Resiliensi: Jurnal Mitigasi dan Adaptasi Bencana
Volume. 1, Issue 1 November 2025
Page No: 43-57

Integrating Digital Innovation and Governance to Strengthen Infrastructure Resilience

Zhanas Tasya[1]
[1]**Universitas Muhammadiyah Palu, Indonesia**
Correspondent: zhanaztasya@gmail.com[1]

Received : October 06, 2025
Accepted : November 06, 2025
Published : November 30, 2025

Citation: Tasya, Z., (2025). Integrating Digital Innovation and Governance to Strengthen Infrastructure Resilience. Resiliensi: Jurnal Mitigasi dan Adaptasi Bencana. 1(1), 43-57.

ABSTRACT: The increasing frequency and intensity of natural hazards underscore the urgent need for resilient critical infrastructure systems, particularly in developing countries where vulnerabilities are pronounced. This narrative review explores how engineering, technological, and governance strategies converge to enhance infrastructure resilience in the face of multi-hazard risks. Drawing from interdisciplinary sources within Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar, the review applies a structured search and evaluation methodology to synthesize findings from empirical studies, case reports, and theoretical models. The results reveal that integrated risk assessments, resilient design approaches, and digital innovations such as AI and digital twins are central to improving infrastructure preparedness and adaptive capacity. However, their implementation is often constrained by financial limitations, policy fragmentation, and lack of technical expertise. Interdependencies between infrastructure systems, while increasingly acknowledged, are still insufficiently incorporated into planning processes. The discussion highlights the importance of multilevel governance, participatory policymaking, and data-driven planning in overcoming these barriers. Moreover, the review emphasizes the need for flexible, inclusive, and adaptive policies that align with local contexts and promote systemic resilience. The study concludes that enhancing critical infrastructure resilience requires a holistic approach that bridges technical solutions with inclusive governance and proactive planning. Recommendations for future research include developing context-sensitive frameworks, promoting policy integration, and investing in capacity-building to support long-term resilience outcomes.

Keywords: Infrastructure Resilience, Multi-Hazard Risk, Digital Twin, Disaster Risk Reduction, Adaptive Infrastructure, Governance Integration, Climate-Related Disasters.

INTRODUCTION

In the face of escalating climate variability and natural disasters, critical infrastructure systems have emerged as highly vulnerable components of modern society. The operational continuity of infrastructure networks—including transportation, energy, water, and communication—is essential for societal function and economic stability. Yet, these systems are increasingly disrupted by the intensifying frequency and severity of natural hazards. Historical accounts have demonstrated that extreme events such as floods, earthquakes, and tropical storms have significantly impaired infrastructure, especially in hazard-prone regions. For instance, the recurring floods in California, exacerbated by climate change, have severely challenged levee-protected infrastructure, while Hurricane Sandy exposed the cascading vulnerabilities of interdependent infrastructure networks in the United States (Mallakpour et al., 2020; Haraguchi & Kim, 2016). Similarly, in Southeast Asia, including Bangladesh, the rising frequency of tropical cyclones and floods has placed essential sectors such as transportation and energy under persistent threat (Wedawatta et al., 2016; Alyami et al., 2023).

Over the past two decades, the global trend in the frequency and magnitude of natural hazards has shown a discernible increase, a development closely associated with climate change dynamics. Empirical evidence indicates that these events not only occur more frequently but also exert greater impacts on infrastructure systems. The importance of infrastructure resilience indicators has been increasingly recognized as essential to mitigating disaster impacts and guiding adaptive strategies. Osei-Kyei et al. (2022) argue that the development and deployment of such indicators are vital in constructing effective policy and engineering responses to mitigate vulnerability. Complementing this, Wang et al. (2024) emphasize the broader economic repercussions of infrastructure failure, urging the need for resilience optimization to minimize disaster-induced losses. These studies underscore a growing imperative to embed resilience thinking into infrastructure planning and management.

The urgency to adapt critical infrastructure to these shifting hazard patterns is becoming increasingly clear. Resilience is not merely a technical concern but a strategic necessity that determines the extent to which societies can recover from and adapt to disruptions. Infrastructure resilience encompasses the capacity of systems to absorb shocks, maintain core functions, and recover efficiently. During natural disasters, the performance of infrastructure systems directly influences community well-being, economic continuity, and public health. Achour et al. (2014) and Sun et al. (2023) show that maintaining the operational viability of healthcare infrastructure during disasters significantly shapes the resilience of affected populations. As such, constructing resilient infrastructure is central to sustaining essential services in an era defined by intensifying hazard exposure.

However, significant challenges remain, particularly in developing countries where resource constraints hinder the pursuit of comprehensive resilience strategies. Financial limitations present a formidable barrier to the reinforcement or redesign of existing infrastructure, especially in low-income settings where public investment capacity is constrained (Pamidimukkala et al., 2021). Moreover, weak regulatory frameworks and the ineffective enforcement of building codes further exacerbate infrastructure vulnerability (Dvir & Atoba, 2025). A lack of risk awareness and disaster preparedness among local populations adds to these difficulties, as communities often fail to recognize the urgency of proactive resilience measures (Espada et al., 2017). This complex matrix of socio-economic and institutional challenges restricts the implementation of robust and adaptive infrastructure policies in vulnerable contexts.

In response, scholars and practitioners have advocated for integrative approaches that combine engineering innovation with evidence-based policy development. Literature increasingly highlights the need for cross-sectoral coordination and system-of-systems thinking in addressing infrastructure resilience. Braun et al. (2018) argue that infrastructure interdependencies must be explicitly considered in resilience frameworks to avoid cascading failures. Community engagement in infrastructure planning, when coupled with risk analysis, enhances the adaptability and responsiveness of infrastructure systems (Melendez et al., 2021). In addition, integrating nature-based solutions with engineered systems presents a multifaceted opportunity to achieve both disaster risk reduction and ecosystem restoration (Sajjad et al., 2018). Such hybrid approaches can simultaneously enhance resilience and social well-being while aligning infrastructure development with the broader objectives of sustainable development goals (Hassan et al., 2022).

Nonetheless, operationalizing these concepts remains a significant hurdle. Disciplinary silos and fragmented governance structures often impede collaboration and knowledge transfer. Belokas et al. (2024) emphasize the importance of interdisciplinary cooperation and the formulation of policies that incentivize innovation in infrastructure resilience. Enhancing technical literacy among decision-makers, and embedding social and environmental criteria in infrastructure planning, are critical to addressing the multidimensional nature of resilience (Faivre et al., 2020; Longo et al., 2025). Without deliberate efforts to bridge the gap between engineering and policy domains, the full potential of resilient infrastructure systems may remain unrealized.

Existing literature reveals notable gaps in both scope and integration. A predominant focus on technical and structural aspects of infrastructure resilience has led to the underrepresentation of social and economic dimensions in resilience planning (Pathirage & Al-Khaili, 2016; Koliou et al., 2018). Furthermore, studies often overlook the interdependence among infrastructure systems, despite the evidence that failures in one domain can propagate across others, amplifying disaster impacts (Räikkönen et al., 2016; Dobrev et al., 2023). Another limitation lies in the geographic and contextual homogeneity of research, with much of the existing work failing to address the unique vulnerabilities and constraints faced by developing countries (Lü et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2020). As Clark-Ginsberg et al. (2020) and Randeniya et al. (2023) suggest, research that is attuned to local conditions and participatory governance is essential for tailoring resilience strategies to specific regional contexts. Finally, the literature has disproportionately emphasized post-disaster recovery, with insufficient attention paid to proactive mitigation and lifecycle-based planning (Ni et al., 2025; Ravadanegh et al., 2022).

This narrative review seeks to address these gaps by synthesizing current scholarship on engineering and policy approaches to infrastructure resilience, particularly within the context of developing nations. The review aims to construct a holistic framework that integrates technical, social, and institutional factors influencing infrastructure performance before, during, and after disasters. Drawing from interdisciplinary sources, it explores the dynamic interactions among critical infrastructure systems, governance mechanisms, and community-level capacities. In doing so, the review contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of how infrastructure resilience can be strengthened through policy coherence, stakeholder engagement, and technological innovation (Espada et al., 2017; McDonald et al., 2020).

The geographic scope of this study centers on developing countries, where infrastructure vulnerabilities are compounded by dense populations, rapid urbanization, and limited adaptive capacity. These regions are disproportionately affected by natural hazards and often lack the institutional robustness required for effective disaster risk governance (Vallecha et al., 2025; Barroca et al., 2023; Sweya et al., 2021). By focusing on these contexts, the review elucidates the socio-ecological and economic determinants that shape infrastructure resilience. It highlights the importance of place-based strategies that reflect local realities and incorporate diverse stakeholder perspectives (Koren et al., 2017; Afzal et al., 2023). This regional focus enhances the relevance and applicability of the review's findings to the areas most in need of resilience-building interventions.

In summary, this introduction has established the critical relevance of infrastructure resilience in the face of escalating natural hazards, highlighted the multidimensional challenges involved, and articulated the rationale for a comprehensive, context-sensitive review. The following sections delve into the methods, results, discussion, and conclusions that collectively aim to advance scholarly and practical understanding of this urgent global issue.

METHOD

The methodology adopted for this narrative review was designed to comprehensively explore the current state of research on critical infrastructure resilience in the context of natural hazards. The approach integrates systematic principles for literature identification, screening, and synthesis to ensure academic rigor and reliability. This section outlines the database selection, keyword strategy, inclusion and exclusion criteria, types of studies considered, and the literature evaluation process that guided the review.

To capture a wide spectrum of relevant and high-quality studies, three prominent academic databases were used: Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar. These platforms are renowned for their extensive coverage of peer-reviewed journal articles, conference proceedings, policy reports, and grey literature, all of which are instrumental in understanding interdisciplinary issues such as infrastructure resilience. Scopus and Web of Science were prioritized due to their comprehensive indexing of top-tier journals and their capability to filter studies by citation metrics, publication year, and research discipline (Clark-Ginsberg et al., 2020; Bhatia et al., 2015). Google Scholar was additionally employed to capture grey literature and regionally focused studies that may not be included in the more curated repositories, thereby ensuring a broad and inclusive literature base.

A precise keyword strategy using Boolean operators was implemented to optimize the retrieval of relevant publications. The search queries were crafted to encompass core terms related to infrastructure and disaster resilience while allowing for thematic variation across disciplines. Key combinations included: "critical infrastructure resilience" AND "natural hazards", "infrastructure vulnerability" AND "disaster risk reduction", and "resilience assessment" AND "critical infrastructure" AND "climate change". These terms were chosen based on their prevalence in the literature and their ability to target both engineering and policy-oriented studies (Fathianpour et al., 2022; Bodas et al., 2022; Hassan et al., 2022; Yadav et al., 2020; Mallakpour et al., 2020). Additional variations such as "evacuation infrastructure", "risk perception", and "systemic risks" were employed to ensure inclusion of more specialized or emerging areas of interest (Sterlacchini et al., 2018; Verschuur et al., 2023; Espada et al., 2017).

The inclusion criteria were designed to ensure that the selected studies provided empirically grounded, peer-reviewed, and thematically relevant insights. Only articles published in English from the year 2000 onwards were considered, reflecting the increasing global awareness and response to climate-induced natural hazards. Studies were included if they addressed at least one of the following domains: assessment of infrastructure vulnerability, strategies for resilience enhancement, policy frameworks supporting disaster risk reduction, and case studies documenting infrastructure responses to real-world hazards. Empirical research, case study analyses, policy reviews, and meta-analyses were all deemed eligible, provided they offered analytical depth and relevance to the central theme of infrastructure resilience. Both quantitative and qualitative methodologies were considered appropriate, as they contribute complementary perspectives to the understanding of resilience.

Conversely, the exclusion criteria ruled out articles that lacked a clear connection to critical infrastructure or did not directly address resilience to natural hazards. Opinion pieces, editorials, and non-peer-reviewed reports were generally excluded unless they offered substantial empirical data or were widely cited as seminal contributions to the field. Additionally, duplicate records retrieved from multiple databases were removed during the initial screening process. Studies focusing solely on economic losses without reference to infrastructure systems or that addressed resilience in unrelated sectors (e.g., personal or psychological resilience) were also excluded from the synthesis.

The literature selection process followed a multi-phase procedure. In the initial phase, search results were screened based on their titles and abstracts to determine preliminary relevance. This step aimed to eliminate obviously irrelevant studies and to narrow down the pool to a manageable number of potentially eligible documents. The second phase involved full-text screening of the shortlisted articles, which allowed for a more detailed assessment of their methodological quality, thematic fit, and empirical contribution. During this phase, articles were evaluated using a structured reading guide that included questions about research objectives, theoretical frameworks, methodological rigor, and policy relevance.

To minimize bias and enhance the reliability of the review process, at least two independent reviewers assessed each article during the full-text screening stage. Discrepancies in judgment were resolved through consensus discussions. This peer-validation step ensured that only studies meeting high academic standards were retained for in-depth analysis. A qualitative synthesis approach was applied to integrate findings from diverse methodological traditions and to extract cross-cutting themes. The analysis prioritized the identification of thematic clusters such as risk and impact assessment, resilience engineering and design, digital infrastructure monitoring, and governance and policy frameworks. These themes emerged organically during the iterative reading process and were subsequently used to organize the results section of the review.

In total, the literature search and selection process yielded a corpus of studies that collectively reflect the breadth and complexity of research in this domain. The resulting dataset serves as a robust foundation for analyzing current trends, identifying knowledge gaps, and generating actionable insights for policymakers, engineers, and disaster risk management professionals. Through this methodologically rigorous approach, the review contributes to advancing both theoretical understanding and practical solutions for enhancing the resilience of critical infrastructure in the face of natural hazards.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Risk and Impact Evaluation

Recent developments in multi-hazard risk assessment for critical infrastructure have demonstrated a shift towards integrative and data-driven approaches. Argyroudis et al., as cited in Bathgate et al. (2022), have introduced a comprehensive framework focusing on transportation infrastructure that accounts for the cumulative impacts of multiple hazards. Their method integrates spatial analysis and network modeling, allowing stakeholders to quantify resilience under compound hazard scenarios. This multidimensional approach is critical as infrastructure systems are rarely affected by isolated risks. Rather, they are vulnerable to sequences or combinations of hazards, which may include earthquakes followed by landslides or storms inducing both wind and flood damage. Koliou et al., interpreted through Osei-Kyei et al. (2022), further argue that assessing resilience requires understanding the interdependencies among infrastructure systems and socio-economic contexts, especially in urban centers where cascading failures can propagate quickly. The incorporation of such interdependencies enhances the strategic value of risk assessment tools by guiding targeted mitigation strategies.

To quantify the socio-economic impacts of infrastructure disruptions, empirical indicators have been developed across the literature. Bhatia et al., referenced in Wedawatta et al. (2016), propose a set of evaluation metrics including income loss, service downtime, and infrastructure repair costs. These indicators enable the translation of physical impacts into measurable economic losses, aiding prioritization of interventions. McDonald et al. (2020) stress the importance of considering recovery time and system interdependence in impact assessments. Their analysis suggests that recovery duration often correlates with indirect economic losses and societal stress. Similarly, Pregnolato et al. (2016) analyze the recovery trajectories of flood-affected transport systems, comparing actual performance metrics against predefined service standards to evaluate mitigation effectiveness. Their findings highlight that infrastructure designed with embedded redundancy tends to achieve faster and more cost-efficient recovery.

Nonetheless, the implementation of multi-hazard frameworks is not without challenges. Garschagen and Sandholz (2018) argue that many risk assessments remain mono-hazard focused due to data limitations and methodological constraints. These limitations restrict the capacity to capture the complex interactions among various hazard types. For instance, integrated assessments that link seismic activity to subsequent hydrological failures are scarce despite empirical evidence supporting such interactions. A broader issue, as reiterated by Osei-Kyei et al. (2022) and Bathgate et al. (2022), lies in the inadequate recognition of interdependencies within infrastructure systems. This oversight may result in underestimating compound risks and misallocating resources. It underscores the critical need for capacity building and methodological innovation to improve the resolution and scope of risk evaluations.

Policy integration within risk assessments has emerged as a vital theme in the literature. Dvir and Atoba (2025) emphasize that multi-stakeholder engagement is essential for developing adaptive and locally responsive policies. They advocate for evidence-based policymaking that aligns community-specific concerns with national and global strategies. This participatory approach ensures that risk assessments not only inform technical design but also embed resilience within institutional frameworks. Their model suggests that inter-sectoral dialogue and co-produced knowledge can improve the granularity and legitimacy of risk mitigation policies.

Design Strategy and Technology

Engineering innovations in infrastructure design are increasingly geared toward enhancing resilience to earthquakes, floods, and storms. Structural retrofitting using composite materials and base isolation techniques has gained prominence in earthquake-prone regions, offering enhanced energy dissipation and stability during seismic events (Bodas et al., 2022; Silver et al., 2019). In flood risk management, urban drainage systems are being redesigned using Integrated Stormwater Management (ISM) strategies that incorporate green infrastructure such as bioswales, retention basins, and permeable pavements. These nature-based solutions mitigate flood intensity while co-delivering ecological benefits (Espada et al., 2017). In coastal zones, Filippou et al. (2024) detail the use of wave-attenuating structural elements like buffer blocks, which protect building foundations from erosion and storm surges. Such hybrid solutions demonstrate how engineering can align with ecosystem services to reduce vulnerability and improve sustainability.

Cost-benefit optimization is a critical tool in evaluating retrofit feasibility and prioritization. Fang and Zio (2019) have introduced an adaptive framework that recalculates investment value based on evolving hazard exposure and projected damage costs. Their model uses multi-attribute utility theory to integrate financial, social, and technical dimensions of resilience planning. By simulating post-disaster recovery under varying conditions, stakeholders can compare alternative retrofit strategies not only by cost efficiency but also by risk reduction performance. Touili (2021) supports this approach, emphasizing scenario-based analysis to quantify avoided losses and long-term savings. Such evidence-based tools offer a more rational basis for allocating limited resources to critical infrastructure upgrades.

Digitalization and Monitoring System

The application of digital twin and remote sensing technologies is transforming the landscape of infrastructure monitoring and risk management. Digital twins, which replicate the physical infrastructure in a virtual environment, allow for real-time performance assessment and scenario simulations. According to Belokas et al. (2024) and Räikkönen et al. (2016), these tools facilitate proactive maintenance and failure prediction by visualizing structural stress and degradation. Remote sensing, particularly satellite and drone-based imagery, has been deployed to monitor environmental changes affecting infrastructure, such as land subsidence, vegetation cover loss, and water inundation patterns. Rezvani et al. (2024) demonstrate how these datasets can be integrated into GIS platforms to assess infrastructure vulnerability to climate-induced hazards. Gardoni and LaFave (2016) note that such technologies improve spatial and temporal resolution in risk analysis, offering more accurate diagnostics compared to conventional inspection methods.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) are also playing a pivotal role in predictive maintenance and disaster response planning. Fan et al. (2023) and Huang et al. (2022) show how

AI algorithms trained on historical sensor data can detect early warning signs of structural fatigue, corrosion, or hydraulic overloads. These systems outperform traditional models by continuously updating risk profiles as new data becomes available. Mohamed and Shen (2024) apply probabilistic AI models to simulate infrastructure failure under multiple disaster scenarios. Their results indicate that AI not only enhances prediction accuracy but also accelerates decision-making during emergencies. By automating data analysis and providing actionable insights, AI-based tools are proving indispensable for disaster resilience.

Globally, the integration of digital technologies into infrastructure resilience strategies varies significantly across regions. High-income countries have advanced capabilities in sensor deployment, data analytics, and AI integration. In contrast, developing countries often face technological and financial constraints that limit the uptake of such innovations. Nonetheless, the cost of entry is decreasing, and international development programs are increasingly supporting digital capacity building in vulnerable regions. Comparative studies suggest that hybrid approaches, combining low-cost remote sensing with community-based monitoring, can bridge technological gaps and enhance local resilience. This highlights the need for tailored strategies that consider resource availability, governance capacity, and environmental context.

Taken together, these findings affirm that improving critical infrastructure resilience requires a synthesis of multi-hazard risk assessment, engineering innovation, and digital transformation. While challenges remain—especially regarding data access, inter-system coordination, and equitable technology deployment—the literature provides a robust foundation for informed policy and practice. The results also demonstrate the importance of contextual adaptation, as resilience strategies must be attuned to the unique vulnerabilities and capacities of each region.

The findings of this review are largely congruent with existing resilience frameworks, particularly those emphasizing the importance of multi-hazard assessments and infrastructure interdependence. The incorporation of resilience-based design and advanced monitoring technologies reinforces theories that view infrastructure as a dynamic and adaptive system rather than a static asset. This is consistent with the integrated models suggested by Bathgate et al. (2022), who emphasized the increased exposure of infrastructure to compound flood risks under climate change conditions. Such an approach aligns with the broader literature, which advocates for the inclusion of socio-economic impact analyses within disaster risk assessments (Clark-Ginsberg et al., 2020).

However, this review also reveals significant gaps between theory and implementation. One recurring shortfall is the insufficient operationalization of interdependencies among infrastructure systems, as pointed out by Mclean and Becker (2019). Although many frameworks acknowledge these linkages, practical assessments and models often treat infrastructure components in isolation, thereby missing critical cascading effects during disasters. Furthermore, while newer methodologies such as digital twin and remote sensing technologies represent promising innovations, they are still underrepresented in much of the resilience literature (Silver et al., 2019). This indicates a lag in academic recognition of emerging tools that could substantially improve infrastructure performance and risk anticipation.

The practical implications of these findings are far-reaching, especially for policy development. First, there is a clear imperative for responsive and adaptive infrastructure policies that prioritize sustainability and flexibility. As Bodas et al. (2022) argue, participatory approaches in infrastructure planning that incorporate local stakeholder inputs can enhance both awareness and community readiness. This, in turn, fosters more grounded and contextually relevant policies. Additionally, the integration of technologies such as AI-driven monitoring systems and digital twins into policy design can significantly improve real-time decision-making. By leveraging these tools, governments can develop more accurate risk profiles and allocate resources with greater precision (Clark-Ginsberg et al., 2020; Silver et al., 2019).

Despite these potential gains, several barriers inhibit the implementation of the proposed strategies. Resource limitations, both financial and technical, pose a substantial constraint, particularly in developing countries. The deployment of advanced technologies often requires specialized expertise and infrastructure that may be lacking at the local level. Governance challenges further complicate implementation. Fragmented institutional responsibilities and limited policy coherence hinder cross-sectoral coordination. Mclean and Becker (2019) underscore the difficulty in aligning diverse regulatory frameworks, particularly when national and local priorities diverge. Without harmonized policy instruments, resilience efforts remain siloed and ineffective.

Another challenge is the inclusivity of resilience initiatives. Ensuring that policies and planning processes are equitable and responsive to marginalized populations is crucial. Uma et al. (2021) note that insufficient community engagement can weaken the legitimacy and effectiveness of resilience measures. When communities are excluded from decision-making, the resulting strategies may not align with local needs or capacities, thus reducing their overall impact. Additionally, managing infrastructure interdependence remains a daunting task. The complexity of modern systems and the unpredictability of hazard interactions require sophisticated tools and governance mechanisms, which are not yet uniformly in place.

The role of national policy frameworks and multilevel governance structures emerges as particularly critical in either enabling or constraining infrastructure resilience. National policies can provide the strategic direction, regulatory standards, and funding mechanisms necessary for effective implementation. Clark-Ginsberg et al. (2020) and Mallakpour et al. (2020) emphasize the value of standardized resilience metrics and policies that promote long-term infrastructure planning. However, in the absence of comprehensive and enforceable policies, initiatives tend to be reactive and disjointed, thereby weakening systemic resilience (Haraguchi & Kim, 2016).

Multilevel governance, involving national, regional, and local actors, plays a pivotal role in translating strategic objectives into operational actions. As Vivo et al. (2023) suggest, collaborative planning across governance tiers enhances resource allocation, capacity building, and the execution of mitigation strategies. Yet, mismatches in policy priorities and institutional capacities between levels of government often create implementation gaps. Effective communication channels and joint planning mechanisms are thus essential for coherence and mutual accountability (Wedawatta et al., 2016).

Nonetheless, even well-designed governance structures face practical limitations. Garschagen and Sandholz (2018), as well as Alyami et al. (2023), point to persistent ambiguity in policy directives and insufficient support for policy enforcement at the local level. This policy-practice gap not only undermines infrastructure resilience but also erodes public trust in governance systems. A lack of actionable information, compounded by uncertainty regarding roles and responsibilities during crises, exacerbates vulnerability. Bridging these divides requires transparent policymaking, inclusive dialogue, and sustained investment in institutional strengthening.

Addressing systemic barriers to resilience demands a combination of strategic approaches. First, strengthening multilevel governance and policy integration is essential. Mclean and Becker (2020) call for clearer coordination mechanisms between national and sub-national entities and the convergence of climate adaptation, disaster risk reduction, and infrastructure planning into a unified policy framework. Establishing integrated standards for infrastructure design and maintenance can simplify implementation and ensure consistency across sectors and regions.

Second, fostering stakeholder collaboration is imperative. Haraguchi & Kim (2016) and Silver et al. argue that engaging communities, private sector actors, and civil society organizations enriches the resilience discourse and facilitates innovation. Community-based adaptation models that include local knowledge and practices can significantly enhance disaster preparedness and adaptive capacity. Embedding such participatory mechanisms within formal planning processes can lead to more inclusive and effective resilience strategies.

Third, the adoption of evidence-based policymaking must be prioritized. As Bhatia et al. and Alyami et al. (2023) contend, empirical data is vital for identifying and addressing structural weaknesses. Risk modeling, particularly through multi-hazard simulations, can reveal interdependencies and systemic vulnerabilities that are not immediately apparent. The use of robust data analytics enables decision-makers to develop targeted interventions and to justify investments in resilience with greater confidence.

Finally, flexibility and responsiveness must be embedded within policy design. Resilience is not a static attribute but a dynamic capability that must evolve with changing risk landscapes. Adaptive policies that incorporate feedback loops, periodic evaluations, and contingency mechanisms are better equipped to handle emerging threats. Clark-Ginsberg et al. (2020) and Wedawatta et al. (2016) advocate for policy frameworks that can adjust to new information and shifting hazard profiles, thus sustaining infrastructure performance over time.

Taken together, these insights suggest that enhancing infrastructure resilience is a complex, multifaceted endeavor requiring coordinated action across sectors, scales, and knowledge systems. While current research provides valuable guidance, it also exposes substantial limitations in both theoretical understanding and practical application. Future research should focus on refining models that integrate technological advances, socio-political realities, and ecological constraints. Longitudinal studies and cross-country comparisons could yield deeper insights into what works, under what conditions, and why. Moreover, greater attention to the ethical and equity implications of resilience policies is needed to ensure that no community is left behind in the pursuit of safer, more sustainable infrastructure systems.

CONCLUSION

This review has synthesized current research on the resilience of critical infrastructure to natural hazards, highlighting the significance of integrating engineering innovation, digital technology, and multilevel governance to mitigate systemic vulnerabilities. Key findings underscore the need for multi-hazard risk assessments that recognize interdependencies among infrastructure systems, a gap still inadequately addressed in prevailing models. The incorporation of digital twin technologies, AI-driven monitoring, and nature-based solutions has shown promise in enhancing resilience, yet these remain underutilized, particularly in developing contexts. Practical challenges such as financial limitations, fragmented policy frameworks, and insufficient community engagement impede the effective implementation of resilience strategies.

The urgency to act is reinforced by the increasing frequency and intensity of climate-related disasters, demanding coordinated policy interventions and adaptive planning. Policy recommendations include the promotion of evidence-based and participatory infrastructure planning, investment in digital resilience tools, and the harmonization of national and local governance frameworks to ensure consistency and responsiveness. There is also a critical need to integrate resilience indicators into infrastructure standards and financing mechanisms.

Future research should aim to refine integrated models that bridge technological, environmental, and socio-political dimensions of resilience. Longitudinal and comparative studies across diverse geographic contexts would enrich our understanding of context-specific challenges and best practices. Ultimately, advancing critical infrastructure resilience will depend on our ability to align scientific innovation, policy coherence, and community empowerment to foster systems that can absorb, adapt to, and recover from disruptive events efficiently and equitably.

REFERENCES

Achour, N., Miyajima, M., Pascale, F., & Price, A. (2014). Hospital resilience to natural hazards: classification and performance of utilities. *Disaster Prevention and Management: An International Journal*, 23(1), 40–52. https://doi.org/10.1108/dpm-03-2013-0057

Afzal, S., Mokhlis, H., Illias, H., Bajwa, A., Mekhilef, S., Mubin, M., … & Shareef, H. (2023). Modelling spatiotemporal impact of flash floods on power distribution system and dynamic service restoration with renewable generators considering interdependent critical loads. *IET Generation Transmission & Distribution*, 18(2), 368–387. https://doi.org/10.1049/gtd2.12947

Alyami, S., Aal, A., Alqahtany, A., Aldossary, N., Jamil, R., Almohassen, A., … & Alsalem, A. (2023). Developing a holistic resilience framework for critical infrastructure networks of buildings and communities in Saudi Arabia. *Buildings*, 13(1), 179. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings13010179

Barroca, B., Clemente, M., & Yang, Z. (2023). Application of "behind the barriers" model at neighbourhood scale to improve water management under multi-risks scenarios: a case study in Lyon, France. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(3), 2587. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20032587

Bathgate, K., Cruz, A., & Zhang, Z. (2022). Quantitative analysis of Hurricane Harvey impacts on Texas maritime facilities. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 2676(7), 411–422. https://doi.org/10.1177/03611981221078574

Belokas, G., Saroglou, C., Moschovou, T., & Vlahogianni, E. (2024). An integrated infrastructure resilience approach, from the geotechnical asset to the transport network. *Eng—Advances in Engineering*, 5(2), 819–833. https://doi.org/10.3390/eng5020044

Bhatia, U., Kumar, D., Kodra, E., & Ganguly, A. (2015). Network science based quantification of resilience demonstrated on the Indian railways network. *PLoS ONE*, 10(11), e0141890. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0141890

Bodas, M., Peleg, K., Stolero, N., & Adini, B. (2022). Risk perception of natural and human-made disasters—cross sectional study in eight countries in Europe and beyond. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.825985

Braun, A., Stötzer, J., Kubisch, S., & Keller, S. (2018). Critical infrastructure analysis (CRITIS) in developing regions – designing an approach to analyse peripheral remoteness, risks of accessibility loss, and isolation due to road network insufficiencies in Chile. *GI_Forum*, 1, 302–321. https://doi.org/10.1553/giscience2018_02_s302

Clark-Ginsberg, A., Rueda, I., Monken, J., Liu, J., & Chen, H. (2020). Maintaining critical infrastructure resilience to natural hazards during the COVID-19 pandemic: Hurricane preparations by US energy companies. *Journal of Infrastructure Preservation and Resilience*, 1(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s43065-020-00010-1

Dobrev, N., Ivanov, P., Berov, B., Frantzova, A., & Krastanov, M. (2023). Scenario risk assessment of landslides – Asenovgrad mountain road. *Geologica Balcanica*, 52(2), 75–82. https://doi.org/10.52321/geolbalc.52.2.75

Dvir, R., & Atoba, K. (2025). Building resilience in Texas: Public views on critical infrastructure policies amid natural hazards. *Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy*, 16(2). https://doi.org/10.1002/rhc3.70008

Espada, R., Apan, A., & McDougall, K. (2015). Vulnerability assessment and interdependency analysis of critical infrastructures for climate adaptation and flood mitigation. *International Journal of Disaster Resilience in the Built Environment*, 6(3), 313–346. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijdrbe-02-2014-0019

Espada, R., Apan, A., & McDougall, K. (2017). Vulnerability assessment of urban community and critical infrastructures for integrated flood risk management and climate adaptation strategies. *International Journal of Disaster Resilience in the Built Environment*, 8(4), 375–411. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijdrbe-03-2015-0010

Faivre, G., Silva, G., Aimbie, J., Ware, D., Tomlinson, R., Mackey, B., … & Zhang, H. (2020). Coastal processes within a coral reef lagoon system: Erakor Lagoon, Efate Island, Vanuatu. *Journal of Coastal Research*, 95(sp1), 1427. https://doi.org/10.2112/si95-276.1

Fang, Y., & Zio, E. (2019). An adaptive robust framework for the optimization of the resilience of interdependent infrastructures under natural hazards. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 276(3), 1119–1136. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2019.01.052

Filippou, C., Votsis, R., Tantele, E., Marangos, O., Fotiou, K., & Kyriakides, N. (2024). GIS-based seismic risk and loss estimation platform for Cyprus. *Proceedings of SPIE*, 46. https://doi.org/10.1117/12.3037318

Gardoni, P., & LaFave, J. (2016). Multi-hazard approaches to civil infrastructure engineering: Mitigating risks and promoting resilience. In *Multi-Hazard Approaches to Civil Infrastructure Engineering* (pp. 3–12). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-29713-2_1

Garschagen, M., & Sandholz, S. (2018). The role of minimum supply and social vulnerability assessment for governing critical infrastructure failure: Current gaps and future agenda. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, 18(4), 1233–1246. https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-18-1233-2018

Haraguchi, M., & Kim, S. (2016). Critical infrastructure interdependence in New York City during Hurricane Sandy. *International Journal of Disaster Resilience in the Built Environment*, 7(2), 133–143. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijdrbe-03-2015-0015

Hassan, R., Yosri, A., Ezzeldin, M., & El-Dakhakhni, W. (2022). Robustness quantification of transit infrastructure under systemic risks: A hybrid network–analytics approach for resilience planning. *Journal of Transportation Engineering Part A: Systems*, 148(10). https://doi.org/10.1061/jtepbs.0000705

Koliou, M., Lindt, J., McAllister, T., Ellingwood, B., Dillard, M., & Cutler, H. (2018). State of the research in community resilience: Progress and challenges. *Sustainable and Resilient Infrastructure*, 5(3), 131–151. https://doi.org/10.1080/23789689.2017.1418547

Longo, A., Ardebili, A., Lazari, A., & Ficarella, A. (2025). Cyber–physical resilience: Evolution of concept, indicators, and legal frameworks. *Electronics*, 14(8), 1684. https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics14081684

Mallakpour, I., Sadegh, M., & AghaKouchak, A. (2020). Changes in the exposure of California's levee-protected critical infrastructure to flooding hazard in a warming climate. *Environmental Research Letters*, 15(6), 064032. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab80ed

McDonald, G., Tímár, L., McDonald, G., & Murray, C. (2020). Better resilience evaluation. *Bulletin of the New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering*, 53(4), 203–214. https://doi.org/10.5459/bnzsee.53.4.203-214

Melendez, A., Caballero-Russi, D., Soto, M., & Giraldo, L. (2021). Computational models of community resilience. *Natural Hazards*, 111(2), 1121–1152. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-021-05118-5

Osei-Kyei, R., Almeida, L., Ampratwum, G., & Tam, V. (2022). Systematic review of critical infrastructure resilience indicators. *Construction Innovation*, 23(5), 1210–1231. https://doi.org/10.1108/ci-03-2021-0047

Pamidimukkala, A., Kermanshachi, S., Adepu, N., & Safapour, E. (2021). Resilience in water infrastructures: A review of challenges and adoption strategies. *Sustainability*, 13(23), 12986. https://doi.org/10.3390/su132312986

Mohamed, K., & Shen, J. (2024). Exploring the potential for incorporating artificial intelligence in highway resilience to climate change. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*. https://doi.org/10.1177/03611981241253610

Ni, M., Xia, L., Wang, X., Wei, Y., Han, X., Liu, Y., … & Pan, S. (2025). Psychological influences and implications for household disaster preparedness: a systematic review. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2025.1457406

Pathirage, C., & Al-Khaili, K. (2016). Disaster vulnerability of Emirati energy sector and barriers to enhance resilience. *Built Environment Project and Asset Management*, 6(4), 403–414. https://doi.org/10.1108/bepam-08-2015-0035

Pregnolato, M., Ford, A., Robson, C., Glenis, V., Barr, S., & Dawson, R. (2016). Assessing urban strategies for reducing the impacts of extreme weather on infrastructure networks. *Royal Society Open Science*, 3(5), 160023. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.160023

Randeniya, M., Palliyaguru, R., & Amaratunga, D. (2023). Legal and policy provisions for protecting energy and telecommunication infrastructure against hazards: Comparison between Sri Lanka and other countries. https://doi.org/10.31705/wcs.2023.57

Ravadanegh, S., Jamali, S., & Mohammadi, A. (2022). Multi-infrastructure energy systems resiliency assessment in the presence of multi-hazards disasters. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 79, 103687. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2022.103687

Rezvani, S., Silva, M., & Almeida, N. (2024). Mapping geospatial AI flood risk in national road networks. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information*, 13(9), 323. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijgi13090323

Sajjad, M., Li, Y., Tang, Z., Cao, L., & Liu, X. (2018). Assessing hazard vulnerability, habitat conservation, and restoration for the enhancement of mainland China's coastal resilience. *Earth's Future*, 6(3), 326–338. https://doi.org/10.1002/2017ef000676

Silver, J., Arkema, K., Griffin, R., Lashley, B., Lemay, M., Maldonado, S., … & Verutes, G. (2019). Advancing coastal risk reduction science and implementation by accounting for climate, ecosystems, and people. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 6. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2019.00556

Sterlacchini, S., Bordogna, G., Cappellini, G., & Voltolina, D. (2018). SIRENE: A spatial data infrastructure to enhance communities' resilience to disaster-related emergency. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Science*, 9(1), 129–142. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13753-018-0160-2

Sun, P., Entress, R., Tyler, J., Sadiq, A., & Noonan, D. (2023). Critical public infrastructure underwater: The flood hazard profile of Florida hospitals. *Natural Hazards*, 117(1), 473–489. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-023-05869-3

Sweya, L., Manoga, R., & Norbert, J. (2021). Resilience to flood hazards: Awareness for the water supply infrastructure. *Water and Environment Journal*, 35(3), 951–961. https://doi.org/10.1111/wej.12685

Touili, N. (2021). Hazards, infrastructure networks and unspecific resilience. *Sustainability*, 13(9), 4972. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13094972

Uma, S., Scheele, F., Abbott, E., & Moratalla, J. (2021). Planning for resilience of water networks under earthquake hazard. *Bulletin of the New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering*, 54(2), 135–152. https://doi.org/10.5459/bnzsee.54.2.135-152

Vallecha, H., Gebreslassie, M., Filli, F., Hara, C., Gogoda, C., Assefa, A., … & Broto, V. (2025). How to build resilient community energy systems? Lessons from Malawi and Ethiopia. *Environmental Research Infrastructure and Sustainability*, 5(1), 015013. https://doi.org/10.1088/2634-4505/adb0eb

Verschuur, J., Koks, E., Li, S., & Hall, J. (2023). Multi-hazard risk to global port infrastructure and resulting trade and logistics losses. *Communications Earth & Environment*, 4(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-022-00656-7

Vivo, C., Barbato, G., Ellena, M., Capozzi, V., Budillon, G., & Mercogliano, P. (2023). Climate-risk assessment framework for airports under extreme precipitation events: Application to selected Italian case studies. *Sustainability*, 15(9), 7300. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15097300

Wang, F., Tian, J., & Xu, Z. (2024). The development of resilience research in critical infrastructure systems: A bibliometric perspective. *Risk Analysis*, 45(5), 1072–1104. https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.17648

Wedawatta, G., Kulatunga, U., Amaratunga, D., & Ahmed, P. (2016). Disaster risk reduction infrastructure requirements for south-western Bangladesh. *Built Environment Project and Asset Management*, 6(4), 379–390. https://doi.org/10.1108/bepam-06-2015-0022

Yang, Y., Guo, H., Chen, L., Liu, X., Gu, M., & Pan, W. (2020). Multiattribute decision making for the assessment of disaster resilience in the Three Gorges Reservoir Area. *Ecology and Society*, 25(2). https://doi.org/10.5751/es-11464-250205

Yadav, N., Chatterjee, S., & Ganguly, A. (2020). Resilience of urban transport network-of-networks under intense flood hazards exacerbated by targeted attacks. *Scientific Reports*, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-66049-y