An empirical test. *Global Environmental Change* 2007, **17**(2)**:** 218-227. **Empirically examines how adaptive capacity may be limited by the weakest component of it's underlying determinants.**

87. Fawcett D, Pearce T, Ford JD, Archer L. Operationalizing longitudinal approaches to climate change vulnerability assessment. *Global Environmental Change* 2017, **45:** 79-88

88. Engle NL. Adaptive capacity and its assessment. *Global Environmental Change* 2011, **21**(2)**:** 647-656

89. Thomas D, Twyman C. Equity and justice in climate change adaptation amongst natural-resource-dependent societies. *Global Environmental Change* 2005, **15:** 115-124

90. McSweeney K, Coomes OT. Climate-related disaster opens a window of opportunity for rural poor in northeastern Honduras. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* 2011, **108**(13)**:** 5203-5208

91. Daw TM, Coulthard S, Cheung WWL, Brown K, Abunge C, Galafassi D*, et al.* Evaluating taboo trade-offs in ecosystems services and human well-being. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* 2015, **112**(22)**:** 6949-6954

92. Marshall NA, Park SE, Adger WN, Brown K, Howden SM. Transformational capacity and the influence of place and identity. *Environ Res Lett* 2012, **7**(3)**:**

93. Brown K. Sustainable adaptation: An oxymoron? *Clim Dev* 2011, **3**(1)**:** 21-31

94. Morrison TH. Evolving polycentric governance of the Great Barrier Reef. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* 2017, **114**(15)**:** E3013-E3021

95. Alcala AC, Russ GR. No-take marine reserves and reef fisheries management in the Philippines: A new people power revolution. *Ambio* 2006, **35**(5)**:** 245-254

96. Barrett CB, Constas MA. Toward a theory of resilience for international development applications. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* 2014, **111**(40)**:** 14625-14630

97. Enfors E. Social-ecological traps and transformations in dryland agro-ecosystems: Using water system innovations to change the trajectory of development. *Global Environmental Change* 2013, **23**(1)**:** 51-60

98. Hughes TP, Barnes ML, Bellwood DR, Cinner JE, Cumming GS, Jackson JBC*, et al.* Coral reefs in the Anthropocene. *Nature* 2017, **546**(7656)**:** 82-90

99. UNFCCC. Paris Agreement, Article 7. *(FCCC/CP/2015/10/Add1, Annex)* 2015**:**

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.