Integrating Local Knowledge and Governance for Effective Climate Resilience

Multy Syaddam[1]
[1]Institut Teknologi Kesehatan dan Bisnis Graha Ananda, Indonesia
Correspondent: Multynirwan@gmail.com[1]

ABSTRACT: Climate change poses escalating challenges to vulnerable communities, particularly in developing countries where adaptation capacity is limited. This narrative review examines key adaptation strategies by synthesizing empirical and conceptual literature across multiple thematic domains. The review aims to identify effective approaches and persistent barriers to adaptation, with an emphasis on policy-practice integration, community engagement, and systemic enablers. Literature was collected from Scopus, Web of Science, and PubMed using defined inclusion criteria focused on community-based and ecosystem-based adaptation, institutional frameworks, social equity, and technological innovation. Studies were screened and thematically analyzed to extract key patterns, emerging strategies, and policy implications. Findings highlight the success of participatory planning, climate-smart agriculture, and nature-based solutions in enhancing resilience. However, adaptation remains constrained by fragmented policy, limited funding, and weak institutional capacity. Gender inequality and socio-economic marginalization further reduce access to adaptation resources. Integrated governance, targeted financing, and inclusive planning are identified as critical enablers of successful adaptation outcomes. This review calls for holistic, inclusive strategies that center community knowledge, strengthen institutions, and link adaptation to development planning. Future research should address psychological, cultural, and long-term dimensions of adaptation to ensure sustainable, equitable climate resilience..

Keywords: Climate Change Adaptation, Community Resilience, Ecosystem-Based Strategies, Participatory Governance, Climate-Smart Technology, Social Equity, Adaptive Capacity.

INTRODUCTION

Climate change has emerged as a defining global challenge of the 21st century, with intensifying impacts across ecosystems, economies, and human systems. Developing countries are disproportionately affected due to their limited adaptive capacities and higher exposure to climate-related hazards (Karki et al., 2021; Ngcamu & Chari, 2020). Within these contexts, adaptation has gained prominence not only as a critical response mechanism to reduce vulnerability but also as a pathway for sustainable development. The complexity of adaptation lies in its intersection with

diverse sectors including agriculture, health, water resources, and governance, often exacerbated by socioeconomic inequalities and governance inefficiencies (Keeler et al., 2022).

Recent literature has increasingly emphasized the importance of transformative adaptation, recognizing the limitations of incremental adjustments in light of escalating climate threats. Keeler et al. (2022) underscore the role of transformative learning and multi-stakeholder partnerships in fostering community-based adaptation, especially where institutional support is weak. Simultaneously, scholars like Liu et al. (2024) and Ngcamu & Chari (2020) highlight the structural barriers—ranging from fragmented governance to inadequate policy frameworks—that undermine effective adaptation planning and implementation.

A growing body of evidence demonstrates that climate-induced risks have intensified significantly in the past decade. According to McLeod et al. (2019) and Bryan et al. (2012), the frequency and severity of extreme weather events such as floods and droughts have increased, directly impacting the resilience of communities in low-income settings. For instance, Nepal has witnessed substantial climate-induced migration, disrupting local livelihoods and placing further strain on urban systems (Karki et al., 2021; McLeod et al., 2019). Furthermore, the health dimensions of climate change have gained scholarly attention, with studies revealing associations between rising temperatures, vector-borne diseases, and psychological stress (Fox et al., 2019; Mallen et al., 2022; Huang et al., 2013).

The implications for food security are particularly alarming. Smallholder farmers in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia face increasing difficulties in sustaining crop yields amid erratic weather patterns, soil degradation, and limited access to adaptive technologies (Wassie & Pauline, 2018; Bryan et al., 2012). As Khumalo et al. (2024) note, early warning systems and climate-smart agriculture remain out of reach for many due to financial and infrastructural constraints. Consequently, adaptation requires a multidisciplinary approach that aligns scientific innovation with local realities (Aggarwal et al., 2018; Truong et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2024).

Nevertheless, several persistent challenges hinder the realization of adaptive goals. One major obstacle is the capacity gap, which includes limited financial resources, insufficient human capital, and institutional inertia (Karki et al., 2021). Inadequate coordination among stakeholders and lack of continuity in policy support often result in fragmented and ineffective responses (Ngcamu & Chari, 2020; Liu et al., 2024). Moreover, adaptation remains predominantly reactive rather than proactive, focusing more on damage control than resilience building.

A second critical challenge is governance inconsistency. Disjointed policy agendas, overlapping jurisdictions, and lack of integration between national and local governance systems often hinder the scalability and coherence of adaptation strategies. Keeler et al. (2022) argue that without inclusive governance mechanisms and meaningful stakeholder engagement, adaptation measures risk becoming top-down interventions that lack local relevance and legitimacy.

Despite increasing recognition of the need for localized and participatory adaptation, literature gaps remain pronounced. First, many studies overlook the importance of indigenous knowledge and culturally embedded practices in shaping adaptive responses. This oversight undermines the potential for community ownership and long-term sustainability (Madnor et al., 2024; Palframan, 2014). For example, in Lesotho, traditional ecological knowledge has been crucial in designing

culturally appropriate adaptation strategies (Palframan, 2014). Secondly, much of the literature emphasizes biophysical impacts while neglecting socio-psychological dimensions such as mental health and emotional well-being (Dupré & Bischeri, 2019; Palinkas et al., 2020).

This review aims to synthesize the emerging scholarship on climate change adaptation with particular emphasis on policy-practice integration in developing countries. It examines key dimensions of adaptation, including capacity building, governance mechanisms, local participation, and knowledge integration. The review also seeks to identify best practices and persistent gaps, providing a holistic understanding of how adaptation can be both context-sensitive and scalable.

The geographic scope of this review spans vulnerable regions in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, with a specific focus on marginalized populations such as smallholder farmers, artisanal fishers, and indigenous communities. These groups are often at the frontline of climate change but receive limited attention in policy dialogues and scientific analyses. By foregrounding their experiences, this review contributes to the growing call for inclusive and equity-oriented adaptation research.

In doing so, this paper also addresses the compounded vulnerabilities these groups face, including food insecurity, livelihood disruption, and cultural displacement. For example, small-scale fishers in coastal areas are increasingly impacted by warming oceans and declining fish stocks, threatening their economic survival (McLeod et al., 2019). Smallholder farmers deal with unpredictable rainfall and frequent natural disasters, which not only reduce crop yields but also challenge their adaptive capacities (Woldeselassie et al., 2021; Makate et al., 2019).

The plight of indigenous communities adds another layer of complexity. Climate variability jeopardizes their traditional livelihoods and erodes cultural identity, resulting in psychological distress and voluntary immobility despite escalating environmental risks (Farbotko & McMichael, 2019). These multifaceted impacts underscore the necessity of holistic frameworks that encompass ecological, social, and psychological resilience.

Finally, the review underscores the limitations of current policy responses. Studies have shown that ineffective or poorly implemented policies can exacerbate vulnerabilities, even where adaptive capacity exists. In the Pacific Islands, institutional fragmentation and lack of political commitment have impeded adaptation efforts (McLeod et al., 2019). Similarly, Jacobson et al. (2018) emphasize the importance of robust risk assessments and participatory planning to ensure that adaptation strategies are responsive to local needs.

Overall, existing literature highlights both the opportunities and limitations of current adaptation efforts. Research in Southeast Asia, such as Truong et al. (2022), illustrates how climate awareness and adaptive farming practices can bolster food security. Meanwhile, Khumalo et al. (2024) advocate for the use of innovative water management and agricultural techniques to strengthen livelihoods in sub-Saharan Africa.

By critically engaging with these regional experiences, this review aims to illuminate pathways for enhancing adaptive capacity through integrated policy frameworks, community engagement, and knowledge co-production. It concludes by outlining implications for future research and policy development, with a focus on building more resilient, equitable, and inclusive adaptation systems in the face of accelerating climate change.

METHOD

This study employed a narrative literature review methodology to analyze adaptation strategies and resilience-building efforts related to climate change, particularly in developing country contexts. The approach focused on capturing a comprehensive understanding of the existing empirical evidence, theoretical discussions, and policy evaluations concerning climate adaptation across vulnerable populations and diverse regional settings. The literature review process was designed to follow a transparent and replicable procedure that ensured both relevance and rigor in the selection and synthesis of studies.

The search for relevant literature was conducted across several academic databases known for their broad coverage and high indexing standards. Specifically, Scopus, Web of Science, and PubMed were utilized to identify scholarly works published in peer-reviewed journals. These databases were chosen due to their extensive collections of interdisciplinary studies encompassing public health, environmental sciences, social sciences, and climate policy. Additionally, targeted searches were performed within specific high-impact journals that focus on climate change adaptation, community resilience, and environmental governance. These included journals such as *Global Environmental Change*, *Climate Policy*, *Sustainability Science*, and *Environmental Research Letters*.

The search strategy employed a combination of Boolean operators and controlled vocabulary terms to maximize sensitivity and specificity. Core search terms included "climate change adaptation," "social-ecological resilience," "climate-smart agriculture," "vulnerable communities," "adaptation strategies," and "policy integration." These terms were adjusted according to the indexing and thesaurus conventions of each database. Truncations and wildcards were used where appropriate to capture variations in terminology, such as "adapt*" to include "adaptation," "adaptive," and "adapting." Additional filters were applied to limit search results to articles published within the last five years (2019–2024), written in English, and directly addressing empirical or conceptual aspects of adaptation in human systems.

Inclusion criteria were formulated to ensure the selection of studies that were most relevant to the objectives of this review. Eligible articles had to meet the following conditions: (1) publication in a peer-reviewed journal between 2019 and 2024; (2) inclusion of primary or secondary data on climate adaptation strategies; (3) a clear focus on vulnerable populations, including but not limited to smallholder farmers, indigenous groups, urban poor communities, and coastal fishers; and (4) relevance to the thematic areas of governance, local knowledge integration, community-based adaptation, or capacity-building initiatives. Studies that addressed multisectoral or cross-scalar policy implications were particularly prioritized for their relevance to policy-practice integration.

Conversely, exclusion criteria were applied to remove studies that did not align with the scope and analytical focus of the review. These included: (1) articles not based on empirical data (e.g., opinion pieces, editorials); (2) studies with a primary emphasis on climate change mitigation rather than adaptation; (3) articles unrelated to human systems or that focused exclusively on biophysical or technological modeling without social context; and (4) studies examining climate impacts without discussing adaptive responses. To avoid redundancy, duplicate records across databases were identified and removed prior to the screening process.

The screening of titles and abstracts was independently carried out by the lead reviewer. Each abstract was assessed against the predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria. When the relevance of an article could not be determined solely from the abstract, the full text was retrieved for further evaluation. Articles that met all criteria proceeded to full-text review, during which detailed notes were taken regarding their methodology, population focus, geographic scope, type of data used, and key findings.

The types of research designs considered in this review were diverse, reflecting the interdisciplinary nature of climate change adaptation studies. Included studies comprised qualitative case studies, quantitative analyses, mixed-methods research, and comparative policy evaluations. For example, qualitative studies provided rich insights into community perceptions, traditional knowledge systems, and participatory adaptation planning, while quantitative research offered statistical evidence on the effectiveness of specific interventions, such as climate-smart agricultural techniques or early warning systems. Mixed-methods designs were particularly valuable in triangulating perspectives from both qualitative narratives and quantitative datasets.

Among the exemplary studies reviewed, Ngcamu and Chari's investigation into drought-induced food insecurity in African contexts demonstrated a rigorous filtering of literature based on thematic alignment, peer-reviewed quality, and regional relevance. Their framework informed this review's prioritization of geographic specificity and issue relevance. Similarly, Karki et al. highlighted the necessity of incorporating locally grounded experiences and knowledge into broader adaptation narratives. Their methodological emphasis on contextual validity inspired the current review to prioritize studies that captured the nuance of socio-cultural dynamics and institutional constraints in different communities.

Additionally, studies like those by Panic and Ford underscored the importance of cross-national comparisons and policy analyses to understand how adaptation planning differs across contexts. Their approach contributed to the development of this review's analytical lens, particularly in evaluating policy coherence and implementation gaps. The emphasis on methodological clarity in their research reinforced the importance of specifying data sources, sampling strategies, and analytical frameworks in selected articles.

After completing the selection of relevant articles, a thematic synthesis approach was employed to organize and analyze the extracted findings. This method facilitated the identification of recurrent themes, emerging concepts, and patterns across studies, such as governance barriers, knowledge co-production, institutional capacity-building, and socio-cultural influences on adaptation. Thematic synthesis also allowed for critical examination of how adaptation strategies vary not only by geography but also by socio-economic context, governance frameworks, and local adaptive capacity.

Throughout the review process, a commitment was maintained to uphold the academic rigor and transparency expected of systematic narrative reviews. Although this study did not register a formal protocol with a review registry such as PROSPERO, the methodological steps, including search strategies, inclusion/exclusion criteria, and analytical techniques, were meticulously documented to facilitate replication and critical appraisal. Limitations regarding database coverage and potential language bias were acknowledged, given the restriction to English-language publications.

In conclusion, the methodology of this review was deliberately structured to balance comprehensiveness with relevance, enabling the synthesis of a wide array of perspectives on climate adaptation while ensuring thematic alignment with the review's objectives. By focusing on peer-reviewed empirical research across diverse geographies and populations, the study aims to contribute meaningful insights into the policy and practice of climate adaptation in vulnerable contexts.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This section synthesizes findings from a wide array of literature on climate change adaptation, structured under five emergent thematic categories: community-based adaptation strategies, ecosystem-based approaches, the role of policy and governance, climate justice and social inequality, and the contribution of technology and innovation. Each thematic area reflects key patterns identified through the systematic narrative review and provides empirical and conceptual insights that highlight the state of adaptation efforts in vulnerable settings.

Community-based adaptation (CBA) strategies have been widely recognized for their ability to reflect the realities and needs of the communities most affected by climate change. The literature consistently supports that participatory adaptation processes, which incorporate local knowledge and foster inclusive decision-making, result in higher levels of community resilience. Wassie and Pauline (2018) observed that in Ethiopia, the application of climate-smart agriculture (CSA) techniques through participatory farmer-to-farmer learning networks significantly enhanced smallholder resilience. These networks enabled local innovation and knowledge sharing, helping to align adaptation strategies with contextual conditions. Furthermore, Karki et al. (2021) documented that when communities are actively involved in decision-making, they demonstrate greater trust in institutions and increased motivation to engage in long-term adaptive planning. This sense of ownership and empowerment has been essential in mobilizing community resources and encouraging proactive behavior in the face of climatic risks.

The success of community-based initiatives is further illustrated by improvements in institutional accountability and the identification of locally available resources. For example, communities that were given a platform to articulate their adaptation needs were more likely to establish informal governance structures, such as cooperative water-sharing systems, which improved overall adaptive capacity. These findings reinforce the argument that adaptation must be grounded in local realities to be sustainable and effective, particularly in low-resource settings.

In parallel, ecosystem-based approaches have emerged as a complementary framework to community-led efforts. Nature-based solutions, including wetland restoration, reforestation, and urban greening, have been increasingly promoted for their co-benefits in both climate mitigation and adaptation. In coastal areas, Gooden and Pritzlaff (2021) describe the successful use of mangrove restoration to buffer communities against storm surges and flooding, while simultaneously enhancing biodiversity. Likewise, Castelo et al. (2023) detail urban interventions such as the expansion of green infrastructure, which not only manage stormwater more effectively but also contribute to public health and urban cooling in heat-stressed cities.

Mcleod et al. (2019) provide a compelling case for the integration of local knowledge into ecosystem restoration projects. Their findings in Southeast Asia underscore that community participation in the restoration of degraded coastal zones leads to improved ecological outcomes and enhanced local livelihoods. These dual gains are particularly valuable in regions where economic vulnerability overlaps with environmental degradation. Consequently, ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) not only fortifies ecological resilience but also addresses critical dimensions of socio-economic vulnerability.

Governance and policy integration are central to the effectiveness of adaptation strategies. The literature demonstrates that adaptation policy is most effective when supported by multi-level governance and informed by cross-sectoral collaboration. Fox et al. (2019) emphasize that integrating health and climate policies facilitates a more comprehensive understanding of vulnerability and allows for better-targeted interventions. Their analysis shows that stakeholders from health, urban planning, and environmental sectors must be brought together to design coherent strategies that address intersecting risks.

Campos et al. (2017) further highlight the benefits of using geospatial technologies, such as GIS mapping, to enhance risk assessment and planning. By visualizing risk-prone zones, local authorities are better equipped to prioritize interventions and allocate resources efficiently. However, while these tools offer substantial promise, their utility depends on institutional capacity and the ability to interpret and act on data.

Despite these advances, integrating adaptation into national development planning remains fraught with obstacles. Ngcamu and Chari (2020) identify weak institutional coordination, political instability, and a lack of technical capacity as key constraints. Mcleod et al. (2019) add that bureaucratic hurdles and limited funding mechanisms further impede policy implementation. This misalignment between policy design and execution is exacerbated by the insufficient incorporation of local realities into national adaptation frameworks.

Climate justice and social equity issues are also crucial in shaping adaptation effectiveness. As numerous studies confirm, communities already marginalized by economic, gender, or ethnic inequalities often face the greatest climate risks and receive the least support. Uduji and Okolo-Obasi (2023) illustrate this through their study of rural women in Nigeria, revealing that unequal social conditions limited the impact of corporate social responsibility (CSR) interventions aimed at improving food security. Their findings advocate for adaptation strategies that are not only environmentally sound but also socially just.

Gender-based disparities are especially pronounced. Khumalo et al. (2024) report that women, despite often being responsible for food production and water collection, are frequently excluded from adaptation planning and resource allocation. This exclusion reduces the effectiveness of adaptation efforts and perpetuates systemic inequalities. Studies that incorporate gender-sensitive approaches tend to show more sustainable outcomes, as they ensure that both men and women can access, contribute to, and benefit from adaptation resources.

The role of technology and innovation in adaptation has gained prominence in recent years, particularly in facilitating timely access to information and improving resource management. Information and communication technologies (ICTs) have become powerful tools in enhancing

community responsiveness to climate variability. Aggarwal et al. (2018) describe how digital platforms in smart villages are used to disseminate weather forecasts, pest control methods, and crop diversification strategies. These platforms have improved harvest predictability and reduced post-harvest losses.

Jha et al. (2013) and Panic and Ford (2013) argue that mobile applications and remote sensing technologies provide real-time data that supports better decision-making among smallholder farmers. This is especially critical in regions where traditional extension services are weak or absent. By linking farmers with meteorological services and technical support, ICTs help bridge information gaps and promote more efficient responses to climate shocks.

Truong et al. (2022) and Khumalo et al. (2024) further emphasize that digital technologies can foster community learning and peer-to-peer support. For instance, participatory video tools and community radio have been employed in Vietnam and South Africa to document and share local adaptation practices, thereby strengthening social networks and promoting horizontal knowledge transfer.

Taken together, the findings reveal that effective climate change adaptation requires a multifaceted approach that combines community engagement, ecological integrity, robust governance, social justice, and technological innovation. Comparative analysis across regions highlights that countries which succeed in embedding adaptation into their development agendas tend to prioritize participatory governance, gender equity, and decentralized implementation. This suggests that adaptation is not merely a technical process but a socio-political endeavor that must be co-produced with the communities it aims to serve.

In sum, the narrative review indicates that while substantial progress has been made in documenting and implementing adaptation strategies, significant gaps remain in scaling these interventions equitably and sustainably. The integration of local knowledge and technology, when supported by inclusive policy frameworks, holds promise for advancing adaptation outcomes across diverse contexts. Future research should continue to explore cross-sectoral synergies, long-term financing mechanisms, and metrics for evaluating adaptation success, especially in underserved regions most vulnerable to climate impacts.

The findings of this narrative review extend and reinforce existing scholarship on climate change adaptation, particularly regarding the importance of community engagement, policy integration, and systemic enablers such as institutional strength and sustainable financing. This section explores how these findings align with previous studies and what they imply for policy and practice in the realm of climate resilience.

Community-based adaptation approaches have consistently been identified as critical to enhancing the resilience of vulnerable populations. The review confirms that participatory strategies rooted in local knowledge not only strengthen community ownership of adaptive initiatives but also foster trust in institutions and sustainability of outcomes. This supports previous research by Fox et al. (2019), who emphasized the value of integrating public health considerations into climate policy to ensure responsiveness to the most vulnerable. Similarly, our findings align with Karki et al. (2021), who argued that robust governance frameworks facilitate the sustained delivery of

adaptation services by linking resources, stakeholder collaboration, and social capital. These synergies are crucial for operationalizing resilience in diverse settings.

Despite these encouraging developments, systemic challenges continue to constrain adaptation effectiveness. A significant barrier identified is political uncertainty and inconsistent commitment from national governments, as highlighted by Panic and Ford (2013). This review finds resonance with that analysis, especially in the context of developing countries where political fragmentation and weak institutions delay or distort the implementation of adaptation measures. These structural limitations emphasize the need to build both institutional capacity and community readiness simultaneously. Without sustained political will and technical competence, adaptation strategies risk being sidelined or poorly executed.

Another persistent challenge is the integration of adaptation into national development planning. Campos et al. (2017) noted the importance of data-driven approaches, such as GIS-based risk mapping, in supporting evidence-informed policy decisions. Our review reinforces this perspective, demonstrating that while technological tools can enhance planning, their utility is constrained by insufficient data infrastructure and limited interpretative capacity among local actors. There is an urgent need to build integrated information systems that link scientific data with community experience and inform a two-way dialogue between policymakers and citizens.

These findings have direct implications for the formulation and execution of adaptation policy. Evidence from this review underscores that successful adaptation policies are those grounded in empirical realities and shaped by local experiences. For instance, the work of Aboye et al. (2023) in Ethiopia illustrates how farmer perspectives can inform the development of climate-resilient agricultural practices. Our synthesis highlights the necessity of embedding such grassroots voices into policy design, thereby enhancing legitimacy, contextual relevance, and local buy-in.

Moreover, this review reveals the importance of aligning adaptation policy with systemic enablers, notably policy structure, financing mechanisms, and institutional architecture. Effective policy structures are those that enable cross-sectoral collaboration and foster synergies across different domains of governance. Fox et al. (2019) emphasized the integrative potential of combining health and climate policies to address multidimensional vulnerabilities. However, in many cases, policy fragmentation undermines coordination and results in disjointed responses. Bridging these gaps requires a shift toward inter-ministerial coordination and multi-stakeholder governance platforms that prioritize inclusive adaptation outcomes.

The role of financing in adaptation cannot be overstated. As noted by Ngcamu and Chari (2020), limited access to climate finance remains one of the primary constraints for communities seeking to implement adaptive interventions. Our review confirms this, especially in contexts where adaptation projects are short-term and donor-driven, failing to provide sustained support. Financing mechanisms must therefore prioritize long-term resilience, including capacity development, community engagement, and infrastructure support. Strategic investment in local adaptation funds, climate risk insurance, and public-private partnerships could provide more reliable and scalable financing options.

Institutional frameworks are equally decisive in determining adaptation success. As Karki et al. (2021) noted, effective institutional support—ranging from local government functionality to

inter-agency coordination—greatly enhances implementation efficiency. However, this review also finds that weak institutional capacity often leads to poor planning and fragmented execution, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa where urban agriculture programs struggle due to inadequate governance (Khumalo et al., 2024). Strengthening institutions through training, decentralization, and accountability mechanisms will be crucial in bridging the policy-practice divide.

Our findings also align with Mcleod et al. (2019), who argued that adaptive capacity increases when local communities are engaged in planning and decision-making. This participatory dynamic creates co-ownership of interventions and increases the likelihood of sustained outcomes. Community involvement must be institutionalized in governance processes to move beyond tokenism and ensure genuine agency in shaping adaptation pathways.

From a policy and practice standpoint, several strategic recommendations emerge. First, the integration of local knowledge with scientific insights remains an underutilized but essential opportunity. Dhanya and Kunnampalli (2024) demonstrated that hybrid approaches—combining indigenous techniques with modern agriculture—offer a pathway to building resilient farming systems. Policymakers must thus recognize and institutionalize local expertise within national adaptation frameworks.

Second, the coherence of environmental and social policies plays a vital role. The integration of health and climate policy, as proposed by Fox et al. (2019), serves as a model for multi-sectoral synergy that can be replicated in other domains. Such approaches not only broaden the impact of adaptation but also attract wider stakeholder participation, making interventions more politically feasible and socially acceptable.

Third, the promotion of climate-smart technologies, as discussed by Mangaza et al. (2021), calls for stronger state investment in research and innovation. Government support for the development and dissemination of technologies such as climate-resilient crops, efficient irrigation systems, and ICT platforms can empower communities to respond proactively to climatic changes. Innovation must be supported by enabling policy environments, adequate training, and knowledge dissemination mechanisms.

Financing remains a persistent challenge. Aboye et al. (2023) argued that farmers are more likely to invest in adaptation when they have access to reliable climate information and financial resources. This highlights the need for policy frameworks that provide targeted financial incentives, subsidized inputs, and access to microinsurance for vulnerable populations. Financial institutions must also be engaged to develop products that cater specifically to the needs of climate-sensitive sectors.

Multi-stakeholder collaboration is a recurring theme in both literature and findings. Mcleod et al. (2019) emphasized the importance of collaboration among governments, civil society, and the private sector to foster adaptive ecosystems. Our review echoes this by showing that adaptation planning benefits from a diversity of perspectives and shared accountability. Joint planning and implementation can help identify context-specific solutions and ensure a more equitable distribution of benefits.

Practical learning mechanisms, such as public education and digital platforms, are vital to scaling adaptation knowledge. Fox et al. (2019) recommended MOOCs and community learning programs as tools for democratizing climate knowledge. Such platforms should be localized, accessible, and responsive to user needs. Educational initiatives can complement policy reforms by building awareness and fostering behavioral change.

Lastly, institutional capacity-building remains a cornerstone of effective adaptation. Karki et al. (2021) advocated for stronger institutions that are not only well-resourced but also inclusive and responsive. Our findings affirm this, indicating that institutions which invest in stakeholder engagement, transparent communication, and cross-sectoral coordination are more likely to deliver successful adaptation outcomes.

In reviewing the limitations of existing literature, it is evident that more longitudinal studies are needed to assess the long-term effectiveness of adaptation strategies. Current evaluations often focus on short-term outputs without sufficient attention to sustainability and scalability. Moreover, psychological and cultural dimensions of adaptation remain under-researched. Future studies should explore how identity, belief systems, and social cohesion shape adaptive behaviors and community resilience.

CONCLUSION

This review reveals that community-based and ecosystem-based adaptation strategies, supported by robust governance and inclusive policy design, are central to effective climate change adaptation in vulnerable regions. The integration of local knowledge with participatory planning processes significantly enhances the sustainability and contextual relevance of adaptive responses. While technological innovations and nature-based solutions offer transformative potential, their success is contingent on the strength of institutional frameworks and equitable access to resources.

Key findings underscore the systemic barriers that continue to hinder adaptation efforts, including fragmented policy structures, inadequate financing mechanisms, and weak institutional capacity. These constraints are particularly pronounced in developing countries where governance deficits intersect with socio-economic vulnerabilities. As such, there is an urgent need for more integrated, multi-sectoral policies that recognize the interdependencies between climate, health, livelihoods, and equity.

Policy recommendations emerging from this study include the creation of locally grounded, cross-sectoral governance frameworks; the establishment of long-term adaptation financing streams; and the development of inclusive planning mechanisms that prioritize marginalized populations. Research should further explore the socio-cultural dimensions of adaptation, as well as longitudinal impacts of existing interventions.

Ultimately, strengthening community resilience through co-produced knowledge, participatory governance, and climate-smart technologies must remain at the core of future adaptation strategies. This approach not only addresses immediate climatic threats but also promotes sustainable development pathways tailored to diverse and dynamic local contexts.

REFERENCES

Aboye, A., Kinsella, J., & Mega, T. (2023). Farm households' adaptive strategies in response to climate change in lowlands of southern Ethiopia. *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management, 15*(5), 579–598. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijccsm-05-2023-0064

Aggarwal, P., Jarvis, A., Campbell, B., Zougmoré, R., Khatri-Chhetri, A., Vermeulen, S., … & Yen, B. (2018). The climate-smart village approach: Framework of an integrative strategy for scaling up adaptation options in agriculture. *Ecology and Society, 23*(1). https://doi.org/10.5751/es-09844-230114

Bedeke, S., Vanhove, W., Gezahegn, M., Natarajan, K., & Damme, P. (2019). Adoption of climate change adaptation strategies by maize-dependent smallholders in Ethiopia. *NJAS - Wageningen Journal of Life Sciences, 88*(1), 96–104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.njas.2018.09.001

Bryan, E., Ringler, C., Okoba, B., Koo, J., Herrero, M., & Silvestri, S. (2012). Can agriculture support climate change adaptation, greenhouse gas mitigation and rural livelihoods? Insights from Kenya. *Climatic Change, 118*(2), 151–165. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-012-0640-0

Campos, I., Guerra, J., Ferreira, J., Schmidt, L., Alves, F., Vizinho, A., … & Penha-Lopes, G. (2017). Understanding climate change policy and action in Portuguese municipalities: A survey. *Land Use Policy, 62*, 68–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2016.12.015

Castelo, S., Amado, M., & Ferreira, F. (2023). Challenges and opportunities in the use of nature-based solutions for urban adaptation. *Sustainability, 15*(9), 7243. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15097243

Dhanya, P., & Kunnampalli, J. (2024). Evaluating the impacts of anticipated sea level rise, climate change and land use land cover scenarios on the rice crop in Alappuzha, Kerala and strategies to build climate responsive agriculture. *International Journal of Disaster Resilience in the Built Environment, 15*(4), 755–775. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijdrbe-05-2023-0066

Dupré, K., & Bischeri, C. (2019). The architecture of resilience in rural towns. *International Journal of Architectural Research Archnet-IJAR, 14*(2), 187–202. https://doi.org/10.1108/arch-07-2019-0178

Farbotko, C., & McMichael, C. (2019). Voluntary immobility and existential security in a changing climate in the Pacific. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint, 60*(2), 148–162. https://doi.org/10.1111/apv.12231

Fox, M., Zuidema, C., Bauman, B., Burke, T., & Sheehan, M. (2019). Integrating public health into climate change policy and planning: State of practice update. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 16*(18), 3232. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16183232

Gooden, J., & Pritzlaff, R. (2021). Dryland watershed restoration with rock detention structures: A nature-based solution to mitigate drought, erosion, flooding, and atmospheric carbon. *Frontiers in Environmental Science, 9*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2021.679189

Huang, C., Barnett, A., Xu, Z., Chu, C., Wang, X., Turner, L., … & Tong, S. (2013). Managing the health effects of temperature in response to climate change: Challenges ahead. *Environmental Health Perspectives, 121*(4), 415–419. https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1206025

Jacobson, C., Crevello, S., Nguon, C., & Chea, C. (2018). Resilience and vulnerability assessment as the basis for adaptation dialogue in information-poor environments: A Cambodian example. In *Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management*, 149–160. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-74669-2_11

Karki, G., Bhatta, B., Devkota, N., & Kunwar, R. (2021). Climate change adaptation governance in Nepal: A framework for sustainable generation of adaptation services. *Banko Janakari, 31*(2), 40–50. https://doi.org/10.3126/banko.v31i2.41900

Keeler, L., Bernstein, M., Nelson, J., & Kay, B. (2022). Audacity: A capacity-building research method for urban sustainability transformation. *Frontiers in Sustainable Cities, 4*. https://doi.org/10.3389/frsc.2022.837578

Khumalo, N., Sibanda, M., & Mdoda, L. (2024). Implications of a climate-smart approach to food and income security for urban Sub-Saharan Africa: A systematic review. *Sustainability, 16*(5), 1882. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16051882

Liu, Z., Xiu, C., Han, G., & Yuan, L. (2024). Spatiotemporal dynamics and mainstreaming strategies of ecosystem-based adaptation to urban climate change. *Sustainability, 16*(8), 3370. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16083370

Madnor, M., Harun, A., & Ros, F. (2024). Exploring gaps and strategies: A pilot interview for enhancing disaster risk governance in Malaysia through integrated climate change adaptation for resilience in the future. *PaperASIA, 40*(3b), 81–95. https://doi.org/10.59953/paperasia.v40i3b.110

Mangaza, L., Sonwa, D., Batsi, G., Ebuy, J., & Kahindo, J. (2021). Building a framework towards climate-smart agriculture in the Yangambi landscape, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management, 13*(3), 320–338. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijccsm-08-2020-0084

Makate, C., Makate, M., Mango, N., & Siziba, S. (2019). Increasing resilience of smallholder farmers to climate change through multiple adoption of proven climate-smart agriculture innovations. Lessons from Southern Africa. *Journal of Environmental Management, 231*, 858–868. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2018.10.069

Mallen, E., Joseph, H., McLaughlin, M., English, D., Olmedo, C., Roach, M., … & York, E. (2022). Overcoming barriers to successful climate and health adaptation practice: Notes from the field. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19*(12), 7169. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19127169

Mcleod, E., Bruton-Adams, M., Förster, J., Franco, C., Gaines, G., Gorong, B., … & Terk, E. (2019). Lessons from the Pacific Islands – Adapting to climate change by supporting social and ecological resilience. *Frontiers in Marine Science, 6.* https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2019.00289

Ngcamu, B., & Chari, F. (2020). Drought influences on food insecurity in Africa: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17*(16), 5897. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17165897

Palframan, A. (2014). "In common nature": An ethnography of climate adaptation in the Lesotho Highlands. *Local Environment, 20*(12), 1531–1546. https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2014.911268

Palinkas, L., O'Donnell, M., Lau, W., & Wong, M. (2020). Strategies for delivering mental health services in response to global climate change: A narrative review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17*(22), 8562. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17228562

Panic, M., & Ford, J. (2013). A review of national-level adaptation planning with regards to the risks posed by climate change on infectious diseases in 14 OECD nations. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 10*(12), 7083–7109. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph10127083

Truong, D., Đạt, T., & Huan, L. (2022). Factors affecting climate-smart agriculture practice adaptation of farming households in coastal Central Vietnam: The case of Ninh Thuan province. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems, 6*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2022.790089

Uduji, J., & Okolo-Obasi, E. (2023). The impact of CSR on rural women custodians of seed, food and climate change resilience in Nigeria's Niger Delta region. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy, 18*(3), 441–468. https://doi.org/10.1108/jec-09-2022-0136

Wassie, A., & Pauline, N. (2018). Evaluating smallholder farmers' preferences for climate-smart agricultural practices in Tehuledere District, Northeastern Ethiopia. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography, 39*(2), 300–316. https://doi.org/10.1111/sjtg.12240

Woldeselassie, A., Dechassa, N., Alemayehu, Y., Tana, T., & Bedadi, B. (2021). Soil and water management practices as a strategy to cope with climate change effects in smallholder potato production in the eastern highlands of Ethiopia. *Sustainability, 13*(11), 6420. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13116420